

1 **Section 8: Project Priorities and Implementation**

2 **8.1 Project Prioritization Process**

3 The Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP will be implemented through specific studies and actions.
4 In order to identify potential projects that facilitate IRWMP implementation (e.g., “Candidate
5 Projects”), the RWMG held an open “call for projects.” Stakeholders and others were
6 encouraged to submit projects during multiple stakeholder meetings, in email correspondence
7 solicitations, and via the project website. Project proponents that had submitted projects as part
8 of the 2008 IRWMP were given copies of their previous submittals and asked to revise the
9 forms to reflect the current project status and to provide information relevant to the latest IRWM
10 Guidelines (e.g., climate change information, cost-benefit information), and resubmit the project
11 for consideration. To implement water management strategies identified in the IRWMP,
12 Stakeholders identified 55 separate projects during this 2013 IRWMP update.

13 The timeline for project solicitation was as follows:

April 2012	Development of project ranking and review criteria by RWMG, development of project solicitation forms
May 2012	Review of project ranking criteria, introduction to data needed for project submittal, announcement of “Call for Projects” during Stakeholder Meeting
July 2012	Refresher on data needed for project submittal, reminder of “Call for Projects” during Stakeholder Meeting
August 2012	Project submittals due
September 2012	Presentations by Stakeholders on projects “ready to proceed”, review of opportunities to integrate projects, project refinement
October 2012	Presentations by Stakeholders on projects “ready to proceed”, review of opportunities to integrate projects, project refinement
November 2012	Initial Project Ranking by RWMG
December 2012	Selection of IRWM Plan Projects Review and refinement of project ranking by Stakeholders Final IRWMP project ranking

14

1 The RWMG, with input from Stakeholders, developed a process to prioritize projects, with the
2 intent that highest-ranked projects be put forth in applications for funding. The prioritization of
3 projects is based upon a detailed screening process. The process had five major steps:

- 4 1. Development of Project Ranking and Scoring Criteria
- 5 2. Call for Projects
- 6 3. Development and Refinement
- 7 4. Initial Project Ranking
- 8 5. Review and Finalization of Ranking by RWMG and Stakeholders

9 All projects will be maintained on the IRWMP Project list, and the list will be updated on a
10 regular basis as new projects are submitted and as projects are developed through time and re-
11 prioritized. The RWMG can hold a “Call for Projects” and update the IRWMP Project list at
12 anytime. Revision of the IRWMP Project list does not require that the entire IRWMP be revised
13 and re-adopted, rather the updated project list can be amended to the existing plan upon simple
14 majority vote by the RWMG.

15 **8.1.1 Development of Project Ranking and Scoring Criteria**

16 The RWMG determined that it was important to develop a systematic process to review projects
17 for inclusion in the IRWMP. To this end the RWMG prepared a project review structure based
18 on a point system. Points are awarded based on (1) how well a project implements the IRWMP
19 objectives and (2) to what extent the project is consistent with the 2012 IRWM Proposition 84
20 Guidelines. The project ranking and scoring criteria are shown in Table 8.1-1. The project
21 review criteria were developed by the RWMG and reviewed and confirmed by the broader
22 Stakeholder group.

23 **8.1.2 Call for Projects**

24 Once the project review process was established, the project solicitation forms were developed.
25 The RWMG wanted to encourage broad participation and directed the preparation of two
26 different forms, a long-form for projects “ready to proceed” and a short-form for more conceptual
27 projects. The long forms were intended to capture all the information needed to rank and review
28 a project; the short-forms were intended to collect the information necessary to determine if a
29 project is consistent with the IRWMP. Forms were distributed at Stakeholder meetings,
30 provided to the email list, and posted at the IRWMP website (www.scrwaterplan.org).
31 Completed forms could be submitted to the IRWMP website, submitted via email to the IRWMP
32 consultant, via email to Castaic Lake Water Agency, or provided in hardcopy during a
33 Stakeholder meeting. Forms submitted during the 2012 “Call for Projects” are provided in
34 Appendix E.

35

1
2

**TABLE 8.1-1
PROJECT RANKING AND REVIEW CRITERIA**

Criterion	Possible Points
Project and Project Applicant Eligible	<p>Pass/Fail Criteria</p> <p>If project affects groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) There must be a GWMP prepared and implemented in compliance with CWC §10753.7 or applicant consents to be subject to a GWMP or other program that meets the requirements of CWC §10753.7. (2) Or the proposal must include development of a GWMP within 1 year of grant submittal date. (3) Or the project conforms to requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater. <p><i>If no to all 3 = Fail</i></p> <p>If project proponent or project beneficiary is Urban Water Supplier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) They must have completed and submitted an Urban Water Management Plan (2) And be in compliance with AB1420 (3) And meet water meter requirements (CWC §525) <p><i>If no to any of the three = Fail</i></p> <p>5 points if Project Proponent has adopted or will adopt the Integrated Plan</p>
	Readiness to Proceed
Addresses Multiple Objectives	15 points for each objective addressed, up to 100 points
Integrates Multiple Resource Management Strategies	5 points for each applicable Resource Management Strategy, up to 100 points
Benefits a Disadvantaged Community/Increases Disadvantaged Community Participation	<p>Yes = 50 points</p> <p>No = 0 points</p>

