



Section G

IMPLEMENTATION

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|---------------|
| G.1 | Implementation Overview | G - 1 |
| G.2 | Formulating a Long-Term Institutional Structure..... | G - 2 |
| | Overview | G - 2 |
| | Existing Institutional Structures - RWMG and RAC | G - 2 |
| | Challenges to Defining a Long-Term Institutional Structure | G - 3 |
| | Proposed Responsibilities of Long-Term Institutional Structure..... | G - 5 |
| | Core Components | G - 5 |
| | Examples of Existing Institutional Structures | G - 7 |
| | Organizational Options for the Proposed Long-Term Institutional Structure | G - 10 |
| | Potential Alternatives for San Diego IRWM Institutional Structure..... | G - 10 |
| G.3 | Implementation Action Plans for Short-Term Priorities | G - 11 |
| | 1. Implement Priority Projects that Support the Region’s Goals and Objectives | G - 11 |
| | 2. Formally Establish a Long-Term Institutional Structure..... | G - 15 |
| | 3. Develop and Implement Public Outreach Plan | G - 17 |
| | 4. Establish a Web-Based Data Management System | G - 20 |
| | 5. Scientific/Technical Foundation of Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Objectives | G - 21 |
| | 6. Updated Assessment of Local Water Management Plans | G - 22 |
| | 7. Prepare Updated Version of IRWM Plan | G - 23 |
| G.4 | Implementation Issues for Priority Projects | G - 25 |
| | Project Costs and Economic Feasibility of Plan | G - 25 |
| | Demonstration of Technical Feasibility | G - 26 |
| | Readiness to Proceed and Tier I Project Implementation Schedules..... | G - 27 |
| | Funding Limitations | G - 27 |
| | Linkages and Interdependencies Among Projects..... | G - 27 |
| | Section G References | G - 28 |

Section G

List of Tables

| | | |
|------------|---|--------|
| Table G-1 | Potential Funding Sources for Long-Term IRWM Planning Effort..... | G - 6 |
| Table G-2 | Action Plan for Implementing Priority Projects | G - 12 |
| Table G-3 | Action Plan for Establishing a Regional IRWM Institutional Structure..... | G - 16 |
| Table G-4 | Action Plan for Stakeholder Outreach and Public Involvement | G - 18 |
| Table G-5 | Action Plan for Identifying and Addressing Environmental Justice Concerns | G - 19 |
| Table G-6 | Action Plan for Disadvantaged Communities | G - 19 |
| Table G-7 | Action Plan for Establishing a Web-Based Data Management System..... | G - 20 |
| Table G-8 | Action Plan for Addressing Deficiencies in the Technical and Scientific Foundation of Basin Plan Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Objectives | G - 22 |
| Table G-9 | Action Plan for Completing an Updated Assessment of Local Water Management Plans | G - 23 |
| Table G-10 | Action Plan for Preparing a Revised and Updated Version of the IRWM Plan | G - 24 |
| Table G-11 | Summary of Direct Linkages and Interdependent Tier I Projects | G - 28 |

G. IMPLEMENTATION

Section G Summary – The RWMG, with RAC guidance, is initially responsible for coordinating IRWM planning within the Region. In the future, however, a new institutional organization will be formed by the RWMG and RAC to take over IRWM Plan implementation responsibilities. One proposed option is the formation of a regional council through the development and acceptance of a common Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Membership of the MOU-formed organization would include interested land use, water, and wastewater agencies; environmental, business, and agricultural non-governmental organizations; and other regional stakeholders. Near-term IRWM Plan implementation will focus on designated short-term priorities, including: (1) implementing priority projects, (2) establishing a long-term IRWM institutional structure, (3) implementing a Public Outreach Plan, (4) establishing a web-based regional data management system, (5) identifying and addressing scientific and technical research needs, (6) completing an assessment of local water management plans, and (7) developing an updated version of this IRWM Plan. A series of near-term action plans are presented for establishing the long-term IRWM organization, implementing priority projects, and implementing the other designated short-term priorities.

G.1 Implementation Overview

This section summarizes actions required to implement short-term priorities and begin the process of addressing the Plan's long-term priorities. As addressed in Section F, short-term Plan priorities to be addressed within a three to five year time frame include:

1. Implement priority projects that support the Region's IRWM goals and objectives.
2. Formally establish a Regional institutional structure to guide the ongoing development and implementation of the Region's IRWM Plan.
3. Implement and update as needed a Public Outreach Plan that ensures key stakeholders and affected parties are informed of and engaged in IRWM planning and implementation.

4. Establish a regional, web-based system for sharing, disseminating, and supporting the analysis of water management data and information.
5. Complete a needs assessment and develop recommendations for addressing existing deficiencies in the technical and scientific foundation of the Basin Plan beneficial uses and water quality objectives.
6. Complete an updated assessment of local water management plans to ensure effective input from these plans during all phases of IRWM planning and implementation. Where planning deficiencies have been identified, address these deficiencies as part of the IRWM Plan update process.
7. Revise the IRWM Plan and publish the second edition of the IRWM Plan.

A series of implementation action plans (see Section G.3) have been developed to implement the above short-term priorities, and to work toward attaining the Plan's long-term priorities of (1) maintaining an effective institutional structure, (2) maintaining public involvement, and (3) achieving Plan goals and objectives.

G.2 Formulating a Long-Term Institutional Structure

Overview. Formulating a regional IRWM institutional structure is a key short-term Plan priority. The RWMG and RAC currently oversee IRWM Plan development and implementation, but a more inclusive regional institutional structure is proposed to coordinate and oversee implementation of IRWM Plan projects, programs, and processes. As a road map for the consideration of alternative institutional structures, this section:

- summarizes challenges associated with formulating a new regional institutional structure,
- identifies proposed responsibilities and core elements of the institutional structure,
- presents and evaluates potential alternative IRWM organizational structures,
- presents examples of currently-operating institutional structures,
- presents a recommended IRWM institutional structure for consideration by the RAC, and
- establishes a tentative schedule and action plan for establishing and implementing the institutional structure.

Existing Institutional Structures – RWMG and RAC. As documented in Section A, the RWMG was formed in 2005 to begin the process of IRWM planning in the Region and

prepare Proposition 50, Chapter 8, grant applications. In December 2006, the RWMG formed the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC), which is comprised of representatives from the water management areas of water supply, water quality and natural resources, and representatives of businesses, academia, and other interested members of the public. The RAC provides recommendations to the RWMG governing bodies on the Plan, project prioritization, funding applications, and long-term institutional structure. This relationship between the RAC and RWMG is reflected in Amendment 1 to the MOU. (See Appendix 9) Currently, the RAC and RWMG are overseeing IRWM Plan implementation until a new institutional structure is in place.

