SAWPA

Statement of Investment Policy
• California law requires the Commission annually adopt a Statement of Investment Policy
• Policy has been updated using the guidelines of the California Municipal Treasurers Association (CMTA) Investment Policy Certification Program
• Staff will submit the policy to the CMTA for certification
Changes from Prior Policy

• Completely updated policy language and changed the sequence of the sections

• Investment Changes:
  – Added “Placement Service Certificates of Deposit” as an approved investment (placement service is designed to allow FDIC-insured depository institutions to accept deposits of more than $250,000 and obtain full coverage for the deposit by spreading the funds among many separate FDIC insured institutions so no institution holds more than the $250,000 for each depositor)
  – Added a limit of 30% of the portfolio to “Municipal Debt”. There were no limits in the prior policy.
Changes from Prior Policy

• Investment Changes (continued):
  – Added a limit of 10% of the portfolio to “Repurchase Agreements”. There were no limits in the prior policy.
  – Replaced CalTRUST with “Local Government Investment Pools (LGIP)”. This will allow investments in not only CalTRUST but any other local investment pools including the California Asset Management Program (CAMP)
Changes from Prior Policy

• Sections Added:
  – “Diversification” explains how investments will be diversified by security type and institution
  – Investment Pools/Mutual Funds – this section is a new requirement of the California Government Code (CGC)

• Sections Removed:
  – Investment Committee – SAWPA does not have one
  – Legislative Changes – not needed
  – Interest Earnings – covered under “Scope” section
  – Limiting Market Value Erosion – addressed throughout policy
  – Portfolio Management Activity – addressed under other sections
Compliance

- This policy is compliant with the California Government Code (CGC)
- Has been developed using the guidelines of the CMTA with support from the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC)
- Will be submitted for the CMTA’s Investment Policy Certification Program
Recommendation

• That the Commission adopt Resolution No. 2019-6, approving the Statement of Investment Policy and delegate authority to the CFO to invest or reinvest funds consistent with the Policy.
Inland Empire Brine Line
Pretreatment Program
Sample Collection and Analysis
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Pretreatment Program
Sample Collection and Analysis

- Recommendation to Commission
  - Authorize the GM to execute the following:
    - Work Order 2020-02 to E.S. Babcock Laboratories in the amount of $91,949 for sample collection and analysis services; and
    - Work Order 2020-01 to WMWD in the amount of $75,000 for SAWPA’s sample collection program
Pretreatment Program

- SAWPA is considered the Delegated Control Authority and along with its Member and Contract Agencies administer the program.
Pretreatment Program

- Permitting, inspection, monitoring, reporting and enforcement
- Currently 76 Permitted Users
  - 33 Direct Discharger Permits
  - 21 Indirect Discharger Permits
  - 12 Emergency Permits
  - 10 Liquid Wastehauler Permits
## Pretreatment Program

### Permits by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Emrgy</th>
<th>LWH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAWPA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMWD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YVWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMWD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pretreatment Program
Sample Collection and Analysis

- Verify compliance with permit conditions, Ordinance No. 8, discharge limitations and billing purposes
- Monitoring at OCSD SARI Metering station for the purposes of billing between SAWPA and OCSD
Pretreatment Program
Sample Collection and Analysis

- SAWPA Issued Permits
  - Babcock Laboratories provides water quality analysis (analysis on over 3,000 samples)
  - SAWPA Staff provides Sample Collection at minimum 10 locations (monthly and quarterly)
  - WMWD provides sample collection at 5 locations (monthly and quarterly) and at the OCSD SARI Metering Station (min. weekly)
Pretreatment Program
Sample Collection and Analysis

- Recommendation to Commission
  - Authorize the GM to execute the following:
    - Work Order 2020-02 to E.S. Babcock Laboratories in the amount of $91,949 for sample collection and analysis services; and
    - Work Order 2020-01 to WMWD in the amount of $75,000 for SAWPA’s sample collection program
Questions
Recommendation

- Authorize the General Manager to award a contract to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder based on bid proposals received on June 17, 2019, for an amount yet to be determined, including a five percent contingency, for the SAWPA Building Renovations Project.
- Receive and file.
# SAWPA Building Improvements - Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertise Bids</td>
<td>June 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bid meeting</td>
<td>June 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid opening</td>
<td>June 17, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start work</td>
<td>July 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End work</td>
<td>August 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

- Receive and file.
Questions??
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Purpose of the Report Card - Mission

To develop a 2019 Infrastructure Report Card that will be used effectively as a public relations tool with State and Local Leaders (elected officials), the Public and the Media.
The Team

Over 100 California professionals and experts dedicated their valuable time for this effort.

