

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan **Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012** ---

10.0	FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT	1
10.1	Introduction	1
10.2	General Budget Information	1
10.3	Fiscal Analysis Methods.....	1
10.4	Fiscal Analysis Results	1
10.4.1	Expenditures	2
10.4.2	Funding Sources	10
10.5	Conclusions and Recommendations	11
10.6	Program Review and Modification.....	12
Table 10. 1– Comparison of Projected Program Expenditures by Fiscal Year		2
Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12		2
Table 10. 3 – Estimated Watershed Expenditures for FY 2011-12		8
Table 10. 4 – Estimated Regional Expenditures for FY 2011-12.....		9
Table 10. 5 – Total Estimated County Expenditures for FY 2011-12		10
Table 10. 6 – Legal Restrictions on the Use of Program Funding		11
Table 10. 7 – Planned Modifications to the Fiscal Analysis Component		12

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

10.0 FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT

10.1 Introduction

JURMP Section 12.0 establishes the general approach employed by the County of San Diego to conduct annual fiscal analyses of its Urban Runoff Management Program (URMP). This section presents an estimated annual budget for the County's urban runoff management programs for FY 2011-12.

10.2 General Budget Information

Table 10.1 provides an overview of estimated program expenditures for fiscal year (FY) 2003-04 through the present. As shown the County estimated its total FY 2011-12 expenditures at \$32,842,855. This is an increase of \$5,963,515 over FY 2003-04 levels, or 22.2%. Despite this overall increase, caution is advised in comparing total values from year to year. Total costs represent the sum of a wide variety of activities and commitments (e.g., capital improvements), many of which are highly variable by year.

10.3 Fiscal Analysis Methods

This section utilizes the methodologies and standards established in *Fiscal Analysis Method* submitted by the Copermittees in January 2009.

10.4 Fiscal Analysis Results

Permit Section G.3 requires that the fiscal analysis address each of the County's Urban Runoff Management Program elements (jurisdictional, watershed, and regional activities). It also requires that the fiscal analysis provide the Copermittee's urban runoff management program budget for the current reporting period (FY 2011-12). For FY 2011-12, the County estimated a total budgeted expenditure of \$32,842,855.

As required by **Permit Section G.3**, expenditures are described by department and major program area. They represent an estimate of the expenditures that the County determined would be needed to meet its compliance obligations for FY 2011-12. However, they should not be interpreted as either budgeted or actual expenditures; first since they were developed prior to the finalization of FY 2011-12 budgets, and, secondly, because stormwater program expenditures are distributed throughout a considerable number of County programs, i.e., a single consolidated "budget" does not exist for the program as a whole. As such, they should be considered best estimates of stormwater-related expenditures.

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10. 1– Comparison of Projected Program Expenditures by Fiscal Year

	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Total	\$26,879,340	\$ 27,656,709	\$ 28,204,830	\$29,536,909	\$31,517,738	\$34,575,288	\$34,605,056	\$35,788,921	\$32,842,855

10.4.1 Expenditures

10.4.1.1 Jurisdictional

Table 10.2 presents the County’s estimated jurisdictional expenditures for FY 2011-12.

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
1	ADMINISTRATION	\$1,220,385	These costs correspond to the DPW WPP development, administrative oversight, and assessment of the County’s stormwater programs. The WPP is responsible for the development of new and augmented County stormwater programs, regulatory reporting, and program assessment. Some administrative costs are associated with other specific functions shown below, but are included here because they could not be separated out.
2	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	\$6,633,794	
A	Land Use Planning	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2011-12.
B	Environmental Review	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2011-12.
C	Development Project Approval and Verification	\$6,633,794	