As identified in Section F.1, forming a long-term institutional structure is a key short-term Plan priority. The MOU frames how the RWMG and RAC will work together to establish and transition to a long-term institutional structure that would (1) replace the existing RWMG/RAC arrangement, and (2) evolve and adapt to meet future Regional water planning and stakeholder needs.

Challenges to Defining a Long-Term Institutional Structure. IRWM planning is unique to each region of the state. Regional characteristics and priorities, stakeholder involvement needs, and governance needs will differ by region. As a result, no specific model can be universally applied to each region; plans must be developed and implemented based on the characteristics of each region. The long-term institutional structure that manages and oversees IRWM planning will also be unique for that region. IRWM planning in the San Diego Region will have a geographic basis and organizational structure different than elsewhere in California.

Some areas of California have engaged in IRWM planning for many years prior to the passage of Proposition 50, with a governance structure in place. These regions are generally organized around one or two major river basins that extend across a large area, and may have a history of water conflicts. In contrast, the San Diego area has had limited experience conducting IRWM planning prior to Proposition 50 approval, and a long-term IRWM institutional structure needs to be formulated.

As described in Section B.3, the Region includes eleven hydrologic units. Seven of these units comprise watersheds for major water courses, such as the San Diego River, and four units are comprised of a series of small watersheds that drain to common coastal waters. (As an example, the Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit contains six watersheds.) Some IRWM Plans within California have been organized and governed around a watershed or watersheds, and

such a watershed-based approach may ultimately prove to be workable within the Region. While action items are proposed to address potential future assessment and implementation of this approach, the RWMG and RAC have determined that such a watershed approach is not feasible for the Region in the immediate near-term, as:

- watersheds within the Region have varying levels of organization, and several of the watersheds do not have a long-term tradition of organization and coordinated planning,
- existing watershed groups within the Region are not always organized in accordance with the hydrologic boundaries addressed in the Basin Plan,
- not all areas within the Region are represented within existing watershed management groups,
- many jurisdictions, key stakeholders, and agencies overlap watershed boundaries, and
- the Region's watersheds share many common water management issues that are appropriately addressed in a regional setting.

As described in Section B, numerous agencies, land-use jurisdictions, and organizations are involved in water management planning within the Region. A challenge to developing a long-term institutional structure is establishing an approach that provides for comprehensive stakeholder involvement, yet allows for efficiency in managing and accomplishing the many responsibilities associated with IRWM planning. In formulating an institutional structure, balanced geographic representation must occur, including representation from urban areas, rural areas, non-government organizations, and disadvantaged communities.

A challenge also exists for gaining adequate representation from disadvantaged communities who may not have the resources to participate. Representation from the three water management areas of water supply, water quality, and natural resources must also be incorporated into the structure. Stakeholders involved in IRWM planning will have varying degrees of involvement and responsibilities. Establishing different levels of participation based on an entities role in IRWM planning should also be considered when formulating a structure. For example, tribal governments, state and federal resource agencies, and the business community, may not have water management projects included in the IRWM Plan, however, they still have an important role in IRWM planning. As noted above, some IRWM planning regions have established participation based on representation from organized watersheds within their region. All these factors should be considered when formulating an institutional structure.

Proposed Responsibilities of the Long-Term Institutional Structure. One of the first steps in formulating a long-term structure is determining the proposed responsibilities of the organization. Broadly stated, the goal of the institutional structure will be to carry out responsibilities related to fulfilling the mission of the San Diego IRWM Plan. The proposed responsibilities include:

- periodically updating the IRWM Plan, including goals, objectives, and priorities,
- developing and implementing a program to promote wide-ranging public and stakeholder involvement and providing a public forum for stakeholder input,
- developing a program to manage and oversee regional data collection and management efforts to monitor plan implementation and assess plan effectiveness,
- developing and implementing a program to address scientific and technical needs relative to the Region's IRWM Plan,
- coordinating regional grant funding applications and addressing regional funding allocation and project prioritization,
- receiving and distributing grant funds and funds from other sources,
- managing the preparation and submittals of grant reporting documents,
- developing a process for soliciting and evaluating additional water management projects and programs,
- coordinating integration of the Region's water management projects,
- coordinating with the Region's watershed planning groups and coastal watershed management efforts,
- coordinating with adjacent IRWM planning efforts, and
- providing a forum for resolving jurisdictional issues and for input on legislative and regulatory concerns.

These roles and responsibilities serve as initial guidance and may evolve as experience is gained through implementation of IRWM planning within the Region.

Core Components. Another important step in formulating a long-term structure is identifying the minimum core components that should be addressed in any proposed structure. These components include a management committee, administering entity, funding mechanism, stakeholder involvement, and technical committees.

Management Committee. The structure should contain a committee or group of representatives that meets frequently to manage Plan implementation and updates, along with tasks associated with applying for and administering grant funds.

Administering Entity. A public agency or non-profit corporation must be identified or established as the administering entity. This entity would be responsible for items such as contracting for consultant services to assist in completing the responsibilities identified above and to receive and distribute grant funds.

Funding Mechanism. The key element to successful long-term IRWM planning is a secure source of funding to complete the responsibilities associated with implementing and maintaining the planning effort. Table G-1 presents several funding options for this effort. Financing of the projects and programs required to implement the Plan is further discussed in Section K.

Table G-1
Potential Funding Sources for Long-Term IRWM Planning Effort

| Funding Source | | Funding Source Issues |
|----------------|--|--|
| Local | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholders ▪ Project proponents receiving outside funding ▪ Assessment fees ▪ Tax | These are the most secure sources of funding, but the ability to pay may be an issue for some stakeholder organizations and gaining public approval of new assessments and taxes may be difficult. |
| State | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grants ▪ Budget appropriations ▪ State-wide assessments | Specific IRWM planning grants will be available through a competitive application process. State funding is not a secure funding source and would only supplement local sources. |
| Federal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grants ▪ Appropriations | Relying on these sources for long-term funding is risky and if received would need to supplement local sources. |
| Others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual and corporate donors ▪ Foundations and other non-profit organizations | Securing these funds may be staff intensive and could not be considered a secure source of funding. These options would need to supplement local sources. |

Stakeholder Involvement. The future institutional structure must be organized to ensure transparency and inclusive stakeholder participation. The structure must have the ability to represent the Region as a whole on IRWM planning. As discussed previously, participation from stakeholders could occur at different levels depending upon their specific role in IRWM planning.

