



County of San Diego

SARAH E. AGHASSI
DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT GROUP
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 212, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
(619) 531-6256 • Fax (619) 531-5476
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/lueg

October 31, 2017

Mr. David Gibson
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region 9
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92108

Dear Mr. Gibson:

FY 2016-17 JRMP ANNUAL REPORT SUBMITTAL

The County of San Diego (County) is pleased to submit the attached Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17. This submittal is comprised of the following:

- Summary of Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program Annual Report Form (Attachment D of Order No. R9-2013-0001)
- Spreadsheet of watershed-specific reporting data for each of the eight Watershed Management Areas in which the County is a responsible party (Attachment D items IV through VII)
- FY 2016-17 Fiscal Analysis

We hope this submittal meets your expectations and look forward to continued interaction with you and your staff. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Todd Snyder, Program Manager, at (858) 694-3672.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Sarah E. Aggassi".

SARAH E. AGHASSI
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments: FY 2016-17 JRMP Annual Report



County of San Diego

SARAH E. AGHASSI
DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT GROUP
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 212, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
(619) 531-6256 • Fax (619) 531-5476
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/lueg

October 31, 2017

David W. Gibson, Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego – Region 9
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92108

Dear Mr. Gibson:

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT AND ENFORCE THE REQUIREMENTS OF 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A-F) AND RWQCB ORDER NO. R9-2013-0001

In compliance with Section E.1 of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS0109266, the County of San Diego (County) does hereby certify that the County has adequate legal authority to implement and enforce the requirements contained in 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A-F) and RWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001. The County has amended its Code of Regulatory Ordinances - Title 6, Division 7, Chapter 8 - to implement its stormwater management and discharge control program in accordance with Order No. R9-2013-0001.

The County remains committed to protecting water quality and will continue to implement its stormwater program in compliance with NPDES Permit No. CAS0109266.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Sarah Aggassi".

SARAH E. AGHASSI
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

cc: Richard Crompton, Director, Department of Public Works (O-332)

ATTACHMENT D
JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT FORM

This page left intentionally blank

**JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT FORM
FY 2016-2017**

I. COPERMITTEE INFORMATION	
I.A Copermitttee Name: <u>County of San Diego (PIN 255223)</u>	
I.B Copermitttee Primary Contact Name: <u>Todd Snyder</u>	
I.C Copermitttee Primary Contact Information: Address: <u>5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410</u> City: <u>San Diego</u> County: <u>San Diego</u> State: <u>California</u> Zip: <u>92123</u> Telephone: <u>(858) 694-3672</u> Fax: <u>(858) 495-5623</u> Email: <u>Todd.Snyder@sdcounty.ca.gov</u>	
II. LEGAL AUTHORITY	
II.A Has the Copermitttee established adequate legal authority within its jurisdiction to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
II.B A Principal Executive Officer, Ranking Elected Official, or Duly Authorized Representative has certified that the Copermitttee obtained and maintains adequate legal authority?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
III. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DOCUMENT UPDATE	
III.A Was an update of the jurisdictional runoff management program document required or recommended by the San Diego Water Board?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III.B If YES to the question above, did the Copermitttee update its jurisdictional runoff management program document and make it available on the Regional Clearinghouse?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
IV. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION PROGRAM	
IV.A Has the Copermitttee implemented a program to actively detect and eliminate illicit discharges and connections to its MS4 that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
IV.B.1 Number of non-storm water discharges reported by the public	370
IV.B.2 Number of non-storm water discharges detected by Copermitttee staff or contractors	112
IV.B.3 Number of non-storm water discharges investigated by the Copermitttee	468
IV.B.4 Number of sources of non-storm water discharges identified	149
IV.B.5 Number of non-storm water discharges eliminated	148
IV.B.6 Number of sources of illicit discharges or connections identified	106
IV.B.7 Number of illicit discharges or connections eliminated	105
IV.B.8 Number of enforcement actions issued	121
IV.B.9 Number of escalated enforcement actions issued	2
V. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROGRAM	
V.A Has the Copermitttee implemented a development planning program that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
V.B Was an update to the BMP Design Manual required or recommended by the San Diego Water Board?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V.C If YES to the question above, did the Copermitttee update its BMP Design Manual and make it available on the Regional Clearinghouse?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
V.D.1 Number of proposed development projects in review	1,015
V.D.2 Number of Priority Development Projects in review	278
V.D.3 Number of Priority Development Projects approved	62
V.D.4 Number of approved Priority Development Projects exempt from any BMP requirements	0
V.D.5 Number of approved Priority Development Projects allowed alternative compliance	0
V.D.6 Number of Priority Development Projects granted occupancy	29
V.E.1 Number of completed Priority Development Projects in inventory	328
V.E.2 Number of high priority Priority Development Project structural BMP inspections	1,177
V.E.3 Number of Priority Development Project structural BMP violations	211
V.E.4 Number of enforcement actions issued	211
V.E.5 Number of escalated enforcement actions issued	2

