

Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department

Miami-Dade Consolidated PWS Water Use Permit No. 13-00017-W

Water Conservation Plan 2013 Annual Report

January 1, 2013 Through December 31, 2013

Miami-Dade
Water and Sewer Department
P.O. Box 33-0316, Miami, FL 33233-0316

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| INTRODUCTION | . 1 |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| SUMMARY | . 2 |
| SECTION I - PLAN IMPLEMENTATION | . 3 |
| Figure 1 | 3 |
| Table 1 | . 4 |
| APPENDIX A - BMP IMPI EMENTATION | Α |

INTRODUCTION

On November 15, 2007, the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) Governing Board approved the Miami-Dade Consolidated Water Use Permit (WUP). On November 1, 2010, the SFWMD Governing Board approved the reissuance of the permit extending the WUP for an additional three years. On December 16, 2012, the permit was reissued to increase the permitted allocation and to modify the water supply for the South Miami Heights Water Treatment Plant to include allocation from the Floridan aquifer.

To comply with the Permit requirements, MDWASD developed a 20-year Water Use Efficiency (WUE) Plan using the Florida Department of Environmental Protection Conserve Florida Guide (Guide). The Guide is a web-based application for goal-based water conservation planning. MDWASD was the first utility in the State to use the Guide to develop, administer and report its water conservation program.

The implementation of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) included in the Conserve Florida Plan guarantees that MDWASD will meet the projected 19.6 million gallons a day (MGD) water savings target by 2026, as required by the Permit. Current water savings from the BMPs are more than an estimated 11.2 MGD, just short of the 2016 water savings goal.

MDWASD hereby submits the seventh Water Conservation Plan Annual Progress Report detailing the County's actions and efforts to comply with Limiting Condition 48 of the WUP.

SUMMARY

Miami-Dade County's Water Use Efficiency (WUE) Program was implemented utilizing the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Conserve Florida Guide. The web-based guide for public water suppliers was used for developing, implementing, and now reporting on the water conservation measures and best management practices (BMPs) of Miami-Dade's WUE program. The use of quantifiable BMPs and measures has assisted in reviewing and evaluating planned and reported water savings on an annual basis to ensure the implementation of a cost-effective conservation program.

To ensure future water savings, the Water Use Efficiency Standards for new residential and commercial developments, which were enacted by the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners on January 1, 2009, are being implemented through local building codes. The standards included technical amendments to the Building Code to require maximum water conservation flow rates for plumbing fixtures.

The County continues to implement the Permanent Landscape Irrigation Restrictions Ordinance which limits landscape irrigation to two days a week. A written advisory notice is sent to follow up on formal complaints that are received through either the County's 3-1-1 system or via a webbased e-mail system.


The County has also enacted a tiered water rate structure which includes a surcharge for high water use to encourage water conservation.

Miami-Dade County is currently experiencing actual finished water demands 40 MGD lower than what was anticipated in November 2007. The lower demands are the result of lower than anticipated population growth, along with the implementation of the County's irrigation restrictions, Water Loss Reduction Program, and Water Use Efficiency Program.

SECTION I - PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The Conserve Florida BMPs that MDWASD has implemented as part of the Water Use Efficiency Plan are shown in this Report in Appendix A.

As a result of the implementation of the BMPs and the landscape irrigation restriction measures, Miami-Dade County has continued to see a lower than expected per capita water consumption. Figure 1 reflects the historical systemwide per capita, showing the effectiveness of all of MDWASD's water efficiency strategies. It should be noted that the historic per capita calculations have been revised based on the most current population data Miami-Dade County Planning Division of the Regulatory and Economic Resources



Notes:

- 1. Data from Table F, revised April 3, 2014
- 2. Per capita from 2008 to 2013, per finished water flows reported to SFWMD
- 3. Historic Population from 2001 2009 adjusted downward based on data from Miami-Dade County Planning Division of the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department. 2010-2013 represents the 2010 TAZ population projections by the Miami-Dade County Planning Division.