Technical Subcommittee(s). As part of the structure, technical subcommittees could be formed to address specific topics related to IRWM planning efforts, including watershed planning issues. The subcommittees would be smaller in size and report to the management committee.

Examples of Existing Institutional Structures. Based on input from the RAC, three example institutional framework structures for IRWM planning within the Region were selected for evaluation, including:

- a joint powers authority (an agency in which members jointly share their powers) or an agency established by legislation (example: San Diego Association of Governments, which is a Regional Consolidated Agency),
- a coalition membership (example: San Diego River Coalition), and
- non-profit corporation with membership through a Memorandum of Understanding (example: California Urban Water Conservation Council).

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). *San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG).* SANDAG is comprised of the 18 cities and County, and serves as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers and builds public transportation; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

On January 1, 2003, a new state law (California Senate Bill 1703) consolidated all of the roles and responsibilities of SANDAG with many of the transit functions of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (now Metropolitan Transit System) and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (now North County Transit District). The consolidation allowed SANDAG to assume transit planning, funding allocation, project development, and construction in the San Diego region, in addition to its ongoing transportation responsibilities and other regional roles.

SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and county supervisors from each of the region's 19 local governments (with two representatives each from the City of San Diego and the County). Voting is based on membership and the population of each jurisdiction, providing for a more accountable and equitable representation of the region's residents. Supplementing these voting members are advisory representatives from Imperial County, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, the U.S. Department of Defense, Port District, Water Authority, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico. A professional staff of over 180 personnel that include planners, engineers, and research specialists assists the Board of Directors. The staff

is lead by an Executive Director appointed by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The agency also contracts for technical and support services.

Bimonthly meetings of the SANDAG Board of Directors and its five policy advisory committees (Executive, Transportation, Planning, Borders, and Public Safety) provide the public forums and decision points for significant regional issues such as growth, transportation and public transit, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and public safety. SANDAG Directors establish policies, adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, and develop programs to address regional issues. Citizens and representatives from community, civic, environmental, education, business, other special interest groups, and other agencies are involved in the planning and approval process by participating in committees as well as by attending workshops and public hearings.

SANDAG has no general taxing authority but receives grants and formula funding from both the federal and state governments. The agency also administers the voter-approved half-cent local sales tax program known as *TransNet*, which will generate \$14 billion through the year 2048 for highway, transit, and street improvements. All 18 cities and the County contribute annual membership dues based on the population of each jurisdiction and amount to less than one percent of the agency's overall budget.

San Diego River Coalition. The San Diego River Coalition (SDRC) is a voluntary coalition of more than 60 non-government organizations and community planning groups that have common interests within the San Diego River Watershed. SDRC members have adopted a mission statement and ground rules that govern member interaction and conduct. Membership in SDRC is contingent on an organization agreeing to (1) support the SDRC mission, (2) support adopted SDRC "ground rules", and (3) attend scheduled meetings.

SDRC representatives are appointed by the member organizations, and SDRC voting is on the basis of one vote per organization. A majority vote is required for motions to pass. Under the SDRC ground rules, voting privileges are suspended if any organization misses more than three consecutive meetings, but the privileges can be reinstated upon attendance of three consecutive subsequent meetings. SDRC holds agendized monthly meetings, but does not have an organization budget or professional staff. Chair, vice chair, and recording secretary positions within SDRC are appointed from among member representatives. SDRC forms committees among member representatives to address common areas of interest. In addition to member organizations with voting privileges, SDRC includes non-voting affiliate members (businesses, corporations, and other entities) that support the SDRC mission statement and are

allowed to participate in discussions. The public also is invited to participate in all SDRC meetings.

California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC). The California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) was created to increase efficient water use statewide through partnerships among urban water agencies, public interest organizations, and private entities. CUWCC's goal is to integrate urban water conservation Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the planning and management of California's water resources.

CUWCC was formed pursuant to the California Nonprofit Corporation Law as a public benefit corporation and is organized through a MOU. Members signing the MOU pledge to develop and implement fourteen comprehensive water conservation BMPs. Originally comprised of nearly 100 urban water agencies and environmental groups, CUWCC has grown over the past 16 years to 384 members.

The CUWCC MOU allows for several forms of membership. Water supply agencies are designated as Group 1 members. Non-profit public advocacy organizations are designated Group 2 members. Group 3 members include any other groups that do not fall within the Group 1 or Group 2 designations. Each MOU signatory designates one representative to CUWCC.

Direction for CUWCC is from a Steering Committee that holds the powers of a Board of Directors of a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (California Corporations Code Section 5210). The CUWCC Steering Committee is comprised of:

- eight Group 1 members,
- eight Group 2 members,
- four Group 3 members,
- an ad hoc representative from the Department of Water Resources, and
- an ad hoc representative from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Voting privileges within the Steering Committee are vested within the Group 1 and Group 2 members, but all members may take part in Steering Committee discussions. Representatives from Group 1 and Group 2 alternate annually in holding the leadership offices of Steering Committee Chair and Vice Chair. A representative from Group 3 acts as Secretary-Treasurer.

Plenary meetings of all CUWCC members are held a minimum of four times per year. Voting privileges for the plenary meetings are vested to Group 1 and Group 2 members, with each member receiving one vote. Attendance of 30 voting members is necessary for a quorum at

the full CUWCC meetings, provided that at least 10 percent of the Group 1 and 10 percent of the Group 2 members are present.

CUWCC funding is provided through annual member assessments. Members that pay the annual assessments are provided with full membership, and may hold representation within the Steering Committee. Voluntary members (members that sign the MOU but do not pay annual assessments) may vote at plenary meetings but may not be represented within the Steering Committee. The CUWCC bylaws allow for Group 2 members assessments to be either through cash payment or by the members providing in-kind services.

Organizational Options for the Proposed Long-Term Institutional Structure. After review of numerous examples of existing institutional structures, the RWMG has identified two basic long-term organizational approaches, which are discussed below.

Regional Joint Powers Authority. The RWMG members and other agencies could create a regional legal authority (Joint Powers Authority, or JPA) to oversee IRWM Plan implementation. The JPA could include all interested agencies with applicable vested powers as members. Under a JPA, formal membership is limited to agencies that share vested powers and would therefore exclude non-governmental organizations. The JPA could establish advisory committees and/or levels of associate membership to provide for water management input from stakeholders, non-government organizations, and regulatory agencies.