3

1 **Table 8.1-1 cont.**

Criterion	Possible Points	
Addresses Critical Water Issues for Native American Tribal Communities	Yes = 50 points No = 0 points	If Native American Tribal Community Qualifies as DAC, points will be awarded per box above and this box will not apply.
Environmental Justice Concerns	50 points	Project redresses inequitable distribution of environmental burdens
Consistent with Local Land Use Plans	Yes = 100 points No = 0 points	
Improves Interregional Coordination	Yes = 100 points No = 0 points	
Tie – Breaker Points	For any projects ranked in the top 15 with the same score the following points will be awarded:	
	10 pts	Project with lower cost per acre-foot of water conserved
	10 pts	Project with the greatest reduction in electrical/energy use per acre-foot of water
	10 pts	Project with lower cost per new acre-foot of water supply
	10 pts	Project with lower cost per acreage of habitat improved
	10 pts	Project with lower cost for per unit of flood reduction

2

3 **8.1.3 Development and Refinement**

4 Over the course of two workshops, those project
 5 proponents with projects “ready to proceed” presented
 6 information on their projects and took questions from
 7 the Stakeholders and public. These workshops served
 8 to: (1) identify opportunities for collaboration between
 9 Stakeholders, (2) identify opportunities for integrating
 10 different implementation projects, and (3) utilize the
 11 collective group experience to refine and improve
 12 proposed projects.

CANDIDATE PROJECTS

A large number of projects were submitted by Stakeholders. During the project development and refinement process, two project proponents observed commonalities in their projects and decided to form a partnership and combine their individual projects into a single enhanced project.

13 **8.1.4 Initial Project Ranking**

14 Based on information provided in the project solicitation forms as well as information gained at
 15 the project workshops, the RWMG scored each of the projects that had an associated long-form
 16 using the project ranking and review criteria (Table 8.1-1). The scoring criteria and resulting
 17 points for each of the 18 “long-form” projects was displayed in a matrix form. As a group the
 18 RWMG reviewed and refined project scores. Where necessary, project proponents were asked
 19 to provide additional information about their proposed project.

1 The RWMG also reviewed each of the 37 short-form projects for consistency with the IRWMP.
2 The “short-form” projects are more conceptual and do not have the information necessary to be
3 ranked. While these conceptual projects are not yet ready for implementation they offer ideas
4 about how to further the objectives of the IRWMP and improve water management in the
5 Region. For this reason the RWMG and Stakeholders want to capture these projects for further
6 consideration.

7 **8.1.5 Review and Finalization of Ranking by RWMG Stakeholders**

8 The initial project ranking developed by the RWMG was presented to the Stakeholders during
9 the regular December 2012 Stakeholder meeting. The Stakeholders were given the opportunity
10 to review scoring for each of the 18 long-form projects as well as the review of each of the 37
11 short-form projects for consistency with the IRWMP.

12 **8.1.6 Selected Plan Projects**

13 Those Candidate Projects selected for inclusion in the IRWMP by the RWMG and Stakeholders
14 become IRWM Plan Projects. The ranked IRWM Plan Projects are presented in Table 8.1-2;
15 conceptual IRWM Plan Projects (not ranked) are presented in Table 8.1-3.

16 It should be noted that Tables 8.1-2 and 8.1-3 represent a “snapshot” particular to this edition of
17 the IRWMP. Over time, new Candidate Projects will be evaluated, added to the plan, and
18 ranked according to the established criteria. The list of IRWM Plan Projects is intended to
19 continually grow and change as projects are completed and new project concepts are added.

20 The list of IRWM Plan Projects is provided in this IRWMP, was distributed to Stakeholders at the
21 December 2012 Stakeholder meeting, and is available at the IRWMP website
22 (www.scrwaterplan.org).

23 **8.2 Integration of Water Management Strategies**

24 CWC § 79501 states the following:

25 *The people of California find and declare that it is necessary and in the public interest to do*
26 *all of the following...*

27 *Establish and facilitate integrated regional water management systems and procedures to*
28 *meet increasing water demands due to significant population growth that is straining local*
29 *infrastructure and water supplies.*

30 *Improve practices within watersheds to improve water quality, reduce pollution, capture*
31 *additional storm water runoff, protect and manage groundwater better, and increase water*
32 *use efficiency.*