Water Savings Report Summary

| Year | Water Savings (MGD) | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Planned | Reported | | | |
| 2007 | 1.09 | 1.212308 | | | |
| 2008 | 2.24 | 3.476908 | | | |
| 2009 | 3.53 | 4.902751 | | | |
| 2010 | 4.82 | 6.541536 | | | |
| 2011 | 6.1 | 8.466445 | | | |
| 2012 | 7.22* | 10.074656 | | | |
| 2013 | 8.42* | 11.226418 | | | |
| 2016 | 11.7 | | | | |
| 2021 | 15.67 | | | | |
| 2026 | 19.62 | | | | |

Table 1

APPENDIX A - BMP IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Toilet & Retrofit Kit

Category: Retrofit

Sector: Single Family –Senior and Low Income Retrofit Project

No Expenditures in 2013

Note Project ended October 2012

| Year | | Units | Savings/Account (Address) Gallons/account/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|---|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 750 | 64 | 48,000 |
| | Reported | 890 | 64 | 56,960 |
| | Difference | 140 | | 8,960 |
| 2008 | Planned | 1000 | 64 | 64,000 |
| | Reported | 1124 | 64 | 71,936 |
| | Difference | 124 | | 7,936 |
| 2009 | Planned | 1000 | 64 | 64,000 |
| | Reported | 1000 | 64 | 64,000 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2010 | Planned | 1000 | 64 | 64,000 |
| | Reported | 845* | 64 | 54,080 |
| | Difference | -155 | | -9,920 |
| 2011 | Planned | 750 | 64 | 48,000 |
| | Reported | 706 | 64 | 45,184 |
| | Difference | 44 | | -2,816 |
| | Planned | 750 | 64 | 48,000 |
| 2012 | Reported | 463 | 64 | 29,632 |
| | Difference | -287 | | -18,368 |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | | | |

Note: Reported Value is for each address where a retrofit occurred. A retrofit consists of up to 2 HETs, 2 showerheads, 2 bathroom faucet aerators and a kitchen aerator.

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebates

Category: Indoor Sector: Single Family Home Washers – Rebate No Expenditures in 2013

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure gallon/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 150 | 16.3 | 2,445 |
| | Reported | 849 | 16.3 | 13,838.7 |
| | Difference | 699 | | 11,393.7 |
| 2009 | Planned | 250 | 16.3 | 4,075 |
| | Reported | 937 | 16.3 | 15,273.1 |
| | Difference | 687 | | 11,198.1 |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 16.3 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |

BMP Implementation for: Ultra Low Flush (ULF) Toilet Rebates

Category: Rebate Sector: Residential High Efficiency Toilet (HET) Rebate Project

Cost per Rebate: \$50

| Year | | Units | Savings/Account gallons per account per day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|---|-------------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 750 | 29 | 21,750 |
| | Reported | 971 | 29 | 28,159 |
| | Difference | 221 | | 6,409 |
| 2008 | Planned | 750 | 29 | 21,750 |
| | Reported | 1253 | 29 | 36,337 |
| | Difference | 503 | | 14,587 |
| 2009 | Planned | 1000 | 29 | 29,000 |
| | Reported | 3478 | 29 | 100,862 |
| | Difference | 2478 | | 71,862 |
| 2010 | Planned | 2000 | 29 | 58,000 |
| | Reported | 2622 | 29 | 76,038 |
| | Difference | 622 | | 18,038 |
| 2011 | Planned | 2000 | 29 | 58,000 |
| | Reported | 2566 | 29 | 74,414 |
| | Difference | 566 | | 16,414 |
| 2012 | Planned | 1200 | 29 | 34,800 |
| | Reported | 1220 | 29 | 35,380 |
| | Difference | 20 | | 580 |
| 2013 | Planned | 1500 | 29 | 43,500 |
| | Reported | 1547 | 29 | 44,863 |
| | Difference | 75 | | 2,175 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Toilet (HET)

Category: Retrofit

Sector: Multi-Family HET Retrofit Project

No Expenditures in 2013

| Year | | Units | Savings/Unit Gallons per multi-family unit per day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|-------------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2009 | Planned | 310 | 64 | 19,840 |
| | Reported | 315 | 64 | 20,160 |
| | Difference | 5 | | 320 |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Showerheads

