

Effects of the Monterey Amendments and Alternatives on Historic State Water Project Allocations

California Department of Water Resources

August 2007

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Period of Analysis.....	6
1.2 SWP Allocations vs. SWP Deliveries.....	7
2.0 METHODS	7
2.1 Baseline Assumptions.....	7
2.1.1 SWP Water Supply	7
2.1.2 Table A Amounts.....	8
2.1.3 Baseline Table A Requests	9
2.2. Assumptions for Evaluation of Alternatives.....	9
2.2.1. Monterey Plus	10
2.2.2 No Project Alternative 1	10
2.2.2.1 NPA1 Table A Amounts.....	10
2.2.2.2 NPA1 Table A Requests	11
2.2.3 Court-Ordered No Projects	11
2.2.3.1 CNP Table A Amounts	12
2.2.3.2 CNP Table A Requests and Ex-Table A Requests	12
2.3. Allocation Methods.....	12
2.3.1 AG and M&I Table A Amounts	13
2.3.2 SWP Water Supply	13
2.3.3 Allocation Calculations.....	13
2.3.3.1 Allocation of Table A in the Baseline.....	14
2.3.3.2 Allocation of Table A in the Proposed Project.....	14
2.3.3.3 Allocation of Table A in NPA1	14
2.3.4 CNP Water Allocations.....	14
2.3.4.1 Allocating XA Water in CNP Alternative 3	15
2.3.4.2 Allocating Scheduled Surplus Water For CNP Alternative 4.....	15
3.0 RESULTS	16
3.1 Effects of the Proposed Project.....	17
3.1.1 Effects of the Proposed Project on M&I Contractors With No Table A Transfers – Group One.....	17
3.1.2 Effects of the Proposed Project on Agricultural Contractors With No Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Two	18
3.1.3 Effects of the Proposed Project on M&I Contractors With Table A Transfers – Group Three.....	19
3.1.3.1 Napa County FC&WCD.....	19
3.1.3.2 Solano County WA.....	20
3.1.3.3 Alameda County FC&WCD, Zone 7.....	20
3.1.3.4 Castaic Lake WA	20
3.1.3.5 Mojave WA.....	21
3.1.3.6 Palmdale WA	21
3.1.4. Effects of Proposed Project on Agricultural Contractors With Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Four	21
3.1.4.1 Dudley Ridge	21
3.1.4.2 KCWA	22

3.1.5. Summary of Proposed Project’s Effects	22
3.1.5.1 Effect of Table A Retirement.....	22
3.1.5.2 Effect of Article 18(a) Change.....	23
3.1.5.3 Effect of Table A Transfers	23
3.2 Effects of NPA1	24
3.2.1 Effects of NPA1 on M&I Contractors With No Table A Transfers – Group One	24
3.2.2. Effects of NPA1 on Agricultural Contractors With No Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Two.....	24
3.2.3. Effects of NPA1 on M&I Contractors That Transferred Table A – Group Three.....	24
3.2.4. Effects of NPA1 on Agricultural Contractors That Transferred Table A – Group Four	25
3.2.5. Summary of NPA1 Effects	25
3.2.5.4 Long-Term Effects of NPA1	26
3.3 Effects of CNP	26
3.3.1 Effects of CNPA3	27
3.3.1.1 Effects of CNPA3 on M&I Contractors.....	27
3.3.1.2 Effects of CNPA3 on Agricultural Contractors	28
3.3.2 Effects of CNPA4	28
3.3.2.1 Effects of CNPA4 on AG Contractors.....	28
3.3.2.2 Effects of CNPA4 on M&I Contractors.....	29
3.3.2.3 Effects of CNPA4 on M&I Contractors with high amounts of groundwater replenishment or agricultural water use.....	29
3.4 Summary of CNP Effects.....	29
3.4.1 Table A.....	29
3.4.2 Article 18(a).....	30
3.4.3 Scheduled Surplus and EX-Table A Water	30
3.4.4. Long-Term Effects of CNP.....	30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to use historical data to evaluate the effects of the Monterey Amendments and other alternatives for the Monterey Plus EIR on State Water Project (SWP) water supplies to contractors. The analysis relies on numerous assumptions that may not necessarily reflect what actually could have occurred in the absence of the Monterey Amendments, but the results provide useful data to quantitatively assess some effects of the Monterey Amendments. This study uses historic SWP contractors' requests and other data to evaluate SWP allocations from 1996 to 2005. Because SWP water supplies were not sufficient to meet SWP contractor demands in all years from 1996 to 2005, the Baseline's pre-Monterey Amendments Article 18(a) allocation provisions for water shortages would have substantially affected SWP allocations.

To report the effects of the proposed project, this study organizes the SWP contractors into four groups based on whether a contractor is an Agricultural (AG) or Municipal and Industrial (M&I) contractor and whether a contractor participated in a proposed project-related Table A transfer or retirement (Table HA-6). These are the two most significant factors affecting Table A allocations under the proposed project. The proposed project's Article 18(a) changes reduced M&I Table A allocations in some years of this analysis. M&I contractors that purchased Table A amounts from AG contractors reduced or eliminated the effect of the proposed project's Article 18(a) changes. In contrast to M&I contractors, the proposed project's Article 18(a) changes increased Table A allocations for AG contractors. Agricultural contractors that reduced their Table A amount through a transfer or retirement received less water in some years when this reduction was not offset by the increase in AG Table A allocations caused by the proposed project's Article 18(a) change.

The annual effect of the proposed project's Article 18(a) change depends on the SWP's annual hydrology because the inability of the SWP to satisfy 100% of Table A requests in any year activates the Article 18(a) AG-first reduction in the Baseline. This reduction, however, is limited to a cumulative total of 100% over a seven-year period. Consequently, there may be years in any seven-year period when there is no effect from the proposed project's Article 18(a) changes because the Baseline's cumulative limit on Article 18(a) AG-first reductions has been reached. In these years, the Department applies Article 18(a) the same way in the proposed project and the Baseline. This occurred in 2003-2005.

The proposed project included and possibly facilitated many individual Table A transfers from AG contractors to M&I contractors. In general, AG contractors that sold Table A amounts receive reduced Table A allocations, while M&I contractors that purchased Table A amounts receive increased Table A allocations. The specific change in Table A allocation will vary depending on the size of the Table A amount transferred and the annual SWP Table A allocation. The straightforward effect of a Table A transfer, however, interacts with the other effects of the proposed project, especially the Article 18(a) revision. This occurs because the proposed project's Article 18(a) effects can exercise a greater influence on Table A allocations in some years than the proposed project's Table A amount transfers. In the case of some contractors, such as Zone 7 and Castaic, the Table A amount transfer's effect clearly dominates Table A

allocations because these contractors increased their Table A amounts by 33% and 40%, respectively, through proposed project-related transfers.

Finally, the study showed that the Monterey Amendments' retirement of 45,000 AF generally increased allocations by a small amount for most contractors. This effect occurs in every year of the study, but the Article 18(a) changes and Table A transfers overshadow its effect for many contractors. This effect is most noticeable in contractors that did not purchase Table A amounts and in years when the Article 18(a) AG-first shortage provision is not applied.

The No Project Alternative 1 (NPA1) alternative had few Table A allocation effects because it did not include any Table A retirements or any revisions of Article 18(a) procedures. The only effects of NPA1 were changes in specific SWP contractor's Table A allocations if they engaged in Table A amount sales or purchases. Contractors that purchased Table A amounts in NPA1 received higher allocations of Table A water in NPA1 than the Baseline. Contractors that sold Table A amounts received lower Table A allocations than in the Baseline.

The Court-Ordered No Project (CNP) alternatives invoke Article 18(b) of the SWP contracts, which reduces the total SWP Table A amount to 1.9 million acre-feet (MAF) by proportionately reducing all contractors' Table A amounts accordingly. The CNP greatly reduces Table A allocations to all contractors, but there is a much higher likelihood that all contractors will annually receive 100% of their reduced amount. In years when there is less than 1.9 MAF of water available to the SWP, CNP causes no Table A allocation changes.

Under current operations, there would be many years when the SWP water supply available for allocation exceeds 1.9 MAF. In these years, it is unclear how the Department of Water Resources (the Department) would allocate the remaining water after it satisfied all Table A amount requests. For this reason, CNP is subdivided into two possible alternatives, CNP Alternative 3 (CNPA3) and CNP Alternative 4 (CNPA4). The CNPA3 allocates all the remaining water that can be allocated and scheduled for delivery according to each contractor's share of the total Table A amounts. In CNPA3, the water available beyond 1.9 MAF is called XA water, shorthand for ex-Table A water. The CNPA4 allocates all remaining SWP water that can be allocated and scheduled for delivery according to the allocation rules in Article 21 of the pre-Monterey SWP contracts; essentially, the water available beyond 1.9 MAF is referred to and treated as scheduled surplus water. In short, both CNPA3 and CNPA4 reduced water allocations to almost all M&I (Municipal and Industrial) contractors while increasing water allocations to AG (Agricultural) contractors.

CNPA3 reduced overall water deliveries to selected M&I contractors by 1 – 15% during 1999-2002 and caused minimal changes in 1996-1998 (including a less than 1% increase in 1998) due to the available water beyond the 1.9 MAF. Article 18(a) was not as beneficial to contractors with M&I Table A amounts in CNP because there is less M&I Table A that received priority when 18(a) was applied. Conversely, contractors with AG Table A received increased allocations, especially in 2001 (257%), in years when Article 18(a) was applied. The application of Article 18(a) to only the reduced 1.9 MAF of Table A amount instead of the Baseline's 4.2 MAF is responsible for virtually all the effects of CNPA3.

CNPA4 reduced overall water deliveries to most M&I contractors by 4– 32% during the 1999-2005 time period. During the years from 1996 through 1998, deliveries were reduced by about 1% relative to the baseline because of the retirement of 45,000 AF of Table A. The reduced application of 18(a) to only 1.9 MAF accounts for some of these changes, but more importantly, the allocation of scheduled surplus water in accordance with the pre-Monterey Article 21 allocates most of the remaining scheduled surplus (SS) water to AG contractors. This increased total water allocations to AG contractors during 1999-2005. A few M&I contractors that were assigned high levels of groundwater replenishment use also received higher allocations in some years in CNPA4.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This study uses historical data to evaluate the effects of the Monterey Amendments and other alternatives on SWP Table A allocations. It focuses on the provisions in each alternative that have the greatest effect on the Department's SWP allocations to SWP contractors in each alternative. These provisions are changes in the Table A amounts of certain SWP contractors, modification of Article 18(a) provisions, and invocation of Article 18(b).

Note: This report utilizes terms such as: proposed project, No Project Alternative 1, Court-Ordered No Project Alternative 3, etc. These terms are used in order to stay consistent with the Monterey Plus EIR. For a more thorough explanation of the proposed project and alternatives, refer to the appropriate chapter in the main body of the Monterey Plus EIR.

1.1 Period of Analysis

The period 1996-2005 provides an interesting set of years to evaluate the EIR's alternatives. The period 1996-2000 was a consistently "wet" period (four "wet" and one "above normal" years), while the 2001-2005 period was variable with two "dry," one "below normal," and two "above normal" years. The SWP contractors' Table A requests during 1996-2000 were variable and less than the total maximum Table A amount of the SWP, but requests in 2001 and 2003-2005 were uniformly equal to the contractors' total maximum Table A amounts. As a result, the SWP had sufficient water supply available to satisfy essentially all contractor requests for water during 1996-1999, but the SWP contractors' requests for water exceeded the SWP's water supply during 2000-2005. Also, beginning in 1996, SWP contractors made numerous proposed project-related Table A amount changes and transfers.

It must be noted, however, that the actual amount of water allocated by the Department in each of these years was used as the available supply, which was then redistributed in accordance with the rules appropriate to each alternative. Because the actual allocation was based on the proposed project after retirement of 45,000 AF of Table A, the amount of water in the baseline and other alternatives was insufficient by 45,000 AF to satisfy all Table A requests in the wetter years.

In hindsight and assuming that the SWP did not adopt the Monterey Amendments in the mid-1990s, the interaction of California's annual hydrology and SWP contractors' water requests on the SWP's annual water allocations would have challenged the Department's management of the SWP. Unable to fully satisfy all Table A requests, the Department would have had to impose Article 18(a) reductions on agricultural contractors in order to meet the requests of M&I contractors. Tables HA-1 and HA-2 show the probable Article 18(a) allocation actions that the Department would have executed during 1996-2005 under the Baseline contractual provisions that existed prior to implementation of the Monterey Amendments. Due to the post-1999 water allocation shortages, the Baseline's pre-Monterey Amendments Article 18(a) allocation provisions for water shortages would have substantially affected SWP allocations during these years. Comparing each alternative's 1996-2005 allocations to the Baseline's 1996-2005

allocations demonstrates the effects the alternatives' water shortage provisions have on SWP allocations.

The Baseline's Article 18(a) water shortage provisions only affect SWP allocations in years when the SWP does not have enough water available to meet SWP contractors' requests. Analysis of the 1996-1998 period demonstrates that Article 18(a) effects of the proposed project and NPA1 on allocations were non-existent because the SWP had sufficient water supply to fully satisfy requests. In addition, since SWP contractors made relatively few changes to SWP Table A amounts during 1996-1998¹, the proposed project's and NPA1's various Table A changes did not substantially alter the SWP's allocations during any year within this period. The 1996-1998 years also showed that the CNP did not have a net affect on the amount of water the contractors ultimately received because the SWP had enough available water to satisfy all contractors regardless of invocation of 18(b). For the above reasons, this study focuses on results from 1999 to 2005.

1.2 SWP Allocations vs. SWP Deliveries

This study evaluates the EIR alternatives' effects on SWP Table A allocations². Because the EIR team utilized CALSIM II to simulate SWP deliveries, the analyses of CALSIM II deliveries may show different results than this study's analyses of SWP allocations. The difference between each contractor's requests and the contractor's deliveries varies among contractors and from year to year.

2.0 METHODS

This section describes the variables, assumptions, and analytical methods used in this study.

2.1 Baseline Assumptions

This study uses adjusted SWP Annual Table A amounts to SWP water data to establish annual Baseline deliveries to SWP contractors from 1996-2005.

2.1.1 SWP Water Supply

This study uses final State Water Project Analysis Office (SWPAO) *Notices to State Water Project Contractors*³ to determine the total SWP water supply available for meeting contractors' annual requests. The Department usually announces the SWP's final annual water supply in late

¹ Dudley Ridge and KCWA collectively retired 45,000 AF of Table A amount, and Mojave acquired 25,000 AF of Table A amount from KCWA in 1998. These actions would have slightly affected the individual allocations to Dudley Ridge and KCWA and Mojave, but the Table A changes did not affect total SWP Table A allocations because all contractor Table A requests were fully met during 1996-1998.

² SWP Table A allocations are different from SWP water deliveries. SWP contractors may request their full Table A amounts, receive a smaller Table A allocation, and then take only a portion of their allocated Table A water for delivery in that year. Therefore, a contractor's annual "request" can differ from its actual "demand," and Table A allocations may differ from actual water deliveries.

³ The SWPAO Allocation Notices are available at <http://www.swpao.water.ca.gov/notices/index.cfm>.

spring after extensive evaluations of Central Valley hydrological data. This study assumes that the Baseline's SWP water supply and alternatives' water supply in all years would have been identical to the actual historical water supply available to the SWP. In addition, this study assumes in the Baseline and all alternatives that the Department would not have acquired additional water for the SWP to allocate through altered operations or from other sources.

2.1.2 Table A Amounts

Each contractor's annual Table A amount is an essential component of this historical analysis because it determines the Department's allocation of water among all the SWP contractors. A contractor's Table A amount indicates the maximum amount of Table A water it may request in a particular year and the maximum Table A that the Department will allocate to it in that year.

Each contractor determined schedules for their annual Table A amounts during the original SWP contract negotiations and approvals. In general, most contractors' Table A amounts started out fairly low when the project first began operating in the 1960's, but then ramped up in successive years. Some contractors' Table A amounts reached their maximums by 1994, but other contractors' Table A amounts continued to increase. Other contractors amended their contracts to change their scheduled Table A amounts. Because of these complexities, the study carefully tracked Table A amounts in each year to ensure that scheduled contractual increases in Table A amounts did not influence or confound the evaluation of the proposed project or alternatives.

In each year of analysis, the study uses each contractor's actual, historic Table A amount for the years 1996-2005. Since some of these include the proposed project's Table A transfers and Table A retirements, this study computes Baseline Table A amounts by removing the proposed project-related Table A changes from the contractual Table A amounts. Removal of proposed project-related Table A changes and retention of other Table A changes unrelated to the proposed project ensures an accurate determination of effects and not exaggerated or artificial effects due to other unrelated changes in a contractor's Table A amount⁴. The need for careful construction of the Baseline in this analysis is because of the complexity of analyzing the past

⁴ For example, if Contractor X had an actual Table A amount of 100 TAF in the year 2000, but 25 TAF of this was the result of a Project-related Table A amount transfer implemented in the year 2000, then the Baseline Table A amount for Contractor X in 2000 would be 75 TAF (100 - 25 TAF). If Contractor X had a Table A amount in 1999 of 150 TAF, but it entered into an independent, unrelated 10-year agreement with the Department to reduce its Table A amount by 75 TAF in every subsequent year, its Table A amount in the Baseline for the year 2000 would remain 75 TAF. If the year 2000 Baseline Table A amount for Contractor X was set or "frozen" at the 1999 amount, however, it would be 150 AF in 2000. In this case, a comparison of the Baseline to the Project would indicate that the Project caused a reduction in Contractor X's Table A amount of 50 AF in the year 2000 (150 AF compared to 100 AF). This is clearly an erroneous conclusion because the fact is that the Project in this example included a purchase of 25 AF of Table A amount from another contractor, which was implemented in 2000. The real effect of the Project in the year 2000, then, must be an increase in X's Table A amount of 25 AF (100 AF compared to 75 AF). This brief example shows that including the non-Project related Table A amount changes in the Baseline as well as the Project reveals the true effect of the Project and the Project only. Conversely, failing to adjust the Baseline Table A amounts to incorporate actions that have already occurred obscures results and can even lead to opposite, erroneous conclusions about the effects of the Project. In this example, the "frozen" Baseline method would have led to the conclusion that the Project caused a decrease in Contractor X's Table A amount, and related water allocations, when in fact the proper effect determination is that the Project caused an increase in Table A amount and related allocations.

impacts of proposed project actions that have already been completed in the midst of many other non-proposed project actions that have also been completed in the past. Table HA-3 lists the contractors whose actual, historic Table A amounts were adjusted to create their Baseline Table A amounts. Table HA-3 also indicates the reason for the Table A amount adjustment.