33

1

The Page Intentionally Left Blank

2

TABLE 8.1-2
RANKEND IRWM PLAN PROJECTS

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives							Rank
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction	
SC-1	Upper Santa Clara River Arundo/Tamarisk Removal Program (SCARP) Implementation	City of Santa Clarita	Santa Clara River Conservancy; Angeles National Forest; Santa Clara Invasive Weeds Task Force	\$0.5M-\$20M (Capital); \$25 - \$100k/yr over 15 years (O&M)	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	1
SCVSD-1	SCVSD Automatic Water Softener Rebate and Public Outreach Program	Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District	City of Santa Clarita; County of Los Angeles	\$1.1M/yr over 3 years (O&M)			◆				◆	2
NCWD-2	Pellet Water Softening Treatment Plant - Phase 1	Newhall County Water District	NA	\$250,000 - \$500,000 (Capital)	◆		◆	◆			◆	3
AA/BCN-1	Bouquet Canyon Creek Restoration, Control of Invasive Weeds	Agricultural Access/Bouquet Canyon Network (Currently no eligible applicant as Sponsor Agency)	Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District; Natural Resource Conservation District; Cooper Ecological Monitoring/Leathermann BioConsulting, Inc.; LA County Fire; Angeles National Forest	\$20,240 - \$52,852 (Capital); \$13,052/yr over 5 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	4
SCWD-2	July 2012 Santa Clarita Water Division Water Use Efficiency Strategic Plan Water Use	Santa Clarita Water Division	Castaic Lake Water Agency; City of Santa Clarita	\$301,930-\$2,520,469 (Capital); \$62,370-	◆	◆	◆	◆			◆	5
SCVSD-2	Saugus Water Reclamation Plan - Ultraviolet Light Disinfection Facility	Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District	Castaic Lake Water Agency	\$8M-\$14M (Capital); \$2K/yr for 20 years (O&M)	◆	◆	◆	◆				6
CLWA-3	Santa Clarita Valley Water Use Efficiency Strategic Plan	Castaic Lake Water Agency	LACWD#36; Newhall County Water District; Santa Clarita Water Division; Valencia Water Company	\$1M-\$5M/yr over 8 years (Capital)	◆	◆	◆					7
LADPW-9	SCR South Fork Rubber Dam No. 1 and Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$5M-\$9M (Capital); \$50K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			8
CLWA-8	Foothill Feeder Connection	Castaic Lake Water Agency	Newhall County Water District; City of Santa Clarita; LACWD#36	\$3M-\$5M (Capital); \$50K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆						9
SC-5	Biofiltration and Low Impact Development Retrofits	City of Santa Clarita	Los Angeles County; Castaic Lake Water Agency	\$4M-\$6M (Capital); \$200,000/yr over 15 years (O&M)	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		10
SC-6	Septic to Sewer Retrofit Project	City of Santa Clarita	NA	\$25M-\$35M (Capital); unknown O&M		◆	◆	◆				11

Table 8.1-2 cont.

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives							Rank
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship/ Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction		
CLWA-7	Castaic Conduit	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$14,910,000-\$16M (Capital); \$5,000/yr (O&M)		◆						12
CLWA-10	Distribution System - RV-2 Modification	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$2,880,000-\$3,200,000 (Capital); \$5,000/yr (O&M)		◆						13
CLWA-9	West Saugus Formation Groundwater Resources Monitoring Project	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$628,675			◆	◆				14
NCWD-1	Santa Clara River – Sewer Trunk Line Relocation Phase II and III	Newhall County Water District	NA	\$2,500,000 - \$4,000,000 (Capital); \$30K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆				15
NCWD-3	Santa Clarita Valley Residential Turf Removal Program	Newhall County Water District	Castaic Lake Water Agency; Santa Clarita Water Division; Valencia Water Company; LA County Waterworks #36	625000 (Capital); \$312,500/yr over 2 years (O&M)	◆				◆			16
CLWA-11	Santa Clarita Valley Volatile Organic Carbon Groundwater Investigation	Castaic Lake Water Agency	Newhall County Water District; City of Santa Clarita; LACWD#36	\$250,000-\$5M (Capital)			◆	◆				17

**TABLE 8.1-3
CONCEPTUAL IRWM PLAN PROJECTS**

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives						
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction
AA/BCN-2	Feasibility of Arundo Stem Cutting Ram (ASCR)	Agricultural Access/Bouquet Canyon	NA	<\$100K		◆		◆	◆		◆
CLWA-1	Irrigation Efficiency Program	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$100K-\$1M	◆					◆	
CLWA-2	Water Use Efficiency Certification	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$100K-\$1M	◆					◆	
CLWA-4	ESFP Sludge Collection System	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$1M-\$1M		◆	◆				
CLWA-5	Saugus Formation Replacement Wells	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$1M-\$10M		◆		◆			
CLWA-6	Santa Clarita Valley Drought Relief Wells	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	\$1M-\$1M		◆					
CLWA-12	Update Rio Vista WTP Education Model	Castaic Lake Water Agency	NA	<\$100,000	◆			◆		◆	
LACWD36-1	Advanced Meter Infrastructure	LACWD#36	NA	<\$100,000	◆						
LACWD36-2	Cash for Grass Rebate Program	LACWD#36	NA	<\$100,000	◆						
LACWD36-3	Landscape Irrigation Efficiency Program	LACWD#36	NA	<\$100,000	◆						
LACWD36-4	Apam and Bayfield Water Main	LACWD#36	NA	\$100K-\$1M		◆					
LACWD36-5	Hasley Canyon Road Water Main, Turnout Connection, and Pump Station Project	LACWD#36	NA	\$1M-\$10M		◆					

Table 8.1-3 cont.

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives							
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction	
LACWD36-6	Replacement of 8-inch Water Main along Del Valle Road	LACWD#36	NA	\$100K-\$1M		◆						
LADPW-1	Lower San Francisquito Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$3M-\$6M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-2	Newhall Creek In-River Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$2M-\$5M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-3	Placerita Creek Off-River Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$3M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-4	Santa Clara In-River Spreading Grounds No. 1	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$4M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			

Table 8.1-3 cont.