Regional Committee/Council through a MOU. The RWMG and stakeholders could form a regional committee or council through a structure created under a MOU. The MOU could include provisions for formal governing meetings of the committee/council and the hiring of professional staff. The MOU could also include all interested government agencies and non-government groups. Membership is achieved through signing a MOU, which can be easily and quickly revised. Additionally, the MOU can be structured to provide for tiered levels of membership.

After review of the two structural options and input received from the RAC, the RWMG recommends that the MOU approach be pursued initially in formulating the Region's IRWM institutional structure. As IRWM planning matures through implementation, the structure could evolve into a more formal structure, such as a JPA or non-profit corporation.

Potential Alternatives for San Diego IRWM Institutional Structure. Several alternatives for a structure to conduct IRWM planning are feasible using the MOU approach. Two options that may be considered utilize the same basic management structure – stakeholder

involvement, a management committee comprising stakeholders, a designated administering entity and a funding mechanism – but employ different approaches to ensure that important interests are represented and the plan goals are met.

One potential alternative, which may be called the San Diego Integrated Water Management Coalition, is organized around functional groups that reflect regional planning principles such as those articulated through the Plan’s goals, objectives, and water management strategies.

Another alternative, which may be called the San Diego Integrated Watersheds Coalition, has a structure based on geographical representation. Each of the Region’s organized watershed groups would be represented in the structure. This approach provides for collaboration within watersheds and at the regional level.

These alternatives are meant to illustrate general organizational principles, neither of which is mutually exclusive. It is important to note the selected approach will only succeed if all interests actively participate. For the “water management” approach, required participants will include stakeholders involved in water supply, water quality and resource stewardship. For the “integrated watersheds” approach, participation will be required from all watersheds of the Region. In the latter approach, it is also essential that organized watershed planning efforts occur within each of the watersheds within the Region.

The RWMG and RAC will discuss options and develop a proposed approach for a long-term institutional structure for consideration by the public stakeholders. The RAC and RWMG will continue their current roles of overseeing IRWM Plan implementation until the new institutional structure is in place. A discussion on the timeline for establishing the institutional structure is included in Section G.3.

G.3 Implementation Action Plans for Short Term Priorities

The following seven designated short-term Plan priorities will be addressed through a series of action plans that are to be completed within a three to five year period.

1. Implement Priority Projects that Support the Region’s Goals and Objectives

On the basis of input received from the RAC, project stakeholders, and the public, a total of 80 Tier I projects (see Section F.3) have been identified that support attainment of Plan goals and objectives. A RAC workgroup has been formed to review the Tier I projects, develop a

short-list of approximately 30 projects, evaluate the short-list projects, and develop a recommended list of priority projects for Proposition 50 funding. In addition to the efforts of the RAC workgroup, further near-term actions are required to:

- develop prioritization criteria for quantifying how the Tier I projects attain Plan objectives,
- identify which Tier I projects best achieve the Plan objectives (these projects will be designated priority projects), and
- implement the selected priority projects.

Table G-2 presents the near-term action plan for developing prioritization criteria, selecting priority projects from the Tier I list, and implementing the priority projects.

Table G-2
Action Plan for Implementing Priority Projects

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ¹ |
|--|--|
| 1. RAC workgroup presents recommended priority projects for funding to the RAC for approval | 2007 |
| 2. Include priority projects in Proposition 50, Step 2 funding application, if called back from Step 1 | January 2008 |
| 3. Reprioritize projects on basis of funding priority criteria and requirements | (depends on funding source requirements and schedule) |
| 4. Develop and submit funding applications | (depends on funding source requirements and schedule)) |
| 5. Execute and implement funding agreements | (depends on funding source requirements and schedule) |

¹ Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

Select Priority Projects. As discussed in Section F, IRWM planning involves a two-step prioritization process. Section F of this IRWM Plan presents initial prioritization on the basis of conformance with Plan objectives and breadth of incorporated water management strategies. A list of Tier I projects is developed from this initial prioritization step.

As part of the second step of the process, the IRWM organization will evaluate and develop criteria on which to select priority projects. In selecting priority projects from the Tier I list, the Region’s IRWM organization may choose to make use of different prioritization criteria

than those used for the Tier I screening. Criteria the IRWM organization may choose to incorporate into the project funding prioritization process may, in part, include cost-effectiveness, technical feasibility, degree of benefit, integration compatibility, readiness to proceed, regional water management needs, and funding program preferences. Near-term tasks associated with selecting priority projects include:

- development of preliminary draft prioritization criteria and scoring methodology, and presentation of the scoring methodology to the IRWM organization (which will be the RAC until a long-term IRWM organization is established for the Region),
- review, evaluation, and discussion of the draft criteria and scoring methodology by the IRWM organization,
- approval of the prioritization criteria and project scoring methodology by the IRWM organization, and
- selection of priority projects using the approved prioritization criteria.

Identify Funding Sources and Requirements. The Region's IRWM institutional organization (initially the RWMG and RAC) will assist project proponents in:

- identifying potential funding sources and opportunities,
- soliciting stakeholder and agency input on funding opportunities,
- coordinating with funding agencies to better understand and assess funding eligibility requirements,
- assisting members in evaluating the cost/effectiveness of pursuing available funding opportunities,
- evaluating the potential for funding success and determining which funding sources to pursue, and
- developing and implementing budgets for the application process.

Develop and Submit Funding Applications. The Region's IRWM organization will take a central role in coordinating, developing, and submitting IRWM funding applications. Developing and submitting funding applications may require the IRWM organization to:

- determine if outside technical assistance is required for developing funding applications,
- establish application budgets and retain required technical assistance,
- solicit additional projects for inclusion and evaluation in the funding application, and utilize the funding prioritization process to prioritize projects for funding,

- identify application data requirements and coordinate collection of information required to support funding applications,
- coordinate preparation of the initial version of the funding applications for the IRWM organization consideration,
- prepare a final version of the funding application for organization approval and submittal to funding agencies,
- perform post-submittal follow-up to track funding agency review, and
- monitor and administer the assigned funding application budget.

Execute and Implement Funding Agreements. The Region's IRWM organization (or administrative entity acting on behalf of the organization) will execute agreements with funding agencies, distribute funds, and be responsible for monitoring agreement compliance. As funding coordinator for the Region, the institutional structure will be responsible for coordinating with agencies that implement IRWM projects. To carry out these responsibilities, the institutional structure may need to:

- monitor compliance with funding agreements,
- monitor completion of required feasibility or planning studies,
- monitor coordination required for regulatory approvals,
- monitor completion of environmental (CEQA and if applicable, NEPA) compliance evaluations,
- monitor preparation of project predesign and design documents, land acquisition, and construction,
- monitor project implementation compliance with funding requirements,
- coordinate data collection efforts to monitor project effectiveness in achieving objectives, and
- monitor operation, maintenance, and sustainability of the water management projects.

