

SECTION 10.0 - IRWM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION; PERFORMANCE MONITORING, AND FUNDING

10.1 Plan Performance and Monitoring

The DWR Plan Performance and Monitoring Standard states that, “IRWM Plans shall contain performance measures and monitoring methods to ensure the objectives of the Plan are met. Therefore, the IRWM Plan must describe a method for evaluating and monitoring the Regional Water Management Group’s (RWMG) ability to meet the objectives and implement the projects in the IRWM Plan. The IRWM Plan must contain policies and procedures that promote adaptive management and, as more effects of climate change manifest, new tools are developed, and new information becomes available, adjustments are made to IRWM plans accordingly.”

The intent of the Plan Performance and Monitoring Standard is to ensure:

- The RWMG is efficiently making progress towards meeting the goals and objectives in the IRWM Plan.
- The RWMG is implementing projects listed in the IRWM Plan.
- Each project in the IRWM Plan is monitored to comply with all applicable rules, laws, and permit requirements.

As the RWMG, the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County (WCVC) oversees and monitors ongoing IRWM Plan implementation, project selection, and IRWM Plan updates and amendments.

Since adoption of the first WCVC IRWM Plan in the 2006 IRWM, WCVC members have initiated or implemented many projects and programs totaling more than \$194 million in state and local investment. This has been accomplished through regional coordination on identification and development of joint, integrated projects and implementation of other collaborative solutions.

There are several ways to measure and monitor the overall performance of the WCVC IRWM Plan, primarily by monitoring progress on the identified goals, resource-management strategies, and implementation projects and programs. A few reasonable and cost-effective methods to monitor IRWM Plan performance include:

- Monitor quantifiable outcomes associated with implementation of projects, programs, and resource management strategies when feasible.
- Document implementation of programs and projects throughout the region that help meet the Plan’s goals (see Section 2 for documentation of projects and programs implemented since 2006).
- Compile and summarize monitoring plans and performance data for IRWM Implementation Grant-funded projects.
- Track participation of stakeholders in activities/meetings in the region.

10.1.1 Plan Performance to Date

The original WCVV IRWM Plan was adopted in 2006, followed by a comprehensive update to the Plan in 2014. In the 2014 Plan, six objectives were established to achieve successful integrated regional water management in the region (see Section 5). Many actions, projects, and programs have been undertaken since adoption of the plan that have helped achieve the stated objectives of increased water supply, improved water quality, enhanced ecosystems, improved flood management, and expanded public access to water related recreation. These accomplishments are documented in Table 2-1, Section 2 – Highlights of IRWM Plan Accomplishments. The table includes information about projects/programs, project proponents, sources of funding, completion dates, and which Plan goals were addressed by each project. Final component reports for the ten IRWM projects funded through Proposition 50 have been compiled which contain detailed information about the results of each project (i.e., quantity of salts and organic materials removed, quantity of new water supplies created through wastewater recycling, treatment of brackish water, acres of habitat protected or restored, etc.) Implementation projects funded through all four rounds of the Proposition 84 IRWM grant program are underway and are being monitored. Ten of these projects have been completed at the time of publication of this amendment.

During the past thirteen (13) years, more than 150 WCVV stakeholder committee meetings and events have been held, representing thousands of hours of individual stakeholder contributions to the IRWM process. The focus of these meetings has been to receive project presentations and updates, develop integrated project concepts, track overall grant administration efforts, guide development of the 2014 IRWM Plan update and the current amendment, guide the Prop. 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement program, coordinate with neighboring IRWM regions, select projects for implementation, and seek solutions to the challenges facing the watersheds and the region.

10.1.2 Performance Metrics

The WCVV IRWM Plan's six goals are the primary vehicle to guide implementation of projects and actions in the region. Progress towards achieving the Plan goals are best measured by tracking implementation of the IRWM projects and programs in the region. Please see Table 5-1 in Section 5 (Goals and Objectives) for the metrics used to monitor and evaluate implementation of the goals and objectives.