- **R9 Director**
  - Kwame Agyare

- **CAIRC Co-Chair**
  - Tony Akel

- **CAIRC Co-Chair**
  - John Hogan

- **Executive Review Committee**
  - Harvey Gobas, Chair
  - Larry Pierce
  - Ken Rosenfield
  - Shahn Ahmad

- **Release Event**
  - Ken Rosenfield
  - Richard Markuson
  - Anne Etsy

- **National Gov. Relations**
  - Anna Denecke
  - Emily Castellano

- **Aviation**
  - Co-Chairs: Larry Pierce

- **Bridges**
  - Co-Chairs: Ed Thometz / Jack Abcarius

- **Dams**
  - Chair: Elizabith Bialek

- **Drinking Water**
  - Co-Chairs: Mark Norton / Xavier Irias

- **Energy**
  - National Staff

- **Hazardous Waste**
  - Chair: Scott Bourne

- **Inland Waterways**
  - Chair: Ruwanka Purasinghe

- **Levees**
  - Co-Chairs: Mike Inanime / Larry Smith

- **Ports**
  - Co-Chairs: Ernie Medina / Charlene Dennis

- **Public Parks**
  - Chair: Hugo Cabrearo

- **Rail**
  - Co-Chairs: Don Sepulveda / Marc Canas

- **Roads**
  - Co-Chairs: Aly Tawfic / Ted Mooradian

- **Schools**
  - Co-Chairs: Alan Mok / Tom Duffy

- **Solid Waste**
  - Chair: Chuck White

- **Transit**
  - Chair: Tricia McColl

- **Stormwater**
  - Chair: Scott Taylor

- **Wastewater**
  - Co-Chairs: Armando Rodriguez / Brian Spindor
Infrastructure Categories and Grading Methodology
Report Cards Categories

8 Categories in 2006

8 Categories in 2012

17 Categories in 2019
Grading Methodology

The grades were based on 8 Key Criteria

**GRADING METHODOLOGY**

The 2019 Report Card for California's Infrastructure was completed by a committee of over 100 professionals and experts from California who dedicated their valuable time to collect and evaluate existing data, assess the infrastructure, document their findings, and develop recommendations. The committee worked with staff from ASCE National and ASCE's Committee on America's Infrastructure to provide a snapshot of our infrastructure, as it relates to us at home, and on a national basis.

The Report Card Sections are graded based on the following eight criteria:

- **CAPACITY** Does the infrastructure's capacity meet current and future demands?
- **CONDITION** What is the infrastructure's existing and near-future physical condition?
- **FUNDING** What is the current level of funding from all levels of government for the infrastructure category as compared to the estimated funding need?
- **FUTURE NEED** What is the cost to improve the infrastructure? Will future funding prospects address the need?
- **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** What is the owners' ability to operate and maintain the infrastructure properly? Is the infrastructure in compliance with government regulations?
- **PUBLIC SAFETY** To what extent is the public's safety jeopardized by the condition of the infrastructure and what could be the consequences of failure?
- **RESILIENCE** What is the infrastructure system's capability to prevent or protect against significant multihazard threats and incidents? How able is it to quickly recover and reconstitute critical services with minimum consequences for public safety and health, the economy, and national security?
- **INNOVATION** What new and innovative techniques, materials, technologies, and delivery methods are being implemented to improve the infrastructure?
Grading uses “A-F” school report card format, intended to communicate the condition of the infrastructure to elected local and state leaders and the public.
2017 National Infrastructure Report Card
## 2017 Infrastructure Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGES</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRINKING WATER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INLAND WATERWAYS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEES</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS AND RECREATION</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTS</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLID WASTE</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTEWATER</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 California Infrastructure Report Card Summary
2019 California Infrastructure Grades

- AVIATION: C+
- BRIDGES: C-
- DAMS: C-
- DRINKING WATER: C
- ENERGY: D-
- HAZARDOUS WASTE: C-
- INLAND WATERWAYS: D
- LEVEES: D
- PORTS: C+
- PUBLIC PARKS: D+
- RAIL: C
- ROADS: D
- SCHOOLS: C
- SOLID WASTE: C-
- STORMWATER: D+
- TRANSIT: C-
- WASTEWATER: C+

Cumulative Infrastructure Grade: C-
2019 California Infrastructure Report Card by Category
California has 26 commercial service airports and 217 general aviation airports.