The RWMG would be responsible for grant funding contractual arrangements prior to the formation of a long-term IRWM institutional structure. Current IRWM grant funding contractual arrangements are set forth in the RWMG MOU. (See Appendix 9) As stipulated in the MOU, the Water Authority will act as the Region's contract agency for State of California grant funding. To address distribution of grant funds for qualifying projects and to ensure conformance with grant funding requirements, the Water Authority would execute agreements with its member agencies, the City of San Diego, and the County. The City of San Diego and County would sub-contract with other proponents (those that are not Water

Authority member agencies) as specified in the MOU; that is to say, the City of San Diego would manage non-member agency projects within the City of San Diego, and the County would manage non-member agency projects outside the City of San Diego. Depending on future institutional arrangements, and subject to agreement between the three parties, responsibilities for developing project lists and managing individual project funding could also be divided differently in the future.

Future contractual arrangements for IRWM planning activities would depend on the legal structure of the long-term IRWM organization and member preferences. If the organization is established as a MOU-based coalition/council, the organization would select an appropriate administrative entity to contractually act on behalf of the organization and assume responsibility for distributing grant funds and coordinating compliance with grant funding conditions. If a JPA or similarly empowered long-term IRWM Plan organization is established, the organization may wish to assume direct contractual responsibilities for the Region's IRWM grant funding.

Implementation of each priority project (or any project addressed within this Plan) will be the responsibility of the project proponent and any applicable project partners. Participating in the Plan is intended to foster cooperation among Plan participants, increase efficiencies, and enhance sustainable water management within the Region. Development or adoption of the Plan does not bind the RWMG or IRWM Plan participants to implementing or funding any specific project or projects. Project proponents and applicable partners have discretionary authority over project design and implementation, and may elect not to implement a project based on many factors, including lack of funding, environmental consequences, or changing regional conditions or needs. Additionally, prior to or after Plan adoption, any agency may choose to withdraw from participation in the Plan, discontinue its project planning and implementation efforts, or secure funding on its own from any source. Project proponents also bear responsibility for ensuring compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

2. Formally Establish a Regional Institutional Structure

Short-term priority #2 is to formally establish an institutional structure to guide the ongoing development and implementation of the Region's IRWM Plan.

Table G-3 (page G-16) presents proposed near-term actions and a tentative schedule for formulating an institutional structure for inclusion in the final IRWM Plan and implementing the structure. The tentative schedule is based on pursuing an MOU agreement, which could later evolve into a more formal structure, such as a JPA or non-profit corporation.

Table G-3
Action Plan for Establishing a Regional IRWM Institutional Structure

| Task | Tentative Schedule ¹ |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. RAC input on core components and funding mechanism for IRWM institutional structure. Finalize process and establish schedule for development and implementation of structure | 2007 |
| 2. RWMG and RAC develop proposed institutional structure | 2008 |
| 3. Implementation of institutional structure ² | 2008 |
| 4. Institutional structure consideration (which may involve convening a work group) of approaches for coordinating with the Region's watershed planning efforts | 2008 |
| 5. Develop a consensus on how watershed-based planning is to be addressed within the Region's IRWM institutional structure and develop a plan for implementing the consensus | 2009 |

1 Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

2 Includes development of an initial draft MOU, refinement of the MOU per agency/stakeholder comment, agency consideration and approval of the MOU, and member execution of the MOU.

Initial Organizational Tasks. Initial tasks to develop the new institutional organization (see Table G-3) will focus on establishing the organization concept, developing and refining the organization MOU, and implementing the MOU. The RAC and RWMG will continue their current roles of overseeing IRWM Plan implementation until the new institutional structure is in place (estimated to be in 2008).

Establish Organization Concept. RAC meetings in 2007 and 2008 will serve as the focal point in soliciting input on refining and establishing the IRWM institutional organization. Initial RAC meetings will focus on developing and refining the basic organizational structure, including:

- organization mission,
- membership requirements,
- member and organizational responsibilities,
- management committee duties and responsibilities,
- administrative entity duties and responsibilities,
- roles and responsibilities of officers,
- voting rules,
- meeting rules,
- committee needs, organization, and rules, and
- funding issues and mechanisms.

Develop and Implement MOU. Once the basic concept is established in early 2008, the RWMG and RAC will take lead roles in:

- drafting an MOU,
- distributing the initial draft for public review,
- revising and modifying the MOU based on received comments,
- approving the revised MOU for distribution to agencies and interested groups for approval,
- monitoring member approval and execution of the MOU, and
- providing meeting locations and facilities for the new institutional structure.

The RWMG and RAC will maintain IRWM planning responsibilities during the period in which the long-term institutional structure is being defined and established.

3. Develop and Implement a Public Outreach Plan

Short-term priority #3 involves implementing and updating as needed a Public Outreach Plan that ensures key stakeholders and affected parties are informed and engaged in IRWM planning and implementation. Developing a Public Outreach Plan is a short-term priority required to supplement the outreach activities (see Section N) that have been implemented to date. The proposed Public Outreach Plan (described in Appendix 8) includes stakeholder coordination and public involvement, disadvantaged community assistance, and identification of environmental justice concerns.

Stakeholder Coordination and Public Involvement. While development of this IRWM Plan has involved significant stakeholder coordination efforts within the water and natural resources management community, further coordination will be required to identify additional interested stakeholders, encourage their participation, and provide a forum for stakeholder dialogue and cooperation. Current stakeholder outreach activities including web-based information (see Section N) will be maintained as the RAC and RWMG transition to a regional institutional structure. Additionally, beginning in 2008 the RWMG will hold quarterly stakeholder meetings to (1) formally discuss the implementation progress of the IRWM Plan elements, and (2) solicit stakeholder involvement in the proposed long-term IRWM institutional structure. In order to encourage the formation of regional partnerships, the RWMG may also host smaller focus group meetings where stakeholders with overlapping

interests meet with those members of the long-term institutional structure that have related areas of technical expertise.

Public involvement efforts to date (see Section N) have, in part, included a series of IRWM workshops, web-based outreach, and outreach efforts conducted by RWMG and RAC members. The proposed Public Outreach Plan will focus on expanding these efforts to solicit and maintain input from the general public.