10.1.3 Methodology for Evaluating and Reporting Performance

The WCVV, through its consultants, staff, and stakeholders, continue to monitor plan performance using the metrics shown in Table 5-1 as appropriate. Monitoring will be included as part of the Data Management System, which uses the WCVV IRWM data platform and website to share and communicate data (see Section 9 – Data Management and Technical Analysis).

WCVV periodically publishes reports highlighting the WCVV program accomplishments and expenditures and projected activities and expenditures for the upcoming year. Section 2 of the 2014 IRWM Plan contains highlights of accomplishments between 2006 and 2014. Future updates to the IRWM Plan will include an adaptive management component to address revisions to the plan goals, resource-management strategies, as well as adaptation and mitigation strategies for climate change resilience.



It is not always possible to quantify the results of IRWM projects, programs, and actions, and not always possible to determine an exact correlation between project outcomes and the IRWM Plan goals. Qualitative assessments, however, are an important tool for measuring the success of IRWM programs and projects. As described in Section 9 (Data Management and Technical Analysis) WCVL also reports on implementation of IRWM projects and activities through its website and the data platform.

10.2 Finance

This section describes existing and potential sources of funding for implementation of the WCVL IRWM Plan. Most projects and programs are funded with local revenues, with the assistance of state and federal grants and low interest loans.

10.2.1 Funding for WCVL IRWM Plan, Program Activities, and Projects

Funding for IRWM Projects in WCVL Region – 2006-2020

The WCVL ongoing IRWM planning and implementation activities have been funded to date through a combination of local financial and in-kind contributions provided by local stakeholder entities - and funding from Proposition 50 and 84 IRWM grants. To date, the region has secured more than \$194 million in grants and matching funds to plan and implement IRWM Projects. Table 10-1 below shows the sources of funding for IRWM planning and projects.

**Table 10-1
IRWM Planning and Implementation Funding History**

IRWM FUNDING SOURCE	GRANT AMOUNT	LOCAL MATCH
2006 – Prop 50 Planning Grant	\$220,000	\$90,860
2007 – Prop 50 Implementation Grant	\$25,000,000	\$40,333,992
2011 – Prop 84 Planning Grant - Round One	\$485,684	\$210,698
2011 – Prop 84 Implementation Grant - Round One	\$17,510,599	\$19,187,235
2013 – Prop 84 Planning Grant – Round Two	\$514,316	\$216,606
2014 – Prop 84 Implementation Grant - Round Two	\$ 18,000,000	\$19,266,439
2015 - Prop 84 Implementation Grant – Drought Round	\$ 8,354,015	\$4,773,089
2016 – Proposition 84 Implementation Grant – Final Round	\$12,296,380	\$28,135,478
2020 – Proposition 1 Implementation Grant – Round One	\$11,858,680	39,083,124
Total Grant Funding Awarded	\$94,239,674	
Total Local Funding Match for Planning and Implementation	\$151,400,000	
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	\$245,639,674	

* Does not include in-kind support and indirect costs provided by the County or stakeholder entities.



As described in Section 4 – Governance and Stakeholder Process and Coordination – the ongoing IRWM Program is governed by an MOU between the County and the principal contributors which describe the duties and responsibilities of all the parties. The MOU terms were recently extended to August 2023.

The County’s role set forth in the MOU include:

The County, as the lead agency for WCV, is responsible for and will:

- a. Coordinate activities of the WCV based on the approved scope of work and at the WCV’s direction, including preparation of the updated IRWM Plan and Plan amendments consistent with future funding program guidelines.
- b. Prepare WCV and related committee meeting agendas and coordinate meeting preparation and meeting follow-up.
- c. Consult with members of the WCV on an as-needed basis.
- d. Obtain water-related project input from the WCV participating jurisdictions.
- e. Assist the WCV with the ongoing efforts of the watershed committees.
- f. Coordinate with other Ventura County agencies, jurisdictions and agencies in presenting the updated IRWM Plan and IRWM Plan amendments to policy boards, commissions and councils.