FY 2016-2017

VI. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM					
VI. A Has the Copermittee implemented a construction management program that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?				YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
VI.B.1 Number of construction sites in inventory				2,623	
VI.B.2 Number of active construction sites in inventory				2,557	
VI.B.3 Number of inactive construction sites in inventory				22	
VI.B.4 Number of construction sites closed/completed during reporting period				1,025	
VI.B.5 Number of construction site inspections				17,938	
VI.B.6 Number of construction site violations				374	
VI.B.7 Number of enforcement actions issued				428	
VI.B.8 Number of escalated enforcement actions issued				108	
VII. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM					
VII.A Has the Copermittee implemented an existing development management program that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?				YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Municipal	Commercial	Industrial	Residential
VII.B.1 Number of facilities or areas in inventory		a. 442	b. 1,764	c. 141	d. 110
VII.B.2 Number of existing development inspections		a. 1,750	b. 617	c. 91	d. 789
VII.B.3 Number of follow-up inspections		a. 15	b. 70	c. 15	d. 331
VII.B.4 Number of violations		a. 22	b. 152	c. 48	d. 462
VII.B.5 Number of enforcement actions issued		a. 11	b. 75	c. 29	d. 374
VII.B.6 Number of escalated enforcement actions issued		a. 0	b. 0	c. 0	d. 0
VIII. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION					
VIII.A Has the Copermittee implemented a public education program component that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?				YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
VIII.B Has the Copermittee implemented a public participation program component that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?				YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
IX. FISCAL ANALYSIS					
Has the Copermittee attached to this form a summary of its fiscal analysis that complies with Order No. R9-2013-0001?				YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

X. CERTIFICATION

I [Principal Executive Officer Ranking Elected Official Duly Authorized Representative] certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this document and all attachments and that, based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, I believe that the information is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment.


Signature

10/26/17
Date

SARAH E. AGHASSI
Print Name

LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT GROUP
DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
Title

(619) 531-5451
Telephone Number

SARAH.AGHASSI@SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV
Email

ATTACHMENT D.1

**JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT FORM BY WATERSHED**

This page left intentionally blank

ATTACHMENT D.2

**JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT FISCAL ANALYSIS**

This page left intentionally blank

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Fiscal Analysis Methods.....	1
1.3. Fiscal Analysis Results	1
1.3.1 Expenditures	2
1.3.2 Funding Source	12
1.4. Conclusions and Recommendations	12
Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17	2
Table 1.2 – Estimated Watershed Expenditures for FY 2016-17	9
Table 1.3 – Estimated Regional Expenditures for FY 2016-17.....	10
Table 1.4 – Total Estimated County Expenditures for FY 2016-17	11
Table 1.5 – Legal Restrictions on the Use of Program Funding.....	12

Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017

FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT

1.1. Introduction

This section presents an estimated annual budget for the County's runoff management programs for FY 2016-17.

1.2. Fiscal Analysis Methods

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

1.3. Fiscal Analysis Results

As shown the County estimated its total FY 2016-17 expenditures at \$34,398,753. This fiscal analysis addresses each of the County's Runoff Management Program elements (jurisdictional, watershed, and regional activities) for the current reporting period (FY 2016-17). Expenditures are described by department and major program area. They represent an estimate of the expenditures that the County incurred in meeting its compliance obligations for FY 2016-17. They should not be interpreted as either budgeted or actual expenditures. Because stormwater program expenditures are distributed throughout a considerable number of County programs, a single consolidated "budget" does not exist for the program as a whole. As such, these figures should be considered best estimates of stormwater-related expenditures.

Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017

1.3.1 Expenditures

1.3.1.1. Jurisdictional

Table 1.1 presents the County's estimated jurisdictional expenditures for FY 2016-17.

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
1	ADMINISTRATION	\$7,478,468	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	\$2,102,444	
A	Land Use Planning	<u>\$0</u>	Expenditures not reported for FY 2016-17; included in other elements.
B	Environmental Review	<u>\$0</u>	Expenditures not reported for FY 2016-17; included in other elements.
C	Development Project Approval and Verification	\$2,102,444	
C1	Public Projects (CIP)	<u>\$1,744,087</u>	
	Project Planning and Engineering	\$1,700,305	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	\$0	
	BMP Implementation	\$43,782	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
C2	Private Projects	<u>\$358,357</u>	
	Permitting and Licensing	\$358,357	This cost covers PDS plan reviews at permitted sites. Total costs are estimated as fixed percentages of annual plan-checking fees.
3	CONSTRUCTION	\$4,429,597	
A	Public Projects (CIP)	<u>\$2,689,447</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	\$1,673,511	
	BMP Implementation	\$1,015,936	
B	Private Projects	<u>\$1,740,150</u>	
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$1,740,150	This cost primarily covers DPW and PDS construction inspections at permitted sites. Total costs are estimated as fixed percentages of inspection program fees.
4	MUNICIPAL	\$10,117,581	
A	Administration	<u>\$139,341</u>	Expenditures associated with the administrative oversight of the stormwater programs, regulatory reporting, and program assessment of municipal facilities by the DPW - Watershed Protection Program.
B	Streets, Roads, and Highways Element	<u>\$4,498,613</u>	
	Administration	\$408,965	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	Maintenance Inspections	\$4,010,348	Founded road operations activities include: culvert inspections and cleaning; 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	\$79,300	
	Other	\$0	
C	MS4 Element	<u>\$1,560,000</u>	
	Administration	\$310,000	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). Other includes the cost of disposal of debris removed from MS4.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$1,030,000	
	BMP Implementation	\$150,000	
	Other	\$70,000	
D	Solid Waste Facilities Element	<u>\$550,000</u>	
	Administration	\$150,000	Costs include Regional Board stormwater permit fees, consultant costs associated with stormwater upgrade and repair projects, and office staff time.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$25,000	Costs include staff time to perform site inspections.
	BMP Implementation	\$75,000	Costs include stormwater consultant site inspections, sampling/testing and BMP materials.
	Other (construction)	\$300,000	Drainage improvement projects and BMP site maintenance projects.
E	Wastewater Facilities Element	<u>\$130,000</u>	
	Administration	\$10,000	This includes costs associated with JRMP report, the sanitary sewer system and facilities including: pump stations, sewage treatment plants and Spring Valley Operations facility. Also includes the cost of BMP design, acquisition,
	Maintenance Inspections	\$50,000	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	BMP Implementation	\$70,000	maintenance and monitoring, for wastewater Capital Improvement Projects, and Major maintenance projects, and at various wastewater facilities.
	Other	\$0	
F	Road Stations Element	<u>\$888,648</u>	
	Administration	\$80,786	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	\$677,369	
	BMP Implementation	\$130,493	
	Other	\$0	
G	Fleet Maintenance Element	<u>\$16,450</u>	
	Administration	\$1,081	This includes costs associated with operation of the County's fleet maintenance and fueling facilities.
	Maintenance Inspections	\$9,270	
	BMP Implementation	\$6,099	
	Other	\$0	
H	Municipal Airfields Element	<u>\$333,130</u>	
	Administration	\$20,000	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	\$8,380	
	BMP Implementation	\$200,000	
	Other (sampling and analysis)	\$24,750	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
I	Parks & Recreational Facilities Element	<u>\$1,565,834</u>	
	Administration	\$99,678	This includes: coordinating all training requirements, preparing and reviewing reports, and overseeing the overall implementation of the stormwater program for DPR.
	BMP Implementation	\$1,346,366	This includes costs associated with implementation of BMPs at County parks.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$119,790	Costs are for DPR enforcement of stormwater requirements at County parks.
	Other	\$0	
J	Office Buildings & Other Municipal Facilities Element	<u>\$275,989</u>	
	Administration	\$0	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	\$119,338	
	BMP Implementation	\$156,651	
	Other	\$0	
	Management of Pesticides, Herbicides, & Fertilizers	<u>\$159,576</u>	
	Administration	\$159,576	Integrated Pest Control Program within the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures (AWM) performs eradication and control of invasive weeds. This program also provides weed control on roadsides, airports, flood control channels,
	Maintenance Inspections	\$0	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
	BMP Implementation	\$0	sewage treatment plants and inactive landfills. It also provides structural pest control to facilities owned and operated by the county.
	Other	\$0	
5	INDUSTRIAL and COMMERCIAL	\$1,200,665	
	Administration	\$267,188	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	\$827,536	
	Educational Outreach	\$105,941	
	Other expenditures	\$0	
6	RESIDENTIAL	\$2,056,926	
	Administration	\$308,334	DPW conducts investigations of residential sources in the unincorporated County, and conducts follow-up inspections and enforcement of stormwater violations. DPW also operates a regional hotline that accepts complaints.
	Compliance Inspection and Enforcement	\$1,286,142	
	Educational Outreach	\$462,450	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	\$644,378	

