

## Conveyance and Distribution Capital Projects Avoided or Deferred Regionally Due to Demand Management Programs

### **2016 Cost of Service:**

“Demand Management Programs reduce the use of and burden on Metropolitan’s distribution and conveyance system, which, in turn, helps reduce the capital, operating, maintenance and improvement costs associated with these facilities. For example, local water resource development and conservation has deferred the need to build additional infrastructure such as the Central Pool Augmentation Project tunnel and pipeline, completion of San Diego Pipeline No. 6, the West Valley Interconnection, and the completion of the SWP East Branch expansion. Overall, the decrease in demand resulting from these projects is estimated to defer the need for projects between four and twenty-five years at a savings of approximately \$2.7 billion in 2015 dollars. The programs also free up capacity in Metropolitan’s system to convey both Metropolitan water, and water from other non-MWD sources.”<sup>1</sup>

### **Details of the calculation methodology to calculate project costs in 2015 dollars:**

In order to identify the value of avoided or deferred projects in 2015 dollars, a cost estimate of identified projects was obtained from Metropolitan Engineering staff. The estimated costs were made at various times through the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) development process. In order to estimate the value in 2015 dollars, the projects were organized and the program estimate and date identified. To escalate the dollars, an index of construction costs increases prepared by Engineering News Record (ENR) was used.

Metropolitan’s CIP cost estimates are prepared by fiscal year. The appropriate ENR index for June of each fiscal year end was located. The ENR index for July 2015 was also located. The cost increase from June of each budget fiscal year to July 2015 was calculated as follows:

1. Calculate escalation value: (July 2015 – June of fiscal year for cost estimate) / June of fiscal year estimate
2. Add escalation value to the number 1 (for example, 1+ .7932821) and multiply by the original project estimate to derive the 2015 project estimate cost

The individual escalated 2015 cost estimates for identified Metropolitan CIP projects and the State Water Project East Branch expansion project were summed to arrive at approximately \$2.7 billion (\$2,682,754,594) in 2015 dollars for the value of avoided or deferred capital projects due to Demand Management Programs.

Example:

West Valley Project, \$266,298,000 as of FY 1995/96 (June 1996)  
ENR index, June 1996 = 5597  
ENR index, July 2015 = 10037  
(10037 – 5597) = 4440  
4440 / 5597 = .7932821  
\$266,298,000 x (1+.7932821) = \$477,547,441

The estimated cost of the West Valley Project in 2015 dollars, based on a cost estimate of \$266,298,000 as of FY 1995/96, is \$477,547,441.

### **Back-up documentation attached**

<sup>1</sup> Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, “Fiscal Years 2016/17 and 2017/18 Cost of Service for Proposed Water Rates and Charges”, April 2016, page 47.

## 2015 Dollars of Avoided or Deferred Conveyance and Distribution Projects Due to Demand Management Programs

Program No.	Appn. Name	Total Program Estimate	Completed features	FY Budget (cost estimate)	ENR Start Period	ENR July 2015	Cost Escalation	Project Estimate 2015 dollars	Comments
5-0229-21	West Valley Project	266,298,000		1995/96	5597	10037	0.7932821	477,547,441	
5-0141-21	Central Pool Augmentation Tunnel & Pipeline	750,460,000		1996/97	5860	10037	0.7127986	1,285,386,863	
5-5560-71	Central Pool Augmentation and Water Quality Project - Study and Land	41,309,000		1996/97	5860	10037	0.7127986	70,753,999	
15428	Second Lower Cross Feeder	52,796,722		2005/06	7700	10037	0.3035065	68,820,870	
5-5580-21 (15121)	San Diego Pipeline No. 6	472,302,000	117,913,800	2010/11	9053	10037	0.1086933	405,724,239.77	
	SWP East Branch Expansion, completion	371,601,356		2007	7967				
						<b>Total MWD</b>		2,308,233,413	
						10037	0.2598218	374,521,181	80% cost responsibility
						<b>Total All</b>		2,682,754,594	