Please see Appendix E for a full copy of the MOU.

The ongoing IRWM program is operated out of the County of Ventura in the County Executive Office and is funded by 22 local funding partners including 3 County agencies, 10 cities, water agencies, and other special districts. Non-governmental organizations are full participants in the planning process but are not required to contribute financially. Table 10-2 below shows the entities currently providing direct support and their respective contributions.



Table 10-2

**Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County
Continuing IRWM Program Process**

COUNTY AGENCIES/ SPECIAL DISTRICTS	2019-20 FUNDING REQUEST* \$	WATERSHED
Ventura County Watershed Protection District	13,000	Regional Entity
Ventura County Waterworks District #1	4,500	Calleguas
Ventura County Public Works Agency	5,500	Regional Entity
SUBTOTAL	23,000	
CITIES		
Camarillo	5,000	Calleguas
Fillmore	3,000	Santa Clara
Moorpark	0	Paid through County WWD#1
Ojai	2,000	Ventura
Oxnard	23,000	Santa Clara
Port Hueneme	4,000	Santa Clara
Santa Paula	5,000	Santa Clara
Simi Valley	13,000	Calleguas
Thousand Oaks	13,000	Calleguas
Ventura	14,000	Ventura
SUBTOTAL	82,000	
WHOLESALE WATER AGENCIES		
Calleguas Municipal Water District	13,500	Calleguas
Casitas Municipal Water District	5,000	Ventura
United Water Conservation District	8,500	Santa Clara
SUBTOTAL	27,000	
WATER AND/OR SANITATION DISTRICTS		
Camrosa Water District	3,000	Calleguas
Ojai Valley Sanitary District	3,000	Ventura
Camarillo Sanitary District	1,500	Calleguas
Pleasant Valley Mutual Water Company	2,500	Calleguas
Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency	2,200	Regional Entity
Ojai Basin Groundwater Mgmt. Agency & Ojai Valley Water Conservation Dist.	2,000	Ventura
SUBTOTAL	14,200	
TOTAL	\$146,200	

**In-direct costs (overhead) are contributed by the County.



All WCVV and IRWMP related tasks conducted by the chair of WCVV are provided as in-kind contributions

Funding Mechanisms for IRWM Projects and Programs

Local investments account for most of the funding for implementation of IRWM projects. These local funds come from a number of sources including fees, taxes, and rates. Other sources of funding include state and federal grants and low interest loans, as well as private or philanthropic funding. Details regarding the various sources of revenue are listed in Table 10-3 below.

The primary source of grant funding for IRWM projects in the WCVV IRWM region has been Proposition 50, 84, and now 1 IRWM Grant funding, but local stakeholders have also funded IRWM projects with Clean Water Revolving Loans (low-interest loans), fisheries grants, other chapters of Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 (i.e. Stormwater Flood Management and Water Use Efficiency grants), Proposition 1 Groundwater, Recycled Water and Coastal Conservancy planning grants, and Federal grants through the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, EPA, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The State of California formed the California Financing Coordinating Committee (CFCC) in 1998 to serve as an information resource for local entities to connect them with funding opportunities. The CFCC is made up of seven funding agencies: five state and two federal. CFCC members facilitate and expedite the completion of various types of infrastructure projects by helping customers combine the resources of different agencies. Project information is shared between members so additional resources can be identified. CFCC members conduct free funding fairs statewide each year to educate the public and potential customers about the different member agencies and the financial and technical resources available.

WCVV staff share information about funding sources and CFCC fairs with local stakeholders each year.

Table 10-4 includes a partial list of specific state and federal funding sources (grants, loans, I-Bank programs, etc.) which have been available for project implementation.