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

Table 1.1 – Estimated Jurisdictional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Jurisdictional Worksheet Component			Explanation/Notes
		\$644,378	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 JRMP 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.
10	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2016-17; included in other elements.
11	NON-EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING	\$0	Expenditures not reported for FY 2016-17; included in other elements.

\$28,030,060

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

1.3.1.2 Watershed

Table 1.2 presents the County’s estimated watershed expenditures for FY 2016-17.

Table 1.2 – Estimated Watershed Expenditures for FY 2016-17

	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	\$82,444	\$117,123	\$96,343	\$131,127	\$78,357	\$158,820	\$69,607	\$108,478
Cost Share Contribution	\$443,322	\$280,248	\$51,222	\$204,473	\$16,285	\$208,758	\$85,127	\$70,110
Watershed Activities	\$903,135	\$291,956	\$182,512	\$117,024	\$0	\$1,022,736	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Watershed Costs	\$1,428,901	\$689,327	\$330,077	\$452,624	\$94,642	\$1,390,314	\$154,733	\$178,588

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

1.3.1.3 Regional

Table 1.3 presents the County’s estimated regional expenditures for FY 2016-17. 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 1.3 – Estimated Regional Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Regional Programs	County Costs
Administration	\$0
Cost Share Contribution	\$1,649,488
Regional Activities	\$0
Other	\$0
Total Estimated Regional Costs	\$1,649,488

**Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

1.3.1.4 Total Expenditures

Table 1.4 presents the County’s total estimated expenditures for FY 2016-17 (jurisdictional, watershed, and regional).

Table 1.4 – Total Estimated County Expenditures for FY 2016-17

Component / Sub-component	Estimated Expenditures
Jurisdictional	
Administration	\$7,478,468
Development Planning	\$2,102,444
Construction	\$4,429,597
Municipal	\$10,117,581
Industrial And Commercial	\$1,200,665
Residential	\$2,056,926
IDDE	\$644,378
Education	\$0
Public Participation	\$0
Special Investigations	\$0
Non-emergency Firefighting	\$0
Jurisdictional Total	\$28,030,060
Watershed	
Santa Margarita WMA	\$1,428,901
San Luis Rey WMA	\$689,327
Carlsbad WMA	\$330,077
San Dieguito WMA	\$452,624
Peñasquitos WMA	\$94,642
San Diego River WMA	\$1,390,314
San Diego Bay WMA	\$154,733
Tijuana WMA	\$178,588
Watershed Total	\$4,719,205
Regional	\$1,649,488

Total Estimated County Costs

\$34,398,753

Transitional Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017

1.3.2 Funding Source

Table 1.5 shows the major sources of funding for the County’s urban runoff management programs in FY 2016-17, and describes the legal restrictions applicable to the use of each.

Table 1.5 – 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.

1.4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The figures presented here are an estimate of the expenditures that the County incurred to meet its compliance obligations for FY 2016-17. For the reasons explained above, they should be considered only best estimates of stormwater-related expenditures.