

This is one of the issues Reinhard accused me of being misleading or technically wrong: that an ILI of 3.0 could unaccounted for water loss of as little as 4%. I bring it up because **the issue is VERY important for retail water agencies.**

- The BMP 3 proposal offered up by CUWCC staff (dated May 19th and posted on the CUWCC website) would require water agencies to do many things; one of those things is the following: you would be required to use the AWWA spreadsheet to calculate something called an ILI, or "infrastructure leakage index". The proposal says that if you have an ILI of 3.0 or greater, then you must do a lot of things. The current trigger requiring agencies to take remedial action is 10% unaccounted for water.
- So this is a very important number, this "ILI of 3.0 or greater". The question is, how does the ILI of 3.0 related to the number we currently use, the 10% unaccounted for water? To determine this for my agency, I completed the AWWA water loss spreadsheet using estimates of the data requested and got an ILI of 3.82; I know that my unaccounted for water losses are in the neighborhood of 5%, so I did some simple math:  $5\% \times \frac{3.0}{3.82} = 3.9\%$ . That is, an ILI of 3.0 roughly equates to unaccounted for water of about 4%.
- So for my agency to get an ILI of less than 3.0, it looks like we need unaccounted for water to be less than 4%. You can argue technicalities forever, but the bottom line is that for a down-and-dirty estimate, this must be very close.