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives							
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction	
LADPW-5	Santa Clara In-River Spreading Grounds No. 2	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$2M-\$5M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-6	Santa Clara Off-River Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$4M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-7	Santa Clara River Rubber Dam No.1	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$5M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-8	Santa Clara River Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$7M-\$10M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-10	SCR South Fork Rubber Dam No. 2	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$5M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-11	SCR South Fork Rubber Dam No. 3	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$5M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			

Table 8.1-3 cont.

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives							
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction	
LADPW-12	SCR South Fork Rubber Dam No. 4	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$5M-\$7M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
LADPW-13	Upper San Francisquito Spreading Grounds	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	NA	\$3M-\$6M (Capital); \$25K/yr over 50 years (O&M)		◆	◆	◆	◆			
NCWD-4	Recycled Water Onsite Conversion	Newhall County Water District	NA	\$100K-\$1M	◆						◆	
NCWD-5	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Program	Newhall County Water District	NA	\$1M-\$10M	◆	◆		◆				◆
SC-2	Upper Santa Clara River Arundo/Tamarisk Removal Program (SCARP) Implementation	City of Santa Clarita	Forest Service; Santa Clara River Conservancy	\$1M-\$10M	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
SC-3	City of Santa Clarita Biofiltration and Low Impact Development Retrofits	City of Santa Clarita	NA	\$1M-\$10M	◆	◆	◆		◆	◆		
SC-4	Septic to Sewer Retrofit Project	City of Santa Clarita	NA	>\$10M		◆	◆	◆				
SCEEC-1	Linking SCEEC to the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP	Santa Clarita Environmental Education Consortium	NA	<\$100K	◆		◆	◆	◆	◆		

Table 8.1-3 cont.

Project ID	Project Name	Sponsor Agency	Coordinating/ Partnering Agency	Estimated Cost	Objectives						
					Reduce Potable Water Demand	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Promote Resource Stewardship	Flooding/ Hydromodification	Climate Change Adaptation	GHG Reduction
SCWD-1	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Program	Santa Clarita Water Division	NA	\$1M-\$10M	◆	◆		◆			◆
SCWD-3	GIS Development and Implementation	Santa Clarita Water Division	NA	\$1M-\$10M		◆	◆				◆
VWC-1	Regional High Resolution GIS Mapping	Valencia Water Company	NA	\$100K-\$1M				◆			
VWC-2	Valleywide Conservation Database	Valencia Water Company	NA	<\$100K	◆			◆		◆	
VWC-3	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Program	Valencia Water Company	NA	\$1M-\$10M	◆	◆		◆			◆
VWC-4	CII Consevation Plan	Valencia Water Company	NA	<\$100K	◆					◆	

1

2

The Page Intentionally Left Blank

3

1 *Protect urban communities from drought, increase supplies of clean drinking water, reduce*
2 *dependence on imported water, reduce pollution of rivers, lakes, streams, and coastal*
3 *waters, and provide habitat for fish and wildlife.*

4 Integrated regional water management planning meets this intent by encouraging broad
5 evaluation of watershed related issues as well as identification of projects to address these
6 needs. Integrated regional water management planning solicits the input and expertise of
7 various groups, including water agencies, flood control agencies, local planning entities,
8 conservancies, sanitation districts, business organizations, open space and recreation interests,
9 and habitat preservation interests. One of the benefits of this planning process is that it brings
10 together this broad array of groups into a forum to discuss and better understand shared needs
11 and opportunities. This format assures that a
12 full range of issues and needs are considered.
13 It also ensures that an extensive range of
14 expertise is used to evaluate projects and
15 identify means to improve and integrate
16 projects.

17 Examples of regional integration took place in
18 the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP process.
19 During the stakeholder meetings, all entities
20 that submitted Candidate Projects for inclusion
21 in the IRWMP were asked to give presentations
22 on their proposals. These presentations and
23 subsequent discussions allowed the group to
24 become familiar with the various Candidate
25 Projects. This information assisted with project sorting, but also led to suggestions for project
26 improvement and led to integration of two Candidate Projects. As part of the initial “Call for
27 Projects,” two separate stakeholders proposed projects that focused on removal of the non-
28 native plant *Arundo donax*. Following Stakeholder discussions on these various proposals,
29 entities decided to join and collaborate rather than duplicate effort and are now jointly
30 sponsoring a single, more regional project for *Arundo* removal.

BENEFITS OF PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

- Regional planning and communication
- Creation of partnerships
- Efficiency (shared data and know-how)
- Consideration of all watershed components
- Sharing of potential impacts and benefits

31 **8.3 Benefits of Plan Implementation**

32 **8.3.1 Benefits of Plan Implementation**

33 The primary benefit of the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP is development of a framework
34 supportive of collaborative regional planning. This IRWMP allows for Stakeholders in the
35 community to create a vision for watershed planning in the Region, and identify appropriate
36 means to achieve this vision. Creation of the IRWMP has facilitated partnerships between local,
37 State, and Federal entities. For example, several IRWM Plan Projects are being jointly
38 sponsored by multiple local entities.