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
C1	Public Projects (CIP)	<u>\$6,415,794</u>	
	Project Planning and Engineering	\$3,202,794	Costs include: preparing and reviewing plans and specifications for stormwater BMPs, and SWPPP/WPCP review. These costs apply to DPW, DPR, and DGS.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$831,356	
	BMP Implementation	\$2,381,644	
C2	Private Projects	<u>\$218,000</u>	
	Permitting and Licensing	\$218,000	This cost covers DPW and DPLU plan reviews at permitted sites. Total costs are estimated as fixed percentages of annual plan-checking fees.
3	CONSTRUCTION	<u>\$5,363,719</u>	
A	Public Projects (CIP)	<u>\$4,481,719</u>	Costs include: BMP compliance inspections during construction, and implementation of construction phase BMPs. These costs apply to DPW, DPR, and DGS.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$2,492,600	
	BMP Implementation	\$1,989,129	
B	Private Projects	<u>\$882,000</u>	
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$882,000	This cost primarily covers DPW and DPLU construction inspections at permitted sites. Total costs are estimated as fixed percentages of inspection program fees.
4	MUNICIPAL	<u>\$13,716,276</u>	
A	Administration	<u>\$152,534</u>	Cost of DPW WPP municipal program oversight.
B	Streets, Roads, and Highways Element	<u>\$1,877,085</u>	
	Administration	\$170,644	Founded road operations activities include: culvert inspections and cleaning;

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	Maintenance Inspections	\$1,621,968	increased culvert waste disposal costs, street sweeping, installation and maintenance of BMPs and road structures, and the placement of additional controls. 10% of the Maintenance and Inspections and BMP Implementation is reported as Administration cost.
	BMP Implementation	\$84,473	
	Other	\$0	
C	MS4 Element	<u>\$7,718,000</u>	
	Administration	\$7,360,000	The combined costs shown here apply across (1) DPW Flood Control -- conversion of existing concrete lined channels to natural bottom channels, updating flood control master plans, increased maintenance of flood control systems, and construction and maintenance of regional treatment BMPs; and (2) DPW Flood Control MS4 Operation & Maintenance -- maintenance on flood control facilities throughout the unincorporated areas of the County, exclusive of facilities within road rights-of-way (included in 4.B above).
	Maintenance Inspections	\$40,000	
	BMP Implementation	\$318,000	
	Other	\$0	
D	Solid Waste Facilities Element	<u>\$830,000</u>	
	Administration	\$80,000	Costs include Regional Board stormwater permit fees, consultant costs associated with stormwater upgrade and repair projects, and office staff time.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$135,000	Costs include staff time to perform site inspections and construction inspection/contract management during Bonsall Drainage Project.
	BMP Implementation	\$140,000	Costs include stormwater consultant site inspections, sampling/testing and BMP materials.
	Other (construction)	\$475,000	Drainage improvement projects and BMP site maintenance projects. \$325K of the estimate is from the Bonsall Drainage Project.
E	Wastewater Facilities Element	<u>\$239,300</u>	
	Administration	\$7,000	This includes costs associated with JURMP report, the sanitary sewer system and facilities including: pump stations, sewage treatment plants and Spring Valley
	Maintenance Inspections	\$226,600	

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	BMP Implementation	\$6,300	Operations facility. Also includes the cost of BMP design, acquisition, maintenance and monitoring, for wastewater Capital Improvement Projects, and Major maintenance projects, and at various wastewater facilities.
	Other	\$0	
F	Road Stations Element	<u>\$905,507</u>	
	Administration	\$82,319	This includes DPW road station operations related to Permit compliance. The Administration cost is determined as 10% of the total costs of maintenance and Inspections and BMP Implementation as reported by the DPW Roads Divisions.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$803,040	
	BMP Implementation	\$20,148	
	Other	\$0	
G	Fleet Maintenance Element	<u>\$111,114</u>	
	Administration	\$53,617	This includes costs associated with operation of the County's fleet maintenance and fueling facilities.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$50,560	
	BMP Implementation	\$6,937	
	Other	\$0	
H	Municipal Airfields Element	<u>\$166,269</u>	
	Administration	\$5,000	These costs involve site inspections, annual reporting, and maintenance of BMPs at airports, including oversight of tenant operations. The BMP implementation item includes Palomar asphalt cap repairs.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$80,000	
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$0	
	BMP Implementation	\$81,269	
	Other (sampling and analysis)	\$0	
I	Parks & Recreational Facilities Element	<u>\$1,221,692</u>	