2.1.3 Baseline Table A Requests

The requests⁵ of the SWP contractors in each year are another important component of the historical analysis. The study uses the actual historical requests of AG and M&I contractors to estimate SWP contractors' requests for the Baseline. Since the 1980's, Agricultural contractors routinely requested 100% of their Table A amounts. This study assumes that agricultural contractors' requests remained 100% of their Table A amounts for the Baseline and all alternatives.⁶

By the 1990's, many M&I contractors were also requesting their full Table A amounts. In 1999, 2000, and 2002, there were still a few M&I contractors that did not request 100% of their Table A; the most notable example is MWD, which holds almost 50% of the total SWP Table A. However, in 2001 and in 2003 and all subsequent years, all contractors requested 100% of their Table A amounts.

An important effect of these assumptions is that the Baseline's total AG Table A amounts and total SWP Table A requests are greater than the historic total AG Table A amounts and requests that occurred during 1996-2005. Table HA-4 lists the Table A amount values used by this study for each contractor in each alternative. In these years, the Baseline AG Table A amounts are greater than in the proposed project because the Baseline has no retirement of Table A amounts. Additionally, since this study assumes that AG contractors always request 100% of their Table A amounts and several M&I contractors that acquired Table A amounts did not request 100% of their Table A amounts in several years of this study, the Baseline has a greater total SWP Table A request than the proposed project.

2.2. Assumptions for Evaluation of Alternatives

To represent each alternative most accurately, the study made assumptions about certain variables, particularly those that change in the alternatives. Table HA-5 lists this study's provisions or assumptions for the Baseline and each alternative regarding the major variables that are the focus of this analysis.

⁵ Request and demand are often used interchangeably, but the two words have different meanings in the context of the SWP. It is also important to understand that what contractors request often differs from what they actually end up taking from the SWP in the form of deliveries, which complicates any attempt to compare actual delivery values with values predicted by this historic analysis.

⁶ The study also assumes that CLWA requests all of the transferred 12,700 AF of Table A that it acquired from Devil's Den.

2.2.1. Monterey Plus

The proposed project incorporates all Table A actions that occurred after implementation of the Monterey Amendments during the period 1996-2005. The proposed project's Table A amounts include the actual Table A transfers from KCWA and Tulare to SWP M&I contractors. It also includes the retirement of Table A amounts by KCWA and Dudley Ridge. Additionally, the proposed project alternative includes Dudley Ridge's purchase of 3,973 acre-feet (AF) of Table A amount from Tulare. Table HA-4 summarizes Table A amounts under the proposed project.

This study uses the final SWPAO *Notice to State Water Project Contractors* to determine total SWP requests in each year. These actual requests occurred after implementation of the provisions in the Monterey Amendments.

2.2.2 No Project Alternative 1

This study assumes that No Project Alternative 1 (NPA1) does not invoke Article 18(b) and that the Monterey Amendments are not in effect. It also assumes that transfers of Table A amounts remain the same as found in the Baseline. Since this study utilizes historic SWP water supply determinations to determine alternatives' allocations and the SWP did not develop conservation storage in the Kern Fan Element property during 1996-2005, this study does not evaluate the potential water allocation effects of SWP storage in the Kern Fan Element property.

2.2.2.1 NPA1 Table A Amounts

As mentioned, this study incorporates the Table A amount transfers already implemented as part of the proposed project. The NPA1 assumes that no contractor would retire Table A amounts.

To evaluate the effects of Table A transfers, this study maintained the distinction between Agricultural Table A (AG Table A) and Municipal and Industrial Table A (M&I Table A) for each contractor's Table A amount. In this study, the designation of AG or M&I always remains with the Table A amounts regardless of whether they are transferred from an AG contractor to an M&I contractor because this allows Article 18(a) to be effectively implemented.⁷

The study also assumes that the transfers would have been implemented in the NPA1 in the same year they were actually implemented in the proposed project. Table A amounts of other SWP contractors did not change as a result of NPA1 and remained the same as those in the Baseline, listed in Table HA-4.

⁷ Although the SWP long-term water supply contracts did not designate each contractor's Table A amount as "AG" or "M&I" for purposes of applying 18(a), the amounts and proportions of contractors' Table A used for agriculture and Table A used for M&I affected SWP allocations during dry periods. The preservation of the AG and M&I designations is included in the provisions of the 1991 Table A transfer from Devil's Den Water District to Castaic Lake W.A.; Castaic Lake's contract amendment for the Table A acquisition included Castaic Lake's agreement to classify water requests for the acquired Table A amount as agricultural use.

2.2.2.2 NPA1 Table A Requests

As noted earlier in the Baseline discussion, this study uses the actual historical requests of agricultural and M&I contractors as the requests for the Baseline and the NPAs. Agricultural contractor requests remain 100% of Table A in all scenarios.⁸ M&I requests also remain the same in all scenarios. NPA1's Table A requests are greater than the proposed project's total SWP requests, for the same reason as explained in the Baseline discussion.

NPA1's total of AG Table A amounts is greater than the proposed project total of AG Table A amounts because the NPAs include fewer transfers of AG Table A amounts to M&I contractors and there is no retirement of Table A amount by KCWA and Dudley Ridge. Since M&I contractor requests were not 100% of their Table A until 2001, while agricultural contractors always request 100% of their Table A during the analysis period, some initial Table A transfers reduced requests associated with AG Table A amounts.

2.2.3 Court-Ordered No Projects

In September 2000, the California State Court of Appeal ordered the Department to analyze a no project alternative that included invocation of Article 18(b) of the pre-Monterey Amendments long-term water supply contracts. The Court-Ordered No Projects (CNP) analyze the Department's invocation and implementation of Article 18(b). The proposed project, in fact, eliminated Article 18(b) from the SWP contracts. Part of the value of analyzing the implementation of Article 18(b) in the CNP is to assess the effects of the elimination of Article 18(b). Article 18(b) of the original long-term water supply contracts stated that in the case of a permanent shortage of SWP water the Director could reduce all contractors' Table A amounts to the minimum project yield as determined by special coordinated operations studies conducted by the Department.

Although Article 18(b) was part of the original long-term water supply contracts, the Department had never invoked it during the first 30 years of SWP operation. Consequently, there is no course of practice or routine methodology to guide development of this alternative. This study analyzes the effects of invoking of 18(b) during 1996-2005. As previously mentioned, the CNP results are not only useful to demonstrate the effects of invoking Article 18(b), but also to determine the proposed project's effect of removing Article 18(b) of the SWP contracts because evaluating what possibilities were lost with the removal of Article 18(b) is only possible if the effects and usefulness of invoking Article 18(b) are examined. Department staff developed the CNP based on interpretations and predictions of what might occur (might have occurred) if the Director invoked Article 18(b). Department staff also used the Settlement Agreement, the Third District Court of Appeal's *PCL et al. v. Department of Water Resources* decision, and EIR committee comments to develop CNP's description.

⁸ The study also assumes that CLWA requests all of the transferred 12,700 AF of Table A that it acquired from Devil's Den.

2.2.3.1 CNP Table A Amounts

In the CNP alternatives, the Department reduces the total Table A amount of the SWP to the “minimum project yield.” CALSIM II modeling studies performed as part of the Monterey Plus EIR effort determined that the SWP could consistently deliver 1.9 MAF of Table A amount in all but the driest years. The 1.9 MAF amount is close to, but actually less than, numerous values reported in Department publications.⁹

To determine contractors’ Table A amounts, all contractors’ Baseline Table A amounts were reduced proportionately regardless of whether they were agricultural or municipal contractors. The reduction procedure multiplied each contractor’s Table A amount in a particular year by the fraction of 1.9 million divided by the total Baseline SWP Table A amount for that year. This procedure decreased each contractor’s Table A amount by roughly 52% each year. Table A amounts for the CNP are listed in Table HA-4.

2.2.3.2 CNP Table A Requests and Ex-Table A Requests

This study used actual historical requests of each contractor to determine the Table A requests for the CNP. Historically, only a few contractors requested less Table A water than their new, reduced Table A amount under the CNP. As a result, the vast majority of contractors request all their Table A amount in the CNP during 1996-2005.

In most cases, a contractor’s historical Table A request exceeds its CNP reduced Table A amount. As a result, requests for SWP water remain after all Table A amounts have been filled. In the Baseline, that requested water is simply part of contractors’ Table A requests, but in the CNP it can not be considered part of the Table A requests because the contractors do not have that much Table A amount. Consequently, this study computes the difference between each contractor’s historical Table A request and its CNP Table A request and considers this amount an additional request for additional SWP water.¹⁰

2.3. Allocation Methods

Earlier discussion described the classification of Table A amounts as either AG or M&I. The CNP analysis also keeps AG Table A and M&I Table A separate, chiefly for implementation of Article 18(a).¹¹

⁹ See Bulletins 160-87 (p.24), 160-93 (p.63), 160-98 (p.3-33), 132-90 (p.86), 132-93 (p.18).

¹⁰ For example, assume Contractor X had a Baseline Table A amount of 100 AF in the year 2000 and requested all 100 AF of its Table A, then Contractor X would only have 45 AF of Table A amount in No Project B in that year. For the year 2000 in No Project B, Contractor X’s Table A request would be 45 AF and its additional SWP water request would be 55 AF.

¹¹ The literal language of Article 18(a) does not expressly call for such a rigid distinction between AG and M&I Table A amounts. Instead, Article 18(a) uses the terminology agricultural, groundwater, and municipal uses.

2.3.1 AG and M&I Table A Amounts

If contractors' requests exceed the SWP's water supply in any year, the Baseline's Article 18(a) requires a reduction in agricultural allocations before reducing municipal allocations. To analyze how Article 18(a) and the revisions of Article 18(a) in the proposed project affect Table A allocations, this study assumes that the AG and M&I labels that were attached to Table A amounts in the Baseline remain with those Table A amounts regardless of whether a contractor transfers Table A amounts in the NPAs. This practice is consistent with the Department's treatment of the 12,700 AF of Table A amount that CLWA purchased from Devil's Den Water District in 1991.

2.3.2 SWP Water Supply

Each year the SWP determines the amount of Table A water for delivery to its contractors. The amount allocated depends on the hydrology, SWP operational capabilities, and regulatory limitations of that particular year. The SWP water supply for Table A allocation is the most crucial input in the historic analysis.

This study uses the historic final SWP Table A allocations during 1996-2005 to represent the maximum amount of Table A water available to the SWP in each of those years and for all alternatives. In effect, this assumption made the historical SWP allocation in each year the total amount of water that could be allocated as Table A under any of the alternatives in that year.¹² While use of the historic SWP water supply may not be 100% accurate in all years because the SWP may have had additional water available for delivery if contractors had requested it, the assumption is accurate for years when the actual SWP allocation did not fully satisfy requests. This occurred in 2000-2005.

2.3.3 Allocation Calculations

This study's allocation procedure uses the same general methodology for the proposed project and all alternatives. The first step is to distribute the total available historic SWP Table A water supply for each year into two general blocks based on total Agricultural and total M&I Table A requests. This initial distribution of Table A water varies between the Baseline, proposed project, and alternatives because Article 18(a) is applied differently and because the size of the blocks differs depending on the total SWP AG and M&I Table A amounts.

After determination of a bulk quantity for the initial AG and M&I Table A blocks, the study further allocates Table A water to individual SWP contractors based on how much AG and/or

¹² As discussed, this assumption may not be totally accurate for years where all contractors received 100% of what they requested (1999-2000) because once all Table A requests have been fulfilled, the SWP may not operate in a manner to maximize current year deliveries and therefore it is uncertain whether additional Table A water could have been allocated if the contractors had asked for it. Typically, when all Table A requests are fulfilled, the Department makes any additional water available as Article 21 water. But if requests for Article 21 water are less than the total supply of Article 21 water available to the project, and all EWA debts to the SWP in San Luis Reservoir have been repaid, the historic deliveries of Article 21 water may also not represent the true maximum possible Article 21 deliveries in that year.

M&I Table A amounts they have in a year relative to the total quantity of Table A that all contractors had in that year. If a contractor had both M&I and AG Table A, then the calculations included two separate calculations for that contractor, and the contractor's total allocation was a combination of AG and M&I Table A.

For 1999, 2000, and 2002, a few contractors still requested less than 100% of their Table A. For these contractors, the study's initial allocation exceeded those contractors' individual requests. Consequently, the study allocated water to meet 100% of those contractors' requests and allocated the remaining excess water (from the initial allocation of water to these contractors) to other contractors.

2.3.3.1 Allocation of Table A in the Baseline

The pre-Monterey Article 18(a) applies in the Baseline; therefore, in years when the amount of Table A supply is insufficient to meet both AG and M&I Table A requests this study applies an Article 18(a) AG-first reduction to the initial AG Table A block. Note that the AG-first reduction has two constraints in the Baseline; it can not exceed 50% in any one year, and the size of any reduction can not exceed the 100% cumulative limit on AG-first reductions within a 7-year period. If either of these constraints is exceeded, this study applies equal additional percentage reductions to allocations of both the AG and M&I blocks until the sum of the two blocks equals the Table A water supply available that year (Table HA-8).

2.3.3.2 Allocation of Table A in the Proposed Project

Allocation of Table A in the proposed project is generally similar to the Baseline's method except there is no longer an AG-first reduction to the AG block of water. In any year where the amount of Table A water available to the SWP can not satisfy the AG and M&I requests, this study reduces the percent allocations to the initial AG and M&I blocks simultaneously and equally until the sum of water allocated to the AG and M&I blocks equals the amount of Table A water available to the SWP in that year (Table HA-11).

2.3.3.3 Allocation of Table A in NPA1

The procedures for allocating Table A water in the NPA1 are identical to the Baseline procedures. The actual allocations, however, differ because of Table A transfers that occur in NPA1. These Table A transfers change some contractors' percentage share of the Total AG Table A amounts and consequently change the amount of water a contractor receives from the initial AG block (Table HA-9).

2.3.4 CNP Water Allocations

This study allocates Table A water in CNP the same way as in the Baseline and NPA1; the Department satisfies Table A requests first using the same Article 18(a) provisions as in the Baseline and NPA1. As a practical matter, however, 18(a) applies less frequently because the

available water supply to the SWP exceeds 1.9 million AF in most years and this is all the water required to satisfy 100% of the Table A requests in the CNP (Table HA-10).

The more complicated issue is the allocation of the remaining available water supply after satisfying the reduced Table A amount requests in the CNP. In this study, the Department considers two possibilities. One possibility treats the water as XA water, while the other treats the water as scheduled surplus water as discussed in the pre-Monterey Article 21. These methods are described below.

2.3.4.1 Allocating XA Water in CNP Alternative 3

One method to allocate the water remaining after all CNP Table A requests are satisfied is to make the XA water available to the contractors in proportion to their Table A amounts (or requests if a contractor requests less than its full Table A). This allocation would not differentiate between AG and M&I contractors. If a contractor's Table A amount (or Table A request) represents 10% of the total Table A amount of the SWP that year, then the contractor is allocated 10% of the available XA water. This method is called the CNPA3 method.

This allocation procedure results in allocations that are similar to the Baseline in many years, but it reduces the number of times Article 18(a) AG-first shortages need to be applied because the SWP often has 1.9 MAF to allocate. The CNPA3 method applies Article 18(a) and its AG-first shortage provision only to the 1.9 MAF of Table A amount, after that the contractors equally share in any water shortage if the XA water available is less than the total amount of requested water.

2.3.4.2 Allocating Scheduled Surplus Water for CNP Alternative 4

Another method to allocate the remaining water is to consider it scheduled surplus water and follow the applicable provisions of the pre-Monterey Article 21. Article 21 sets out a complicated procedure for allocating all surplus water based on geographic location and percent use of the water for agricultural or groundwater replenishment purposes. The details of the procedures are summarized below.¹³

The pre-Monterey Article 21 makes several geographic distinctions that affect allocations of scheduled surplus water. The first is a distinction between SWP contractors upstream and downstream of Dos Amigos Pumping Plant (Dos Amigos Pumping Plant is located near Los Banos, approximately 100 miles south of Banks Pumping Plant). Upstream contractors include Plumas, Butte, Yuba City, Napa, Solano, Alameda County, Zone 7, Santa Clara, and Oak Flat. All other SWP contractors are considered downstream contractors. Upstream and downstream groups of contractors receive scheduled surplus allocations based on the percent of agricultural and groundwater replenishment use each group has relative to the total agricultural and groundwater replenishment use of both groups.¹⁴

¹³ The procedure was developed using MWD's SWP long term water supply contract and any amendments to it that were enacted prior to MWD's execution of the Monterey Amendment.

¹⁴ For example, assume the group upstream of Dos Amigos Pumping Plant has a combined demand of 100 AF for agricultural and groundwater replenishment use and the downstream group has a combined demand of 900 AF for

After this initial “block” distribution, there are additional procedures to allocate the blocks of scheduled surplus water to individual contractors in the upstream and downstream groups. For the upstream group, each contractor simply receives a share of the scheduled surplus designated for upstream contractors proportionate to their share of the total agricultural and groundwater replenishment use of the upstream group as a whole.

Pre-Monterey Article 21 further subdivides the downstream group of contractors into three groups – San Joaquin, Central Coast, and Southern California contractors. Article 21 specifies that the “block” of scheduled surplus water for the downstream contractors should be split 69% to the San Joaquin group, 29% to the Southern California group, and 2% to the Central Coast group. After this step the scheduled surplus water is allocated to contractors within each group in the same way as it was in the upstream group; each contractor gets a share of the scheduled surplus water designated for its group in proportion to its share of the total agricultural and groundwater replenishment use of its subgroup.

If particular contractors within a group can not take all the scheduled surplus available to them, then other contractors within that group can take water allocated to their group before the water is made available to SWP contractors in other groups for agricultural and groundwater replenishment uses. Scheduled surplus water deliveries to contractors with municipal or industrial uses are a lower priority. The Department developed assumptions about each contractor’s use of SWP water for agricultural, groundwater replenishment, and municipal uses to complete this study. Table HA-7 lists these assumptions for each contractor.

3.0 RESULTS

The annual net effect of each alternative is the annual difference between the Baseline’s allocation and the alternative’s allocation. As emphasized earlier, this study discusses the years 1996-2005 because some of these years demonstrate the alternatives’ effects on allocations during a period when the SWP’s water supply was less than the SWP contractors’ requests.¹⁵ To clarify the alternatives’ effects, the discussion focuses on the relative effects of the alternatives’ Article 18(a) provisions, Table A transfers, Table A retirements, and the CNP invocation of Article 18(b).

the same use. The supply of scheduled surplus would then be allocated in proportion to each group’s respective demand relative to the total demand of both groups; therefore, the upstream group would be allocated 10% of the scheduled surplus and the downstream group would be allocated 90% of the scheduled surplus.