Table G-4 summarizes near-term actions for proposed stakeholder outreach and public involvement. Proposed action items include public workshops and public meetings to solicit IRWM Plan input and ideas for the development of a long-term public involvement/outreach plan. Action items to be directed by the RWMG and RAC also involve identifying and evaluating additional public outreach mechanisms.

Environmental Justice. Environmental justice identification will be the third component of the proposed Public Outreach Plan. Table G-5 (page G-19) presents the proposed near-term action plan for identifying and addressing environmental justice concerns.

Table G-4
Action Plan for Stakeholder Outreach and Public Involvement^{1,2}

| Activity | Focus | Tentative Schedule ³ |
|---------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| IRWM Workshops | Identify additional stakeholders on basis of input received during the comment period and review the IRWM Plan and Public Outreach Plan with local water management groups | 2007 |
| Public Meetings | Quarterly stakeholder meetings to discuss IRWM planning and Plan implementation | September 2007 |
| | | November 2007 |
| | | January 2008 |
| | | March 2008 |
| | | May 2008 |
| Additional Outreach | Develop outreach plan for community events (e.g. speakers, poster boards, informational booths) | 2008 |
| | Identify additional outreach elements (e.g. public information announcements, information inserts in utility bills, etc.) | 2008 |

- 1 See Appendix 8 for a summary of the proposed Public Outreach Plan. Action items are to be performed under the direction of the RWMG and RAC.
- 2 Additional public meetings may be scheduled in conjunction with IRWM Plan milestones.
- 3 Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

Table G-5
Action Plan for Identifying and Addressing Environmental Justice Concerns^{1,2}

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ³ |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Contact environmental advocacy organizations | July 2007 |
| 2. Identify environmental justice communities and critical needs | August 2007 |
| 3. Develop potential solutions to environmental justice concerns and incorporate the solutions into the IRWM project review process | September 2007 |
| 4. Review IRWM projects for potential environmental justice benefits or negative impacts | October 2007 |
| 5. Update IRWM Plan to more thoroughly discuss environmental justice concerns | November 2007 |

- 1 See Section N.3 for a summary of environmental justice outreach to date. See Appendix 8 for environmental justice outreach proposed as part of the Public Outreach Plan. Action items are to be performed under the direction of the RWMG and RAC.
- 2 See Sections L.4 for discussion of environmental justice issues.
- 3 Tentative schedule subject to revision by of RAC and RWMG.

Disadvantaged Community Assistance. Disadvantaged community identification and outreach (see Appendix 8) represents an additional element of the Public Outreach Plan. While disadvantaged communities have been identified by planning area within the Region (see Table B-4 on page B-8), many additional disadvantaged communities exist within portions of designated municipal and County planning areas. These additional disadvantaged communities will be identified and an effort will be implemented to engage the participation of all identified disadvantaged communities in the ongoing development and implementation of the IRWM Plan. Table G-6 presents near-term action items for identifying and engaging disadvantaged communities in the IRWM Plan process.

Table G-6
Action Plan for Disadvantaged Communities¹

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ² |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Review 2003 census data | July 2007 |
| 2. Identify additional disadvantaged communities by census tract | July 2007 |
| 3. Identify and contact leaders within disadvantaged communities | July 2007 |
| 4. Develop approach for identifying disadvantaged community water management needs | August 2007 |
| 5. Update IRWM Plan to identify additional disadvantaged communities and to discuss water management needs of disadvantaged communities | September 2007 |
| 6. Identify additional water management projects or programs to address disadvantaged community needs | November 2007 |

1. See Appendix 8 for disadvantaged community outreach proposed as part of the Public Outreach Plan. Action items to be performed under the direction of the RWMG and RAC.
2. Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

4. Establish a Web-Based Data Management System

Short-term priority #4 is to establish a web-based data management system for sharing, disseminating, and supporting the analysis of water management data and information. Near-term data management actions are required to foster implementation of priority projects, monitor project performance, and to support ongoing planning and program management. Table G-7 presents near-term actions for establishing a web-based system to provide interactive access to a variety of existing sources of water management data and information, including direct access to IRWM-generated data and information.

These actions constitute an important first step in addressing the Region’s long-term data management needs, and provide for attainment of key targets for Objective A (maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship) and Objective B (effectively obtain, manage, and assess water resource data and information). The actions will also assist in addressing currently known data gaps and data management needs as described in Section J.

Table G-7
Action Plan for Establishing a Regional, Web-Based Data Management System^{1,2}

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ³ |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Identify regional stakeholders and agencies with a role in data collection or management | 2007 |
| 2. Solicit initial public input (via the public outreach program) on data management needs | 2007 |
| 3. Convene a work group or technical committee to oversee key data management tasks (e.g., review and update of regional data gaps, identification of strategies for addressing them, development of a centralized system for accessing data, etc.) | 2008 |
| 4. Solicit public and stakeholder input on data accessibility and data management needs | 2008 |
| 5. Develop baseline standards for integrating and assessing water management data and information (Objective B target) | 2008 |
| 6. Develop a centralized, web-based system for providing public access to key water management data sets for the Region (Objective A and B targets) | 2009 |
| 7. Begin providing centralized, web-based access to key water management data sets (Objective B target) | 2010 |

1 Near-term actions proposed to address short-term priority #4: Establish a regional web-based system for sharing, disseminating, and supporting the analysis of water management data and information.

2 See Section J for a discussion of existing data collection efforts, known data gaps, and data management priorities.

3 Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

5. Scientific/Technical Foundation of Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Objectives

Short-term priority #5 involves completing a needs assessment and developing recommendations for addressing existing deficiencies in the technical and scientific foundation of Basin Plan beneficial uses and water quality objectives. As described in Section M, the San Diego Basin Plan is central to water management in the Region because it designates existing and potential beneficial uses of groundwater and surface waters, establishes water quality objectives to protect those uses, and establishes regional implementation, enforcement, and remediation policies to ensure attainment of the water quality objectives. It is axiomatic that a key objective of IRWM planning and implementation should be to ensure consistency with Basin Plan standards and directives.

As discussed in Section B.5, receiving waters within portions of all of the region's hydrologic units do not comply with established water quality standards. Non-compliance with water quality standards can result in a water body or segment being Section 303(d)-listed, and ultimately a TMDL being conducted. In many instances, however, important questions have been raised regarding the basis of beneficial use designations and the validity of established water quality standards, including:

- Do designated Basin Plan beneficial uses reflect current and potential beneficial uses?
- Are water quality standards achievable?
- Do water quality standards accurately represent current conditions?
- Are revisions to the 303(d) evaluation/listing process appropriate?
- Are site-specific objectives needed?