**MWD**

*METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA*

## CAPITAL PROGRAM

For Fiscal Year 1995/96

**CAPITAL PROGRAM  
FISCAL YEAR 1995-96  
DEFERRED / CANCELLED  
PROGRAMS**

CIP PAGE	PROGRAM TITLE	PROGRAM NO.	PROGRAM ESTIMATE
<u>Programs Deferred Beyond Fiscal Year 1996-97 (Cont'd)</u>			
F-1	West Valley Project	5-0229-21	266,298,000
F-2	Perris Filtration Plant	5-0516-31	402,639,100
F-3	Central Pool Augmentation Filtration Plant	5-0221-32	392,027,800
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,624,764,900</b>
<u>Cancelled Programs</u>			
-	Interconnection Of Lakeview Pipeline	5-0144-11	13,262,900
-	* Imperial Irrigation District/Metropolitan Water District Conservation Program, Phase II	5-0230-11	153,113,700
-	* Imperial Irrigation District/Metropolitan Water District Test Land Fallowing Program	5-0403-11	30,000,000
-	* Imperial Irrigation District/Metropolitan Water District Conservation Program, Phase I	5-5920-11	109,060,500
-	* Main San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Storage Program	5-6370-11	578,943,700
-	* Coachella Canal Lining Project	5-6470-11	126,000
-	* Demonstration Program on Interstate Underground Storage of Colorado River Water	5-6520-11	8,000,000
-	* All American Canal Lining Project	5-6870-11	123,506,000
-	Lake Mathews - Sewer Connection To Western Municipal	5-0211-12	636,200
-	Los Angeles Headquarters - Seismic Modifications	5-5880-61	5,209,700
-	L. A. Headquarters Building - Fire Sprinkler System	5-6200-61	3,970,200
-	Soto Street Operations and Maintenance Center Replacement	5-5510-63	7,100,600
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,032,929,500</b>

\* Note: While these projects have been postponed indefinitely for consideration, there are opportunities that Metropolitan will continue to review and, should the need arise, these projects will once again be pursued.



**MWD**

*METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA*

## CAPITAL PROGRAM

For Fiscal Year 1996/97

**CAPITAL PROGRAM  
FISCAL YEAR 1996-97  
DEFERRED PROJECTS**

	<b>PROGRAM TITLE</b>	<b>PROGRAM NO.</b>	<b>PROGRAM ESTIMATE</b>
<b>Def-1</b>	<b>Central Pool Augmentation Tunnel and Pipeline</b>	<b>5-0141-21</b>	<b>750,460,000</b>
Def-2	West Valley Project	5-0229-21	8,470,200
Def-3	Allen McColloch Pipeline Parallel	5-0507-21	74,798,700
Def-4	Skinner Filtration Plant - Install Effluent Adjustable Weir Slide Gates	5-0304-31	830,000
Def-5	Skinner Filtration Plant - Modules 4,5 and 6 Sedimentation Basins	5-0410-31	47,038,200
Def-6	Skinner Filtration Plant Monofill	5-6510-31	2,091,600
Def-7	Central Pool Augmentation Filtration Plant	5-0221-32	497,377,000
Def-8	Lake Mathews Auto and Heavy Equipment Shop.	5-0408-61	5,000,000
Def-9	La Verne Construct Office and Warehouse Storage	5-0001-63	4,897,000
Def-10	Weymouth Replace Existing Asphalt Paving	5-0002-63	1,201,300
Def-11	La Verne Facilities - Construct a Utility Shop Building	5-0112-63	9,635,000
Def-12	Warehouse and Storage Building At Mills Filtration Plant	5-0402-63	2,700,000
Def-13	Lake Mathews Multi-Purpose Building	5-0404-63	1,265,900
Def-14	Perris Filtration Plant - Study and Advance Land Acquisition	5-5800-71	35,881,600
Def-15	San Bernadino/Riverside Area Study	5-5810-71	2,512,900
Def-16	West Valley Area Study	5-5990-71	3,362,600
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,447,522,000</b>

# CAPITAL PROGRAM

**Program** Central Pool Augmentation and Water Quality Project - Study and Land Acquisition **Program No** 5-5560-71

**Scope** Feasibility study, environmental documentation, and early acquisition of critically needed lands for implementation of a new treatment plant at Lake Mathews and an 18-mile tunnel and pipeline conveyance system to the existing distribution system in Orange County. The project is needed to meet increasing demand for treated water in the Central Pool, improve water quality in compliance with anticipated water quality regulations, strengthen system reliability, and make water system operations more reliable. The project would also provide treated water service to Western Riverside County.

## Accomplishments Through 1995-1996

Completion of the final EIR and associated planning documents. Acquisition of the Eagle Valley Water treatment plant site near Lake Mathews and the pipeline, tunnel and access road rights-of way to the site were also completed.