Overall, runway condition is good, but airport capacity is the main challenge.

20% of flights were delayed across the top 10 airports in CA in 2017, which is slightly more than the national average of 18.36%.

11 airports rank within the top 100 Commercial Service Airports.

- LAX – 2\textsuperscript{nd}
- SFO – 7\textsuperscript{th}

In 2017, California published a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan, which identified $2.77 billion in funding needs for 1,735 aviation projects.

Continued investment is needed to keep up with a growing economy and population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Approximately 50% of bridges in the state have exceeded their design life and the backlog of recommended maintenance, repair, and replacement work continues to grow.
• 13 of the top 25 most traveled structurally deficient bridges in the U.S. are in California.
• 6.2% of California bridges are structurally deficient.
• California is home to the second largest percentage of functionally obsolete bridges.
• The 30% of bridges in the state that are in fair condition require maintenance to ensure they do not slip down to the “poor” category.
Approximately 70% of California’s dams are greater than 50 years old.
- Aging dam infrastructure challenges must be met with increased resources to ensure their reliability and safety.

Dams provide 70% of California’s water supply, 15% of the power, flood control, recreation, fisheries and wildlife habitat.

Over half of California’s 1,476 state, federal, and locally owned dams are considered high hazard dams.

An estimated $2.5 billion is needed to repair dams statewide.
- Fortunately, funding for dam inspection has increased in recent years. In 2015, the California Division of Safety of Dams budget was approximately $13 million, up from $11 million in 2010. This increase kept funding on par with inflation.
Due to variations in water availability, California built a vast network of water storage and conveyance facilities. Today, much of this network is aging.

- In San Francisco, approximately 150 miles of the 1,200 miles of drinking water pipes are over 100 years old.
- The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power reports that approximately 33% of the city’s 6,780 miles of water pipes were installed before 1938.

Urban areas in the state generally have state-of-the-art water treatment facilities, while rural areas are dependent on wells – which can be inadequate during dry years.

To fund and finance necessary drinking water infrastructure projects, water rates have risen, and voters passed Prop 1 and Prop 68 to finance water quality and supply projects. While the additional revenue is helpful, it does not cover all needs throughout the state.
California’s energy systems have generally met the needs of consumers, but the network faces many challenges including: fire threats, seismic events, storms, gas storage mishaps, elevated cost of service, aging equipment, inferior design, poor right-of-way vegetation management.

California receives and generates energy through a variety of sources, primarily from natural gas, nuclear, and utility-scale solar and wind.

Increased renewable energy contribution has had a major impact on the overall capacity of the California electric grid.

- California now has a legislatively-mandated target of 100% clean energy by 2045, but the cost of building infrastructure to support this goal is unknown.

Natural gas continues to help meet peak electric and heating demands, but the state depends on in-state production and imports, which requires extensive processing resulting in high pricing to the consumer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HAZARDOUS WASTE C-

- California does not meet its own hazardous waste disposal needs.
  - Over half of all hazardous waste generated is exported to surrounding states for landfill disposal.
- In 2017, California generated 3.8 million tons of hazardous waste and cleaned up 1,800 contaminated sites.
- An estimated 90,000 properties in California are contaminated with some level of toxic substances.
- It costs $3.4 billion per year to continue operating California’s existing hazardous waste infrastructure.
  - This spending is necessary for improved human health and a cleaner environment.
  - Upkeep also has economic benefits including reduced health-care costs for exposure related illness, increased land values, more land available for housing and conservation, and returning hazardous recyclables back into industrial production.
- Hazardous waste challenges include fluctuating funding levels, new contaminants and knowledge of health effects, increase in use of consumer electronics, rising compliance costs for private businesses and public entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INLAND WATERWAYS

- The USACE operates and maintains two inland waterways in California; the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC) and the Stockton (DWSC).

- Both waterways face similar issues: they are not wide or deep enough for larger ships.
  - To deepen the Sacramento DWSC, it would cost an estimated $17 million; to deepen the Stockton DWSC, it would cost an estimated $225 million.
  - Both of these projects have been on hold since 1990. These projects do not have not funding set aside yet for future fiscal years.