In view of these and other questions, additional work is needed to thoroughly review the technical and scientific basis for specific use designations and standards established under the Basin Plan. Because of the complexity and scope of this undertaking, a necessary first step is to complete a thorough needs assessment that establishes priorities and recommended actions for addressing identified deficiencies.

These short-term actions will enable the future attainment of designated targets for Objective C (further the scientific and technical foundation of water management). Table G-8 (page G-22) presents near-term actions for completing this assessment.

**Table G-8
Action Plan for Addressing Deficiencies in the
Technical and Scientific Foundation of Basin Plan Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Objectives**

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ¹ |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. RAC and public review of key Basin Plan issues identified in the IRWM Plan | 2007 |
| 2. Solicit additional regulatory agency input on key Basin Plan issues | 2007 |
| 3. Convene a work group or technical committee to coordinate with the Regional Board to oversee the development of a Basin Plan needs assessment | 2008 |
| 4. Further solicit agency and stakeholder input on perceived Basin Plan deficiencies and needs and coordinate with the Regional Board identify means of addressing the deficiencies and needs | 2009 |
| 5. Complete a Basin Plan needs assessment/recommendations report and coordinate with the Regional Board to develop and implement a plan for addressing the report recommendations | 2010 |

¹ Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

6. Updated Assessment of Local Water Management Plans

Short-term priority #6 involves completing an updated assessment of local water management plans to ensure effective input and coordination with these planning efforts during all phases of IRWM planning and implementation. Where planning deficiencies are identified, the deficiencies are to be addressed as part of the IRWM Plan update process. This short-term priority will involve establishing workgroups for each of the “functional areas” of water management:

- water supply and water quality,
- wastewater and recycled water,
- flood protection,
- stormwater management, and
- natural resources.

These workgroups will review their existing documents (including watershed and other plans that address multiple water management disciplines) and identify planning priorities and

planning needs for the IRWM Plan update. Table G-9 (page G-23) presents proposed near-term actions for completing an assessment of local water management plans.

Table G-9
Action Plan for Completing an Updated Assessment of Local Water Management Plans¹

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ² |
|---|---|
| 1. Form workgroups for the following functional areas of water management (a) water supply and water quality, (b) wastewater and recycled water, (c) flood protection, (d) stormwater management, and (e) natural resources | 2007 |
| 2. Collect existing water resources management plans within the Region, and develop a data-base summary of objectives and recommendations presented in the plans | January 2008 |
| 3. Review the plans for consistency with the 2007 version of the IRWM Plan, identify deficiencies in the 2007 version of the Plan, and develop proposed means of addressing the deficiencies | April 2008 |
| 4. Convene a workgroup to address means of providing assistance to project proponents in coordinating integration of the Region's projects. | April 2008 |
| 5. Identify additional projects not currently on the IRWM Plan list that were addressed as priority projects within the Region's local water management plans | April 2008 |
| 6. Workgroups present findings to the RAC for consideration | 2008 |
| 7. RAC consensus on short-term means of addressing Plan deficiencies to be incorporated in the 2007 IRWM Plan Update, and RAC consensus on which deficiencies to be deferred to future IRWM Plan updates | 2008 |
| 8. Identification, evaluation, and resolution of inconsistencies between local plans and IRWM Plan ³ | (depends on established schedule; see Table G-10) |
| 9. Address deficiencies per direction from the RAC as part of the Second Edition of the IRWM Plan | (depends on established schedule; see Table G-10) |

1 See Section M for a discussion of known existing local water management plans.

2 Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

3 Updating the IRWM Plan will require two-way coordination with local agencies and stakeholders. As part of this coordination, the RAC or institutional structure will assess actions required to coordinate update of the IRWM plan with revisions or updates to local water plans. It will also be necessary for local agencies/organizations to coordinate preparation or update of their plans with the IRWM Plan.

7. Prepare Updated Version of IRWM Plan

As part of short-term priority #7, an updated (second edition) version of the Plan will be prepared. The updated Plan will be prepared on the basis of:

- information developed from short-term actions (as identified above),

- RAC planning decisions and direction, and
- stakeholder and public comment on the 2007 version of the IRWM Plan.

Table G-10 presents actions to prepare an updated version of the IRWM Plan. As shown in Table G-10, the RAC (with appropriate public input) or its institutional successor will take the lead updating the IRWM Plan, prioritizing projects for future funding opportunities, and coordinating Plan implementation with adjacent areas.

Table G-10
Action Plan for Preparing a Revised and Updated Version of the IRWM Plan

| Action Item | Tentative Schedule ¹ |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Finalization of list of priority projects for Proposition 50 funding by RAC (see Table G-2) | September 2007 |
| 2. RAC input on core components of institutional structure (see Table G-3) | September 2007 |
| 3. RAC recommendation that RWMG governing bodies adopt IRWM Plan | October 2007 |
| 4. RWMG governing bodies adopt 2007 IRWM Plan | November 2007 |
| 5. Contacts with adjacent IRWM planning groups and Mexico to establish ongoing means of inter-regional coordination of Plan implementation and to address inter-regional issues/conflicts | 2008 |
| 6. RAC establishment of a schedule for preparing the next update (2 nd Edition) of the IRWM Plan | 2008 |
| 7. Pursue a planning grant through DWR or other sources to help fund preparation of the next update of the IRWM Plan and for overall IRWM planning activities | (depends on established schedule) |
| 8. Select and retain a technical team to assist the IRWM organization in Plan preparation and stakeholder outreach | (depends on established schedule) |
| 9. Monitor and document results from completed action items for short-term priorities #1 through #6 | (depends on established schedule) |
| 10. Initiate stakeholder outreach to obtain input to the Updated IRWM Plan and coordination with adjacent IRWM planning areas | (depends on established schedule) |
| 11. Evaluate Plan objectives, targets, and priorities, and prepare an initial draft version of the Updated IRWM Plan | (depends on established schedule) |
| 12. Prepare an updated version of the Updated IRWM Plan | (depends on established schedule) |

¹ Tentative schedule subject to revision by RAC and RWMG.

G.4 Implementation Issues for Priority Projects

As described above, the long-term institutional structure will play a central role in coordinating implementation of the IRWM projects presented in this Plan. Key issues that may affect implementability of the projects presented in this plan include:

- overcoming implementation challenges,
- evaluating project costs, cost-effectiveness, and funding issues, and
- evaluating project readiness.