Category: Indoors Sector: Single Family - Showerhead Exchange Cost per Showerhead: \$3.00

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 1600 | 35 | 56,000 |
| | Reported | 4194 | 35 | 146,790 |
| | Difference | 2594 | | 90,790 |
| 2008 | Planned | 1600 | 35 | 56,000 |
| | Reported | 2437 | 35 | 85,295 |
| | Difference | 837 | | 29,295 |
| 2009 | Planned | 1480 | 35 | 51,800 |
| | Reported | 2163 | 35 | 75,705 |
| | Difference | 683 | | 23,905 |
| 2010 | Planned | 1500 | 35 | 52,500 |
| | Reported | 1986 | 35 | 69,510 |
| | Difference | 486 | | 17,010 |
| 2011 | Planned | 1500 | 35 | 52,500 |
| | Reported | 1936 | 35 | 67,760 |
| | Difference | 436 | | 15,260 |
| 2012 | Planned | 1500 | 35 | 52,500 |
| | Reported | 3158 | 35 | 110,530 |
| | Difference | 1658 | | 58,030 |
| 2013 | Planned | 1100 | 35 | 38,500 |
| | Reported | 1228 | 35 | 42,980 |
| | Difference | 128 | | 4,480 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Retrofit Kit

Category: Indoors

Sector: Single Family - Retrofit Kit (High Efficiency Bathroom & Kitchen Faucet Aerators and Dye Tablets) Note savings of 12 gallons per aerator.

Cost per Retrofit Kit: \$2.83

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 1600 | 12 | 19,200 |
| | Reported | 4194 | 12 | 50,328 |
| | Difference | 2594 | | 31,128 |
| 2008 | Planned | 1600 | 12 | 19,200 |
| | Reported | 2437 | 12 | 29,244 |
| | Difference | 837 | | 10,044 |
| 2009 | Planned | 1480 | 12 | 17,760 |
| | Reported | 1498 | 12 | 17,976 |
| | Difference | 18 | | 216 |
| 2010 | Planned | 1000 | 12 | 12,000 |
| | Reported | 1321 | 12 | 15,852 |
| | Difference | 321 | | 3,852 |
| 2011 | Planned | 1000 | 12 | 12,000 |
| | Reported | 1417 | 12 | 17,004 |
| | Difference | 417 | | 5,004 |
| 2012 | Planned | 1000 | 12 | 12,000 |
| | Reported | 2576 | 12 | 30,912 |
| | Difference | 1576 | | 18,912 |
| 2013 | Planned | 800 | 24 | 19,200 |
| | Reported | 890 | 24 | 21,360 |
| | Difference | 90 | | 2,160 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Showerheads Category: Indoors
Sector: Multi-Family – Showerhead Exchange
Cost per Showerhead: \$3.00

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/Unit/Day | Total Savings Gallons Per Day (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 2007 | Planned | 1600 | 35 | 56,000 |
| | Reported | 4193 | 35 | 146,755 |
| | Difference | 2593 | | 90,755 |
| 2008 | Planned | 1600 | 35 | 56,000 |
| | Reported | 4000 | 35 | 140,000 |
| | Difference | 2400 | 35 | 84,000 |
| 2009 | Planned | 2120 | 35 | 74,200 |
| | Reported | 2130 | 35 | 74,550 |
| | Difference | 10 | | 350 |
| 2010 | Planned | 5000 | 35 | 175,000 |
| | Reported | 6519 | 35 | 228,165 |
| | Difference | 3485 | | 53,165 |
| 2011 | Planned | 2500 | 35 | 87,500 |
| | Reported | 2857 | 35 | 99,995 |
| | Difference | 357 | | 12,495 |
| 2012 | Planned | 2000 | 35 | 70,000 |
| | Reported | 2163 | 35 | 75,705 |
| | Difference | 163 | | 5,705 |
| 2013 | Planned | 800 | 35 | 28,000 |
| | Reported | 814 | 35 | 28,490 |
| | Difference | 14 | | 490 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Retrofit Kit

Category: Indoors

Sector: Multi-Family – Retrofit Kit (High Efficiency Bathroom & Kitchen Faucet Aerators and Dye Tablets) Note savings of 12 gallons per aerator.

