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Development of Draft Master Plan Documents

- Supply/Demand Analysis and Scenario Planning
- Evaluation Thresholds and Decision Metrics
- Baseline System Performance
- Storage Utilization Analysis
- New Supply and Conveyance Options (Long-Term)
- Recommended System Improvements (Near-Term)
- Project Costs, Supply/Conveyance Cost Comparisons
- CEQA Process (Supplemental PEIR)
- In-line Hydroelectric Opportunities
- Approval/Selection of Recommended Projects
Today’s Agenda

- Recap of Master Plan Analyses
- Recommended System Improvements
- Project Timelines and Budget Revisions
- Cost Comparisons of Long–Term Supply Options
- CEQA Process
- Remaining Steps
Supply/Demand Analysis

- Scenario planning determines a reasonable range of system demands

- No Supply/Demand Gaps under Normal Weather
  - Dependent on member agencies achieving conservation and local supply targets

- Supply/demand gaps occur in dry years
  - Multi-year dry weather and MWD allocation of imported supplies
  - Compounded by lower levels of local supply development
  - Continued uncertainty in imported water availability may result in lower reliability levels

[Graph showing water authority demand (TAF) from 2012 to 2035 with various scenarios and projections]
When Are New Facilities Needed?

- Baseline System Analysis and Performance
- Evaluation metrics and thresholds determine when conveyance constraints and supply shortfalls will occur
- Decisions points on new infrastructure are influenced by
  - Frequency of dry-weather occurrence
  - Magnitude of dry-weather shortfall
  - Risk tolerance
Untreated Water Delivery System Conveyance Constraints

- **Future System Capacity Constraint – Pipelines 3 and 5 (beyond 2020)**
- **Crossover Pipeline to serve WTP (beyond 2030)**
- **SV Pump Station (Full use of emergency storage)**
- **Existing Capacity Constraint – Serving South County WTPs (current 2014)**
Baseline System Analysis – Conveyance Utilization

- Conveyance Risks are solely related to untreated water deliveries
  - Risks increase around 2020
  - New infrastructure needed 2020 to 2025
  - Coordination with member agencies reduces near-term conveyance risk
  - Existing system bottlenecks addressed in near-term
Supply Shortage Risks

- Low through 2025 under all demand scenarios
- Shortage risk beyond 2025 depends on demand growth, member agency conservation, and local supply
- Addition of fully proposed City of San Diego IPR resolves most long-term supply-demand imbalances
Proposed Projects to Improve System Performance

Project Time Frames
Preliminary List of Potential Projects

Near- and Mid-Term Projects
1. ESP North County Pump Stations
2. ESP San Vicente Pump Station 3rd Pump Drive and Power Supply
3. Pipelines P3/P4 Conversion
4. Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure
   4a. Lake Murray Control Valve
   4b. South County Intertie
5. System Storage
6. System Isolation Valves (various locations)
7. Asset Management Program (various locations)
8. Facility Planning Studies

Potential Long-Term Projects
1. Pipeline 6
2. Second Crossover Pipeline
3. Camp Pendleton Desalination
4. Colorado River Conveyance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County ESP Pump Station</td>
<td>Meet ESP delivery requirements</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Isolation Valves</td>
<td>Improve aqueduct operations and maintenance flexibility</td>
<td>2015-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Trails Suite of Projects</td>
<td>Increase untreated water conveyance to serve South County WTPs</td>
<td>2015-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Intertie*</td>
<td>Alleviate conveyance bottleneck south of Alvarado</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP - San Vicente PS Third Pump Drive and Power Supply</td>
<td>Meet ESP and Carryover Storage requirements</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline 3/4 Conversion</td>
<td>Alleviate untreated water conveyance constraint at MWD delivery point</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Storage</td>
<td>Provide operational storage for increased deliveries</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Project may be eliminated subject to timing of Mission Trails Projects
## Preliminary Timing of Potential CIP Projects

### Beyond 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Crossover Pipeline</td>
<td>Address untreated water delivery constraint s/o Twin Oaks</td>
<td>2035+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline 6 *</td>
<td>Address untreated water delivery constraint at MWD delivery point</td>
<td>2035+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Beyond 2025 – Mutually Exclusive Options to Pipeline 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Conveyance *</td>
<td>Convey QSA supply through a CWA-owned facility</td>
<td>2035+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pendleton Desalination *</td>
<td>Address potential regional supply shortages</td>
<td>2025+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Implementation of a project would preclude other options.
### Preliminary Timing of Potential CIP Projects