Table 10-3

Types of State and Local Water Management Revenue Sources

Revenue Source	Appropriate Uses	Feasibility	Key Tradeoffs	Application in California
General Fund	Activities that benefit the general public.	Available each year but subject to competing uses.	Funds are limited.	A common source of funding.
General Obligation Bonds	Projects that benefit the general public.	Commonly used.	Subject to a vote.	Commonly used but some concern about getting future bonds approved.
Revenue Bonds	Projects where a dependable revenue stream is available.	A standard method of financing.	None	A typical method of financing for local and state projects.
User Fees	Projects where direct beneficiaries are easily identified.	Potentially works well with clearly defined beneficiaries; less likely to work for projects with significant public benefits.	Will focus projects to those with local scope which may undermine IRWM efforts. May limit state's ability to increase fees and taxes to support other projects.	State Water Project is an excellent example as over 90% of project cost will be repaid by direct beneficiaries (contractors).
Assessment Districts	Can be formed by majority vote but must support local projects that do not provide a "general" public benefit.	The state could coordinate with local agencies to establish assessment districts.	Assessment districts cannot be used to support general public benefits and, as such,	1911 and 1913/1915 assessment districts are widely used by local agencies in California.

Revenue Source	Appropriate Uses	Feasibility	Key Tradeoffs	Application in California
	Water and stormwater projects are generally allowed under assessment districts.		will tend to focus on local projects.	
Utility User Tax	Earmarked for a special purpose or used as a general tax.	Used by many cities and a few counties.	Must be approved by a ballot measure.	Widely used by cities.
Impact Fees	Used by local governments to charge new development for the additional cost imposed on existing public infrastructure.	Impact fees are generally used in over 90% of local governments in California; thus, there is limited opportunities for further expansion.	Deters new development.	Widely used in California.
Statewide Water Use Fee (Proposed in 2006, 2011 and 2019)	Would have been used for state water management activities.	Failed to move forward	Could impact local agencies' ability to generate local revenues.	Would require a vote.
Public Goods Charge	Could fund a variety of IRWM activities.	Was approved for electricity but sunset in 2011. Failed to secure support for water.	Could impact local agencies' ability to generate local revenues.	Not yet tried in California; would need a two-thirds vote.
Mello-Roos Special Taxes	Areas with new development. It is possible to establish Community Facility Districts (CFDs) in other areas, but this requires a majority vote by residents to tax themselves.	CFDs are most feasible during strong housing markets when there is significant new development.	When housing markets and development slows, forming additional CFDs is difficult and there may be concerns with revenues to pay back existing bonds.	Recently used to finance the Bear River Levee Setback project in Yuba County.



Revenue Source	Appropriate Uses	Feasibility	Key Tradeoffs	Application in California
Private Investors	Local water projects that generate revenue.	Typically have been used as part of design-build process.	Interest rates are higher than public debt; can't be used on state projects.	Limited to local projects.
Private-Philanthropic	Traditionally has been used for ecosystem and recreation projects.	Commonly used.	Not a predictable revenue source.	Widely used in California.

Source: California Water Plan Update 2013; Volume 1, Chapter 7 – Finance Planning Framework

Table 10-4
Funding Sources for IRWM Projects

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
LOCAL FUNDING					
Local funding sources include revenue bonds, certificates of participation, property taxes, existing capital improvement budgets, user fees, etc. See Table 10-3					
STATE FUNDING					
Water and Flood Infrastructure Bonds – Proposition 50, 84, 1E and 1 – These bonds have provided funding for IRWM Implementation as well as other water, ecosystem and flood management related infrastructure and restoration projects. More information about current Proposition 1 funding is available on the California Natural Resources Agency website - http://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/p1.aspx.					
Other State Funding					
Water Supply	HUD	Community Development Block Grant Program	Grants are available with a program emphasis on creating or retaining jobs for low-income workers in rural communities.	Grants of up to \$2.5M are available.	City with less than 50,000 residents and County jurisdictions with less than 200,000 residents in unincorporated areas.