¹⁵ Although the SWP’s 1996-1999 allocations were 100% for all contractors, the 1996-1999 allocations were based on the Monterey Amendment’s provisions which included retirement of 45 TAF by agricultural contractors. Because this study fixes the available water supply for allocation in all alternatives at the historic 1996-1999 SWP quantities, utilizes a Baseline that does not include the retirement of 45 TAF of agricultural contractors’ Table A amount, assumes that agricultural contractors would have requested an additional 45 TAF of water (associated with the non-retired 45 TAF of Table A amount) in the Baseline, and assumes that the SWP did NOT have an additional 45 TAF of water available for allocation, this study’s Baseline allocation includes a difference of 45 TAF between the Baseline’s SWP water supply and the Baseline’s total SWP contractor requests for Table A. For this reason, the Department did not show AG-first reductions in 1996-1999, even though AG allocations are shown as 98% and 99% for some alternatives in 1996-1998. In the absence of the Monterey Amendment’s 45 TAF retirement, however, it is very likely that the SWP would have allocated an additional 45 TAF in 1999 and thereby satisfied all contractor requests.

In order to make the presentation of results more concise and focused, this study organizes the SWP contractors into groups. In the proposed project analysis, two critical distinctions define four groups of contractors: the first distinction is whether the contractor is an Agricultural (AG) or Municipal and Industrial (M&I) contractor, while the second distinction is whether the contractor participated in a Table A transfer or retirement. Table HA-5 presents the four categories of contractors. Contractors within each of these groups experienced similar, if not identical, Table A allocation effects in each of the alternatives.

3.1 Effects of the Proposed Project

In the Baseline, the original Article 18(a) “AG-first” shortage provision was applied when total SWP Table A requests exceed the SWP Table A supply during 1999-2002 (Table HA-8). There were no Article 18(a) AG-first cuts in 1996-1998. There were also no Article 18(a) AG-first cuts in 2003-2005 even though Table A requests exceeded Table A water supply in 2003-2005 because AG-first allocation reduction reached the Article 18(a) cumulative cap of 100% in a seven-year period in 2002. After 2002 allocations, the Department could not impose further AG-first reductions until 2006. Therefore, Article 18(a) reduces AG and M&I Table A allocations equally during 2003-2005. Note that the Baseline also applied equally shared reductions to all contractors in 2001 and 2002 in addition to AG first reductions.

Table HA-11 shows the proposed project’s effect on allocations for Agricultural and M&I contractors during 1996-2005. The difference in percent allocation between the proposed project and the Baseline causes the SWP to allocate large quantities of Table A water differently. Tables HA-13 and HA-14 list the quantities of Table A allocation changes for M&I and AG contractors in the proposed project compared to the Baseline. Tables HA-15 and HA-16 list the quantities of Table A allocation changes for M&I and AG contractors to the Baseline under NPA1. Tables HA-17 and HA-18 list the quantities of Table A allocation changes for M&I and AG contractors to the Baseline under the CNP alternatives.

Some contractors’ Table A requests in 1999, 2000, and 2002 were not 100% of Table A amounts. MWD and several other M&I contractors requested Table A amounts below their maximum contractual allowance in those years. These less-than-maximum requests made it easier for the Department to satisfy the total Table A request, forestalling application of Article 18(a). However, in 2001 and 2003-2005, virtually all SWP contractors have requested 100% of their maximum Table A amount in each year. The SWP does not have sufficient water to fulfill all Table A requests in most years.

3.1.1 Effects of the Proposed Project on M&I Contractors With No Table A Transfers – Group One

Seventeen SWP M&I contractors that did not participate in transfers or retirements of Table A amounts are in Group One. Table HA-19 shows the proposed project’s effects on selected Group One contractors. The Table displays Santa Clara Valley, whose Table A amount of 100 TAF is a conveniently round number that makes evaluation easier; Santa Barbara, a contractor whose Table A amount is approximately equal to the median M&I Table A amount, and MWDSC, the

largest SWP contractor that also has Table A amount changes that are unrelated to the proposed project. Note that Group One also includes KCWA's M&I Table A amount

The Baseline's allocations include AG-first cuts during 1999-2002 (Table HA-8). Although the Baseline includes a 6% Article 18(a) AG-first reduction for AG Table A allocations in 1999, the proposed project had no Article 18(a)-related effect on Group One's Table A allocations in 1999 because the AG-first reduction did not increase M&I Table A allocations. In 2000-2002, the effects of the pre-Monterey Amendments' Article 18(a) provisions were more pronounced because almost all SWP contractors requested 100% of their Table A (except MWDSC in 2000). In these years, the total SWP Table A requests (AG and M&I combined) were much greater than the SWP's Table A water supply available for allocation. The results demonstrate that the proposed project reduced allocations for all Group One contractors. The proposed project caused annual reductions in Table A allocation of approximately 27%, and 14% in 2001, and 2002, respectively (Table HA-19). The 45,000 AF Table A retirement by KCWA and Dudley Ridge slightly offsets the effect of the proposed project's Article 18(a) revision by slightly increasing allocations to all contractors. This effect is more evident in 2003-2005.

In 2003-2005, total SWP Table A requests were still greater than the water supply available for Table A allocation, but the Department could no longer impose Article 18(a) AG-first cuts in the Baseline because of the Article 18(a) cap of 100% in a seven-year period. Therefore, the Department applied equal reductions to Table A allocations of both M&I and AG Table A amounts. This study shows that in years when the Article 18(a) cap restricts Ag-first cuts, the Baseline's allocation cuts are identical to the proposed project's cuts under the revised Article 18(a); therefore, the proposed project's Article 18(a) provisions had no effect in these years, although the proposed project's 45,000 AF retirement slightly increased M&I allocations during 2003-2005 (Table HA-19).

3.1.2 Effects of the Proposed Project on Agricultural Contractors With No Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Two

Four contractors are in Group Two: Empire Westside, Oak Flat, Kings, and Tulare. Table HA-20 shows the proposed project's effect on Group Two contractors. In many respects, the proposed project's effect on Group Two is the opposite of the proposed project's effect on Group One contractors. While contractors with M&I Table A lost allocation because of the proposed project's elimination of the AG-first shortage provision of Article 18(a), contractors with AG Table A received higher allocations except for Empire West Side in 2002 because that agency had not signed the Monterey Amendment. The 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement by KCWA and Dudley Ridge also slightly increased allocations for Group Two contractors in 1996-2005. There was a 2% increase in Table A allocation for Group Two contractors from 1996 to 1998.

During 1999-2002, Group Two received higher allocations from the proposed project due to the elimination of the Article 18(a) AG-first shortage provision and the 45,000 AF retirement. This beneficial effect was most pronounced in 2001. In that year, the Baseline included a 50% AG-first cut, the maximum allowed under the Baseline's original Article 18(a) provisions. The Baseline also included an additional 47% shared cut to all Table A across the board in 2001. As a consequence, Baseline deliveries to Group Two contractors were extremely low in 2001,

approximately 3% of full Table A requests. The deliveries under the proposed project in 2001, on the other hand, were over eleven times these Baseline deliveries.

Once the Article 18(a) AG-first cumulative seven-year 100% cap is reached, the Baseline and proposed project allocations in 2003-2005 are very similar. The only difference is that the proposed project allocates slightly more water to Group Two contractors in each year due to the retirement of 45,000 AF of Table A amount (Table HA-20).

3.1.3 Effects of the Proposed Project on M&I Contractors With Table A Transfers – Group Three

This group includes six SWP M&I contractors that purchased additional Table A amounts from agricultural contractors. For the years prior to each Group Three contractor's Table A acquisition, Group Three contractors experienced the same Article 18(a) and 45,000 AF Table A retirement effects of the proposed project as the Group One contractors (Table HA-21). However, following their respective transfers, Group Three contractors received more water than Group One contractors. From 2002-2005 Group Three contractors received allocation increases of up to 78%.

The acquisition of additional SWP Table A amounts and the effect of AG requests associated with these Table A transfers have unique and direct effects on each Group Three contractor's Table A allocation. The following analysis discusses each of the Group Three contractors separately.

3.1.3.1 Napa County FC&WCD

In 2001, Napa purchased 4,025 AF of AG Table A amount from KCWA. The acquisition of AG Table A increased Napa's Table A allocation in 2001 and subsequent years, but the allocation provided by the additional Table A amount¹⁶ was not enough to offset the effect of the proposed project's change to Article 18(a) in 2001. Napa still received a lower Table A allocation in 2001 than it would have in the Baseline, but the Table A acquisition decreased Napa's allocation reduction from 27% (Group One contractors) to only 9%.

In 2002, Napa's allocation from the Table A transfer¹⁶ provided more water than Napa lost from the proposed project's Article 18(a) revision. Since the 2003-2005 Baseline allocations have no Article 18(a) AG cuts due to the provision's 100% limit, the proposed project's Article 18(a) changes did not reduce Napa's allocation and the 45,000 AF retirement increased Napa's allocation. The proposed project's Table A transfer further increases Napa's allocations so that Napa's final allocations are 2% to 24% above the Baseline's allocations during 2002-2005 (Table HA-21).

¹⁶ The project's retirement of 45 TAF by KCWA and Dudley Ridge also increases all contractors' allocations by a small amount; the retirement-related allocation effects are much smaller than the Table A transfer effects.

3.1.3.2 Solano County WA

Solano's purchase of 5,756 AF of AG Table A amount from KCWA became effective in 2001. Similar to Napa's results, implementation of the Table A transfer increased Solano's Table A allocation in 2001, but the transfer's allocation increases¹⁶ did not offset the effect of the proposed project's Article 18(a) change. But Solano's Project allocation was only 16% less than the Baseline allocation rather than the 27% decline experienced by the Group One contractors.

Solano's 2002-2005 results are also similar to Napa's results. Solano's 2002 allocation from the Table A transfer provided more water than Solano lost from the proposed project's Article 18(a) revision. Since the 2003-2005 Baseline allocations have no Article 18(a) AG-first cuts due to the provision's 100% limit, differences in Solano's Project allocations in these years are not attributable to the proposed project's Article 18(a) revision. Instead, the differences between the proposed project and Baseline after 2001 result from the proposed project's Table A amount transfer and 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement. These differences change Solano's allocations from -2% to +15% during 2002-2005 (Table HA-21).

3.1.3.3 Alameda County FC&WCD, Zone 7

Beginning in 2000, Zone 7 made several proposed project-related purchases of AG Table A amounts from KCWA and Tulare. These purchases increased Zone 7's Table A allocations in 2000 and all subsequent years of the historical study. Zone 7's percent increase in allocation ranged from 33% to 76% during 2000-2005.

Zone 7's acquisitions offset the reductions experienced by Group One contractors due to the proposed project's elimination of the AG-first shortage provision of Article 18(a). In addition, Zone 7's proposed project-related Table A amount acquisitions and the 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement raised Zone 7's SWP allocations above the Baseline allocations. In 2001, although Group One contractors suffered a 27% reduction in Table A allocation, Zone 7 received an allocation 24% greater than its Baseline allocation (Table HA-21).

3.1.3.4 Castaic Lake WA

Castaic previously purchased 12,700 AF of AG Table A amount from Devil's Den in 1991 before implementation of the proposed project; therefore, Castaic has 12,700 AF of AG Table A amount under both the Baseline and proposed project.

In 2000, Castaic purchased an additional 41,000 AF of Table A amount from KCWA.¹⁷ These varying mixtures of Table A amounts in the baseline and proposed project interact to give Castaic a unique series of proposed project effects. The proposed project's elimination of the Article 18(a) AG-first cutback reduces Castaic's allocations for its 41,500 AF of Table A amount

¹⁷ The Monterey Amendment Settlement Agreement recognizes that this transfer is not finalized and is being implemented by DWR and CLWA on an interim basis. The transfer is included in this study to provide an estimation of the historic allocation effects of interim implementation and to allow predictions of future allocation effects.

while concurrently increasing allocations for Castaic's 12,700 AF of agricultural Table A amount. In combination with Castaic's 41,700 Table A amount acquisition, the proposed project increases Castaic's SWP allocations from 62% to 78% during 2000-2005 (Table HA-21).

3.1.3.5 Mojave WA

Mojave was the first M&I contractor to acquire AG Table A amounts after signing the Monterey Amendments. Consequently, Mojave had 25,000 AF of AG Table A amount from 1998 to 2005 of this historical study. Mojave only requested 20,000 AF of Table A water in 1999, this affected its M&I allocation in 1999. Mojave's Table A allocations under the proposed project did increase in 2000-2005 by up to 51% due to the Table A amount acquisition and the previously discussed 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement (Table HA-21).

3.1.3.6 Palmdale WA

Palmdale purchased 4,000 AF of AG Table A amount from KCWA in 2000. This proposed project-related purchase and the 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement increased Palmdale's Table A allocation in five years (2000 and 2002-2005) by 9% to 25%. In 2001, however, Palmdale's Table A acquisition did not provide enough water to counteract the effect of the proposed project's Article 18(a) change, and Palmdale received a 10% reduction in Table A water allocation under the proposed project than it would have under the Baseline. But this reduction of 10% was less than the 27% reduction that Group One contractors experienced—and what Palmdale would have experienced if it had not purchased some AG Table A amount with implementation of the proposed project (Table HA-21).

3.1.4. Effects of Proposed Project on Agricultural Contractors With Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Four

Group Four contains the two agricultural contractors that had proposed project-related Table A changes. KCWA and Dudley Ridge retired a combined 45,000 AF of Table A amount as specified in Article 53 of the Monterey Amendments. KCWA also transferred Table A amounts to various M&I contractors.

The 45,000 AF Table A amount retirement by KCWA and Dudley Ridge reduced their allocation by up to 8%; however, that reduction was offset by the proposed project's elimination of the Article 18(a) "AG-first" shortage provision. Consequently, the effects of the proposed project on the Group Four contractors vary depending upon the interaction of their Table A amount changes and the Article 18(a) changes. The following analysis discusses each of the Group Four contractors separately (Table HA-22).

3.1.4.1 Dudley Ridge

Dudley Ridge received a slightly lower Table A allocation in 1999 under the proposed project due to its retirement of 4.33 thousand acre-feet (TAF) of Table A amount. The 4.33 TAF retirements represented 8.1% of Dudley Ridge's Baseline Table A amount, but due to the

proposed project's Article 18(a) change and KCWA's 40.33 TAF Table A amount retirement, Dudley Ridge's 1999 allocation fell only 2%. In 2001-2002, Dudley Ridge received a higher Table A allocation due to the proposed project's elimination of Article 18(a)'s AG-first allocation provisions and KCWA's Table A retirement.

3.1.4.2 KCWA

KCWA changed its Table A through transfers, sales, and retirement, which complicates its analysis. Similar to other agricultural contractors, KCWA received more water during 2000-2002, due to the proposed project's Article 18(a) changes and Dudley Ridge's 4.33 TAF Table A amount retirement. The percent increase in KCWA's Table A allocation in each year of this period was less than other agricultural contractors because KCWA transferred AG Table A amounts during this period, which reduced its Table A amount below the Baseline Table A amount. In 2003-2005 when the Article 18(a) "AG-first" cuts were not applied in the Baseline, KCWA still received a lower allocation of Table A under the proposed project because of KCWA's transfer and retirement of Table A amounts.

From an amendment to the long-term water supply contract, starting in 1998, KCWA sold Mojave 25,000 AF of its SWP entitlement. This was the first sale under the provisions of the Monterey Amendments that allow for the sale of 130,000 AF of agricultural entitlements to contractors for urban use.

A second factor also complicates any analysis of the proposed project's effects on KCWA. Although KCWA's Table A retirement and transfers confound the proposed project's Article 18(a) and Dudley Ridge Table A retirement effects, KCWA's Table A retirements and transfers apply to specific KCWA member agencies rather than uniformly to all of its member agencies. Thus, the "Group Four" effects described in this section apply to KCWA's member units that transferred Table A amounts.¹⁸ Other member units of KCWA did not modify their SWP Table A amount contracts with KCWA; therefore, the proposed project's effects on these member units¹⁹ are identical to Group Two contractors rather than Group Four (Table HA-22).

3.1.5. Summary of Proposed Project's Effects

As indicated in the introduction, the historical allocation study analyzes the effects of three major changes caused by the Monterey Amendments: Table A transfers, Table A retirements, and the Article 18(a) revision. The following text summarizes the results of these individual changes.

3.1.5.1 Effect of Table A Retirement

The proposed project's Table A retirements from KCWA and Dudley Ridge increase the Table A allocations of all other SWP contractors because the retirements reduce the total Table A

¹⁸ Belridge Water Storage District, Berrenda Mesa Water District, Lost Hills Water District, and Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa WSD

¹⁹ Cawelo WD, Henry Miller WD, Kern Delta WD, Improvement District No. 4, Rosedale-Rio Bravo WSD, Semitropic WSD, Tehachapi-Cummings County WD, and West Kern WD.

requests of KCWA and Dudley Ridge and thereby leave a small amount of additional water available for allocation to all the SWP contractors. Theoretically, KCWA and Dudley Ridge benefit from the others retirement of Table A amount in the same way, but the incremental benefit is not sufficient to offset the allocation losses incurred by each contractor's own Table A amount retirement. The allocation percentage increase attributable to the retirements depends on the amount of water available to the SWP for allocation; however, since the 45,000 AF of Table A amount represents approximately 1% of the SWP's total Table A amount, the Table A retirement generally increased allocations in this study by 1% in years when all contractors requested their full Table A amount. This effect is highlighted in 2003-2005 when the Article 18(a) change does not affect allocations because the "agriculture-first" reduction was exhausted during 1999-2002.

3.1.5.2 Effect of Article 18(a) Change

The Baseline's original Article 18(a) provision of the SWP long term water supply contracts shifted a large amount of Table A allocation from Agricultural to M&I contractors when the SWP could not satisfy all Table A requests. The proposed project eliminated this feature of Article 18(a), and instead required the Department to reduce all SWP contractors' Table A amounts equally in years when the SWP Table A water supply could not meet all Table A requests.

In general, this change greatly increased agricultural contractors' Table A allocations and reduces M&I contractors' Table A allocations. This trend is evident in the analysis period, but the results also emphasize that the annual effects of the Article 18(a) change depend on the SWP's annual hydrology and application of the Article 18(a) cumulative cap of 100% AG-first cuts over a seven-year period.