## Objectives For 1996-97

Complete right-of-way studies and appraisals for key tunnel portal sites and other key project sites under threat of development in Temescal Canyon. Completion of studies and appraisals for sites in Orange County that will be converted to mitigation land on the Orange County NCCP. Pending Board approval and funding, acquisition of certain needed project lands is anticipated and necessary to preserve right-of-way and project viability. Completion of additional environmental documentation for Federal project approvals. Litigation is also anticipated in response to lawsuit on CEQA issues.

EXPENSE DETAIL	Program Estimate (A)	Projected Cost Thru June 30, 1996 (B)	Budget Estimate 1996-97 (C)	BALANCE A-(B+C)	Fiscal Year 1995-96	
					Budget	Projected
Labor and Additives	817,900	555,300	74,800	187,800	80,200	99,800
Materials and Supplies	8,400	8,400				
Incidental Expenses	176,800	123,400	42,400	11,000	63,000	25,200
Professional Services	3,798,300	3,491,100	263,000	44,100	498,800	166,100
Land Purchase	36,041,200	16,546,900	13,829,000	5,665,300	10,500,000	3,460,000
Usage of Operating Equipment	400	400				100
Administrative Charges	415,900	282,600	29,700	103,600	37,800	54,600
Contract Payments	50,000	50,000				
Contingency	100			100		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41,309,000</b>	21,058,100	14,238,900	6,011,900	11,179,800	3,805,800

MWD  
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA

**ORANGE COUNTY CROSS FEEDER  
PRELIMINARY DESIGN REPORT  
(12/20/2005)**

**ORANGE COUNTY CROSS FEEDER  
APPROPRIATION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Manager – Sergio Escalante

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Engineer – Bert Bukirin

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
ROW Engineering – Pete Wiseman

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Field Survey – Julio Castillo

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Acquisition and Appraisal – Guy Walters

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Construction Inspection – Paul Weston

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Environmental Planning – Anthony Klecha



2 <sup>nd</sup> Lower Shutdown (2 <sup>nd</sup> lower tie-in)	October 2007	
As-Built	April 2008	June 2008

\*End of month

### 1.6.2 Budget

The estimated budget cost for the project is as follows:

1. Owners Cost Estimate.....\$800,000\*
2. Study/Preliminary Design Cost Estimate.....\$237,000
3. Final Design Cost Estimate.....\$1,573,000
4. Right-of-way .....\$5,500,000\*
5. 84” Butterfly Valves .....\$1,350,000
6. Construction Management Cost Estimate \$2,581,499\*
7. Construction Cost Estimate.....\$33,868,694\*  
(see Section 4.4 for details)
8. Contingency Cost Estimate.....\$6,886,529
9. Total Project Cost Estimate .....\$52,796,722\*

\* Projected/Estimated Cost

## 2.0 PROJECT STUDIES

### 2.1 Alternative Alignment Studies – See Section 4.4

### 2.2 Hydraulic and Surge Analysis

The Orange County Cross Feeder (OCCF) can distribute water in two directions; from West to East and from East to West. For operational information and the purpose of flowing water from West to East or West to East, see the Waster System Operations section of this report.

The OCCF will connect the East Orange County Feeder No. 2 (EOCF #2) and the Second Lower Feeder (2LF). Since the EOCF#2 is designed for a hydrostatic grade of 810-feet, and the 2LF is designed for a hydrostatic grade of 660-feet, pressure relief valves are needed to prevent the 2LF from inadvertently being over pressurized.

#### 2.2.1 Flow for West to East

Flowing water from West to East requires a Pressure Control Structure (PCS) to control water flows and break head into the lower pressure section of the 2LF. The EOCF #2 is designed for a maximum hydrostatic grade of 810-feet. The 2LF at the location where the OCCF is connecting is designed for a maximum hydrostatic grade of 660-feet. Therefore, during a normal operation of flowing water from the EOCF # 2 (with either Diemer or future CPA as the water source) across the OCCF to the 2LF, a PCS is required to reduce the pressure and control flow. This PCS will be able to control the flow rate to a desired amount and ensure the pressure in the 2LF will not exceed a

2010/11  
**BUDGET**



THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT  
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**San Diego Pipeline No. 6**