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	Administration	\$205,485	This includes: coordinating all training requirements, preparing and reviewing reports, and overseeing the overall implementation of the stormwater program for DPR.
	BMP Implementation	\$943,701	This includes costs associated with implementation of BMPs at County parks.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$72,506	Costs are for DPR enforcement of stormwater requirements at County parks.
	Other	\$0	
J	Office Buildings & Other Municipal Facilities Element	<u>\$395,860</u>	
	Administration	\$25,500	DGS conducts a variety of storm water activities including: inspections and clean-up of County-owned, occupied, and leased facilities and vacant lands; maintenance and signage of storm drain inlet inserts and trash dumpsters; placement of inlet filters; maintenance of coverage and containment improvements for on-site supplies and materials; parking lot sweeping and controlled parking lot power washing; and application of erosion and sediment control measures. These costs are exclusive of fleet maintenance and fueling operations.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$290,360	
	BMP Implementation	\$80,000	
	Other		
	Management of Pesticides, Herbicides, & Fertilizers	<u>\$98,915</u>	
	Administration	\$98,915	Integrated Pest Control Program within the Department of Agriculture Weights and Measures performs eradication and control of invasive weeds. This program also provides weed control on roadsides, airports, flood control channels, sewage treatment plants and inactive landfills. It also provides structural pest control to facilities owned and operated by the county.
	Maintenance Inspections		
	BMP Implementation		
	Other		
5	INDUSTRIAL and COMMERCIAL	\$1,373,062	

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	Administration	\$0	DPW and AWM conduct inspections of a variety of businesses in the unincorporated County, provide regulatory oversight of mobile businesses, and conduct follow-up and enforcement of stormwater violations.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$1,423,062	
	Educational Outreach	\$130,000	
	Other expenditures	\$0	
6	RESIDENTIAL	\$1,127,502	
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$290,000	DPW conducts complaint investigations for residential sources in the unincorporated County, and conduct follow-up and enforcement of stormwater violations. DPW also operates a regional hotline.
	Educational Outreach	\$837,502	Several County departments coordinate and provide outreach to the residential sector and schoolchildren in support of Permit Section D.5 requirements. Costs reported here correspond to DPW only. Funded activities include developing pollution prevention content and providing direct outreach to various target audiences within the general residential and schoolchildren target audiences.
7	IDDE	\$1,171,659	
		\$1,171,659	DPW conducts monitoring programs, assesses scientific data, and provides technical and scientific support to other County program staff. They also provide support for all technical and scientific aspects of URMP development and implementation. These costs are exclusive of the regional monitoring program which is addressed separately under regional costs.
8	EDUCATION	\$0	Education costs are included in other sections as applicable.
9	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	\$0	Public participation costs are included in other sections as applicable.

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

Table 10.2 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
10	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2011-12.
11	NON-EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2011-12.
TOTAL COSTS		\$30,606,397	

10.4.1.2 Watershed

Table 10. 3 presents the County's estimated watershed expenditures for FY 2011-12.

Table 10. 3 – Estimated Watershed Expenditures for FY 2011-12

	Santa Margarita WMA	San Luis Rey WMA	Carlsbad WMA	San Dieguito WMA	Peñasquitos WMA	San Diego River WMA	San Diego Bay WMA	Tijuana WMA
Administration	\$60,000	\$40,000	\$80,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$35,000	\$30,000	\$58,000
Cost Share Contribution	0	0	\$7,000	\$11,000	\$1,000	\$10,000	\$3,820	\$40,000
Watershed Activities	\$271,320	\$261,023	\$63,422	\$231,681	\$48,896	\$167,757	\$45,137	\$154,570
Other	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total Estimated Watershed Costs	\$331,320	\$301,023	\$150,422	\$253,681	\$60,896	\$212,757	\$78,957	\$252,570

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

10.4.1.3 Regional

Table 10. 4 presents the County's estimated regional expenditures for FY 2011-12. This includes only those expenditures associated with the Copermittees' adopted Regional Budget and Work Plan. Other costs associated with regional participation (meeting attendance, etc.) are included within the jurisdictional expenditures presented above.