3.1.5.3 Effect of Table A Transfers

The proposed project included or possibly facilitated²⁰ many individual Table A amount transfers. Most of these were from agricultural contractors to M&I contractors. In general, agricultural contractors that sold Table A amounts receive reduced Table A allocations and contractors that purchased Table A amounts received increased allocations. The specific increase in allocation varies depending on the Table A amount purchased and the SWP Table A allocation in any particular year. Some contractors still receive lower or higher Table A allocations despite their participation in a Table A amount transfer because the proposed project's Article 18(a) effects can exercise a greater influence on Table A allocations in some years than the Table A amount transfers. In other cases, such as Zone 7 and Castaic, the Table A amount transfers clearly had the greatest effect.

²⁰ The Monterey Amendments may have facilitated transfers by improving the reliability of agricultural contractors' SWP supplies and by improving the value of agricultural contractors' Table A amounts, making them more desirable to other water users.

3.2 Effects of NPA1

NPA1 differs from the Baseline only because it includes all the Table A amount transfers included in the proposed project, except the 41,000 AF transfer from KCWA to CLWA. Although the EIR's NPA1 includes operation of a SWP component in the Kern Fan Element property, this study assumes that SWP water supplies remain identical to historical SWP water supplies for 1996-2005; therefore, this study does not evaluate the potential allocation effects of an SWP component in the Kern Fan Element property. NPA1 implements Article 18(a) the same way as the Baseline. The allocation changes as a result of the Table A transfers are the only differences between SWP contractor allocations under the NPA1 and the Baseline. Contractors that purchased Table A amounts receive higher Table A allocations in NPA1 than in the Baseline, and contractors that sold Table A amounts receive lower Table A allocations in NPA1 than in the baseline. Tables HA-23 through HA-26 display these effects for the contractors with and without Table A transfers in the NPA1.

3.2.1 Effects of NPA1 on M&I Contractors With No Table A Transfers – Group One

The Group One contractors experienced almost no effects when the Baseline is compared to NPA1 (Table HA-23). These M&I contractors did not participate in any Table A transfers in NPA1; therefore, their allocations under the Baseline and the NPA1 are virtually identical. Castaic Lake Water Agency is a member of Group One because the 41,000 AF Table A amount transfer from KCWA is not included in NPA1. A greater AG-first reduction in any year would benefit Group One contractors because they possess mostly M&I Table A amounts.

3.2.2. Effects of NPA1 on Agricultural Contractors With No Table A Transfers or Retirements – Group Two

Group Two contractors experienced minor (up to 2% in 1999) changes to their allocations in NPA1 because they have no Table A amount changes and administration of Article 18(a) remains unchanged from the baseline (Table HA-24).

3.2.3. Effects of NPA1 on M&I Contractors That Transferred Table A – Group Three

Group Three contractors in NPA1 are the same contractors described in the proposed project with the exception of Castaic Lake Water Agency.²¹ Castaic is not a part of Group Three because NPA1 does not incorporate the 41,000 acre-foot transfer of Table A amount that occurs in the proposed project. Consequently, Castaic is part of Group One for purposes of analysis of NPA1. Results are depicted in Table HA-25.

Group Three contractors experienced allocation increases in NPA1 from 2001 through 2005 because their purchases of AG Table A amounts increase their overall Table A amount, while

²¹ Group Three in NPA1 includes Napa, Solano, Zone 7, Castaic, Mojave, and Palmdale

Article 18(a) remains the same as in the Baseline. With the benefits of the AG-first reduction of the pre-Monterey Article 18(a), Group Three contractors gain from any purchase of AG Table A in NPA1. The annual allocation benefit of the purchased AG Table A to any particular contractor, however, varies because it is still subject to the Article 18(a) AG-first reductions. The actual benefit in Table A allocation to a particular Group Three contractor that purchased AG Table A is roughly equal to the amount of AG Table A purchased, discounted by the Baseline SWP allocation percentage to AG Table A in that year.

An interesting effect of NPA1 is the decreased SWP demand due to KCWA's transfer of 25 TAF of Table A amount to Mojave Water Agency in 1998. The assumptions of this study are that AG contractors requested their maximum Table A amounts since 1995; therefore, KCWA would have requested the 25 TAF of Table A amount in the Baseline. The historic requests, however, reflect that Mojave did not request the additional 25 TAF that it purchased until 2000. Consequently, there is a decrease of 25 TAF of SWP demand in NPA1 during the period 1998-1999. The period 1998-1999, however, was a wet period when contractor demands were not at their maximum and in which every contractor received 100% allocations every year; therefore, this slight decrease in SWP demand during 1998 and 1999 probably did not raise SWP Table A allocations for other contractors (Table HA-25).

3.2.4. Effects of NPA1 on Agricultural Contractors That Transferred Table A – Group Four

This analysis divided Group Four contractors into two categories. KCWA transferred Table A amounts to other contractors and thereby reduced its Table A amount during the analysis period. Dudley Ridge did not make any Project related transfers and therefore it experienced minor (up to 2% in 1999) changes to its allocation, similar to the NPA1 related effects to Group Two contractors. KCWA received lower Table A allocations after transferring Table A amounts. The amount of the reduction in Table A allocation depends on how much Table A amount was cumulatively transferred. This generally increased throughout the analysis period as KCWA more Table A amounts. As noted earlier in Section 3.1.4.2, KCWA's Table A amount transfers apply to specific KCWA member agencies rather than uniformly to all KCWA member agencies. KCWA member agencies that did not modify their portion of KCWA's SWP Table A amount have water supply effects identical to Group Two contractors.

While all AG contractors in this group are still subject to the AG-first reductions of Article 18(a), this effect is the same as in the Baseline and the only actions that affect Table A allocations in this analysis are the amounts of Table A possessed by each contractor. (See Table HA-26)

3.2.5. Summary of NPA1 Effects

NPA1's one major effect is either an increase or decrease in particular contractor's Table A allocations depending upon whether they purchased or sold Table A amounts. Contractors that did not change Table A amount experience no Table A allocation changes.

3.2.5.4 Long-Term Effects of NPA1

NPA1 and the Baseline demonstrate some of the implications of the mismatch between SWP contractors' Table A requests and SWP water supplies that began in the 1990's. Beginning during the 1999-2005 period and likely into the foreseeable future, the SWP could expect that contractors' water requests would exceed the SWP's available water supply for allocation in most years. The extent of this difference would depend upon annual hydrology and any additional facilities or projects the SWP completes in the future. In any event, the Department would be required to apply Article 18(a) AG-first reductions as often as permitted by Article 18(a). Only a string of multiple wet years where SWP water supplies for allocation exceeded contractors' requests (generally 4.2 MAF but perhaps as low as 3.3 MAF in some years when contractors' service areas experience exceptionally wet conditions) would interrupt this cycle of water allocation reductions.

Agricultural contractors would experience a reduced and unpredictable water supply as M&I Table A requests increased under both the Baseline and NPA1; however, under NPA1, some Agricultural contractors would receive even less water than in the Baseline because of participation in Table A amount transfers. On the other hand, M&I contractors would receive the same amount of water under the Baseline and NPA1, unless they purchased additional Table A amount which would increase their Table A allocation under NPA1.

3.3 Effects of CNP

Table A Allocations

CNP allocates Table A water using the same general method as the Baseline and NPA1; however, the Table A amounts possessed by the SWP contractors are lowest in CNP. As previously mentioned in the discussion of the Baseline and NPA1, Article 18(a) is applied in years when the SWP's Table A water supply is less than the total Table A amount request of all the contractors. In CNP, as in the Baseline and NPA1, the Article 18(a) AG-first reduction is limited to up to 50% in any one year and a seven-year running total of 100%. After all Table A amount requests have been satisfied, then any remaining water is allocated as scheduled surplus or XA water.

During the years 1996-2005, the SWP was able deliver 100% allocations of Table A water to both AG and M&I contractors in CNP every year except 2001. Conditions were so dry in 2001 that even though the SWP Table A amount totaled only 1.9 MAF there was still a need to apply the shortage provisions of Article 18(a) because there was roughly only 1.6 MAF of water available to the SWP to deliver. In 2001, M&I Table A requests received a virtually full allocation of 99%, but AG Table A requests only received an allocation of 49% after an additional 1% shared reduction (Table HA-10). As indicated by the percentages, the AG-first shortage was applied to the fullest extent allowed (50%) and then an additional shared reduction of 1% was imposed on both AG and M&I Table A requests. The Table A allocations in CNPA3 and CNP Alternative 4 (CNPA4) are identical. Differing allocations of so-called XA water and scheduled surplus cause the real differences in water allocations between the two CNP.

Several factors help clarify the results reported for the CNP. One factor to understand is that the effect of Article 18(a) in CNP is different from its effect in the Baseline because 18(a) is applied more frequently in the Baseline when the SWP Table A amount is not reduced. Refer to Table HA-12 to see the Table A water allocations for CNP. Secondly, the EIR assumes that there are no Table A transfers in CNP, so any effects of CNP are attributable to the difference in application of Article 18(a) and the difference in allocation of scheduled surplus and XA water.

3.3.1 Effects of CNPA3

Many contractors experienced the same effects as other contractors in CNPA3. As with the other discussions, the contractors can be grouped in categories. The general effects on each group of contractors are discussed below.

3.3.1.1 Effects of CNPA3 on M&I Contractors

CNPA3 reduced overall water deliveries to most M&I contractors by 1 – 15% during 1999-2002 and caused minimal changes in 1996-1998 due to the available water beyond the 1.9 MAF (Table HA-27). Article 18(a) was not as beneficial to contractors with M&I Table A amounts in CNP because there is less M&I Table A that received priority when 18(a) was applied.

M&I contractors that received only M&I Table A amounts were affected by CNPA3 similarly. Every contractor in this group requested 100% of its M&I Table A amount during 1996-2005. In general, all these contractors experienced a decrease in allocations of from 1% to 15% in 1999-2002, but CNPA3 had little effect on allocations during 2003-2005. The results for all contractors in this group are detailed in Table HA-28.

Note that MWD and Mojave did not request the maximum amount of water in 1998 and 1999. Consequently, CNPA3 affected these contractors differently than the rest of the group in those years (Table HA-28).

CNPA3's effect from 1999 to 2002 is a result of the reduced effect of Article 18(a) in CNPA3 compared to the Baseline. Recall that one of Article 18(a)'s biggest effects is to shift allocation from AG to M&I Table A amounts through application of the AG-first shortage provision when SWP Table A supplies are less than Table A requests. In CNPA3, however, Article 18(a)'s effect is reduced because it only applies to the first 1.9 MAF of SWP contractor requests.

Consequently, when SWP supplies are less than the Table A and XA water demand, M&I contractors only receive the Article 18(a) benefits for their initial Table A amount requests, which are lower than in the Baseline. After receiving their Table A allocation, these contractors get the remaining XA water allocation in proportion to the share of their Table A amounts compared to the total Table A amounts of the SWP. Article 18(a) does not apply to XA water allocations. This means that if there is a shortage of XA water, these contractors must equally share any reduction in XA water deliveries with all other contractors, including those with AG Table A amounts.

3.3.1.2 Effects of CNPA3 on Agricultural Contractors

AG contractors with only AG Table A amounts experienced the same allocation effects from CNPA3: increases of 5% and 18% in 1999 and 2000, increases of 257% in 2001, and 18% increases in 2002. Contractors in this group received from 5% to 257% more allocation from the SWP from 1999-2002, but then experienced no impact from 2003-2005. Table HA-29 shows the detailed results for this group.

The increase in allocation for this group is basically the inverse of the previous group of M&I contractors. Article 18(a)'s AG-first shortage provision plays a decreased role in CNP because there is a lower total M&I Table A request that must be satisfied first. As mentioned, when Article 18(a) AG-first reductions are applied, it increases the allocation to M&I Table A amounts at the expense of AG Table A amounts. The years 1999-2002 are years when the AG-first reduction is applied in the Baseline, but it is only applied in 2001 in CNP. Contractors with AG Table A received increased allocations, especially in 2001(257%), in years when Article 18(a) was applied.

3.3.2 Effects of CNPA4

CNPA4 is more complicated than CNPA3 because the remaining available water is allocated according to the pre-Monterey Article 21 provisions. As discussed in Section 2.3.5.2, agricultural and groundwater replenishment use had the highest priority for allocation of scheduled surplus under this method. One of the key assumptions, therefore, is how much groundwater replenishment and agricultural use should be assigned to each contractor. Table HA-7 lists the assumptions used for development and analysis of this allocation method.

Because the Article 21 allocation method applied to scheduled surplus water contains numerous procedures, most contractors experience unique individual effects in CNPA4; however, they can be grouped into three general categories for discussion purposes. The three groups are agricultural contractors, M&I contractors with little agricultural and groundwater use, and M&I contractors with high agricultural or groundwater replenishment use. Tables HA-30 and HA-31 provide results for selected agricultural and M&I contractors.

3.3.2.1 Effects of CNPA4 on AG Contractors

Contractors in this group received more water in CNPA4 than in the Baseline in every year for two major reasons. First, these contractors have high rates of agricultural and groundwater replenishment use, which receives priority in CNPA4's Article 21 allocation provisions. Second, they all are geographically located in the San Joaquin group of contractors, which receives 69% of the scheduled surplus water that is directed to the contractors downstream of Dos Amigos Pumping Plant. Due to the Article 18(b) invocation and application of Article 21 provisions, AG contractors receive a general increase in allocations in every year of the analysis (Table HA-31).

3.3.2.2 Effects of CNPA4 on M&I Contractors

Contractors in this group have low scheduled surplus water requests for groundwater replenishment or agricultural use. Two major factors caused this group to receive lower allocations of SWP water in every year of the analysis. First, these contractors all have very high municipal water use rates and little agriculture and groundwater replenishment use. Second, many of these contractors are in the Southern California contractor sub-group, which receives only 29% of the scheduled surplus water delivered to contractors downstream of Dos Amigos Pumping Plant.

Individual contractor's results vary for several reasons. The EIR assumes that some of these contractors have some amount of agricultural or groundwater replenishment use, and these uses elevate the priority of the M&I contractor's request for scheduled surplus water, which increases the contractor's scheduled surplus water allocation. The geographic group the contractor is in causes another slight variation in scheduled surplus allocations. Contractors in this analysis group fall into several geographic groups for purposes of Article 21's allocation provisions. These geographic groups are upstream of Dos Amigos Pumping Plant, Central Coast, and Southern California (Table HA-30).

3.3.2.3 Effects of CNPA4 on M&I Contractors with high amounts of groundwater replenishment or agricultural water use

These M&I contractors have a relatively high amount of groundwater replenishment or agricultural water uses as specified in Article 21. As a result, this group has a higher priority for scheduled surplus water than the other M&I contractors without such water uses. The contractors in this group, Mojave and Coachella were assessed a 100% groundwater replenishment value; therefore, each contractor experienced the same effects from CNPA4. These contractors are in the Southern California sub-group; since Article 21 initially allocates only 29% of the scheduled surplus water supply available downstream from Dos Amigos Pumping Plant to this sub-group, these M&I contractors receive lower scheduled surplus water allocations than San Joaquin Valley agricultural contractors.

CNPA4 only caused a reduction in allocation to Coachella in 2001 because that is the only year when Article 18(a) AG-first cuts had to be imposed. Recall that the AG-first reduction provision of Article 18(a) has less value in CNP because the total AG Table A has been reduced and there is proportionately less AG Table A to cut for the benefit of M&I contractors. In the years 2002-2005, these contractors experienced increased allocations under CNPA4 ranging from 9% -37%. Table HA-30 details the effects of CNPA4 for each of these contractors.

3.4 Summary of CNP Effects

3.4.1 Table A

CNP reduced Table A allocations because Table A amount were reduced by approximately 55%. During 1996-2005, SWP Contractors received 100% allocations of Table A in every year except

2001. 2001 was the only year that Article 18(a) was applied to impose a 50% AG-first reduction and a very slight shared reduction of 1%. It appears that in CNP, contractors would be more likely to get full Table A amount allocations, but these would be considerably lower than Table A allocations in the Baseline in almost all years.

3.4.2 Article 18(a)

Both CNP alternatives applied Article 18(a) less frequently because the Table A amounts of all contractors were reduced. Article 18(a) will only apply when the SWP supply is less than 1.9 MAF. Under similar circumstances in the Baseline, the SWP supply would have to be near 4.2 MAF every year to avoid application of Article 18(a). This indicates that Article 18(a)'s effects on Table A allocations in the CNP would be less than Article 18(a)'s effects in the Baseline.

3.4.3 Scheduled Surplus and EX-Table A Water

Ex-Table A water or scheduled surplus water, makes up a considerable amount of deliverable water in many years under the CNP alternatives. As expected this analysis shows that both the apportioned and surplus allocation methods in CNP increase water allocations to agricultural contractors and reduce allocations to M&I contractors. In the apportioned method all contractors receive scheduled surplus based on their share of the total SWP Table A amount. This reduces the advantage that M&I contractors have from Article 18(a) AG-first reductions. In the scheduled surplus method, M&I contractors are further disadvantaged because their scheduled surplus requests are usually not for the higher priority uses of groundwater replenishment or agriculture specified in Article 21. As a result, agricultural contractors get much more of the water as scheduled surplus under this method than they would as Table A in the Baseline.

3.4.4. Long-Term Effects of CNP

Both CNP alternatives would require the Department to invoke Article 18(a) much less frequently because in many years the SWP would have 1.9 MAF to allocate. Neither of the CNP alternatives would reduce the SWP's annual water deliveries, but they would complicate the SWP's allocation accounting and modify the distribution of water to SWP contractors. The results of this analysis indicate that most M&I contractors would receive less water in most years under either CNP alternative. This appears to run counter to the purposes of the SWP, and sends reduced amounts of water to the contractors who have paid and will pay the most for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the SWP.

Note: For purposes of space and readability, some of the tables use the term "Project" instead of "Proposed Project".

Table HA-1. List of Article 18(a) actions in the Baseline and NPA1.

Year	Water Year Type	No Table A Allocation Reductions²²	AG-First Allocation Reductions	AG-First Allocation Reductions & Additional Allocation Reductions for All Contractors	No AG-First Allocation Reductions²³ & Allocation Reductions for All Contractors
1996	W	X			
1997	W	X			
1998	W	X			
1999	W	X			
2000	AN		X		
2001	D			X	
2002	D			X	
2003	AN				X
2004	BN				X
2005	AN				X

Table HA-2. List of Article 18(a) actions in the CNP.