As presented in Section F and Appendix 7, the Region's water management projects have been screened into Tier I and Tier II groups. While further prioritization using additional criteria will be required by the RWMG and RAC to assess project prioritization within funding applications, the list of Tier I projects presented in Section F and Appendix 7 represent the mix of projects that best works toward attaining the IRWM Plan objectives and targets.

Project Costs and Economic Feasibility of Plan. Estimated costs for IRWM Plan projects on the Tier I list are presented in Appendix 10. As shown in Appendix 10, total budgeted costs for all of the Region's Tier I water management projects are estimated at approximately \$630 million. Annual operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for the Tier I projects are estimated at approximately \$13 million. (As shown in Appendix 10, project proponents have not yet reported all applicable O&M costs.)

While total costs for the Tier I prioritized projects are significant, the proposed IRWM Plan is economically feasible on a programmatic level. The proposed IRWM projects represent a small fraction of the Region's water and wastewater facility assets. For comparison, total Water Authority assets are listed at \$2.2 trillion, \$1.4 trillion of which are capital assets. (Water Authority, 2005) Combined capital water management assets within the Region (water, wastewater, flood control, stormwater, etc.) would be significantly in excess of an order of magnitude greater than Water Authority water system assets. Proposed IRWM Plan capital projects thus represent significantly less than 1/100th of one percent of the value of the Region's existing water management capital assets.

The long-term IRWM program costs also represent a small fraction of the overall regional economy. Amortized over a 15-year period at 5 percent, the \$630 million capital cost and \$13

million annual O&M costs of the Tier I IRWM projects equates to a few 1/100^{ths} of one percent of the Region's \$160 billion annual gross regional product.

Implementation of the IRWM projects would result in significant benefits for the Region (see Section H), including

- water supply reliability benefits to residences, business, industry, and agriculture,
- surface and groundwater quality improvements,
- benefits to habitat and wildlife,
- environmental health benefits,
- regulatory compliance benefits,
- benefits to recreation,
- aesthetic benefits, and
- benefits to the local economy (including economic stimulus benefits).

The economic benefits associated with a reliable water supply, in particular, are enormous. Studies performed as part of the Water Authority Emergency Storage Program (ESP) estimated that:

- a 20 percent reduction in water supplies for a two-month period within the Region would result in employment and other economic losses to the Region of \$2.3 billion,
- a 20 percent reduction in water supplies for a six-month period within the Region would result in employment and other economic losses to the Region of \$8 billion,
- a 60 percent reduction in water supplies for a two-month period within the Region would result in employment and other economic losses to the Region of \$13 billion, and
- a 60 percent reduction in water supplies for a six-month period within the Region would result in employment and other economic losses to the Region of \$32 billion.

Specific cost/benefit analyses of individual projects will be considered as part of the of project grant funding prioritization. The proposed IRWM organization may choose to make use of the cost-benefit analyses in assessing funding needs, prioritizing projects, and in making funding allocation decisions.

Demonstration of Technical Feasibility. Tier I IRWM projects are in varying stages of implementation. Appendix 10 identifies the technical feasibility status of each Tier I project.

Several of the Tier I projects consist of technical feasibility studies. Additionally, several projects are land acquisition projects that will not require a demonstration of technical feasibility. As shown in Appendix 10, the technical feasibility of the remaining Tier I projects has been demonstrated (1) in published feasibility studies, master plans, pre-design studies, and/or (2) by successful implementation and operation of other similar projects.

Readiness to Proceed and Tier I Project Implementation Schedules. Appendix 10 presents proposed implementation schedules for applicable planning, design, environmental/permitting, land acquisition, and construction tasks. Securing project funding represents the next key implementation factor for many of the Tier I IRWM projects. With this funding, all but a few of the Tier I projects would be completed or implemented within 5 years (year 2012).

Funding Limitations. Securing adequate funding is key to implementing the Region's Tier 1 projects. The RWMG and project proponents understand that outside funding from the state and federal government cannot fund the \$630 million in total capital costs estimated to implement the projects. Outside funding, however, can assist by providing seed money for agencies to implement projects that may be linked to other projects and thereby maximizing water management benefits. The RWMG has requested \$25 million in grant funding from Proposition 50, Chapter 8, Round 2, to help implement projects that are part of this IRWM Plan and long-term planning effort.

Linkages and Interdependencies Among Projects. Many indirect linkages among the Tier I projects exist, as projects may:

- be located in the same watershed,
- be subject to similar environmental or regulatory issues,
- represent subsequent phases of earlier projects,
- address similar water management needs, or
- concurrently implement existing local plans (e.g. MSCP Plans, water supply master plans, watershed plans, flood plans, etc.).

Several key direct linkages and interdependencies exist among the Tier I projects that will require close interagency coordination. Table G-11 (page G-28) summarizes these key linkages and interdependencies.

Table G-11
Summary of Direct Linkages and Interdependent Tier I Projects

| Linked or Interdependent Projects ¹ | Direct Linkage or Interdependency | Required Coordination |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance | <p>Conveyance facility proposed by Olivenhain MWD is linked to the construction of the Carlsbad Desalination Facility by a private entity</p> | <p>Coordination is required among Olivenhain MWD (the project proponent), City of Carlsbad (Carlsbad Municipal Water District), and the private entity constructing the Carlsbad Desalination Facility</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Los Peñasquitos Watershed Sediment Transport | <p>Linked with current TMDL assessment and modeling for sediment/siltation for the Los Peñasquitos Watershed and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon</p> | <p>Coordination is required between the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Foundation, the Regional Copermittees, and the Regional Board</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County of San Diego Chollas Creek Runoff Reduction and Groundwater Recharge Project | <p>Linked to implementation of TMDLs for dissolved copper, lead, and zinc in Chollas Creek</p> | <p>Coordination is required between County, Regional Copermittees, and the Regional Board</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Monte Groundwater Recharge Project • Santee Water Reclamation Facility Expansion and El Monte Recharge | <p>Groundwater recharge project proposed by Helix Water District is dependent on recycled water from the Padre Dam MWD Santee Water Reclamation Facility</p> | <p>Interagency coordination is required between Helix Water District and Padre Dam Municipal Water District</p> |

¹ Interdependent or significantly linked projects that require interagency or inter-organization coordination. (List does not include multiple projects proposed by a single organization that are linked or interrelated.) Based on Tier I IRWM projects listed in Appendices 5 and 9.

Section G References

Water Authority. *San Diego County Water Authority 2005 Annual Report*. 2005.