- Currently, the Sacramento DWSC width is unsafe, particularly for marine vessels navigating the canal in inclement weather.
2019 | National
---|---
D | D
Fiscal impacts of climate change, increased regulatory pressure, more rigorous maintenance, updated safety standards and higher cost estimates call for more investment.
  - A capital investment of $45 billion is needed to rehabilitate and improve California’s levees. Unfortunately, the path to this funding is unclear.
  - Local agencies currently spend $1.3 billion annually on all flood management activities.
  - Additional annual funding of at least $100 million is necessary to repair flood damage.

The most dangerous and oldest levees in the state exist in the Central Valley.

Most levees, particularly those on the Sacramento River, were constructed by pioneers to protect farms, not the 1.3 million people who live in this area today.

In the past 6 years, unprecedented funding has been put towards California’s aging levee system to improve many miles of levee, but additional funds are necessary to meet the state’s needs.
For now, California ports are in satisfactory condition, but require significant improvements to maintain existing conditions and meet new demands.

In 2017, California’s ports handled 40% of all containerized cargo entering the U.S. and 30% of the nation’s exports.

Since 2012, maritime traffic volumes have increased by over 16%.

The funding gap is an estimated $10.7 billion over the next 10 years, and available revenue has been insufficient to fill the gap as needs continue to outpace available funds.

Looking ahead, ports face challenges related to earthquakes, sea-level rise, increased demand for security and emergency management, tighter regulatory requirements including air quality regulations, modernization, and maintaining competitiveness.
PUBLIC PARKS  D+

- California is home to 28 national parks, two World Heritage Sites, 284 state parks, and 14,000 local parks managed by nearly 1,000 agencies.
- In total, the state has 47 million acres of outdoor recreational areas and local parks.
- 62% of Californians live in areas that do not meet the California Department of Parks and Recreation recommendation of 3 acres of park land per 1,000 residents.
- Since the 2008 recession, park budgets have declined, and infrastructure deficiencies have increased.
- Deferred maintenance at state parks is estimated at $1.2 billion, while local parks report an estimated $1 billion in unmet needs.
- The National Parks Service estimates the maintenance backlog for its parks in California is $1.8 billion.
- Voters approved Prop 68 in 2018, which will provide $4 billion in bonds with some funds dedicated to parks of underserved communities and address the multi-billion deferred maintenance issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B
• The state’s rail systems still face challenges including a lack of adequate funding for grade crossing safety programs, interconnectivity, and capital investment. 2018 CA State Rail Plan Addresses many of these issues.
• A major portion of California’s passenger rail system is on right-of-way operated by Class I freight railroads.
• Passenger rail systems and smaller freight carriers (Class II and III), rely on public funding for operations and maintenance.
• Class I freight railroads are able to fund maintenance and capital investment from their revenues, and generally operate on infrastructure that is in good condition.
• Additionally, commuter rail and state-supported intercity passenger rail do not have a dedicated revenue source for operations, maintenance, and capital investment programs.
• Dedicated and sufficient funding would help achieve and sustain a state of good repair of existing systems and allow these systems to expand capacity to meet future needs.
  o Population demands and shifting demographics will increase the demand for additional passenger and freight rail capacity.
  o Successful rail passenger services will need to be competitive with other modes of transportation (airports and freeways).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROADS**
• Only 19% of the 402,000 miles of California’s major roads are in good condition.
• Driving on deficient roads costs Californians $61 billion annually due to congestion-related delays, traffic collisions and increased vehicle operating costs caused by poor road conditions.
• Congestion costs California drivers up to $1,774 each year in lost time and wasted fuel.
• The condition of California roads is among the worst in the nation, ranking 49th.
• Southern California and the Bay Area are the second and third most congested urban areas in the nation, respectively.
• 68% of California’s roads are in mediocre or poor condition and 13% are in fair condition.
2019
C
National
D+
Today, most of California’s schools are in fair to good condition thanks to upgrades to structures, roofing systems, fire alarms, ADA access, electrical, HVAC and technology.

The outdoor environment, including parking lots, play areas and playfield areas, are only in fair condition.

There are 1,026 school districts in California and over 10,000 public elementary and secondary schools serving more than 6,220,000 students statewide.

In some municipalities, capacity is sufficient and overall population is declining, while in others, new facilities to accommodate growing enrollment rates are required.