Year	Water Year Type	No Table A Allocation Reductions²⁴	AG-First Allocation Reductions	AG-First Allocation Reductions & Additional Allocation Reductions for All Contractors	No AG-First Allocation Reductions²⁵ & Allocation Reductions for All Contractors
1996	W	X			
1997	W	X			
1998	W	X			
1999	W	X			
2000	AN	X			
2001	D			X	
2002	D	X			
2003	AN	X			
2004	BN	X			
2005	AN	X			

²² Allocation reduction as used in this table denotes a reduction in allocations of Table A water.

²³ No agriculture-first Article 18(a) allocation cuts occur in these years due to the limit of cumulative 100% allocation cuts in a seven-year period

²⁴ Allocation reduction as used in this table denotes a reduction in allocations of Table A water.

²⁵ No agriculture-first Article 18(a) allocation cuts occur in these years due to the limit of cumulative 100% allocation cuts in a seven-year period

Table HA-3. Revisions of Bulletin 132 Table B-4 Values to Convert Published Monterey Amendments (Project) Table A Amounts to Baseline Table A Amounts

Year	Contractor	MA Change to Baseline	Reason
1996	KCWA	Increase Table AG by 40,670 af	Reverse retirement by KCWA
1996	Dudley Ridge	Increase Table A by 4,330 af	Reverse retirement by Dudley Ridge
1998	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 25,000 af	Reverse transfer to Mojave
1998	Mojave	Decrease AG Table A by 25,000 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2000	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 22,000 af	Reverse transfer to Zone 7
2000	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 4,000 af	Reverse transfer to Palmdale
2000	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 41,000 af	Reverse transfer to Castaic
2000	Zone 7	Decrease AG Table A by 22,000 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2000	Palmdale	Decrease AG Table A by 4,000 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2000	Castaic	Decrease AG Table A by 41,000 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2001	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 4,025 af	Reverse transfer to Napa
2001	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 5,756 af	Reverse transfer to Solano
2001	KCWA	Increase AG Table A by 12,219 af	Reverse transfer to Zone 7
2001	Napa	Decrease AG Table A by 4,025 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2001	Solano	Decrease AG Table A by 5,756 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA
2001	Zone 7	Decrease AG Table A by 12,219 af	Reverse transfer from KCWA

Table HA-4. SWP Contractors' Table A amounts in Baseline, Project, and Alternatives.

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Napa County	1996	10,425	0	10,425	0	10,425	0	4,766	0
	1997	11,065	0	11,065	0	11,065	0	5,091	0
	1998	11,710	0	11,710	0	11,710	0	5,386	0
	1999	15,850	0	15,850	0	15,850	0	7,231	0
	2000	16,325	0	16,325	0	16,325	0	7,444	0
	2001	16,700	0	16,700	4,025	16,700	4,025	7,611	1834
	2002	17,075	0	17,075	4,025	17,075	4,025	7,780	1834
	2003	17,450	0	17,450	4,025	17,450	4,025	8,021	0
	2004	17,825	0	17,825	4,025	17,825	4,025	8,114	1832
	2005	18,200	0	18,200	4,025	18,200	4,025	8,291	1834
Solano County	1996	37,800	0	37,800	0	37,800	0	17,280	0
	1997	38,250	0	38,250	0	38,250	0	17,597	0
	1998	38,710	0	38,710	0	38,710	0	17,804	0
	1999	39,170	0	39,170	0	39,170	0	17,870	0
	2000	39,620	0	39,620	0	39,620	0	18,067	0
	2001	40,080	0	40,080	5,756	40,080	5,756	18,266	2623
	2002	40,540	0	40,540	5,756	40,540	5,756	18,471	2623
	2003	41,000	0	41,000	5,756	41,000	5,756	18,845	0
	2004	41,450	0	41,450	5,756	41,450	5,756	18,869	2620
	2005	41,500	0	41,500	5,756	41,500	5,756	18,906	2622
Alameda Zone 7	1996	44,000	0	44,000	0	44,000	0	20,114	0
	1997	46,000	0	46,000	0	46,000	0	21,163	0
	1998	46,000	0	46,000	0	46,000	0	21,157	0
	1999	46,000	0	46,000	0	46,000	0	20,986	0
	2000	46,000	0	46,000	22,000	46,000	22,000	20,976	10032
	2001	46,000	0	46,000	34,219	46,000	32,000	20,964	14583
	2002	46,000	0	46,000	34,219	46,000	32,000	20,959	14580
	2003	46,000	0	46,000	34,219	46,000	32,000	21,143	0
	2004	46,000	400	46,000	34,619	46,000	34,619	20,940	15759
	2005	46,000	400	46,000	34,619	46,000	34,619	20,956	15771
Alameda	1996	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,200	0
	1997	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,323	0
	1998	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,317	0
	1999	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,161	0
	2000	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,152	0
	2001	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,141	0
	2002	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,137	0
	2003	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,305	0
	2004	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,119	0
	2005	42,000	0	42,000	0	42,000	0	19,134	0

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Santa Clara Valley WD	1996	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,713	0
	1997	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	46,006	0
	1998	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,993	0
	1999	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,622	0
	2000	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,600	0
	2001	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,573	0
	2002	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,563	0
	2003	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,963	0
	2004	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,522	0
	2005	100,000	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	45,556	0
SLO	1996	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,428	0
	1997	6,215	0	6,215	0	6,215	0	2,859	0
	1998	6,215	0	6,215	0	6,215	0	2,858	0
	1999	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,406	0
	2000	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,400	0
	2001	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,393	0
	2002	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,391	0
	2003	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,491	0
	2004	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,380	0
	2005	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	11,389	0
Santa Barbara	1996	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,793	0
	1997	38,986 ²⁶	0	38,986	0	38,986	0	17,936	0
	1998	38,986	0	38,986	0	38,986	0	17,931	0
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,752	0
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,742	0
	2001	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,729	0
	2002	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,725	0
	2003	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,907	0
	2004	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,706	0
	2005	45,486	0	45,486	0	45,486	0	20,722	0
Dudley Ridge	1996	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26377
	1997	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26546
	1998	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26538
	1999	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26324
	2000	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26311
	2001	0	57,700	0	53,370	0	57,700	0	26296
	2002	0	61,673	0	57,343	0	61,673	0	28100
	2003	0	61,673	0	57,343	0	61,673	0	28347
	2004	0	61,673	0	57,343	0	61,673	0	28075
	2005	0	61,673	0	57,343	0	61,673	0	28096

²⁶ For the years 1997 and 1998, Santa Barbara saw a reduction of Table A entitlement of 6,500 AF due to the execution of an amendment to Santa Barbara's long-term water supply by the Department.

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Empire West Side	1996	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1371
	1997	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1380
	1998	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1380
	1999	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1369
	2000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1368
	2001	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1367
	2002	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1367
	2003	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1379
	2004	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1366
	2005	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1367
KCWA	1996	134,600	1,023,130	134,600	982,460	134,600	1,023,130	61,530	467706
	1997	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	978,130	134,600	1,018,800	61,925	468713
	1998	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	953,130	134,600	993,800	61,907	457083
	1999	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	953,130	134,600	993,800	61,407	453393
	2000	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	886,130	134,600	926,800	61,378	422624
	2001	134,600	1,021,019	134,600	866,349	134,600	907,019	61,341	413356
	2002	134,600	1,021,019	134,600	866,349	134,600	907,019	61,328	413267
	2003	134,600	1,021,019	134,600	866,349	134,600	907,019	61,866	469293
	2004	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	864,130	134,600	904,800	61,273	411883
	2005	134,600	1,018,800	134,600	864,130	134,600	904,800	61,318	412191
Kings	1996	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1829
	1997	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1840
	1998	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1840
	1999	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1825
	2000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1824
	2001	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1823
	2002	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1823
	2003	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	4137
	2004	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	4097
	2005	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	9,000	0	4100
Oak Flat Irrigation District	1996	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2606
	1997	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2622
	1998	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2622
	1999	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2600
	2000	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2599
	2001	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2598
	2002	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2597
	2003	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2620
	2004	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2595
	2005	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	5,700	0	2597

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Tulare	1996	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54170
	1997	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54518
	1998	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54502
	1999	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54062
	2000	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54036
	2001	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	118,500	0	54004
	2002	0	111,527	0	111,527	0	111,527	0	50815
	2003	0	111,127	0	111,127	0	111,127	0	51077
	2004	0	96,227	0	96,227	0	96,227	0	43804
	2005	0	96,227	0	96,227	0	96,227	0	43837
AVEK	1996	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,267	0
	1997	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,673	0
	1998	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,655	0
	1999	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,141	0
	2000	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,111	0
	2001	138,400	0	138,400	0	138,400	0	63,073	0
	2002	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	63,059	1367
	2003	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	63,613	1379
	2004	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	63,002	1366
	2005	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	138,400	3,000	63,050	1367
Castaic	1996	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	18,971	5806
	1997	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	19,093	5843
	1998	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	19,087	5841
	1999	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	41,500	12,700	18,933	5794
	2000	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	18,924	24487
	2001	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	18,913	24473
	2002	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	18,909	24467
	2003	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	19,075	5837
	2004	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	18,892	24445
	2005	41,500	12,700	41,500	53,700	41,500	53,700	18,906	24464
Coachella	1996	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,560	0
	1997	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,627	0
	1998	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,624	0
	1999	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,539	0
	2000	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,534	0
	2001	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,527	0
	2002	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,525	0
	2003	23,100	0	23,100	0	23,100	0	10,617	0
	2004	23,100	9,900	23,100	9,900	23,100	9,900	10,516	4507
	2005	111,200	9,900	111,200	9,900	111,200	9,900	50,658	4510

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Crestline	1996	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,651	0
	1997	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,668	0
	1998	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,668	0
	1999	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,646	0
	2000	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,645	0
	2001	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,643	0
	2002	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,643	0
	2003	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,666	0
	2004	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,640	0
	2005	5,800	0	5,800	0	5,800	0	2,642	0
Desert	1996	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,417	0
	1997	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,528	0
	1998	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,524	0
	1999	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,382	0
	2000	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,374	0
	2001	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,363	0
	2002	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,360	0
	2003	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,512	0
	2004	38,100	0	38,100	0	38,100	0	17,344	0
	2005	50,000	0	50,000	0	50,000	0	22,778	0
Littlerock	1996	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,051	0
	1997	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,058	0
	1998	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,058	0
	1999	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,049	0
	2000	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,049	0
	2001	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,048	0
	2002	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,048	0
	2003	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,057	0
	2004	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,047	0
	2005	2,300	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	1,048	0
Mojave	1996	50,800	0	50,800	0	50,800	0	23,222	0
	1997	50,800	0	50,800	0	50,800	0	23,371	0
	1998	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,365	11498
	1999	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,176	11406
	2000	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,165	11400
	2001	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,151	11393
	2002	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,146	11391
	2003	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,349	11491
	2004	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,125	11380
2005	50,800	0	50,800	25,000	50,800	25,000	23,142	11389	

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Palmdale	1996	17,300	0	17,300	0	17,300	0	7,908	0
	1997	17,300	0	17,300	0	17,300	0	7,959	0
	1998	17,300	0	17,300	0	17,300	0	7,957	0
	1999	17,300	0	17,300	0	17,300	0	7,893	0
	2000	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,889	1824
	2001	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,884	1823
	2002	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,882	1823
	2003	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,952	0
	2004	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,875	1821
	2005	17,300	0	17,300	4,000	17,300	4,000	7,881	1822
San Bernardino	1996	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,902	0
	1997	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	47,203	0
	1998	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	47,189	0
	1999	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,808	0
	2000	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,786	0
	2001	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,758	0
	2002	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,748	0
	2003	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	47,158	0
	2004	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,706	0
	2005	102,600	0	102,600	0	102,600	0	46,741	0
San Gabriel	1996	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,165	0
	1997	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,250	0
	1998	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,246	0
	1999	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,139	0
	2000	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,133	0
	2001	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,125	0
	2002	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,122	0
	2003	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,237	0
	2004	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,110	0
	2005	28,800	0	28,800	0	28,800	0	13,120	0
San Gorgonio	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1999	2,000	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	912	0
	2000	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	1,368	0
	2001	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1,823	0
	2002	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	1,823	0
	2003	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	2,298	0
	2004	6,000	0	6,000	0	6,000	0	2,731	0
	2005	6,500	0	6,500	0	6,500	0	2,961	0

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
MWD	1996	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	920,482	0
	1997	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	925,417	0
	1998	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	925,159	0
	1999	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	917,689	0
	2000	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	917,252	0
	2001	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	916,701	0
	2002	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	916,504	0
	2003	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	924,549	0
	2004	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	2,011,500	0	915,674	0
	2005	1,911,500	0	1,911,500	0	1,911,500	0	870,804	0
Ventura	1996	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,143	0
	1997	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,201	0
	1998	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,199	0
	1999	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,124	0
	2000	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,120	0
	2001	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,115	0
	2002	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,113	0
	2003	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,193	0
	2004	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,104	0
	2005	20,000	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	9,111	0
Yuba	1996	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,388	0
	1997	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,417	0
	1998	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,415	0
	1999	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,380	0
	2000	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,378	0
	2001	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,375	0
	2002	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,374	0
	2003	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,412	0
	2004	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,370	0
	2005	9,600	0	9,600	0	9,600	0	4,373	0
Butte	1996	1,200	0	1,200	0	1,200	0	549	0
	1997	1,200	0	1,200	0	1,200	0	552	0
	1998	1,200	0	1,200	0	1,200	0	552	0
	1999	2,890	0	2,890	0	2,890	0	1,318	0
	2000	2,890	0	2,890	0	2,890	0	1,318	0
	2001	3,500	0	3,500	0	3,500	0	1,595	0
	2002	3,500	0	3,500	0	3,500	0	1,595	0
	2003	3,500	0	3,500	0	3,500	0	1,609	0
	2004	3,500	0	3,500	0	3,500	0	1,593	0
	2005	1,200	0	1,200	0	1,200	0	547	0

Contractor	Year	Table A Amount							
		Baseline		Project		NPA1		CNP	
		M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG	M&I	AG
Plumas	1996	1,300	0	1,300	0	1,300	0	594	0
	1997	1,350	0	1,350	0	1,350	0	621	0
	1998	1,400	0	1,400	0	1,400	0	644	0
	1999	1,450	0	1,450	0	1,450	0	662	0
	2000	1,510	0	1,510	0	1,510	0	689	0
	2001	1,570	0	1,570	0	1,570	0	715	0
	2002	1,630	0	1,630	0	1,630	0	743	0
	2003	1,690	0	1,690	0	1,690	0	777	0
	2004	1,750	0	1,750	0	1,750	0	797	0
	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table HA-5 – Historical Analysis Assumptions for Baseline, Project, and Alternatives.

Issue	Assumptions for EIR Alternatives				
	Baseline	Proposed Project	NPA1	CNPA3	CNPA4
Article 18 provisions for allocation of Table A Water	Uses 1994 contract provisions	Uses Monterey Plus provisions	Uses 1994 contract provisions	Uses 1994 contract provisions	Uses 1994 contract provisions
Table A changes and transfers	A contractor’s Table A changes only if original SWP contract specified or through another action unrelated to Project.	Baseline values and includes 22 TAF of transfers from TLBWD to M& I contractors during 2000-05, (2) 114 TAF of transfers from KCWA to M&I contractors during 1998-2003.	Same as Baseline	Baseline values reduced proportionately so that total SWP Table A amounts equal 1.9 MAF in each year. No transfers of Table A amount between SWP contractors.	Same as CNPA3
Table A Retirements by KCWA (40,670) and DRWD (4,330)	No retirement. KCWA and DRWD retain Table A amounts.	Table A amounts are retired in 1996	Same as Baseline.	Same as Baseline.	Same as Baseline.
Invocation of Article 18(b)	Contracts retain Article 18(b) but DWR does not invoke Article 18(b).	Elimination of Article 18(b) from the SWP contracts.	Same as Baseline.	DWR invokes Article 18(b) in 1996.	DWR invokes Article 18(b) in 1996.

Table HA-6. Four Groupings of SWP Contractors for Interpretation of Project Effects*.

SWP Contractors With ...	M&I Contractors	Agricultural Contractors
No Monterey Amendment-related Transfers or Retirements	<u><i>Group 1</i></u> Plumas, Butte, Yuba City, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Crestline, Desert, Littlerock Creek, MWD, San Bernardino Valley, San Gabriel Valley, San Geronio Pass, Coachella, AVEK & Ventura	<u><i>Group 2</i></u> Oak Flat, Kings, Tulare & Empire Westside
Table A Transfers or Retirements	<u><i>Group 3</i></u> Napa, Solano, Zone 7, Castaic, Mojave & Palmdale	<u><i>Group 4</i></u> KCWA (AG), & Dudley Ridge

* Note that these groupings apply only to Project effects. Different groupings are used to present the effects of other alternatives.

Table HA-7. Study Assumptions Regarding SWP contractors' Agricultural, Groundwater Replenishment, and Municipal uses of Scheduled Surplus Water in CNPA4.