Cost per Retrofit Kit: \$2.83

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 1600 | 12 | 19,200 |
| | Reported | 4193 | 12 | 50,316 |
| | Difference | 2593 | | 31,116 |
| 2008 | Planned | 1600 | 12 | 19,200 |
| | Reported | 4000 | 12 | 48,000 |
| | Difference | 2400 | | 28,800 |
| 2009 | Planned | 2120 | 12 | 25,440 |
| | Reported | 2130 | 12 | 25,560 |
| | Difference | 10 | | 120 |
| 2010 | Planned | 2600 | 12 | 31,200 |
| | Reported | 5657 | 12 | 67,884 |
| | Difference | 3057 | | 36,684 |
| 2011 | Planned | 2000 | 12 | 24,000 |
| | Reported | 2618 | 12 | 31,416 |
| | Difference | 618 | | 7,416 |
| 2012 | Planned | 1500 | 12 | 18,000 |
| | Reported | 1567 | 12 | 18,804 |
| | Difference | 67 | | 804 |
| 2013 | Planned | 500 | 24 | 12,000 |
| | Reported | 662 | 24 | 15,888 |
| | Difference | 162 | | 3,888 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Showerheads Rebate Category: Indoors
Sector: Single Family - Showerhead Rebate
Cost per Rebate: \$10.00

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/Unit/Day | Total Savings Gallons Per Day (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2008 | Planned | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| 2009 | Planned | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2012 | Planned | 50 | 35 | 1750 |
| | Reported | 23 | 35 | 805 |
| | Difference | -27 | | -945 |
| 2012 | Planned | 50 | 35 | 1750 |
| | Reported | 46 | 35 | 1610 |
| | Difference | -4 | | -140 |

BMP Implementation for: High Efficiency Faucet Rebate

Category: Indoors
Sector: Single Family - Faucet Rebate
Cost per Rebate: \$10.00

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/Unit/Day | Total Savings Gallons Per Day (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2008 | Planned | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2009 | Planned | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | 0 |
| 2012 | Planned | 50 | 12 | 600 |
| | Reported | 107 | 12 | 1284 |
| | Difference | 57 | | 684 |
| 2013 | Planned | 50 | 12 | 600 |
| | Reported | 120 | 12 | 1440 |
| | Difference | 70 | | 840 |

BMP Implementation for: Water-Efficient Landscape and Irrigation Evaluations and Rebates

Category: Landscape and Irrigation Evaluations with Rebates Sector: Large Property Landscape Evaluation with Smart Controller

Cost per Evaluation, Smart Controller and Rebate: \$3200

| Year | | Units | Savings/Account Gallons/account/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 20 | 35,000 | 700,000 |
| | Reported | 20 | 35,000 | 700,000 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 20 | 35,000 | 700,000 |
| | Reported | 50 | 35,000 | 1,750,000 |
| | Difference | 30 | | 1,050,000 |
| 2009 | Planned | 20 | 35,000 | 700,000 |
| | Reported | 25 | 35,000 | 875,000 |
| | Difference | 5 | | 175,000 |
| 2010 | Planned | 25 | 35,000 | 875,000 |
| | Reported | 26 | 35,000 | 910,000 |
| | Difference | 1 | | 35,000 |
| 2011 | Planned | 35 | 35,000 | 1,225,000 |
| | Reported | 44 | 35,000 | 1,540,000 |
| | Difference | 9 | | 315,000 |
| 2012 | Planned | 25 | 35,000 | 875,000 |
| | Reported | 36 | 35,000 | 1,260,000 |
| | Difference | 11 | | 385,000 |
| 2013 | Planned | 26 | 35,000 | 910,000 |
| | Reported | 28 | 35,000 | 980,000 |
| | Difference | 2 | | 70,000 |