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Supply	DWR	New Local Water Supply Construction Loans	Eligible projects include a canal, dam reservoir, desalination facility, groundwater extraction facility, or other construction or improvement, including rehabilitation of a dam for water supply purposes by a local public agency for the diversion, storage, or distribution of water which will remedy existing water supply problems.	Loans: \$5M max per construction project; \$500,000 max per feasibility project. The interest rate is equal to the rate that the state pays on the general obligation bonds sold to finance the program.	Local Public Agencies.
Energy Efficiency	CEC	Energy Financing Program	Low-interest loan financing for water and wastewater utilities for energy efficiency projects, feasibility studies, and implementing energy-saving and renewable energy measures.	Max loan amount is \$3M per application or 12 times the annual energy savings, whichever is less. 3% interest rate.	Publicly owned water and wastewater treatment facilities, cities, counties, special districts, or other non-profit entities.
Water Quality	SWRCB, I-Bank	State Revolving Fund (SRF)	Provides low-interest loans and/or grants to assist public agencies in correcting deficiencies in water infrastructure	Grants and loans can be combined with other funding sources.	Publicly owned treatment works, local public agencies, non-profit organizations, and private parties.

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Quality	SWRCB	Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	Provides low-interest loans or grants to assist public water systems in achieving or maintaining compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act. Project includes water treatment facilities, replace aging infrastructure, planning studies, consolidation of water systems, source water protection, etc. Projects must be needed to comply with Safe Drinking Water Act.	Up to \$500,000 per planning study; \$20M per project and a max of \$30M per entity	Public Water System.
Water Quality	I-Bank	Infrastructure State Revolving Fund Program	The California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank provides loans for construction and/or repair of publicly owned water supply, treatment and distribution systems, and drainage, and flood control facilities. Loans are also available for public infrastructure, such as solid waste collection and disposal, environmental mitigation, as well as projects such as parks and recreational facilities and public safety facilities.	Loan: \$10M per project; (\$2M max per environmental mitigation project per year; \$2M max per project for parks and recreation facilities) and \$20M per jurisdiction per fiscal year.	Local Municipal Entity.
Water Quality	SWRCB	Clean Water State Revolving Fund	Low-interest loans and other financing mechanisms are	Max \$50M per agency per year, with a max	Public Agencies, non-profit



Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
			available for wastewater treatment facility construction projects and expanded use projects that include nonpoint source and estuary projects.	financing term of 20 years.	organizations, Native American tribes.
Water Quality	SWRCB	Federal CWA 319(h) Program (Nonpoint source grant program)	Funding to support projects throughout the state to restore impaired surface waters through the control of nonpoint source pollution.	Project Funding: \$250,000-\$1 million. 25% local match required but waived for Disadvantaged Communities and small water systems. For 2012, funding for planning/assessment projects ranges between \$75,000 and \$125,000 and funding for implementation projects ranges between \$250,000 and \$750,000.	Public agencies, public colleges, 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations, tribes, state and federal entities.
Water Supply	SWRCB	Water Recycling Funding Program	Grants are provided for facilities planning studies to determine the feasibility of using recycled water to offset the use of fresh/potable water from state and/or local supplies. Water recycling construction projects that meet objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program are eligible	Grants for planning studies will cover 50% of eligible costs, up to \$75,000. Grants for construction will cover up to 25% of costs or \$5M (whichever is less). Construction projects not eligible for grants may also apply for loans	Public agencies.

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
			to compete for Proposition 50 grant funds.	are under the SRF loan program.	
Water Quality	SWRCB	Cleanup and Abatement Account	This account generally provides public agencies with grants for emergency cleanup or abatement of conditions of pollution where no viable responsible parties are available to undertake the work.	Use of funds are limited to activities specified by the SWRCB and include among other things, waste cleanup and abatement of effects of a waste, and remedying a significant water-pollution problem.	Public agencies with authority to cleanup or abate a waste.
Water Quality	SWRCB	Agricultural Drainage Loan Program	This program provides loans from the Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986 to fund treatment, storage, conveyance, or disposal of agricultural drainage water.	Funding cap is \$20 million for implementation projects and \$100,000 for feasibility studies. Rates are set at 1/2 of the state's General Obligation bond rate.	City, county, district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision of the state involved with water management.