Contractor	Agricultural Use	Groundwater Replenishment Use (%)	Municipal or other use (%)
Butte	0%	0%	100%
Yuba	0%	0%	100%
Plumas	0%	0%	100%
Napa	10%	0%	90%
Solano	0%	0%	100%
Alameda County	0%	10%	90%
Zone 7	10%	0%	90%
Santa Clara	10%	10%	80%
Oak Flat	100%	0%	0%
Kings	100%	0%	0%
Dudley	100%	0%	0%
Empire	100%	0%	0%
KCWA	90%	0%	10%
Tulare	100%	0%	0%
San Luis Obispo	0%	0%	100%
Santa Barbara	0%	0%	100%
AVEK	30%	0%	70%
Castaic	0%	0%	100%
Coachella	0%	100%	0%
Crestline	0%	0%	100%
Desert	0%	0%	100%
Littlerock	30%	0%	70%
Mojave	0%	100%	0%
Palmdale	0%	0%	100%
San Bernardino	0%	0%	100%
San Gabriel	0%	100%	0%
San Geronio	5%	0%	95%
MWD	7%	20%	73%
Ventura	0%	0%	100%

Table HA-8. Implementation of Article 18(a) cuts in the Baseline			
Year	Baseline's Article 18(a) Reductions²⁷		
	AG-first Reduction	Cumulative 7-year Total Ag-first Reduction	AG and M&I shared Reduction
1996	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0
1999	6%	6%	0
2000	21%	27%	0
2001	50%	77%	47%
2002	23%	100%	19%
2003	0	100%	11%
2004	0	100%	36%
2005	0	100%	11%

Table HA-9. Implementation of Article 18(a) cuts in NPA1			
Year	NPA1's Article 18(a) Reductions		
	AG-first Reduction	Cumulative 7-year Total Ag-first Reduction	AG and M&I Shared Reduction
1996	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0
1999	4%	4%	0
2000	21%	25%	0
2001	50%	75%	47%
2002	25%	100%	17%
2003	0	100%	11%
2004	0	100%	36%
2005	0	100%	11%

Table HA-10. Implementation of Article 18(a) cuts in CNP			
Year	CNP's Article 18(a) Reductions		
	AG-first Reduction	Cumulative 7-year Total Ag-first Reduction	AG and M&I Shared Reduction
1996	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0
2001	50%	50%	1%
2002	0	50%	0
2003	0	50%	0
2004	0	50%	0
2005	0	50%	0

²⁷ Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Year	AG Table A Allocation (%)		M&I Table A Allocation (%)	
	Baseline	Project	Baseline	Project
1996	98%	100%	98%	100%
1997	99%	100%	99%	100%
1998	98%	100%	98%	100%
1999	94%	100%	100%	100%
2000	79%	90%	100%	90% (96%) ²⁸
2001	3%	39%	53%	39%
2002	58%	70%	74%	70%
2003	89%	90%	89%	90%
2004	64%	65%	64%	65%
2005	89%	90%	89%	90%

Year	AG Table A Allocation (%)		M&I Table A Allocation (%)	
	NPA1	CNP	NPA1	CNP
1996	98%	100%	98%	100%
1997	99%	100%	99%	100%
1998	99%	100%	99%	100%
1999	96%	100%	100%	100%
2000	79%	100%	100%	100%
2001	3%	49%	53%	99%
2002	58%	100%	83%	100%
2003	89%	100%	89%	100%
2004	64%	100%	64%	100%
2005	89%	100%	89%	100%

Year	M&I Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,497,042	1,521,977	24,935	2%
1997	1,775,017	1,801,846	26,829	2%
1998	1,996,842	2,040,645	43,803	2%
1999	2,063,859	2,063,859	0	0%
2000	2,440,720	2,348,545	-92,175	-4%
2001	1,568,529	1,150,233	-418,296	-27%
2002	2,172,159	2,064,870	-107,289	-5%
2003	2,626,324	2,656,373	30,050	1%
2004	1,899,020	1,919,717	20,698	1%
2005	2,626,608	2,655,257	28,649	1%
Total	20,666,118	20,223,322	-442,796	-2%

Table HA-14. Project Effects on Total AG Table A Allocations				
Year	AG Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,204,665	1,179,730	-24,935	-2%
1997	1,202,229	1,175,400	-26,829	-2%
1998	1,194,204	1,150,400	-43,804	-4%
1999	1,150,400	1,150,400	0	0%
2000	965,363	1,057,538	92,175	10%
2001	39,041	457,337	418,296	1071%
2002	714,856	822,145	107,289	15%
2003	1,087,909	1,057,860	-30,049	-3%
2004	784,707	764,010	-20,697	-3%
2005	1,086,509	1,057,860	-28,649	-3%
Total	9,429,883	9,872,680	442,797	5%

Table HA-15. NPA1 Effects on Total M&I Table A Allocations				
Year	M&I Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,497,042	1,497,042	0	0%
1997	1,775,017	1,775,017	0	0%
1998	1,996,842	2,012,268	15,426	1%
1999	2,063,859	2,063,859	0	0%
2000	2,440,720	2,440,720	0	0%
2001	1,568,529	1,568,579	50	0%
2002	2,172,159	2,183,432	11,273	1%
2003	2,626,324	2,627,720	1,397	0%
2004	1,899,020	1,899,020	0	0%
2005	2,626,608	2,626,608	0	0%
Total	20,666,118	20,694,265	28,147	0%

Table HA-16. NPA1 Effects on Total AG Table A Allocations				
Year	AG Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,204,665	1,204,665	0	0%
1997	1,202,229	1,202,229	0	0%
1998	1,194,204	1,178,777	-15,427	-1%
1999	1,150,400	1,150,400	0	0%
2000	965,363	965,363	0	0%
2001	39,041	38,991	-50	0%
2002	714,856	703,582	-11,274	-2%
2003	1,087,909	1,086,513	-1,397	0%
2004	784,707	784,707	0	0%
2005	1,086,509	1,086,509	0	0%
Total	9,429,883	9,401,736	-28,147	0%

Table HA-17. CNP Effects on Total M&I Table A Allocations				
Year	M&I Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,497,042	1,052,932	-444,110	-30%
1997	1,775,017	1,132,769	-642,248	-36%
1998	1,996,842	1,198,137	-798,704	-40%
1999	2,063,859	1,203,136	-860,723	-42%
2000	2,440,720	1,266,307	-1,174,413	-48%
2001	1,568,529	1,329,486	-239,043	-15%
2002	2,172,159	1,343,947	-828,212	-38%
2003	2,626,324	1,344,199	-1,282,124	-49%
2004	1,899,020	1,344,450	-554,569	-29%
2005	2,626,608	1,344,034	-1,282,574	-49%
Total	20,666,118	12,559,397	-8,106,721	-39%

Table HA-18. CNP Effects on Total AG Table A Allocations				
Year	M&I Table A Allocations (AF)		Allocation Difference (AF)	Percent Change
	Baseline	Project		
1996	1,204,665	847,068	-357,597	-30%
1997	1,202,229	767,231	-434,998	-36%
1998	1,194,204	701,863	-492,341	-41%
1999	1,150,400	696,864	-453,536	-39%
2000	965,363	633,693	-331,670	-34%
2001	39,041	278,086	239,045	612%
2002	714,856	555,801	-159,055	-22%
2003	1,087,909	555,801	-532,109	-49%
2004	784,707	555,550	-229,158	-29%
2005	1,086,509	555,966	-530,543	-49%
Total	9,429,883	6,147,923	-3,281,960	-35%

Table HA-19. Effects of Project on Historic SWP Table A Allocations To Selected M&I Contractors With No Project-Related Table A Changes (Group One)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			Project's Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Santa Clara Valley WD	1996	98,362	0	98,362	100,000	0	100,000	1,638	2%
	1997	98,511	0	98,511	100,000	0	100,000	1,489	2%
	1998	97,853	0	97,853	100,000	0	100,000	2,147	2%
	1999	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0%
	2000	100,000	0	100,000	90,000	0	90,000	-10,000	-10%
	2001	53,193	0	53,193	39,000	0	39,000	-14,193	-27%
	2002	81,450	0	81,450	70,000	0	70,000	-11,450	-14%
	2003	88,982	0	88,982	90,000	0	90,000	1,018	1%
	2004	64,299	0	64,299	65,000	0	65,000	701	1%
	2005	89,029	0	89,029	90,000	0	90,000	971	1%
Total		871,680	0	871,680	844,000	0	844,000	-27,680	-3%
Santa Barbara	1996	42,282	0	42,282	42,986	0	42,986	704	2%
	1997	38,406	0	38,406	38,986	0	38,986	580	2%
	1998	38,149	0	38,149	38,986	0	38,986	837	2%
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	45,486	0	45,486	0	0%
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	40,937	0	40,937	-4,549	-10%
	2001	24,195	0	24,195	17,740	0	17,740	-6,456	-27%
	2002	37,048	0	37,048	31,840	0	31,840	-5,208	-14%
	2003	40,474	0	40,474	40,937	0	40,937	463	1%
	2004	29,247	0	29,247	29,566	0	29,566	319	1%
	2005	40,496	0	40,496	40,937	0	40,937	442	1%
Total		381,269	0	381,269	368,402	0	368,402	-12,868	-3%
MWD	1996	726,696	0	726,696	738,800	0	738,800	12,104	2%
	1997	1,028,554	0	1,028,554	1,044,100	0	1,044,100	15,546	2%
	1998	1,177,743	0	1,177,743	1,203,578	0	1,203,578	25,835	2%
	1999	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	0	0%
	2000	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	0	0%
	2001	1,069,982	0	1,069,982	784,485	0	784,485	-285,497	-27%
	2002	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	0	0%
	2003	1,789,871	0	1,789,871	1,810,350	0	1,810,350	20,479	1%
	2004	1,293,378	0	1,293,378	1,307,475	0	1,307,475	14,097	1%
	2005	1,701,788	0	1,701,788	1,720,350	0	1,720,350	18,562	1%
Total		12,883,197	0	12,883,197	12,704,324	0	12,704,324	-178,873	-1%

Table HA-20. Effects of Project on SWP Table A Allocations To Agricultural Contractors With No Project-Related Table A Changes (Group Two)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			Project's Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Empire West Side	1996	0	2,951	2,951	0	3,000	3,000	49	2%
	1997	0	2,955	2,955	0	3,000	3,000	45	2%
	1998	0	2,936	2,936	0	3,000	3,000	64	2%
	1999	0	2,828	2,828	0	3,000	3,000	172	6%
	2000	0	2,373	2,373	0	2,378	2,378	5	0%
	2001	0	96	96	0	101	101	5	5%
	2002	0	1,754	1,754	0	1,465	1,465	-289	-16%
	2003	0	2,669	2,669	0	2,700	2,700	31	1%
	2004	0	1,929	1,929	0	1,950	1,950	21	1%
	2005	0	2,671	2,671	0	2,700	2,700	29	1%
Total	0	23,161	23,161	0	23,294	23,294	133	1%	
Oak Flat Irrigation District	1996	0	5,607	5,607	0	5,700	5,700	93	2%
	1997	0	5,615	5,615	0	5,700	5,700	85	2%
	1998	0	5,578	5,578	0	5,700	5,700	122	2%
	1999	0	5,373	5,373	0	5,700	5,700	327	6%
	2000	0	4,509	4,509	0	5,130	5,130	621	14%
	2001	0	182	182	0	2,223	2,223	2,041	1121%
	2002	0	3,332	3,332	0	3,990	3,990	658	20%
	2003	0	5,072	5,072	0	5,130	5,130	58	1%
	2004	0	3,665	3,665	0	3,705	3,705	40	1%
	2005	0	5,075	5,075	0	5,130	5,130	55	1%
Total	0	44,007	44,007	0	48,108	48,108	4,101	9%	
Kings	1996	0	3,934	3,934	0	4,000	4,000	66	2%
	1997	0	3,940	3,940	0	4,000	4,000	60	2%
	1998	0	3,914	3,914	0	4,000	4,000	86	2%
	1999	0	3,771	3,771	0	4,000	4,000	229	6%
	2000	0	3,164	3,164	0	3,600	3,600	436	14%
	2001	0	128	128	0	1,560	1,560	1,432	1121%
	2002	0	2,338	2,338	0	2,800	2,800	462	20%
	2003	0	3,559	3,559	0	3,600	3,600	41	1%
	2004	0	5,787	5,787	0	5,850	5,850	63	1%
	2005	0	8,013	8,013	0	8,100	8,100	87	1%
Total	0	38,548	38,548	0	41,510	41,510	2,962	8%	
Tulare	1996	0	116,559	116,559	0	118,500	118,500	1,941	2%
	1997	0	116,736	116,736	0	118,500	118,500	1,764	2%
	1998	0	115,956	115,956	0	118,500	118,500	2,544	2%
	1999	0	111,703	111,703	0	118,500	118,500	6,797	6%
	2000	0	93,736	93,736	0	106,650	106,650	12,914	14%
	2001	0	3,784	3,784	0	46,215	46,215	42,431	1121%
	2002	0	65,188	65,188	0	78,069	78,069	12,881	20%
	2003	0	99,239	99,239	0	100,374	100,374	1,135	1%
	2004	0	61,873	61,873	0	62,548	62,548	674	1%
	2005	0	85,670	85,670	0	86,604	86,604	934	1%
Total	0	870,443	870,443	0	954,460	954,460	84,017	10%	

Table HA-21. Effects of Project on SWP Table A Allocations To M&I Contractors With Project-Related Table A Changes (Group Three)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			Project's Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Napa County	1996	10,254	0	10,254	10,425	0	10,425	171	2%
	1997	10,900	0	10,900	11,065	0	11,065	165	2%
	1998	11,459	0	11,459	11,710	0	11,710	251	2%
	1999	15,850	0	15,850	15,850	0	15,850	0	0%
	2000	16,325	0	16,325	14,693	0	14,693	-1,633	-10%
	2001	8,883	0	8,883	6,513	1,570	8,083	-801	-9%
	2002	13,908	0	13,908	11,953	2,818	14,770	862	6%
	2003	15,527	0	15,527	15,705	3,623	19,328	3,800	24%
	2004	11,461	0	11,461	11,586	2,616	14,203	2,741	24%
	2005	10,900	0	10,900	11,065	0	11,065	165	2%
Total		125,468	0	125,468	120,564	10,626	131,190	5,722	5%
Solano County	1996	37,181	0	37,181	37,800	0	37,800	619	2%
	1997	31,829	0	31,829	32,310	0	32,310	481	2%
	1998	37,879	0	37,879	38,710	0	38,710	831	2%
	1999	39,170	0	39,170	39,170	0	39,170	0	0%
	2000	39,620	0	39,620	35,658	0	35,658	-3,962	-10%
	2001	21,320	0	21,320	15,631	2,245	17,876	-3,444	-16%
	2002	33,020	0	33,020	28,378	4,029	32,407	-613	-2%
	2003	36,483	0	36,483	36,900	5,180	42,080	5,598	15%
	2004	26,652	0	26,652	26,943	3,741	30,684	4,032	15%
	2005	36,947	0	36,947	37,350	5,180	42,530	5,583	15%
Total		340,100	0	340,100	328,850	20,376	349,226	9,126	3%
Alameda Zone 7	1996	43,279	0	43,279	44,000	0	44,000	721	2%
	1997	45,315	0	45,315	46,000	0	46,000	685	2%
	1998	42,191	0	42,191	43,117	0	43,117	926	2%
	1999	46,000	0	46,000	46,000	0	46,000	0	0%
	2000	46,000	0	46,000	41,400	19,800	61,200	15,200	33%
	2001	24,469	0	24,469	17,940	12,480	30,420	5,951	24%
	2002	37,467	234	37,701	32,200	22,400	54,600	16,899	45%
	2003	40,932	0	40,932	41,400	28,800	70,200	29,268	72%
	2004	29,578	257	29,835	29,900	22,502	52,402	22,568	76%
	2005	40,953	356	41,309	41,400	31,157	72,557	31,248	76%
Total		396,184	847	397,031	383,357	137,139	520,496	123,465	31%
Mojave	1996	19,672	0	19,672	20,000	0	20,000	328	2%
	1997	14,383	0	14,383	14,600	0	14,600	217	2%
	1998	14,678	0	14,678	15,000	0	15,000	322	2%
	1999	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	0	0%
	2000	50,800	0	50,800	45,720	22,500	68,220	17,420	34%
	2001	27,022	0	27,022	19,812	9,750	29,562	2,540	9%
	2002	41,377	0	41,377	35,560	17,500	53,060	11,683	28%
	2003	45,203	0	45,203	45,720	22,500	68,220	23,017	51%
	2004	32,664	0	32,664	33,020	16,250	49,270	16,606	51%
	2005	45,227	0	45,227	45,720	22,500	68,220	22,993	51%
Total		311,025	0	311,025	295,152	111,000	406,152	95,127	31%

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			Project's Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Castaic	1996	40,820	12,492	53,312	41,500	12,700	54,200	888	2%
	1997	40,882	12,511	53,393	41,500	12,700	54,200	807	2%
	1998	40,609	12,427	53,037	41,500	12,700	54,200	1,163	2%
	1999	41,500	11,972	53,472	41,500	12,700	54,200	728	1%
	2000	41,500	10,046	51,546	37,350	48,330	85,680	34,134	66%
	2001	22,075	406	22,481	16,185	20,943	37,128	14,647	65%
	2002	33,802	7,423	41,225	29,050	37,590	66,640	25,415	62%
	2003	36,927	11,301	48,228	37,350	48,330	85,680	37,452	78%
	2004	26,684	8,166	34,850	26,975	34,905	61,880	27,030	78%
	2005	36,947	11,307	48,254	37,350	48,330	85,680	37,426	78%
	Total	361,747	98,050	459,797	350,260	289,228	639,488	179,691	39%
Palmdale	1996	17,017	0	17,017	17,300	0	17,300	283	2%
	1997	17,042	0	17,042	17,300	0	17,300	258	2%
	1998	16,929	0	16,929	17,300	0	17,300	371	2%
	1999	17,300	0	17,300	17,300	0	17,300	0	0%
	2000	17,300	0	17,300	15,570	3,600	19,170	1,870	11%
	2001	9,202	0	9,202	6,747	1,560	8,307	-895	-10%
	2002	14,091	0	14,091	12,110	2,800	14,910	819	6%
	2003	15,394	0	15,394	15,570	3,600	19,170	3,776	25%
	2004	11,124	0	11,124	11,245	2,600	13,845	2,721	24%
	2005	15,402	0	15,402	15,570	3,600	19,170	3,768	24%
	Total	150,801	0	150,801	146,012	17,760	163,772	12,971	9%

Table HA-22. Effects of Project on SWP Table A Allocations To Agricultural Contractors With Project-Related Table A Changes (Group Four)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			Project's Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Dudley Ridge	1996	0	56,755	56,755	0	53,370	53,370	-3,385	-6%
	1997	0	56,841	56,841	0	53,370	53,370	-3,471	-6%
	1998	0	56,461	56,461	0	53,370	53,370	-3,091	-5%
	1999	0	54,390	54,390	0	53,370	53,370	-1,020	-2%
	2000	0	45,642	45,642	0	48,033	48,033	2,391	5%
	2001	0	1,843	1,843	0	20,814	20,814	18,972	1030%
	2002	0	36,048	36,048	0	40,140	40,140	4,092	11%
	2003	0	54,878	54,878	0	51,609	51,609	-3,269	-6%
	2004	0	39,655	39,655	0	37,273	37,273	-2,382	-6%
	2005	0	54,907	54,907	0	51,609	51,609	-3,298	-6%
Total		0	457,420	457,420	0	462,958	462,958	5,538	1%
KCWA	1996	132,395	1,006,368	1,138,762	134,600	982,460	1,117,060	-21,702	-2%
	1997	132,596	1,003,630	1,136,226	134,600	978,130	1,112,730	-23,496	-2%
	1998	131,711	996,931	1,128,642	134,600	953,130	1,087,730	-40,912	-4%
	1999	134,600	960,364	1,094,964	134,600	953,130	1,087,730	-7,234	-1%
	2000	134,600	805,893	940,493	121,140	797,517	918,657	-21,836	-2%
	2001	71,598	32,604	104,202	52,494	337,876	390,370	286,168	275%
	2002	109,632	596,787	706,418	94,220	606,444	700,664	-5,754	-1%
	2003	119,770	908,522	1,028,292	121,140	779,714	900,854	-127,437	-12%
	2004	86,547	655,080	741,627	87,490	561,685	649,175	-92,452	-12%
	2005	119,833	907,027	1,026,860	121,140	777,717	898,857	-128,003	-12%
Total		1,173,281	7,873,205	9,046,486	1,136,024	7,727,803	8,863,827	-182,659	-2%