#### Planning Study Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Prioritize facility /operations with high risk</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Assessment</td>
<td>Develop facility needs/operational strategies to mitigate nitrification</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Revisions to CIP Appropriations 2014 through 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014 – 2025 Project Budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing CIP (all projects) 1</td>
<td>$2,961M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Deferrals of Long-Term Projects beyond 2025 2</td>
<td>($653M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted Service Connections</td>
<td>($20M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Long-Term Project Evaluations 3</td>
<td>$3.5M to $4.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Re-scoping of Near-Term Projects</td>
<td>($8M) to $62M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed New Near –Term Projects 4</td>
<td>$40M to $60M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Total CIP (all projects)</td>
<td>$2,344M to $2,434M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Change to 2014-2025 CIP Budget

($546M) to ($637M)

---

1. Total CIP is $3.1 billion and includes expenditures beyond 2025.
2. Defers portion of Pipeline 6 and Second Crossover Pipeline beyond 2025.
3. Includes Camp Pendleton Desalination and Colorado River feasibility evaluations.
4. Includes system isolation valves and portion of P3/P4 Conversion Project south of delivery point. Estimate for total project ranges between $200-$220M.
Cost Comparisons of Long-Term Supply Options
Long-Term Supply/Conveyance Projects

- **Camp Pendleton Desalination**
  - Improves supply reliability and addresses long-term untreated water conveyance constraint
  - Compares to MWD Tier 1 supply rate

- **Colorado River Conveyance**
  - Only addresses conveyance constraint
  - Existing supply does not improve reliability
  - Compares to MWD wheeling rate
Costs above are 2013 dollars, and are escalated to the start of construction and/or operations.

Salinity management, San Vicente Reservoir re-operation, and All American Canal operating impacts not considered.

MWD Wheeling Rates will be incurred through completion of construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pipeline Alternative</th>
<th>Tunnel Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Capital Cost</td>
<td>$2.31 billion</td>
<td>$1.98 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M Cost</td>
<td>$131.8 million</td>
<td>$70.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Environmental and Design Phase</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Early Online Date</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colorado River Conveyance – Cost Comparison

Planning/Environmental and Design Phase

Construction Phase

Post-Construction Phase

Cost includes Project Financing Cost + Project Operating Costs

Cost per Acre-Foot

Project Timeline

- Tunnel-30 yr
- Tunnel-40 yr
- Pipeline-30 yr
- Pipeline-40 yr
- MWD Wheeling (high)
- MWD Wheeling (low)

Note: 45-year initial term of the QSA transfer agreement ends 2048.
# Colorado River Conveyance – Net Present Value Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pipeline Alternative</th>
<th>Tunnel Alternative</th>
<th>MWD Wheeling Rate (low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Capital Cost</td>
<td>$2.31 billion</td>
<td>$1.98 billion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value (thru end of QSA term – 2047)</td>
<td>$7.80 billion</td>
<td>$6.72 billion</td>
<td>$7.79 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payments (thru end of QSA term – 2047)</td>
<td>$12.13 billion</td>
<td>$10.07 billion</td>
<td>$12.85 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- First year costs of a new Colorado River Conveyance are comparable to projected MWD Wheeling Rate.
- Colorado River Conveyance is more favorable when analyzed at longer terms (i.e., thru life of facility).
- Colorado River Conveyance cannot be completed in time to address untreated water conveyance constraint.
Colorado River Conveyance Implementation Risks

- Financial results dependent on escalation factors and outcome of MWD rate litigation case
- Extensive Federal, State and Local permitting
- Seven States opposition, potential litigation
- Facility useful life exceeds initial 45-year term of Transfer Agreement – potential stranded asset
- Agreement required for use All-American Canal
- Reoperation of San Vicente system required to distribute supply to local water treatment plants
- Additional capital facilities/operating costs may be required to meet salinity goals
## Camp Pendleton Desalination – Cost Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial 50 MGD Project</th>
<th>Ultimate 150 MGD Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Capital Cost Range</td>
<td>$1.44 – $1.56 billion</td>
<td>$2.70 – $3.11 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M Cost Range</td>
<td>$62 – $68 million</td>
<td>$178 – $192 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Environmental and</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Early Online Date</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Costs above are 2013 dollars, and are escalated to the start of construction and/or operations.
- Project could produce desalinated water meeting either treated or untreated water quality requirements.
- Camp Pendleton Desalination can be built in time to address untreated water conveyance constraint.
Camp Pendleton Desalination – Cost Comparison