39 The IRWMP process fosters coordination, collaboration, and communication among entities in
40 the Region and has resulted in greater efficiencies (e.g., efforts are not duplicated, information
41 is shared), will enhance public services, and will facilitate public support for watershed projects.
42 As part of preparing this IRWMP, the regional agencies have provided input as to their ongoing
43 research and data collection projects. Knowledge of these research and data collection projects

1 assists other agencies from duplicating efforts. Knowledge of each other's efforts has allowed
2 Stakeholders to better coordinate data (developing consistent formats and consistent means of
3 examining data). This "pooled" data results in a larger and more significant data set. For
4 example, CLWA, SCWD, LACWWD No. 36, NCWD, and VWC annually coordinate preparation
5 of a summary of water supplies and demands. In addition, during IRWMP preparation many of
6 the agencies and non-profit groups shared the experience gained in implementing past projects
7 – passing their know-how to others. For example, the City of Santa Clarita provided details
8 related to their experience with Arundo removal, including information on successful removal
9 techniques and the tradeoffs with various approaches. VWC provided information on their
10 experience with water softening technologies. Efficiencies have also been achieved by
11 cooperating on regional efforts rather than separate localized efforts.

12 A regional planning effort ensures that all potential components of watershed planning are
13 considered rather than one particular area or project type dominating. Regional planning
14 improves the likelihood that benefits and impacts are shared instead of one group or area
15 reaping the benefits while another bears the impacts. Regional planning efforts also increase
16 the likelihood that projects that implement one particular objective (e.g., water supply) are
17 considerate of other objectives (e.g., flood control or habitat preservation). As part of project
18 integration, projects can be refined so that they achieve multiple objectives.

19 The IRWMP will allow otherwise separate agencies to speak as a region and to improve
20 policies, regulations and laws related to water demand, water supply, water quality, operational
21 efficiency, and resource stewardship.

22 The range of projects identified by this IRWMP meet all objectives identified by the
23 Stakeholders:

24 • Implement technological, legislative and behavioral changes that will reduce user
25 demands for water.

26 • Understand future regional demands and obtain necessary water supply sources.

27 • Supply drinking water with appropriate quality; improve groundwater quality; and
28 maintain water quality standards.

29 • Promote resource stewardship:

30 - Preserve and improve ecosystem health

31 - Improve flood management

32 - Preserve and enhance water-dependent recreation

33 • Reduce flood damage and/or the negative effects on waterways and watershed health
34 caused by hydromodification and flooding outside the natural erosion and deposition
35 process endemic to the Santa Clara River.

36 • Take actions within the watershed to adapt to climate change.

37 • Promote project and actions that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

1 Full implementation of this IRWMP will result in multiple benefits associated with these
2 objectives. In addition, the IRWMP will provide for the following specific benefits through
3 implementation of these projects:

4 • Projects to Reduce Potable Water Demand. IRWM Plan Projects include preparation of
5 a Valley-wide conservation strategic plan and technical support to improve water use
6 efficiency in large landscape areas. More efficient water use will result in less demand
7 on imported water supplies, less energy usage for treatment and delivery of water, and
8 reduced demand for new or expanded water supply infrastructure. In addition, improved
9 outdoor irrigation reduces the flows of poor quality urban run-off.

10 • Water Supply Projects. The majority of IRWM Plan Projects submitted by Stakeholders
11 relate to water supply, particularly stormwater capture, groundwater recharge, and
12 development of recycled water supplies. Stormwater capture and subsequent
13 groundwater recharge provides for increased use of local supplies rather than imported
14 water. These projects assist in maintaining the long-term sustainability of the
15 groundwater supply. Depending on project specifics, these projects can also serve to
16 decrease peak flood flows and provide opportunities for habitat improvement and
17 restoration. Recycled water supplies, likewise, decrease demand for imported water.
18 Recycled water can offset potable water demand, recharge groundwater, and be used to
19 create and restore wetland areas.

20 • Water Quality Improvement Projects. IRWM Plan Projects include efforts to reduce use
21 of water softeners in the Region, removal of septic systems, and installation of improved
22 water treatment technologies. The primary benefit from implementing some of these
23 water quality projects would be the reduced potential for human exposure to potentially
24 harmful substances. These projects
25 would also improve the efficiency of both
26 water and wastewater treatment
27 processes. Besides improving drinking
28 water, these projects could potentially
29 benefit other types of water users, such
30 as agricultural water users and water
31 dependent wildlife habitat.



*Preservation of Ecosystem Health is an
IRWMP Objective*

32 • Resource Stewardship Projects. IRWM
33 Plan Projects include invasive species
34 removal programs. Projects that remove
35 trash and non-native species, such as
36 Arundo, improve overall habitat quality.
37 These projects also reduce flooding by
38 removing obstructions in the river that can result in significant erosion and damage to
39 public facilities. Arundo removal also increases water supply as this plant utilizes large
40 quantities of surface and groundwater.