Table HA-23. Effects of NPA1 Historic SWP Table A Allocations To M&I Contractors With No Table A Changes (Group One)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			NPA1 Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Santa Clara Valley WD	1996	98,362	0	98,362	98,362	0	98,362	0	0%
	1997	98,511	0	98,511	98,511	0	98,511	0	0%
	1998	97,853	0	97,853	98,609	0	98,609	756	1%
	1999	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0%
	2000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0%
	2001	53,193	0	53,193	53,195	0	53,195	2	0%
	2002	81,450	0	81,450	82,652	0	82,652	1,202	1%
	2003	88,982	0	88,982	89,029	0	89,029	47	0%
	2004	64,299	0	64,299	64,299	0	64,299	0	0%
	2005	89,029	0	89,029	89,029	0	89,029	0	0%
	Total	871,680	0	871,680	873,686	0	873,686	2,007	0%
Santa Barbara	1996	42,282	0	42,282	42,282	0	42,282	0	0%
	1997	38,406	0	38,406	38,406	0	38,406	0	0%
	1998	38,149	0	38,149	38,444	0	38,444	295	1%
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	45,486	0	45,486	0	0%
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	45,486	0	45,486	0	0%
	2001	24,195	0	24,195	24,196	0	24,196	1	0%
	2002	37,048	0	37,048	37,595	0	37,595	547	1%
	2003	40,474	0	40,474	40,496	0	40,496	22	0%
	2004	29,247	0	29,247	29,247	0	29,247	0	0%
	2005	40,496	0	40,496	40,496	0	40,496	0	0%
	Total	381,269	0	381,269	382,133	0	382,133	864	0%
MWD	1996	726,696	0	726,696	726,696	0	726,696	0	0%
	1997	1,028,554	0	1,028,554	1,028,554	0	1,028,554	0	0%
	1998	1,177,743	0	1,177,743	1,186,841	0	1,186,841	9,098	1%
	1999	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	0	0%
	2000	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	0	0%
	2001	1,069,982	0	1,069,982	1,070,016	0	1,070,016	34	0%
	2002	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	0	0%
	2003	1,789,871	0	1,789,871	1,790,823	0	1,790,823	952	0%
	2004	1,293,378	0	1,293,378	1,293,378	0	1,293,378	0	0%
	2005	1,701,788	0	1,701,788	1,701,788	0	1,701,788	0	0%
	Total	12,883,197	0	12,883,197	12,893,282	0	12,893,282	10,085	0%

Table HA-24. Effects of NPA1 on SWP Table A Allocations To Agricultural Contractors With No Table A Changes (Group Two)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			NPA1 Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Empire West Side	1996	0	2,951	2,951	0	2,951	2,951	0	0%
	1997	0	2,955	2,955	0	2,955	2,955	0	0%
	1998	0	2,936	2,936	0	2,958	2,958	23	1%
	1999	0	2,828	2,828	0	2,887	2,887	59	2%
	2000	0	2,373	2,373	0	2,373	2,373	0	0%
	2001	0	96	96	0	96	96	0	0%
	2002	0	1,754	1,754	0	1,730	1,730	-24	-1%
	2003	0	2,669	2,669	0	2,671	2,671	1	0%
	2004	0	1,929	1,929	0	1,929	1,929	0	0%
	2005	0	2,671	2,671	0	2,671	2,671	0	0%
	Total	0	23,161	23,161	0	23,221	23,221	59	0%
Oak Flat Irrigation District	1996	0	5,607	5,607	0	5,607	5,607	0	0%
	1997	0	5,615	5,615	0	5,615	5,615	0	0%
	1998	0	5,578	5,578	0	5,621	5,621	43	1%
	1999	0	5,373	5,373	0	5,485	5,485	112	2%
	2000	0	4,509	4,509	0	4,509	4,509	0	0%
	2001	0	182	182	0	182	182	0	0%
	2002	0	3,332	3,332	0	3,286	3,286	-46	-1%
	2003	0	5,072	5,072	0	5,075	5,075	3	0%
	2004	0	3,665	3,665	0	3,665	3,665	0	0%
	2005	0	5,075	5,075	0	5,075	5,075	0	0%
	Total	0	44,007	44,007	0	44,119	44,119	113	0%
Kings	1996	0	3,934	3,934	0	3,934	3,934	0	0%
	1997	0	3,940	3,940	0	3,940	3,940	0	0%
	1998	0	3,914	3,914	0	3,944	3,944	30	1%
	1999	0	3,771	3,771	0	3,849	3,849	79	2%
	2000	0	3,164	3,164	0	3,164	3,164	0	0%
	2001	0	128	128	0	128	128	0	0%
	2002	0	2,338	2,338	0	2,306	2,306	-32	-1%
	2003	0	3,559	3,559	0	3,561	3,561	2	0%
	2004	0	5,787	5,787	0	5,787	5,787	0	0%
	2005	0	8,013	8,013	0	8,013	8,013	0	0%
	Total	0	38,548	38,548	0	38,627	38,627	79	0%
Tulare	1996	0	116,559	116,559	0	116,559	116,559	0	0%
	1997	0	116,736	116,736	0	116,736	116,736	0	0%
	1998	0	115,956	115,956	0	116,852	116,852	896	1%
	1999	0	111,703	111,703	0	114,039	114,039	2,336	2%
	2000	0	93,736	93,736	0	93,736	93,736	0	0%
	2001	0	3,784	3,784	0	3,786	3,786	2	0%
	2002	0	65,188	65,188	0	64,297	64,297	-890	-1%
	2003	0	99,239	99,239	0	99,292	99,292	53	0%
	2004	0	61,873	61,873	0	61,873	61,873	0	0%
	2005	0	85,670	85,670	0	85,670	85,670	0	0%
	Total	0	870,443	870,443	0	872,840	872,840	2,396	0%

Table HA-25. Effects of NPA1 on SWP Table A Allocations To M&I Contractors With Table A Changes (Group Three)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			NPA1 Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Napa County	1996	10,254	0	10,254	10,254	0	10,254	0	0%
	1997	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	0	10,900	0	0%
	1998	11,459	0	11,459	11,547	0	11,547	89	1%
	1999	15,850	0	15,850	15,850	0	15,850	0	0%
	2000	16,325	0	16,325	16,325	0	16,325	0	0%
	2001	8,883	0	8,883	8,884	129	9,012	129	1%
	2002	13,908	0	13,908	14,113	2,320	16,433	2,526	18%
	2003	15,527	0	15,527	15,536	3,583	19,119	3,592	23%
	2004	11,461	0	11,461	11,461	2,588	14,049	2,588	23%
	2005	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	0	10,900	0	0%
	Total	125,468	0	125,468	125,770	8,621	134,391	8,923	7%
Solano County	1996	37,181	0	37,181	37,181	0	37,181	0	0%
	1997	31,829	0	31,829	31,829	0	31,829	0	0%
	1998	37,879	0	37,879	38,172	0	38,172	293	1%
	1999	39,170	0	39,170	39,170	0	39,170	0	0%
	2000	39,620	0	39,620	39,620	0	39,620	0	0%
	2001	21,320	0	21,320	21,321	184	21,504	185	1%
	2002	33,020	0	33,020	33,507	3,318	36,825	3,806	12%
	2003	36,483	0	36,483	36,502	5,125	41,627	5,144	14%
	2004	26,652	0	26,652	26,652	3,701	30,353	3,701	14%
	2005	36,947	0	36,947	36,947	5,125	42,072	5,125	14%
Total	340,100	0	340,100	340,900	17,452	358,352	18,252	5%	
Alameda Zone 7	1996	43,279	0	43,279	43,279	0	43,279	0	0%
	1997	45,315	0	45,315	45,315	0	45,315	0	0%
	1998	42,191	0	42,191	42,517	0	42,517	326	1%
	1999	46,000	0	46,000	46,000	0	46,000	0	0%
	2000	46,000	0	46,000	46,000	17,402	63,402	17,402	38%
	2001	24,469	0	24,469	24,470	1,022	25,492	1,023	4%
	2002	37,467	234	37,701	38,020	18,449	56,468	18,768	50%
	2003	40,932	0	40,932	40,953	28,489	69,443	28,511	70%
	2004	29,578	257	29,835	29,578	22,260	51,837	22,003	74%
	2005	40,953	356	41,309	40,953	30,821	71,774	30,465	74%
Total	396,184	847	397,031	397,085	118,443	515,529	118,498	30%	
Mojave	1996	19,672	0	19,672	19,672	0	19,672	0	0%
	1997	14,383	0	14,383	14,383	0	14,383	0	0%
	1998	14,678	0	14,678	14,791	0	14,791	113	1%
	1999	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	0	0%
	2000	50,800	0	50,800	50,800	19,776	70,576	19,776	39%
	2001	27,022	0	27,022	27,023	799	27,822	800	3%
	2002	41,377	0	41,377	41,987	14,413	56,400	15,023	36%
	2003	45,203	0	45,203	45,227	22,257	67,484	22,281	49%
	2004	32,664	0	32,664	32,664	16,075	48,739	16,075	49%
	2005	45,227	0	45,227	45,227	22,257	67,484	22,257	49%
Total	311,025	0	311,025	311,774	95,577	407,351	96,325	31%	

Castaic	1996	40,820	12,492	53,312	40,820	12,492	53,312	0	0%
	1997	40,882	12,511	53,393	40,882	12,511	53,393	0	0%
	1998	40,609	12,427	53,037	40,923	12,523	53,446	410	1%
	1999	41,500	11,972	53,472	41,500	12,222	53,722	250	0%
	2000	41,500	10,046	51,546	41,500	42,478	83,978	32,432	63%
	2001	22,075	406	22,481	22,076	1,716	23,792	1,311	6%
	2002	33,802	7,423	41,225	34,300	30,959	65,259	24,035	58%
	2003	36,927	11,301	48,228	36,947	47,809	84,756	36,528	76%
	2004	26,684	8,166	34,850	26,684	34,529	61,213	26,363	76%
	2005	36,947	11,307	48,254	36,947	47,809	84,756	36,502	76%
Total	361,747	98,050	459,797	362,580	255,047	617,626	157,830	34%	
Palmdale	1996	17,017	0	17,017	17,017	0	17,017	0	0%
	1997	17,042	0	17,042	17,042	0	17,042	0	0%
	1998	16,929	0	16,929	17,059	0	17,059	131	1%
	1999	17,300	0	17,300	17,300	0	17,300	0	0%
	2000	17,300	0	17,300	17,300	3,164	20,464	3,164	18%
	2001	9,202	0	9,202	9,203	128	9,331	128	1%
	2002	14,091	0	14,091	14,299	2,306	16,605	2,514	18%
	2003	15,394	0	15,394	15,402	3,561	18,963	3,569	23%
	2004	11,124	0	11,124	11,124	2,572	13,696	2,572	23%
	2005	15,402	0	15,402	15,402	3,561	18,963	3,561	23%
Total	150,801	0	150,801	151,148	15,292	166,440	15,639	10%	

Table HA-26. Effects of NPA1 on SWP Table A Allocations To Agricultural Contractors With Project-Related Table A Changes (Group Four)

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			NPA1 Allocation (AF)			Change in Table A Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I	AG	Total	AF	%
Dudley Ridge	1996	0	56,755	56,755	0	56,755	56,755	0	0%
	1997	0	56,841	56,841	0	56,841	56,841	0	0%
	1998	0	56,461	56,461	0	56,898	56,898	436	1%
	1999	0	54,390	54,390	0	55,528	55,528	1,137	2%
	2000	0	45,642	45,642	0	45,642	45,642	0	0%
	2001	0	1,843	1,843	0	1,843	1,843	1	0%
	2002	0	36,048	36,048	0	35,556	35,556	-492	-1%
	2003	0	54,878	54,878	0	54,907	54,907	29	0%
	2004	0	39,655	39,655	0	39,655	39,655	0	0%
	2005	0	54,907	54,907	0	54,907	54,907	0	0%
	Total	0	457,420	457,420	0	458,531	458,531	1,112	0%
KCWA	1996	132,395	1,006,368	1,138,762	132,395	1,006,368	1,138,763	0	0%
	1997	132,596	1,003,630	1,136,226	132,596	1,003,630	1,136,226	0	0%
	1998	131,711	996,931	1,128,642	132,728	979,980	1,112,708	-15,933	-1%
	1999	134,600	960,364	1,094,964	134,600	956,389	1,090,989	-3,974	0%
	2000	134,600	805,893	940,493	134,600	733,119	867,719	-72,774	-8%
	2001	71,598	32,604	104,202	71,600	28,979	100,579	-3,623	-3%
	2002	109,632	596,787	706,418	111,249	522,913	634,162	-72,257	-10%
	2003	119,770	908,522	1,028,292	119,833	807,512	927,345	-100,946	-10%
	2004	86,547	655,080	741,627	86,547	581,779	668,326	-73,301	-10%
	2005	119,833	907,027	1,026,860	119,833	805,534	925,367	-101,493	-10%
	Total	1,173,281	7,873,205	9,046,486	1,175,982	7,426,203	8,602,185	-444,301	-5%

Table HA-27. Effects of CNPA3 on SWP Allocations To Selected M&I Contractors.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNP3 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	XA ²⁸	Total	AF	%
Santa Clara Valley WD	1996	98,362	0	98,362	69,164	0	29,184	98,347	-14	0%
	1997	98,511	0	98,511	62,867	0	35,644	98,511	0	0%
	1998	97,853	0	97,853	58,714	0	39,896	98,609	756	1%
	1999	100,000	0	100,000	58,295	0	40,324	98,619	-1,381	-1%
	2000	100,000	0	100,000	51,925	0	41,160	93,085	-6,915	-7%
	2001	53,193	0	53,193	45,087	0	0	45,087	-8,107	-15%
	2002	81,450	0	81,450	45,563	0	23,669	69,232	-12,218	-15%
	2003	88,982	0	88,982	45,543	0	43,487	89,029	47	0%
	2004	64,299	0	64,299	45,522	0	18,777	64,299	0	0%
	2005	89,029	0	89,029	45,556	0	43,473	89,029	0	0%
Total		871,680	0	871,680	528,235	0	315,613	843,848	-27,831	-3%
Santa Barbara	1996	42,282	0	42,282	29,731	0	12,545	42,276	-6	0%
	1997	38,406	0	38,406	24,509	0	13,896	38,406	0	0%
	1998	38,149	0	38,149	22,890	0	15,554	38,444	295	1%
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	26,516	0	18,342	44,858	-628	-1%
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	23,619	0	18,722	42,341	-3,145	-7%
	2001	24,195	0	24,195	20,508	0	0	20,508	-3,687	-15%
	2002	37,048	0	37,048	20,725	0	10,766	31,491	-5,557	-15%
	2003	40,474	0	40,474	20,715	0	19,780	40,496	22	0%
	2004	29,247	0	29,247	20,706	0	8,541	29,247	0	0%
	2005	40,496	0	40,496	20,722	0	19,774	40,496	0	0%
Total		381,269	0	381,269	230,641	0	137,920	368,561	-12,708	-3%
MWD	1996	726,696	0	726,696	510,981	0	215,609	726,590	-106	0%
	1997	1,028,554	0	1,028,554	656,396	0	372,158	1,028,554	0	0%
	1998	1,177,743	0	1,177,743	706,665	0	480,177	1,186,841	9,099	1%
	1999	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	687,886	0	475,822	1,163,708	-16,292	-1%
	2000	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	782,581	0	620,333	1,402,914	-104,222	-7%
	2001	1,069,982	0	1,069,982	906,918	0	0	906,918	-163,065	-15%
	2002	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	916,504	0	476,106	1,392,610	-15,440	-1%
	2003	1,789,871	0	1,789,871	916,088	0	874,735	1,790,823	952	0%
	2004	1,293,378	0	1,293,378	915,674	0	377,704	1,293,378	0	0%
	2005	1,701,788	0	1,701,788	870,804	0	830,984	1,701,788	0	0%
Total		12,883,197	0	12,883,197	7,870,497	0	4,723,628	12,594,124	-289,073	-2%

²⁸ XA as used in this table refers to ex-Table A water.