Table 10. 4 – Estimated Regional Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Regional Programs	County Costs
Administration	\$0
Cost Share Contribution	\$894,652
Regional Activities	\$0
Other	\$0
Total Estimated Regional Costs	\$894,652

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

10.4.1.4 Total Expenditures

Table 10.5 presents the County's total estimated expenditures for FY 2011-12 (jurisdictional, watershed, and regional).

Table 10.5 – Total Estimated County Expenditures for FY 2011-12

Component / Sub-component	Estimated Expenditures
Jurisdictional	
Administration	\$1,220,385
Development Planning	\$6,633,794
Construction	\$5,363,719
Municipal	\$13,716,276
Industrial And Commercial	\$1,373,062
Residential	\$1,127,502
IDDE	\$1,171,659
Education	\$0
Public Participation	\$0
Special Investigations	\$0
Non-emergency Firefighting	\$0
Jurisdictional Total	\$30,606,397
Watershed	
Santa Margarita WMA	\$271,320
San Luis Rey WMA	\$261,023
Carlsbad WMA	\$63,422
San Dieguito WMA	\$231,681
Peñasquitos WMA	\$48,896
San Diego River WMA	\$167,757
San Diego Bay WMA	\$45,137
Tijuana WMA	\$252,570
Watershed Total	\$1,341,806
Regional	\$894,652
Total Estimated County Costs	\$32,842,855

10.4.2 Funding Sources

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

Permit Section G.3 requires that the County's fiscal analysis include a description of the sources of funds that are proposed to be used to meet the expenditures estimated above, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

Table 10. 6 shows the major sources of funding for the County’s urban runoff management programs in FY 2011-12, and described the legal restrictions applicable to the use of each.

Table 10. 6 – Legal Restrictions on the Use of Program Funding

Funding Source	Legal Restrictions
General Fund	There are no restrictions on the use of general fund for County water quality programs and activities except that they must be used only for the purposes for which they are budgeted and allocated by the County Board of Supervisors.
Flood Control District Fees	Revenue generated from these fees must be expended for activities related to flood and storm management.
Developer Deposits / Permit Fees	Deposits / fees may be used only to fund activities related to the work for which the permits are issued.
Gas Tax	Gas Tax is collected by the state and allocated to local government for transportation-related work including maintenance of existing transportation systems and construction of new transportation facilities. These funds may not be used for other purposes.
Sanitary District Fees	Sanitary District Fees are used for work related to the maintenance of sewer lines, pump stations, force mains, and several treatment plants that serve the unincorporated areas. They may be used only for such maintenance-related purposes within the respective sewer district for which they are collected.
Other Funding Sources	Other funding sources collectively account for a relatively small portion of ongoing expenditures. However, all funding for the County’s stormwater compliance programs is expended within applicable legal restrictions and limitations.

10.5 Conclusions and Recommendations

Translating existing methods of cost estimation to the specific formats required by the Fiscal Analysis Method presents a number of challenges. It should be emphasized that the figures presented here are an estimate of the expenditures that the County determined would be needed to meet its compliance obligations for FY 2011-12. For the reasons explained above, they should be considered only best estimates of stormwater-related expenditures. Moreover, since a new permit is likely to be adopted during 2013, it makes little sense to pursue modifications or improvements to existing methodologies until these new requirements are solidified.

Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

10.6 Program Review and Modification

In accordance with *Permit Section 1.1.b*, the County has reviewed the results of its JURMP effectiveness assessment and other relevant information to identify modifications needed to maximize JURMP effectiveness and achieve compliance with *Permit section A*. As shown in **Table 10. 7**, no modifications to the JURMP Fiscal Analysis Component are currently planned.

Table 10. 7 – Planned Modifications to the Fiscal Analysis Component

Target Date	JURMP Section(s)	Planned Modification(s)
N/A	10.0	No modifications are planned for FY 2012-13.