41 • Flooding/Hydromodification Projects. Several projects focus on reducing flood damage
42 and improving stormwater management. These include invasive species removal
43 projects, low impact development projects, and on- and off-stream groundwater
44 recharge projects. These activities will help avoid damage to property from floods,

1 reduce impervious surfaces and associated runoff, and reduce the amount of polluted
2 runoff which could enter waterways.

3 **8.3.2 Plan Beneficiaries**

4 The potential beneficiaries of the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP are residents of the Region,
5 water agencies, local, State and Federal agencies, businesses, wildlife and associated habitats,
6 and others within the jurisdictions served by IRWMP projects. These beneficiaries are
7 represented by members of the RWMG and the larger Stakeholder group.

8 Potential benefits and impacts from Plan implementation are summarized in Table 8.3-1.

9 **8.3.3 Interregional Benefits**

10 The Region is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains to the south and southeast, the Santa
11 Susana Mountains to the southwest, and the Liebre Mountains and Transverse Ranges to the
12 northeast and northwest. Therefore, projects implemented in the Region are unlikely to directly
13 affect IRWMP efforts in the neighboring Antelope Valley or greater Los Angeles areas.
14 However, the Region does have a hydrologic connection to the portion of the Santa Clara River
15 in Ventura County. It is likely that projects to enhance and protect the watershed may have
16 downstream benefits.

17 **8.4 Impacts of Plan Implementation**

18 Negative impacts that may be associated with the Plan Projects include (1) short-term, site-
19 specific impacts related to site grading and construction, and (2) long-term impacts associated
20 with project operation. For the purposes of this IRWMP, impacts are discussed at a screening
21 level below.

22 Project-specific and/or programmatic environmental compliance processes (consistent with
23 CEQA and, if applicable, the National Environmental Policy Act) will evaluate the significance of
24 the impacts. Under CEQA, impacts determined to be significant must be mitigated to a level of
25 non-significance (unless the lead agency makes findings of overriding consideration). The
26 IRWMP itself does not lead to the implementation of any specific project. It has been
27 determined that the IRWMP itself is exempt from CEQA. The following provisions of the State
28 CEQA Guidelines apply:

- 29 • Statutory Exemption (15262 for Feasibility and Planning Studies)
- 30 • Categorical Exemption (15306-Information Collection)

31 CEQA review of specific projects will provide an evaluation of impacts in much greater detail
32 than discussed below:

- 33 • Aesthetics. Projects that include construction activities and new infrastructure have the
34 potential to affect aesthetics. However, it is likely that projects would be constructed in
35 areas that are already disturbed, or would include mitigation measures that would return
36 disturbed areas to their pre-construction conditions.

**TABLE 8.3-1
POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND IMPACTS FROM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

	Within IRWM Region		Inter-Regional	
	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>
Projects to Reduce Potable Water Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less demand for imported water • Less energy usage for treatment and delivery of water • Avoided need to expand water supply infrastructure • Reduced urban runoff • Benefits extend to broad Region, including any disadvantage communities 	<p>Water conservation projects are unlikely to result in ground disturbance or other related impacts.</p> <p>Development of recycled water could have temporary impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise and soils. Use of recycled water could increase salinity in groundwater and the Santa Clara River.</p> <p>No environmental justice or DAC impacts anticipated</p>	<p>Reduced demand for potable water would reduce demands for Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta water and this would have benefits outside of the Upper Santa Clara River Region</p>	<p>Development of recycled water to offset potable demand could introduce salts to the lower Santa Clara River</p>
Projects to Increase Water Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased supply • Enhanced supply reliability • Reduced dependence on imported water • Potential wetland restoration • Improved groundwater recharge • Benefits extend to broad Region, including any disadvantaged communities 	<p>Development of water supply projects could result in ground disturbance and have temporary impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, soils, and transportation systems. Use of recycled water could increase salinity in groundwater and the Santa Clara River.</p> <p>No environmental justice or DAC impacts anticipated</p>	<p>Reduced demand for imported water, resulting from development of local supplies, would reduce demands for Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta water and this would have benefits outside of the Upper Santa Clara River Region</p>	<p>Development of recycled water to offset potable demand could introduce salts to the lower Santa Clara River</p>

Table 8.3-1 cont.

	Within IRWM Region		Inter-Regional	
	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>
Projects to Improve Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced human exposure to pollutants • Improved efficiency of water and wastewater treatment • Preservation of aquatic habitat • Improvement of water-based recreation • Benefits extend to broad Region, including any disadvantaged communities 	<p>Projects to improve water quality that involve construction could result in temporary impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, soils, and transportation systems.</p> <p>No environmental justice or DAC impacts anticipated</p>	<p>Improved water quality in the Upper Santa Clara River would also benefit the Lower Santa Clara River and associated groundwater basins</p>	<p>No inter-regional impacts anticipated</p>
Projects to Promote Resource Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved habitat quality • Reduced erosion • Reduced fire risk • Improved water supply • Improved water quality • Benefits extend to broad Region, including any disadvantaged community 	<p>Projects to remove invasive species could have temporary negative impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, and soils</p> <p>No environmental justice or DAC impacts anticipated</p>	<p>Removal of invasive species in the Upper Santa Clara River would reduce the transport and deposition of invasive species to the Lower Santa Clara river.</p>	<p>No inter-regional impacts anticipated</p>

Table 8.3-1 cont.