Table HA-28. Effects of CNPA3 on SWP Allocations To Selected M&I Contractors.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA3 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	XA	Total	AF	%
Alameda	1996	31,934	0	31,934	22,455	0	9,475	31,929	-5	0%
	1997	41,375	0	42,000	26,404	0	14,970	41,375	-625	-1%
	1998	41,098	0	42,000	24,660	0	16,756	41,416	-584	-1%
	1999	42,000	0	42,000	24,484	0	16,936	41,420	-580	-1%
	2000	42,000	0	42,000	21,809	0	17,287	39,096	-2,904	-7%
	2001	22,341	0	42,000	18,936	0	0	18,936	-23,064	-55%
	2002	34,209	0	42,000	19,137	0	9,941	29,078	-12,922	-31%
	2003	37,372	0	42,000	19,128	0	18,264	37,392	-4,608	-11%
	2004	27,006	0	42,000	19,119	0	7,886	27,006	-14,994	-36%
	2005	37,392	0	42,000	19,134	0	18,259	37,392	-4,608	-11%
	Total	356,728	0	409,934	215,265	0	129,775	345,040	-64,894	-16%
Santa Clara Valley	1996	98,362	0	98,362	69,164	0	29,184	98,347	-14	0%
	1997	98,511	0	98,511	62,867	0	35,644	98,511	0	0%
	1998	97,853	0	97,853	58,714	0	39,896	98,609	756	1%
	1999	100,000	0	100,000	58,295	0	40,324	98,619	-1,381	-1%
	2000	100,000	0	100,000	51,925	0	41,160	93,085	-6,915	-7%
	2001	53,193	0	53,193	45,087	0	0	45,087	-8,107	-15%
	2002	81,450	0	81,450	45,563	0	23,669	69,232	-12,218	-15%
	2003	88,982	0	88,982	45,543	0	43,487	89,029	47	0%
	2004	64,299	0	64,299	45,522	0	18,777	64,299	0	0%
	2005	89,029	0	89,029	45,556	0	43,473	89,029	0	0%
Total	871,680	0	871,680	528,235	0	315,613	843,848	-27,831	-3%	
SLO	1996	24,590	0	24,590	17,291	0	7,296	24,587	-4	0%
	1997	5,797	0	5,797	3,700	0	2,098	5,797	0	0%
	1998	3,810	0	3,810	2,286	0	1,554	3,840	29	1%
	1999	25,000	0	25,000	14,574	0	10,081	24,655	-345	-1%
	2000	25,000	0	25,000	12,981	0	10,290	23,271	-1,729	-7%
	2001	13,298	0	13,298	11,272	0	0	11,272	-2,027	-15%
	2002	20,363	0	20,363	11,391	0	5,917	17,308	-3,054	-15%
	2003	22,245	0	22,245	11,386	0	10,872	22,257	12	0%
	2004	16,075	0	16,075	11,380	0	4,694	16,075	0	0%
	2005	22,257	0	22,257	11,389	0	10,868	22,257	0	0%
Total	178,437	0	178,437	107,650	0	63,670	171,319	-7,117	-4%	

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA3 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	XA	Total	AF	%
Santa Barbara	1996	42,282	0	42,282	29,731	0	12,545	42,276	-6	0%
	1997	38,406	0	38,406	24,509	0	13,896	38,406	0	0%
	1998	38,149	0	38,149	22,890	0	15,554	38,444	295	1%
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	26,516	0	18,342	44,858	-628	-1%
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	23,619	0	18,722	42,341	-3,145	-7%
	2001	24,195	0	24,195	20,508	0	0	20,508	-3,687	-15%
	2002	37,048	0	37,048	20,725	0	10,766	31,491	-5,557	-15%
	2003	40,474	0	40,474	20,715	0	19,780	40,496	22	0%
	2004	29,247	0	29,247	20,706	0	8,541	29,247	0	0%
	2005	40,496	0	40,496	20,722	0	19,774	40,496	0	0%
	Total	381,269	0	381,269	230,641	0	137,920	368,561	-12,708	-3%
Crestline	1996	4,082	0	4,082	2,870	0	1,211	4,081	-1	0%
	1997	1,921	0	1,921	1,226	0	695	1,921	0	0%
	1998	1,908	0	1,908	1,145	0	778	1,923	15	1%
	1999	5,800	0	5,800	3,381	0	2,339	5,720	-80	-1%
	2000	5,800	0	5,800	3,012	0	2,387	5,399	-401	-7%
	2001	3,085	0	3,085	2,615	0	0	2,615	-470	-15%
	2002	4,724	0	4,724	2,643	0	1,373	4,015	-709	-15%
	2003	5,161	0	5,161	2,641	0	2,522	5,164	3	0%
	2004	3,729	0	3,729	2,640	0	1,089	3,729	0	0%
	2005	5,164	0	5,164	2,642	0	2,521	5,164	0	0%
	Total	41,374	0	41,374	24,816	0	14,916	39,731	-1,643	-4%

Table HA-29. Effects of CNPA3 SWP Allocations To AG Contractors.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA3 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	XA ²⁹	Total	AF	%
Dudley Ridge	1996	0	56,755	56,755	0	39,907	16,839	56,746	-8	0%
	1997	0	56,841	56,841	0	36,274	20,567	56,841	0	0%
	1998	0	56,461	56,461	0	33,878	23,020	56,898	436	1%
	1999	0	54,390	54,390	0	33,636	23,267	56,903	2,513	5%
	2000	0	45,642	45,642	0	29,961	23,749	53,710	8,068	18%
	2001	0	1,843	1,843	0	6,574	0	6,574	4,731	257%
	2002	0	36,048	36,048	0	28,100	14,598	42,698	6,650	18%
	2003	0	54,878	54,878	0	28,087	26,820	54,907	29	0%
	2004	0	39,655	39,655	0	28,075	11,580	39,655	0	0%
	2005	0	54,907	54,907	0	28,096	26,811	54,907	0	0%
Total	0	457,420	457,420	0	292,589	187,250	479,839	22,419	5%	
Kings	1996	0	3,934	3,934	0	2,767	1,167	3,934	-1	0%
	1997	0	3,940	3,940	0	2,515	1,426	3,940	0	0%
	1998	0	3,914	3,914	0	2,349	1,596	3,944	30	1%
	1999	0	3,771	3,771	0	2,332	1,613	3,945	174	5%
	2000	0	3,164	3,164	0	2,077	1,646	3,723	559	18%
	2001	0	128	128	0	456	0	456	328	257%
	2002	0	2,338	2,338	0	1,823	947	2,769	431	18%
	2003	0	3,559	3,559	0	1,822	1,739	3,561	2	0%
	2004	0	5,787	5,787	0	4,097	1,690	5,787	0	0%
	2005	0	8,013	8,013	0	4,100	3,913	8,013	0	0%
Total	0	38,548	38,548	0	24,336	15,737	40,073	1,524	4%	
Empire West Side	1996	0	2,951	2,951	0	2,075	876	2,950	0	0%
	1997	0	2,955	2,955	0	1,886	1,069	2,955	0	0%
	1998	0	2,936	2,936	0	1,761	1,197	2,958	23	1%
	1999	0	2,828	2,828	0	1,749	1,210	2,959	131	5%
	2000	0	2,373	2,373	0	1,558	1,235	2,793	419	18%
	2001	0	96	96	0	342	0	342	246	257%
	2002	0	1,754	1,754	0	1,367	710	2,077	323	18%
	2003	0	2,669	2,669	0	1,366	1,305	2,671	1	0%
	2004	0	1,929	1,929	0	1,366	563	1,929	0	0%
	2005	0	2,671	2,671	0	1,367	1,304	2,671	0	0%
Total	0	23,148	23,148	0	13,051	11,512	24,563	1,415	6%	

²⁹ XA as used in this table refers to ex-Table A water.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA3 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	XA	Total	AF	%
Oak Flat Irrigation District	1996	0	5,607	5,607	0	3,942	1,663	5,606	-1	0%
	1997	0	5,615	5,615	0	3,583	2,032	5,615	0	0%
	1998	0	5,578	5,578	0	3,347	2,274	5,621	43	1%
	1999	0	5,373	5,373	0	3,323	2,298	5,621	248	5%
	2000	0	4,509	4,509	0	2,960	2,346	5,306	797	18%
	2001	0	182	182	0	649	0	649	467	257%
	2002	0	3,332	3,332	0	2,597	1,349	3,946	615	18%
	2003	0	5,072	5,072	0	2,596	2,479	5,075	3	0%
	2004	0	3,665	3,665	0	2,595	1,070	3,665	0	0%
	2005	0	5,075	5,075	0	2,597	2,478	5,075	0	0%
	Total	0	44,007	44,007	0	28,189	17,990	46,179	2,172	5%
Tulare	1996	0	116,559	116,559	0	81,959	34,583	116,542	-17	0%
	1997	0	116,736	116,736	0	74,498	42,238	116,736	0	0%
	1998	0	115,956	115,956	0	69,576	47,276	116,852	896	1%
	1999	0	111,703	111,703	0	69,080	47,784	116,864	5,161	5%
	2000	0	93,736	93,736	0	61,531	48,774	110,305	16,569	18%
	2001	0	3,784	3,784	0	13,501	0	13,501	9,717	257%
	2002	0	65,188	65,188	0	50,815	26,398	77,213	12,025	18%
	2003	0	99,239	99,239	0	50,792	48,499	99,292	53	0%
	2004	0	61,873	61,873	0	43,804	18,069	61,873	0	0%
	2005	0	85,670	85,670	0	43,837	41,833	85,670	0	0%
	Total	0	870,443	870,443	0	559,394	355,454	914,847	44,404	5%

Table HA-30. Effects of CNPA4 on SWP Allocations To Selected M&I Contractors.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA4 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	SS	Total	AF	%
Santa Barbara	1996	42,282	0	42,282	29,731	0	11,606	41,336	-945	-2%
	1997	38,406	0	38,406	24,509	0	13,200	37,710	-696	-2%
	1998	38,149	0	38,149	22,890	0	14,362	37,252	-897	-2%
	1999	45,486	0	45,486	26,516	0	16,977	43,493	-1,993	-4%
	2000	45,486	0	45,486	23,619	0	15,400	39,019	-6,467	-14%
	2001	24,195	0	24,195	20,508	0	0	20,508	-3,687	-15%
	2002	37,048	0	37,048	20,725	0	0	20,725	-16,324	-44%
	2003	40,474	0	40,474	20,715	0	15,123	35,839	-4,636	-11%
	2004	29,247	0	29,247	20,706	0	0	20,706	-8,541	-29%
	2005	40,496	0	40,496	20,722	0	14,874	35,596	-4,900	-12%
	Total	381,269	0	381,269	230,641	0	101,543	332,184	-49,085	-13%
MWD	1996	726,696	0	726,696	510,981	0	207,123	718,104	-8,592	-1%
	1997	1,028,554	0	1,028,554	656,396	0	362,755	1,019,151	-9,402	-1%
	1998	1,177,743	0	1,177,743	706,665	0	457,836	1,164,501	-13,242	-1%
	1999	1,180,000	0	1,180,000	687,886	0	454,373	1,142,259	-37,741	-3%
	2000	1,507,136	0	1,507,136	782,581	0	568,135	1,350,716	-156,420	-10%
	2001	1,069,982	0	1,069,982	906,918	0	0	906,918	-163,065	-15%
	2002	1,408,050	0	1,408,050	916,504	0	234,797	1,151,301	-256,749	-18%
	2003	1,789,871	0	1,789,871	916,088	0	783,977	1,700,064	-89,806	-5%
	2004	1,293,378	0	1,293,378	915,674	0	183,757	1,099,431	-193,948	-15%
	2005	1,701,788	0	1,701,788	870,804	0	737,288	1,608,092	-93,696	-6%
	Total	12,883,197	0	12,883,197	7,870,497	0	3,990,041	11,860,537	-1,022,660	-8%
Palmdale	1996	17,017	0	17,017	11,965	0	4,671	16,636	-380	-2%
	1997	17,042	0	17,042	10,876	0	5,858	16,734	-309	-2%
	1998	16,929	0	16,929	10,157	0	6,373	16,531	-398	-2%
	1999	17,300	0	17,300	10,085	0	6,457	16,542	-758	-4%
	2000	17,300	0	17,300	8,983	2,077	4,395	15,455	-1,845	-11%
	2001	9,202	0	9,202	7,800	911	0	8,711	-491	-5%
	2002	14,091	0	14,091	7,882	1,823	0	9,705	-4,386	-31%
	2003	15,394	0	15,394	7,879	1,822	4,640	14,340	-1,054	-7%
	2004	11,124	0	11,124	7,875	1,821	0	9,696	-1,428	-13%
	2005	15,402	0	15,402	7,881	1,822	4,563	14,266	-1,136	-7%
	Total	150,801	0	150,801	91,385	10,276	36,956	138,616	-12,184	-8%

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA4 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	SS	Total	AF	%
Mojave	1996	19,672	0	19,672	13,833	0	6,167	20,000	328	2%
	1997	14,383	0	14,383	9,179	0	5,421	14,600	217	2%
	1998	14,678	0	14,678	8,807	0	6,193	15,000	322	2%
	1999	20,000	0	20,000	11,659	0	8,341	20,000	0	0%
	2000	50,800	0	50,800	26,378	12,981	11,441	50,800	0	0%
	2001	27,022	0	27,022	22,904	5,697	0	28,601	1,578	6%
	2002	41,377	0	41,377	23,146	11,391	12,916	47,453	6,076	15%
	2003	45,203	0	45,203	23,136	11,386	16,279	50,800	5,597	12%
	2004	32,664	0	32,664	23,125	11,380	10,120	44,626	11,962	37%
	2005	45,227	0	45,227	23,142	11,389	16,269	50,800	5,573	12%
Total	311,025	0	311,025	185,309	64,224	93,146	342,679	31,654	10%	
Coachella	1996	22,722	0	22,722	15,977	0	7,123	23,100	378	2%
	1997	22,756	0	22,756	14,522	0	8,578	23,100	344	2%
	1998	22,604	0	22,604	13,563	0	9,537	23,100	496	2%
	1999	23,100	0	23,100	13,466	0	9,634	23,100	0	0%
	2000	23,100	0	23,100	11,995	0	11,105	23,100	0	0%
	2001	12,288	0	12,288	10,415	0	0	10,415	-1,873	-15%
	2002	18,815	0	18,815	10,525	0	9,987	20,512	1,697	9%
	2003	20,555	0	20,555	10,520	0	12,580	23,100	2,545	12%
	2004	14,853	6,366	21,219	10,516	4,507	11,165	26,188	4,969	23%
	2005	99,000	8,814	107,814	50,658	4,510	65,932	121,100	13,286	12%
Total	279,792	15,179	294,972	162,157	9,017	145,640	316,814	21,842	7%	

Table HA-31. Effects of CNPA4 on SWP Allocations To AG Contractors.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA4 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	SS ³⁰	Total	AF	%
Empire West Side	1996	0	2,951	2,951	0	2,075	925	3,000	49	2%
	1997	0	2,955	2,955	0	1,886	1,114	3,000	45	2%
	1998	0	2,936	2,936	0	1,761	1,239	3,000	64	2%
	1999	0	2,828	2,828	0	1,749	1,251	3,000	172	6%
	2000	0	2,373	2,373	0	1,558	1,442	3,000	627	26%
	2001	0	96	96	0	684	0	684	588	614%
	2002	0	1,754	1,754	0	1,367	1,566	2,932	1,179	67%
	2003	0	2,669	2,669	0	1,366	1,634	3,000	331	12%
	2004	0	1,929	1,929	0	1,366	1,255	2,621	692	36%
	2005	0	2,671	2,671	0	1,367	1,633	3,000	329	12%
Total	0	23,161	23,161	0	15,178	12,059	27,237	4,075	18%	
Oak Flat Irrigation District	1996	0	5,607	5,607	0	3,942	1,758	5,700	93	2%
	1997	0	5,615	5,615	0	3,583	2,117	5,700	85	2%
	1998	0	5,578	5,578	0	3,347	2,353	5,700	122	2%
	1999	0	5,373	5,373	0	3,323	2,377	5,700	327	6%
	2000	0	4,509	4,509	0	2,960	2,740	5,700	1,191	26%
	2001	0	182	182	0	1,299	0	1,299	1,117	614%
	2002	0	3,332	3,332	0	2,597	2,975	5,572	2,240	67%
	2003	0	5,072	5,072	0	2,596	3,104	5,700	628	12%
	2004	0	3,665	3,665	0	2,595	2,384	4,979	1,314	36%
	2005	0	5,075	5,075	0	2,597	3,103	5,700	625	12%
Total	0	44,007	44,007	0	28,838	22,911	51,750	7,743	18%	
Dudley Ridge	1996	0	56,755	56,755	0	39,907	17,793	57,700	945	2%
	1997	0	56,841	56,841	0	36,274	21,426	57,700	859	2%
	1998	0	56,461	56,461	0	33,878	23,822	57,700	1,239	2%
	1999	0	54,390	54,390	0	33,636	24,064	57,700	3,310	6%
	2000	0	45,642	45,642	0	29,961	27,739	57,700	12,058	26%
	2001	0	1,843	1,843	0	13,148	0	13,148	11,305	614%
	2002	0	36,048	36,048	0	28,100	32,184	60,285	24,237	67%
	2003	0	54,878	54,878	0	28,087	33,586	61,673	6,795	12%
	2004	0	39,655	39,655	0	28,075	25,798	53,872	14,217	36%
	2005	0	54,907	54,907	0	28,096	33,577	61,673	6,766	12%
Total	0	457,420	457,420	0	299,163	239,988	539,151	81,731	18%	

³⁰ SS as used in this table refers to scheduled surplus water.

Contractor	Year	Baseline Table A Allocation (AF)			CNPA4 Allocation (AF)				Change in Total Allocation	
		M&I	AG	Total	M&I TA	AG TA	SS	Total	AF	%
KCWA	1996	132,395	1,006,368	1,138,762	93,094	707,634	352,559	1,153,287	14,525	1%
	1997	132,596	1,003,630	1,136,226	84,619	640,491	424,515	1,149,625	13,398	1%
	1998	131,711	996,931	1,128,642	79,029	583,496	485,587	1,148,112	19,470	2%
	1999	134,600	960,364	1,094,964	78,466	579,340	490,388	1,148,193	53,230	5%
	2000	134,600	805,893	940,493	69,891	481,241	584,456	1,135,589	195,096	21%
	2001	71,598	32,604	104,202	60,687	206,678	0	267,364	163,163	157%
	2002	109,632	596,787	706,418	61,328	413,267	587,574	1,062,170	355,751	50%
	2003	119,770	908,522	1,028,292	61,300	413,079	654,708	1,129,087	100,796	10%
	2004	86,547	655,080	741,627	61,273	411,883	470,080	943,235	201,608	27%
	2005	119,833	907,027	1,026,860	61,318	412,191	652,737	1,126,247	99,387	10%
	Total	1,173,281	7,873,205	9,046,486	711,005	4,849,301	4,702,604	10,262,909	1,216,423	13%
Kings	1996	0	3,934	3,934	0	2,767	1,233	4,000	66	2%
	1997	0	3,940	3,940	0	2,515	1,485	4,000	60	2%
	1998	0	3,914	3,914	0	2,349	1,651	4,000	86	2%
	1999	0	3,771	3,771	0	2,332	1,668	4,000	229	6%
	2000	0	3,164	3,164	0	2,077	1,923	4,000	836	26%
	2001	0	128	128	0	911	0	911	784	614%
	2002	0	2,338	2,338	0	1,823	2,087	3,910	1,572	67%
	2003	0	3,559	3,559	0	1,822	2,178	4,000	441	12%
	2004	0	5,787	5,787	0	4,097	3,765	7,862	2,075	36%
	2005	0	8,013	8,013	0	4,100	4,900	9,000	987	12%
	Total	0	38,548	38,548	0	24,791	20,892	45,683	7,135	19%
Tulare	1996	0	116,559	116,559	0	81,959	36,541	118,500	1,941	2%
	1997	0	116,736	116,736	0	74,498	44,002	118,500	1,764	2%
	1998	0	115,956	115,956	0	69,576	48,924	118,500	2,544	2%
	1999	0	111,703	111,703	0	69,080	49,420	118,500	6,797	6%
	2000	0	93,736	93,736	0	61,531	56,969	118,500	24,764	26%
	2001	0	3,784	3,784	0	27,002	0	27,002	23,218	614%
	2002	0	65,188	65,188	0	50,815	58,201	109,016	43,829	67%
	2003	0	99,239	99,239	0	50,792	60,735	111,527	12,288	12%
	2004	0	61,873	61,873	0	43,804	40,251	84,056	22,183	36%
	2005	0	85,670	85,670	0	43,837	52,390	96,227	10,557	12%
	Total	0	870,443	870,443	0	572,895	447,434	1,020,328	149,885	17%