**15121**

<b>Total Program Estimate:</b>	<b>\$472,302,000</b>	<b>Total Projected Through June 30, 2010:</b>	\$105,281,000
<b>Appropriated Amount:</b>	\$117,914,000	<b>Estimated Percent Complete:</b>	22%
<b>FY 2010/11 Estimate:</b>	\$171,000	<b>Estimated Completion Date:</b>	2026-2027

**Scope**

The San Diego Pipeline No. 6 Program, a joint project between Metropolitan and the SDCWA, includes the construction of a 30-mile, nine to ten-foot diameter pipeline and tunnel conveyance system to meet supplemental water needs in southern Riverside and San Diego Counties. The current total program estimate only includes costs for the portion in Riverside County.

**Purpose**

To provide raw water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural users in southern Riverside and San Diego counties, and to increase system reliability and operational flexibility.

**Accomplishments Through FY 2009/10**

In Oct 2002, the Board authorized staff to proceed with design and land acquisition for the north reach of San Diego Pipeline 6. By June 2004, the supplemental EIR had been approved. The construction of the North Reach was successfully completed and the Notice of Completion was issued on January 26, 2007. In March 2006 the Board authorized staff to conduct feasibility investigations of alternative alignments in order to determine the most cost-effective project corridor for the remaining portions of Pipeline 6. In February 2007, the Board authorized staff to enter into agreement with Jacobs Associates to conduct geological, geotechnical, and hydrogeological investigations, and tunnel engineering feasibility analyses and cost estimates. It is anticipated that the final feasibility report, including San Diego's portion, will be presented to the Board in early 2010. A request to the Board to authorize funding to proceed with final aerial surveys, preliminary design, CEQA, and securing right of way entry permits, for the recommended alignment is planned for 2010.

**Objectives For FY 2010/11**

Continue remaining mitigation and monitoring measures associated with the supplemental EIR and permits along the completed North Reach.



**DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET**  
FISCAL YEARS 2012/13 AND 2013/14

**San Diego Pipeline No. 6**

**15121**

<b>Total Program Estimate:</b>	<b>\$117,913,800</b>	<b>Total Projected Through June 30, 2012:</b>	<b>\$105,646,600</b>
<b>Appropriated Amount:</b>	<b>\$117,913,800</b>	<b>Estimated Percent Complete:</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Biennial Estimate:</b>	<b>\$69,200</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date:</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>

**Scope**

This program was established as a joint project between Metropolitan and the San Diego County Water Authority, includes the construction of a 30-mile, nine to ten-foot diameter pipeline and tunnel conveyance system to meet supplemental water needs in southern Riverside and San Diego Counties. The construction of the North Reach was successfully completed and the Notice of Completion was issued on January 26, 2007. The current total program estimate only includes costs for the portion in Riverside County.

**Purpose**

To provide raw water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural users in southern Riverside and San Diego counties, and to increase system reliability and operational flexibility.

**Accomplishments Through FY 2011/12**

Through FY 2011/12, one project has been completed.

Major project milestones in FY 2011/12:

North Reach Environmental Monitoring – Continued monitoring in compliance with the Mitigation/Monitoring Plan