	Within IRWM Region		Inter-Regional	
	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>	<i>Potential Benefits</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>
<p>Flooding/ Hydromodification Projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced erosion • Reduced flood damages • Improved groundwater recharge • Benefits extend to broad Region, including any disadvantaged community 	<p>Flood reduction projects could result in ground disturbance and have temporary impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, soils, and transportation systems</p> <p>Depending on the location of the flood-related project, there could be inequitable distribution of impacts affecting disadvantaged or minority communities.</p>	<p>Flood reduction projects in the Upper Santa Clara River could benefit the Lower Santa Clara River through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced erosion • Reduced flood damages • Improved groundwater recharge 	<p>Depending on the nature of the flood reduction project, flood-related impacts could be increased downstream.</p>
<p>Actions to Adapt to Climate Change</p>	<p>Actions to incorporate climate change will occur in conjunction with other types of projects described above.</p>			
<p>Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p>	<p>Actions to incorporate climate change will occur in conjunction with other types of projects described above.</p>			

- Air Quality. Short-term air quality impacts could result from construction of Plan Projects. However, through the CEQA process potential air emissions would be minimized through application of BMPs identified by the air quality management district or mitigation measures.
- Biological Resources. Short-term biological impacts could result from construction activities as well as non-native plant removal. Most of these negative effects would be avoided or minimized through mitigation efforts related to CEQA. Additionally, the IRWMP includes preservation of ecosystem health as one of its objectives. Thus, if implemented, Plan Projects could result in overall benefits to biological resources.
- Cultural Resources. Impacts to cultural resources (historical, archeological, and paleontological resources) could result from construction activities from Plan Projects. As part of the CEQA process it will be necessary to develop mitigation measures to avoid or minimize these potential impacts.
- Geology and Soils. Plan Projects with the potential to impact geologic resources would be required to undergo geological feasibility studies which would specify the appropriate engineering standards the contractor would have to comply with during construction. Compliance with these standards would mitigate project site geological and soil impacts.
- Hydrology and Water Quality. It is anticipated that impacts to hydrology and water quality would be generally beneficial because in the long-term Plan Projects are intended to improve water supply reliability and water quality. For short-term erosion or sedimentation, project-specific BMPs would be identified as part of the NPDES permitting process.

A number of Plan Projects proposed in this IRWMP are groundwater recharge projects using either stormwater or recycled water. Because recycled water generally contains more salts than other water sources in the Region, recharge with recycled water could increase the salinity of the local groundwater. There is also concern that groundwater recharge with stormwater and recycled water will result in decreased flow in the Santa Clara River. These issues merit particular analysis in project specific CEQA documentation.

- Land Use and Planning. The Plan Projects were evaluated as to their compatibility with other planning documents for the Region, including local and regional General Plans. Therefore, no significant land use changes or inconsistencies with policies are anticipated.
- Noise. Noise impacts could result from construction activities from some of the proposed projects. However, through the CEQA process most of these activities would be minimized through mitigation efforts and no long-term noise impacts are expected.
- Population and Housing. No adverse impacts to population and housing are anticipated. IRWMP implementation would help to meet the water demands of the existing and anticipated future population.

- Public Services and Utilities. Many of the IRWM Plan Projects are intended to enhance water supply, water quality, and improve storm water management and flood control. These types of projects would benefit the utilities and service systems in the Region.
- Recreation. One of the objectives of the IRWMP is to preserve and enhance water-dependent recreation. Therefore, impacts to recreation from IRWMP implementation are likely to be beneficial.
- Transportation and Circulation. Transportation and circulation could be temporarily impacted during construction of some of the Plan Projects. Construction can temporarily increase traffic congestion due to transportation of equipment and trips by workers. Construction of projects located near roadways can result in temporary lane closures and detours. However, through the CEQA process most of these activities would be avoided or minimized and no long-term transportation and circulation impacts are expected.

8.5 Institutional Structure for Plan Implementation

The RWMG governance structure and approach used to-date have been successful in adopting the IRWMP and communicating with stakeholders about progress made in developing and implementing the IRWMP goals. After the 2008 IRWMP adoption, the RWMG formed a governance subcommittee based on the need to develop a more formal agreement to facilitate the sustained development of regional water management and the IRWM process, both now and beyond the state grant IRWM funding programs.

The Subcommittee, comprised initially of a subset of the RWMG group, identified and prioritized objectives for the re-established governance structure, as well as recommended roles and responsibilities for all participants in the IRWMP process, as discussed below.

The Governance Subcommittee first identified the purposes that a governance structure would be designed to fulfill for the benefit of IRWMP implementation, and subsequently identified which group (e.g., RWMG, Stakeholders, etc.) would best govern each of those efforts:

- Provide focused leadership for implementing and updating the IRWMP (RWMG in lead, with input from Stakeholders).
- Track and report progress in meeting IRWMP goals (RWMG and Stakeholders).
- Identify potential sources of outside funding and assist local entities to compete for those funds (RWMG, Stakeholders, and other sources of information).
- Provide leadership to focus cooperation for broad regional planning and implementation efforts such as (RWMG with input from Stakeholders):
 - regional water recycling
 - regional water quality preservation
 - regional water conservation programs
 - regional data and information management

- Select a contracting agency for any State or Federal grant funds obtained for implementation of the IRWMP (RWMG to select Grantee from among its members in accordance with applicable grant requirements, once the RWMG is formalized).