There is a lack in adequate funding for future routine and major maintenance issues.
2019 National
C- C+
• With 1,390 existing solid waste facilities and operations, California has an adequate infrastructure for minimization, collection, processing, recycling, and disposing of solid waste.
• The condition of California’s existing infrastructure has declined in recent years and is not enough to meet solid waste reduction and recycling goals.
  o Many legislative and regulatory goals have been implemented without sufficient markets, planning, infrastructure development and funding, consideration of recent restrictions by other countries on imported recyclables.
• California is considering policies such as mandated restrictions on solid waste generation and handling to reduce both the generation and disposal of solid waste including greater manufacturer responsibility, waste reduction, improved recyclability, and increased waste fees.
• It is important that California focus on waste conversion technologies and internal markets that can help meet its recycling goals/policies.
STORMWATER D+

- Stormwater: storm drains, pipes, ditches, canals, channels, green infrastructure (vegetated areas that provide habitat, flood protection, clean air, clean water).
- Much of the drainage infrastructure in California was constructed before the 1940s and needs repair or replacement.
- New and innovative drainage systems are needed to meet water quality standards and promote a sustainable environment, however these systems are significantly underfunded.
  - For example, to achieve water quality objectives in LA county in the next 20 years, it will cost about $20 billion. In San Diego County it will cost $5 billion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The California Transportation Plan 2040 acknowledges highway and road investments alone will not solve congestion problems exacerbated by the more than five million people added to California’s population every decade.

Approximately 5.3% of Californians commute to work using public transit.

The SB 1 transportation package passed in 2017 stands to provide some of the much-needed funding for transit. SB 1 is slated to provide $750 million annually in new revenue, including $25 million for local and regional planning as well as $7 million in transportation research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most systems and treatment plants have adequate capacity and are prepared to meet the population needs for the next 10 to 20 years.

California has started to prioritize and invest in wastewater infrastructure including adapting advanced technologies to treat and discharge wastewater.

California wastewater systems serve 40 million people in over 13 million homes and treat 4 billion gallons of sewage per day while protecting surface waters, the coastline and public health.

There are about 900 publicly-owned collection and treatment systems, while about 10% of the population is served by onsite water systems such as septic tanks.

California’s system of pipes and manholes is 40 years.

California must maintain the condition of the infrastructure, meet discharge requirements, and continue elimination of sanitary sewer overflows.
Recommendations to Raise the Grades
Recommendations to Raise the Grades

1. PROMOTE EFFECTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP
2. DEVELOP SMART PLANS TO BETTER IDENTIFY FUNDING NEEDS
3. INCREASE STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING
4. INFORM THE PUBLIC AND RAISE AWARENESS
• Address aging infrastructure needs.
• Continue to make conservation a California way of life.
• Increase regional self-reliance and integrated water
• Achieve the co-equal goals for the Delta.
• Manage and prepare for dry periods.
• Expand water storage capacity
2019 Report Card for California’s Infrastructure

Californians use infrastructure each day. Our roads, bridges, and transit networks allow us access to our iconic coastlines, lakes, and vineyards. Water systems deliver clean drinking water to our homes, communities, and businesses. School buildings provide a safe place for our children to learn. Wastewater systems keep our rivers and beaches clean. Energy systems keep our homes warm and our economy running. But too often, the infrastructure that helps us thrive is crumbling.

https://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/california/
California Infrastructure Grades

- AVIATION: C+
- BRIDGES: C
- DAMS: C-
- DRINKING WATER: C
- ENERGY: D-
- HAZARDOUS WASTE: C-
- INLAND WATERWAYS: D
- LEVEES: D
- PORTS: C+
- PUBLIC PARKS: D+
- RAIL: C
- ROADS: D
- SCHOOLS: C
- SOLID WASTE: C-
- STORMWATER: D+
- TRANSIT: C-
- WASTEWATER: C+
California wastewater systems serve a population of 40 million in over 13 million homes and treat 4 billion gallons of sewage per day while protecting surface waters, the coastline and public health. There are approximately 900 publicly-owned collection and treatment systems, while approximately 10% of the population is served by onsite wastewater systems such as septic tanks. The average age of collection system pipes and manholes is approximately 40 years. Most, although not all, systems and treatment plants appear to have adequate capacity and are prepared to meet the population needs for the next 10 to 20 years. Modest progress has been made in recent years to prioritize and invest in wastewater infrastructure. For example, in 2014 Proposition 1 authorized over $7.5 billion in general obligation bonds to fund ecosystems and watershed protection and restoration projects. California also continues to advance in technologies aimed at treating and discharging wastewater at a higher water quality standard. However, the cost to maintain wastewater systems continues to rise with the age of the systems. We must maintain the condition of the infrastructure, meet discharge requirements, and continue elimination of sanitary sewer overflows.
2019
California’s
Infrastructure Report Card

Questions