The South Reach portions have been deferred

**Objectives for 2012/13 – 2013/14**

North Reach Environmental Monitoring – Complete monitoring

**East Branch Enlargement - Phase II**

**Table 8-1 Summary of Scenario Costs**

		Scenario 1 DWR 2004 Report Conditions (Bases Case Water Surface Elevations)											Scenario 2 Canal Raise Alternative			Scenario 3 Smooth Siphon Alternative		
Item	Unit	2007 Unit Cost (a)	Estimated Lifecycle	Quantity	2007 Construction Costs	Annualized Cost with Contingency	Quantity	Costs	Annualized Cost with Contingency	Quantity	Costs	Annualized Cost with Contingency						
<b>B &amp; D Canal</b>																		
1 Mobilization and Demobilization <sup>4</sup>	EA	\$ 0	50	1	\$ 12,774,000	\$ 823,498	1	\$ 12,426,104	\$ 801,070	1	\$ 11,801,550	\$ 760,807						
2 Raise Embankment <sup>3</sup>	CY	23	100	4,198,686	96,569,767	5,698,144	3,540,274	81,426,291	4,804,597	2,304,919	53,013,128	3,128,064						
3 Compacted Embankment	CY	33	100	292,008	9,636,269	568,593	246,217	8,125,168	479,429	160,301	5,289,945	312,136						
4 Raise Concrete Lining	CY	400	50	37,397	14,958,640	964,335	33,485	13,393,804	863,455	26,597	10,638,945	685,858						
6.5 Remove and Replace Primary Road	FT	60	15	485,496	28,918,929	3,315,150	309,038	18,408,101	2,110,231	167,746	9,991,891	1,145,430						
7 Add One Bay Check Structures <sup>1</sup>	EA	908,072	50	16	14,529,147	936,647	23	20,885,649	1,346,430	23	20,885,649	1,346,430						
8 Add Single Barrel Siphon <sup>1</sup>	EA	3,178,492	50	8	25,427,935	1,639,256	8	25,427,935	1,639,256	8	25,427,935	1,639,256						
8.1 Add Single Barrel Siphon (Tejon)	EA	2,022,677	50	1	2,022,677	130,395	1	2,022,677	130,395	1	2,022,677	130,395						
8.2 Add Single Barrel Siphon (Antelope)	EA	13,002,921	50	1	13,002,921	838,256	1	13,002,921	838,256	1	13,002,921	838,256						
9 Add Three R.C. Box Siphon <sup>1</sup>	LF	3,756	50	555	2,084,802	134,400	555	2,084,802	134,400	555	2,084,802	134,400						
10 New Radial Gates and Radial Gate Hoists <sup>1</sup>	EA	211,883	25	16	3,390,134	285,040	23	4,873,318	409,746	23	4,873,318	409,746						
11 Modify Existing Radial Gate and Check <sup>1</sup>	EA	15,135	50	41	620,516	40,003	41	620,516	40,003	41	620,516	40,003						
12 Remove Raised Concrete Sill at Check <sup>1</sup>	EA	12,108	50	54	653,812	42,149	54	653,812	42,149	54	653,812	42,149						
13 Modify Existing Radial Gate Hoist and Electrical <sup>1</sup>	EA	75,673	25	41	3,102,578	260,863	41	3,102,578	260,863	41	3,102,578	260,863						
14 Bridges <sup>2</sup>	EA	655,876	75	33	21,643,908	1,302,854	31	20,332,156	1,223,894	20	13,117,520	789,609						
15 Overchutes <sup>1</sup>	EA	20,000	50	71	1,420,000	91,543	71	1,420,000	91,543	67	1,340,000	86,385						
16 Raise Pipelines <sup>1</sup>	EA	126,450	50	12	1,517,405	97,822	12	1,517,405	97,822	12	1,517,405	97,822						
17 Raise 121" Steel Pipeline <sup>1</sup>	LS	224,801	50	1	224,801	14,492	1	224,801	14,492	1	224,801	14,492						
18 Extend Culvert Inlets and Outlets <sup>1</sup>	EA	121,076	30	106	12,834,080	987,620	67	8,169,426	628,662	37	4,434,353	341,237						
19 Hydromulching <sup>1</sup>	AC	9,178	20	100	917,803	87,442	64	584,220	55,660	35	317,114	30,212						
20 Traffic Control and Detour <sup>1</sup>	LS	2,003,869	50	1	2,003,869	129,183	1	2,003,869	129,183	1	2,003,869	129,183						
21 Slip Form Wall LF	LF	84	50	-	-	-	21,595	1,813,997	116,942	18,110	1,521,274	98,072						
23 Precast Panel System LF	LF	119	30	-	-	-	154,862	18,428,626	1,418,137	291,773	34,720,963	2,671,881						
24 Smooth Coating for Siphons SF	SF	14	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,801,827	25,225,584	2,891,760						
<b>C Pearlblossom Pumping Plant</b>																		
1 Furnish and install pump units <sup>1</sup>	EA	6,276,793	25	2	12,553,585	1,055,498	2	12,553,585	1,055,498	2	12,553,585	1,055,498						
2 Furnish and install motors <sup>1</sup>	EA	5,803,598	25	2	11,607,195	975,926	2	11,607,195	975,926	2	11,607,195	975,926						
3 Furnish and install valves <sup>1</sup>	EA	2,045,589	50	2	4,091,179	263,745	2	4,091,179	263,745	2	4,091,179	263,745						
4 Install 11'-0" discharge line <sup>1</sup>	JOB	13,161,846	50	1	13,161,846	848,501	1	13,161,846	848,501	1	13,161,846	848,501						
Discount Rate: 4.875%				Subtotal	\$ 309,667,797	\$ 21,531,356	Subtotal	\$ 302,361,980	\$ 20,820,285	Subtotal	\$ 289,246,353	\$ 21,168,116						
Contingency: 20%					\$ 61,933,559			\$ 60,472,396			\$ 57,849,271							
Project Lifecycle (Years): 50					\$ 371,601,356			\$ 362,834,375			\$ 347,095,623							
					<b>Present Value: \$400,000,000</b>			<b>Present Value: \$390,000,000</b>			<b>Present Value: \$390,000,000</b>							