The Governance Subcommittee next identified the following factors that must be provided within a new governance structure to successfully accomplish these purposes and serve the recommended roles:

- Staff dedicated to provide leadership in the following areas:
 - Initiate actions
 - Collaborate with others
 - Call public/stakeholder meetings, set agendas, and lead meetings
 - Prepare background documents for IRWMP updates
 - Identify, select, and apply for appropriate funding opportunities
 - Oversee update of the IRWMP
- Capability to gather, compile and manage data and information.
- Ability to execute and manage contracts.
- Ability to receive and process financial transactions and meet Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.
- Expertise to make a valuable contribution of services to IRWMP preparation.
- Ability to obtain funds to contribute to IRWMP preparation.
- Ability and willingness to serve as a point of contact for IRWMP related information.
- Willingness to support process facilitation and outreach.

8.5.1 Implementing Plan Activities

The expectation is that the same stakeholder process that guided the selection of water management strategies applicable to the Region, regional goals and objectives, a project prioritization framework, and Disadvantaged Community Outreach, will be used to implement the Plan.

The roles and responsibilities of the various participants envisioned to carry out the broad purposes of the governance structure have been described in Section 1.

In addition to the RWMG, another subset of the Stakeholder Group critical for Plan implementation is the local project sponsors, as described below.

8.5.1.1 Local Project Sponsors' Roles and Responsibilities

Local Project Sponsors are those IRWMP Stakeholder agencies or entities having IRWM Plan Projects that are included in the IRWMP database. Information on each of the IRWM Plan Projects and a summary list of all IRWM Plan Projects is maintained at www.scrwaterplan.org

“Projects” tab). The database is intended to be a comprehensive list of projects that, when completed, will aid in advancing the IRWMP’s regional objectives. It is envisioned that the Local Project Sponsors will have the following roles and responsibilities:

1. Provide project-specific information for the database that may aid in advancing the IRWMP’s regional objectives.
2. Seek opportunities to integrate, where possible and practical, IRWM Plan Projects in the database in order to most-efficiently achieve the regional objectives. This process may be facilitated at Stakeholder meetings, but Local Project Sponsors are also encouraged to seek these opportunities outside of that forum.
3. Provide updated project-specific information for the database as necessary to reflect major project milestones (e.g., CEQA completion, 100% design, construction underway, construction complete, and project completion). Although this particular role is not a requirement, it is in the best interest of the Local Project Sponsors to keep the database current, so the most updated information is used to evaluate projects using the project prioritization framework as outside funding sources become available.
4. Participate in Stakeholder meetings to educate others about the Local Project Sponsor’s project(s) in the database. This happens naturally as a result of casual collaboration with other Local Project Sponsors but may also be in the form of presentations made at Stakeholder meetings.
5. Identify a point person for each project who will provide in a timely manner to the RWMG and/or consultant, requested information for projects selected for inclusion in a grant application.
6. Identify a point person for each project who will provide in a timely manner to the Grantee and/or consultant, requested information for projects selected for funding through a funding agency.
7. Comply with grant requirements, as identified by the funding agency, in order to qualify for grant funding.

8.5.1.2 IRWMP Term and Plan Revisions

The first IRWMP was adopted in July 2008. The stated goal of the RWMG is to update and re-adopt the plan a minimum of every five years, sooner if one of the following events triggers re-adoption within 1 year of the event, prior to the scheduled five-year interval:

- Significant change in conditions as defined by the RWMG with input from the Stakeholders.
- Achievement of an objective which necessitates setting a revised or replacement regional objective.
- The need, as determined by the RWMG with Stakeholder input, to set new regional objectives.

8.5.1.3 IRWMP Adoption

The decision of which entities should appropriately adopt the IRWMP is directly related to the intent of the IRWMP’s governance structure. The RWMG’s membership is intended to ensure

balanced representation across the IRWMP's three main regional objectives (i.e., water supply, water quality, and resources stewardship), as well as geographic diversity across the Region. Given this balanced representation, it is therefore appropriate that all the RWMG entities with governing bodies adopt the IRWMP. Additionally, given the benefits to all Stakeholders in the Region of achieving the regional objectives set forth in this IRWMP, it is further appropriate that any stakeholder (including Local Project Sponsors) with an interest in this Region's watershed issues also be encouraged adopt the IRWMP, provide a resolution in support of the IRWMP or provide a letter in support of the IRWMP, whichever is appropriate based on the type of entity.

Because the IRWMP is envisioned to "live through time" regardless of the makeup or turnover of the RWMG, a change in RWMG membership would not trigger re-adoption of the IRWMP. Additionally, modifying or updating the IRWMP in order to qualify for funding through a funding agency would not automatically trigger re-adoption of the IRWMP.

Ongoing review of plan performance and an adaptive management process will allow the IRWMP to evolve in response to changing conditions and ensure that the IRWMP and associated objectives are current.