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Quality	SWRCB	Agricultural Drainage Management Loan Program	This program provides loans from Proposition 204 to fund treatment, storage, conveyance, or disposal of agricultural drainage water.	Funding cap is \$5 million for implementation projects and \$100,000 for feasibility studies. Rates are set at 1/2 of the State's General Obligation bond rate.	City, county, district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision of the state involved with water management.
Water Quality	SWRCB	Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund	Funds are available to provide a means for petroleum UST owners and operators to meet the federal and state requirements. The Fund also assists many small businesses and individuals by providing reimbursement for unexpected and catastrophic expenses associated with the cleanup of leaking petroleum USTs.	Loans are available in amounts up to \$1.5 million, depending on project and special program.	Various entities depending on special program.



Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Quality, Water Supply	SWRCB	Supplemental Environmental Projects	The SWRCB or Regional Boards may allow Supplemental Environmental Projects to be implemented or funded to partially satisfy a monetary assessment made in an administrative civil liability order. Projects must directly benefit or study groundwater or surface water quality or quantity.	Generally, projects with a value of at least \$50,000 will be considered under this program.	Projects may either be performed by the discharger or third parties paid by the discharger.
FEDERAL FUNDING					

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Quality and Resource Stewardship	EPA	EPA Wetlands Program Development Grants	Projects that promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution	Three priority areas identified by the EPA: Developing a comprehensive monitoring and assessment program; improving the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation; and refining the protection of vulnerable wetlands and aquatic resources. Awards for 2012 were anticipated to range from \$50,000 to \$350,000. 25% match required.	States, tribes, local governments, interstate associations, intertribal consortia, and national non-profit, non-governmental organizations are eligible to apply.
Resource Stewardship	EPA and other partners	Five Star Restoration Program	This program provides challenge grants, technical support and opportunities for information exchange to facilitate community-based wetland, riparian and coastal habitat restoration projects. Project sites may be public or private land.	Key project elements include on the ground restoration, environmental education, partnerships and measurable results.	Schools, youth groups, public, private or corporate landowners, local, state and federal government agencies, local non-profit organizations, etc.

Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Resource Stewardship	National Park Service	Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program	The program provides technical and staff assistance to conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. Note: RTCA does not provide monetary grants or loans.	Projects will be evaluated on how they meet the following criteria: 1) A clear outcome leading to on the ground success; 2) Commitment, cooperation, and cost-sharing by applicant; 3) Opportunity for significant public involvement; 4) Protection of significant natural and/or cultural resources and enhancement of outdoor recreational opportunities; and 5) Consistency with the National Park Service mission.	Nonprofits, community groups, tribes, or tribal governments; and state or local government agencies.
Resource Stewardship	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention	Funding for activities that promote soil conservation and the preservation of the watersheds of rivers and streams throughout the US.	Matching funds are not required: applicants must generally provide matching ranging from 0%-50% in cash or in-kind resources depending on such factors as project type and the kinds of	States, local governments, and other political subdivisions; soil or water conservation districts; flood prevention or control districts and tribes. Potential



Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
				structural measures a project proposes.	applicants must be able to obtain all appropriate land and water rights and permits to successfully implement proposed projects.
Water Quality	United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development	Water and Waste Disposal Program	Program that provides financial assistance (loans and grants) for community water, wastewater, and drainage systems in rural areas.	Funds may be used for planning, design, and construction of new or existing systems; eligible projects include storage, distribution, source development; no funding limits, but average project size is \$3-5 million. Greater funding share provided for low-income communities. Grants may be made for up to 75% of eligible project costs.	Cities, towns, public bodies, and census designated places with populations less than 10,000. Must demonstrate financial need.