**Notes:**

- Unit Cost is escalated from the DWR East Branch Enlargement Report Costs for 2001.
- Bridge cost is the average between the cost of replacing and raising the bridge.
- Updated embankment quantity from DWR
- Mobilization and Demobilization cost excludes C Pearlblossom Pumping Plant.
- Design, Environmental and Right of Way costs are not included



## Construction Cost Index History - As of October 2015

**HOW ENR BUILDS THE INDEX:** 200 hours of common labor at the 20-city average of common labor rates, plus 25 cwt of standard structural steel shapes at the mill price prior to 1996 and the fabricated 20-city price from 1996, plus 1.128 tons of portland cement at the 20-city price, plus 1,088 board ft of 2 x 4 lumber at the 20-city price.

View the [ANNUAL AVERAGE For ENR'S CONSTRUCTION COST INDEX](#).

### ENR'S CONSTRUCTION COST INDEX HISTORY (1908-2015)

YEAR	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG.
2015	9972	9962	9972	9992	9979	10039	10037	10039	10065	10128	10092		
2014	9664	9681	9702	9750	9796	9800	9835	9846	9870	9886	9912	9936	9806
2013	9437	9453	9456	9484	9516	9542	9552	9545	9552	9689	9666	9668	9547
2012	9176	9198	9268	9273	9290	9291	9324	9351	9341	9376	9398	9412	9308
2011	8938	8998	9011	9027	9035	9053	9080	9088	9116	9147	9173	9172	9070
2010	8660	8672	8671	8677	8761	8805	8844	8837	8836	8921	8951	8952	8799
2009	8549	8533	8534	8528	8574	8578	8566	8564	8586	8596	8592	8641	8570
2008	8090	8094	8109	8112	8141	8185	8293	8362	8557	8623	8602	8551	8310
2007	7880	7880	7856	7865	7942	7939	7959	8007	8050	8045	8092	8089	7966
2006	7660	7689	7692	7695	7691	7700	7721	7722	7763	7883	7911	7888	7751
2005	7297	7298	7309	7355	7398	7415	7422	7479	7540	7563	7630	7647	7446
2004	6825	6862	6957	7017	7065	7109	7126	7188	7298	7314	7312	7308	7115
2003	6581	6640	6627	6635	6642	6694	6695	6733	6741	6771	6794	6782	6694
2002	6462	6462	6502	6480	6512	6532	6605	6592	6589	6579	6578	6563	6538
2001	6281	6272	6279	6286	6288	6318	6404	6389	6391	6397	6410	6390	6343

YEAR	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG.
2000	6130	6160	6202	6201	6233	6238	6225	6233	6224	6259	6266	6283	6221
1999	6000	5992	5986	6008	6006	6039	6076	6091	6128	6134	6127	6127	6059
1998	5852	5874	5875	5883	5881	5895	5921	5929	5963	5986	5995	5991	5920
1997	5765	5769	5759	5799	5837	5860	5863	5854	5851	5848	5838	5858	5826
1996	5523	5532	5537	5550	5572	5597	5617	5652	5683	5719	5740	5744	5620
1995	5443	5444	5435	5432	5433	5432	5484	5506	5491	5511	5519	5524	5471
1994	5336	5371	5381	5405	5405	5408	5409	5424	5437	5437	5439	5439	5408
1993	5071	5070	5106	5167	5262	5260	5252	5230	5255	5264	5278	5310	5210
1992	4888	4884	4927	4946	4965	4973	4992	5032	5042	5052	5058	5059	4985
1991	4777	4773	4772	4766	4801	4818	4854	4892	4891	4892	4896	4889	4835
1990	4680	4685	4691	4693	4707	4732	4734	4752	4774	4771	4787	4777	4732