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Westside IRWP – Why?

- Water Supply Lost through 1990’s
  - Causes:
    - Regional Hydrology – Average Rainfall ~9 inches annually
    - ESA Implementation
    - CVPIA Implementation
    - CWA Implementation
  - Regional Water Supply Gap ~ 1.2 MAF
- 1st Iteration – 2001
  - Updates in 2003, 2006, and currently.
Long-term Westside Ag Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Action</th>
<th>Acre-Feet</th>
<th>% Reduction</th>
<th>Contract Allocation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical South Delta CVP Ag contract supply</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lost to CVPIA, Clean Water Act, and Prior ESA</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Sub-Total</td>
<td>1,170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lost to FWS '08 Delta Smelt Opinion</td>
<td>337,500</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Sub-Total</td>
<td>832,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lost to NMFS '09 Salmon Opinion*</td>
<td>202,500</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - What's left on average?</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary analysis; does not include upstream impacts.
Westside IRWP – Successes

- $25M Prop 50 Grant Award
  - Westside Regional Drainage Plan
- 12 Current Water Management Strategies
  - 2010 Survey Identified Additional 22 Projects
  - >$1B in Estimated Funding Demand
- Broad Participation – And Growing
  - 26 Regional Water Agencies & Municipalities
  - 2 Disadvantaged Communities + 1 New Request
  - 2 Environmental Justice Organizations
  - Multiple State and Federal Partnerships
Westside IRWP – Challenges

- Maintaining Interest
  - DWR Criteria have become too Onerous;
  - PSP Response Cost has become too High;
  - Likelihood of Success too Uncertain;
  - California’s Payment on Existing Grant Obligations Unstable;
  - Preferred Focus on Projects with Direct Control & Benefits.

- Stabilizing State and Federal Regulations
  - ESA & CWA Implementation Undermining Prior Investments;
  - Reductions in Contract Surface Supplies Reducing Revenues.

- Incorporating New State Guidelines
  -Numerous; some Scientifically Uncertain
Lessons Learned

- PSP Response Very Competitive & Costly;
- Guidelines & Criteria Not Always Clear;
- Scoring Instructions & Expectations Unknown;
- Scoring Evaluations Inconsistent with G & C;
- Maintaining Stakeholder Interest Unassured.