Funding Objective	Agency	Program	Brief Description	Key Points	Eligibility
Water Supply	United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)	WaterSMART Challenge Grant Programs	Reclamation provides 50/50 cost share funding to irrigation and water districts and states for projects focused on water conservation, efficiency, and water marketing. Past and proposed programs have included Water and Energy Efficiency Grants, Advanced Water Treatment Pilot and Demonstration Projects, Grants to Develop Climate Analysis Tools.	Matching funds are required. Applicants must provide a minimum 50% of project costs in non-Federal cash or in-kind resources.	Eligible applicants include irrigation and water districts and state governmental entities with water management authority. Projects must be located in Western United States.
Resource Stewardship	US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	North American Wetlands Conservation Act	The Small Grants Program provides funding, up to \$75,000, for projects that provide long-term protection of wetlands and wetlands dependent fish and wildlife. Funding available under the Standard Grants Program averages \$40M annually for the whole U.S. and is provided to projects exceeding \$75,000 per proposal.	Partners must match the grant request at a 1-to-1 ratio.	Organizations and individuals who have developed partnerships to carry out wetlands conservation projects in the US, Canada, and Mexico. Small Grants only apply to the U.S.

Source: Modified from Upper Santa Clara River Watershed IRWM Plan Update 2014

10.2.2 Certainty and Longevity of Funding for WVCV IRWM Program

The funding partners in WVCV have expressed a commitment to continuing the coordinated IRWM planning and implementation program. As previously mentioned, the MOU was recently extended by five (5) years to 2023. The first MOU was executed in 2004 and has been amended or extended twice. WVCV stakeholders recognize that the availability of state and federal funding support is uncertain and that in the future local entities may need to bear a greater financial burden to continue funding implementation of IRWM projects. Local agencies are examining opportunities to expand local revenue-generating mechanisms such as increasing pumping fees within groundwater management agencies, increasing consumer rates and fees, implementing more cost-effective joint, multi-use projects, and instituting penalties for violation of water use ordinances. These sources will expand the local base of funding and help mitigate reductions in the availability of outside funding.

10.2.3 Certainty of Ongoing Operation and Maintenance Costs

Support and Financing for Operation and Maintenance of Implemented Projects

Most of the implementation projects identified in the WVCV IRWM Plan will require ongoing operation and maintenance (O&M) and therefore incur associated costs. Ongoing O&M funding is expected to derive from many of the same sources that were identified to fund project implementation. For all types of projects, the availability and certainty of O&M funding is an important consideration in evaluating the project's viability and overall cost/benefit.

The source of O&M funding is largely dependent upon the type of the project as follows:

Projects that Result in a Commodity or Service for Which a User Pays a Fee

These projects include potable water supply, treatment, and distribution; wastewater treatment and collection; recycled water supply, treatment, and distribution; and the Salinity Management Pipeline. Users of these services typically pay for it on a unit-price (per unit volume), fixed-price (per unit time), or combined basis. O&M costs are covered by the funds paid by those users. Public agencies generally establish fair rates via a cost of service study, which considers the O&M associated with the facilities. Private entities (such as private water companies) undergo a California Public Utilities Commission process for the establishment of rates that includes consideration of O&M costs. O&M costs may also be partially supported by property tax assessments, grants, and other sources. The source of funding for O&M costs for these types of projects is typically quite certain and reliable.

Other Types of Projects

These projects include environmental and habitat restoration, water quality improvement (not associated with commodity/service projects above), and stormwater-management projects. These types of projects typically do not result in a commodity that is purchased by users, and therefore, the source of O&M funding tends to be quite different and somewhat less certain. However, these types of projects also tend to have much lower O&M costs, and some may require little or no O&M. Support and financing will likely come primarily from local sources, including user rates, fees, and assessments. They may also include grants and endowment-related operational funding, particularly for non-governmental organizations.