BMP Implementation for: Water-Efficient Landscape and Irrigation Evaluations and Rebates

Category: Landscape and Irrigation Evaluations with Rebates

Sector: Single Family Homes (UCU) Landscape Evaluation and Rebate

Cost per Evaluation and Rebate: \$600

| Year | | Units | Savings/Account Gallons/account/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 233 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 233 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 0 | 233 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 233 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2009 | Planned | 200 | 233 | 46,600 |
| | Reported | 200 | 233 | 46,600 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2010 | Planned | 120 | 233 | 27,960 |
| | Reported | 131 | 233 | 30523 |
| | Difference | 11 | | 2563 |
| 2011 | Planned | 120 | 233 | 27,960 |
| | Reported | 145 | 233 | 33,785 |
| | Difference | 25 | | 5,825 |
| 2012 | Planned | 100 | 233 | 23,300 |
| | Reported | 81 | 233 | 18,873 |
| | Difference | -19 | | -4427 |
| 2013 | Planned | 75 | 233 | 17,475 |
| | Reported | 58 | 233 | 13,514 |
| | Difference | 17 | | -3961 |

Category: Evaluations without Rebates
Sector: Non-Residential – County Owned Facilities Landscape Evaluation
Cost per Evaluation - \$250

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 22 | 1,500 | 33,000 |
| | Reported | 22 | 1,500 | 33,000 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 10 | 1,500 | 15,000 |
| | Reported | 38 | 1,500 | 57,000 |
| | Difference | 28 | | 42,000 |
| 2009 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 3 | 1,500 | 4500 |
| | Difference | 3 | | 4500 |
| 2011 | Planned | 10 | 1,500 | 15000 |
| | Reported | 7 | 1,500 | 10,500 |
| | Difference | 3 | | -4,500 |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 1500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 16 | 1500 | 24,000 |
| | Difference | 16 | | 24,000 |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 1500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1500 | 0 |
| | Difference | | | |

Category: Evaluations without Rebates

Sector: Non-Residential – Green Restaurant Program

Cost per Evaluation and Spray Nozzle: \$250

No Expenditures in 2012

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure Gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 12 | 100 | 1,200 |
| | Reported | 14 | 100 | 1,400 |
| | Difference | 2 | | 200 |
| 2009 | Planned | 12 | 100 | 1,200 |
| | Reported | 12 | 100 | 1,200 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2010 | Planned | 12 | 100 | 1,200 |
| | Reported | 11 | 100 | 1,100 |
| | Difference | -1 | | -100 |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |

Category: Evaluations without Rebates Sector: Non-Residential – Green Lodging Project

Cost per Evaluation: \$250

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure gallons/measure/day | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 12 | 1,617 | 19,404 |
| | Reported | 17 | 1,617 | 27,489 |
| | Difference | 5 | | 8,085 |
| 2009 | Planned | 12 | 1,617 | 19,404 |
| | Reported | 21 | 1,617 | 33,957 |
| | Difference | 9 | | 14,553 |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Reported | 4 | 1,617 | 6,468 |
| | Difference | 4 | | 6,468 |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Reported | 3 | 1,617 | 4,851 |
| | Difference | 3 | | 4,851 |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Reported | 2 | 1,617 | 3234 |
| | Difference | 2 | | 3234 |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 1,617 | 0 |
| | Reported | 1 | 1,617 | 1,617 |
| | Difference | 1 | | 1,617 |

Category: Evaluations without Rebates

Sector: Non-Residential Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) – Private Facilities

No Expenditures in 2013

| Year | | Units | Savings/Measure (gpmd) | Total Savings (gal/day) |
|------|------------|-------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2007 | Planned | 22 | 1,500 | 33,000 |
| | Reported | 22 | 1,500 | 33,000 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2008 | Planned | 10 | 1,500 | 15,000 |
| | Reported | 38 | 1,500 | 57,000 |
| | Difference | 28 | | 42,000 |
| 2009 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2010 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2011 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2012 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |
| 2013 | Planned | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Reported | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| | Difference | 0 | | |