Cost per Acre-Foot

Project Timeline

- **Planning/Environmental and Design Phase**
- **Construction Phase**
- **Post-Construction Phase**

Cost includes Project Financing

Cost + Project Operating Costs

MCTSSA-SUB-50
SRTTP-OPEN-50
SRTTP-OPEN-150
SRTTP-SUB-150
MWD-Low
MWD-high
First year cost for Camp Pendleton will exceed projected MWD Tier 1 rates. Point when rates crossover is beyond 2033.

Camp Pendleton is more favorable at larger plant sizes (economy of scale) and when analyzed at longer terms.

Cost results are sensitive to financial assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial 50 MGD Project</th>
<th>Ultimate 150 MGD Project</th>
<th>MWD Tier 1 UT 50 MGD (low)</th>
<th>MWD Tier 1 UT 150 MGD (low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Capital Cost</td>
<td>$1.44 billion</td>
<td>$2.70 billion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value (30 yr operating term – 2054)</td>
<td>$3.69 billion</td>
<td>$8.61 billion</td>
<td>$2.96 billion</td>
<td>$8.87 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payments (30 yr operating term – 2054)</td>
<td>$6.63 billion</td>
<td>$15.72 billion</td>
<td>$5.76 billion</td>
<td>$17.28 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### “No Regrets” Adaptive Management Decisions Affecting Long-Term Conveyance and Supply Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conveyance Constraint</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline 3/Pipeline 4 Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Environmental, Pre-Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine status of demand, local supply, conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conveyance and Supply Constraint</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pendleton Desal Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Testing, Site Preservation, Pre-Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pendleton Desal Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting for initial 50 MGD Camp Pendleton Desal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial 50 MGD Camp Pendleton Desal Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award construction contract for P3/P4 Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract for Phase 1 IPR awarded. Financing on Rosarito Desal closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contract for BDCP conveyance awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Untreated Capacity Constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Potential Supply Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Master Planning
Conclusions

Near Term (2014–2025)

- Address raw water conveyance constraints
  - South County
  - MWD Delivery Point
- Improve operational flexibility to optimize existing assets
- Defer ~$700 million in CIP expenditures beyond 2025
- Revise scope and timing of existing projects (budgeted at $150 million) in current CIP
Adaptively Manage Future Needs Through Near-Term Actions

- Adaptive Management of long-term supply projects
  - Monitor local and imported water supply development per 2010 UWMP Scenario Planning
  - Monitor water demand trends and achievement of GPCD targets
  - Provide staff direction on continuing to develop long term options
    - Colorado River Conveyance
    - Camp Pendleton Desalination
  - Determine implementation of facilities based on needs
CEQA Process
What is CEQA?

- Disclose the significant effects of proposed activities
- Identify ways to avoid or reduce effects
- Prevent effects through feasible alternatives or mitigation measures
- Disclose the reasons why an agency approves activities having significant effects
- Foster interagency cooperation
- Enhance public participation
Benefits of Program EIR

- Avoid duplicative reconsideration of broad policies, alternatives, and program wide mitigation measures
- Provide a more exhaustive consideration of regional effects than would be practical in a project specific EIR
- Provide the basis for determining whether a subsequent activity may have new effects which had not been considered before
- Allow reduction in paperwork
Benefits of 2003 Program EIR

- Growth inducement analysis on new supply
- Cumulative impacts of project implementation
Master Plan Project Description/Alternatives
- North, West, East
- Common elements (Table 2–1)

Resource issues examined
- Not significant, no further review
- Not significant with mitigation
- Significant and unavoidable

Alternatives not considered

Other CEQA Considerations

Findings/Conclusions
2003 Master Plan Supply Alternatives

- **Supply from the North**
  Expand Supply and Conveyance from MWD

- **Supply from the West**
  Seawater Desalination (Proposed Project in PEIR)

- **Supply from the East**
  Colorado River Conveyance Facility
2003 PEIR Approved: *Supply from the West – Seawater Desalination*

Types of included projects:

- Initial 50 mgd Carlsbad Desalination Project
- Addition of Regional Water Treatment Capacity
- Addition of 100,000 AF of Carryover Storage
- Expansion of Internal System Capacity
- Rehabilitation of Existing Facilities
Near- and Mid-Term Projects
1. ESP North County Pump Stations
2. ESP San Vicente Pump Station 3rd Pump Drive and Power Supply
3. Pipelines P3/P4 Conversion
4. Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure
   4a. Lake Murray Control Valve
   4b. South County Intertie
5. System Storage
6. System Isolation Valves (various locations)
7. Asset Management Program (various locations)
8. Facility Planning Studies

Potential Long-Term Projects
1. Pipeline 6
2. Second Crossover Pipeline
3. Camp Pendleton Desalination
4. Colorado River Conveyance
Near- and Mid-Term Projects
1. ESP North County Pump Stations
2. ESP San Vicente Pump Station 3rd Pump Drive and Power Supply
3. Pipelines P3/P4 Conversion
4. Mission Trails Flow Regulatory Structure
   4a. Lake Murray Control Valve
   4b. South County Intertie
5. System Storage
6. System Isolation Valves (various locations)
7. Asset Management Program (various locations)
8. Facility Planning Studies

Potential Long-Term Projects
1. Pipeline 6
2. Second Crossover Pipeline
3. Camp Pendleton Desalination
4. Colorado River Conveyance
(a)(2) *Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.*
Benefits of 2013 Supplemental Program EIR

- Greenhouse gas emissions analysis
- Biological resources – incorporate NCCP/HCP
- Cumulative impacts of project implementation
The SPEIR will evaluate and update the following environmental effects from the 2003 PEIR, as required:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service System
- Other CEQA mandated analyses including Alternatives, Cumulative Effects and Growth Inducement
Supplemental Program EIR

Master Plan
Identify future facilities needed and associated emissions

Climate Action Plan
Will add new facilities to baseline emissions
April 15 – NOP released for 30-day public comment; posted at County Clerk’s office
  ◦ Mailed 61 copies of NOP to federal, state and local agencies; member agencies; stakeholders

April 19 – Notice published in Union-Tribune

April 29 – Public scoping meeting held
  ◦ Two attendees, no comments

May 18 – Public comment period closes
  ◦ Three comment letters received
# Summary of Scoping Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State Lands Commission</td>
<td>• Potential Responsible Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego – Planning and Development</td>
<td>• County CAP included SBX7–7 targets consistent with SDCWA; coordination to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Bay Council – Surfrider</td>
<td>• Minimize negative environmental impacts, GHG emissions, and ‘embedded energy’ in water supply portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– San Diego Audubon Society</td>
<td>• Pursue supply options such as IPR and DPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– San Diego Coastkeeper</td>
<td>• Greater per capita water reduction targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation</td>
<td>• Analyze broad range of conservation alternatives in EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a preferred “loading order” of water supply options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess long term conceptual projects in EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CAP should inform prioritization of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Board review/selection of Master Plan list of projects to be analyzed in PEIR
- Board and Member Agency review of project specific cost estimates
- Board input on CAP and PEIR
- Initiate CEQA public reviews
- Member Agency and public review of Draft Master Plan, PEIR and CAP
# 2013 Master Plan Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Member Agency Technical Advisory Committee Meeting</strong> – Review recommended projects and CEQA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Water Planning Committee Meeting</strong> – Review May 16th workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Special Meeting of the Water Planning Committee</strong> – Review recommended projects, proposed budget revisions, cost comparison of long-term supply projects, and CEQA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25, 2013</td>
<td><strong>Water Planning Committee</strong> – Board input for preparation of the Draft Master Plan, CAP, and PEIR for public review. Obtain Committee approval of “Staff Recommended Projects.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td><strong>Public Release</strong> of the Draft Program EIR, CAP and Draft Master Plan for the 45-day public review period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-Nov 2013</td>
<td><strong>Public Hearing</strong> on Draft Program EIR, CAP and Draft Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td><strong>Regular Board Meeting</strong> - Certification of Final PEIR and approval of Final Master Plan and CAP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>