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## Los Peñasquitos Lagoon



## Ecosystem Services within the Regulatory Framework

- Impairment Identified
- Sedimentation of the lagoon
- Ecosystem Services Lost - Loss of Saltwater Marsh
- Regulatory Driver - TMDL
- Quantify Waste Load Allocations
- Identify Numeric Targets
- Implementation Plan for Restoration Blueprint
- Meet Waste Load Allocations
- Restore Beneficial Uses of the Lagoon
- Ecosystem Services to Prioritize Restoration Alternatives



## National Wetland Inventory - 2009



## Ecosystem Services Lost

- Wildlife habitat
- Endangered species protection
- Recreational uses (hiking, birding, boating)
- Fisheries (shellfish harvesting)
- Aesthetic value
- Education \& research
- Flood protection


## Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Sediment/Siltation TMDL

$$
\mathrm{TMDL}=\sum \mathrm{WLAs}+\sum \mathrm{LAs}+\mathrm{MOS}
$$

| Source | Current <br> Load <br> (tons) | Historical <br> Load <br> (tons) | Load <br> Reduction <br> (tons) | Percent <br> Reduction <br> Required |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TMDL | 13,663 | 12,360 | 1,303 | $10 \%$ |
| Watershed <br> Contribution <br> (WLA) | 7,719 | 2,580 | 5,139 | $67 \%$ |
| Ocean <br> boundary <br> (LA) | 5,944 | 9,780 | $+3,836$ <br> (increase) | $+39 \%$ <br> (increase) |



## Numerous Stakeholders



## Increasing Population in the Watershed

## San Diego Regional Population (SANDAG)



## Increasing Urbanization Leads to Larger Flows

## Los Penasquitos Creek (USGS Gage 11023340) 1964-2000 Monthly Flow





## Streambank Erosion







## Regulatory Process

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { USEPA } \longrightarrow \text { SWRCB } \longrightarrow \text { RWQCB } \longrightarrow \text { Stakeholders } \\
& \text { (CWA) } \\
& \text { 303(d) } \\
& \text { TMDL } \\
& \text { Third Party } \\
& \text { TMDL } \\
& 1996 \quad 2006 \quad \text { 2007-2011 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\longrightarrow$| Plan |
| :---: |
| $2011-2012$ |\(\underset{\substack{Goals \& <br>


Numeric}}{WLA} \longrightarrow\)| Lagoon |
| :---: |
| Restoration |

## Ecosystem Services:

- Are the beneficial outcomes of ecosystem functions
- Include such things as clean air and water, flood control, various active and passive use values, and aesthetic and other "non-use values"
- Are often taken for granted as free
- Are often left out of important decisions


## Building Blocks of Ecosystem Services \& Values



## Flow of Information

## About Ecosystem Services



## Key Questions

- What features of ecosystems support functions that generate valuable ecosystem services?
- What changes \& trends in features \& functions are affecting ecosystem services?
- What policies \& investments will favorably affect these changes \& trends?
- How much will those policies \& investments cost?
- How should we decide among restoration alternatives?


## Cost-Effectiveness/

## Incremental Cost Analysis

- Cost Effectiveness Analysis
- Is used to ensure that the least cost alternative is identified for each possible level of output (e.g., production of ecosystem services)
- Incremental Cost Analysis
- Reveals the additional cost of achieving increasing output
- Presents tradeoffs for policy makers to determine whether the increase in output is worth the additional cost


## Hlustration: Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

| Plan | Total Cost | Ecosystem <br> Services |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No-action | $\$ 0$ | 0 |
| Plan A | $\$ 20,000$ | 40 |
| Plan B | $\$ 10,000$ | 40 |
| Plan C | $\$ 15,000$ | 45 |
| Plan D | $\$ 15,000$ | 55 |
| Plan E | $\$ 42,000$ | 105 |
| Plan F | $\$ 40,000$ | 110 |

Plans are sorted in order of increasing output

## Cost-Effectiveness Frontier



## Incremental Cost Analysis

| Plan | Cost | Output <br> (Ecosystem <br> Services) | Incremental <br> Cost | Incremental <br> Output | Incremental <br> Cost per Unit <br> Ecosystem <br> Service(ES) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No-action | $\$ 0$ | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| Plan B | $\$ 10,000$ | 40 | $\$ 10,000$ | 40 | $\$ 250 / E S$ |
| Plan D | $\$ 15,000$ | 55 | $\$ 5,000$ | 15 | $\$ 333 / E S$ |
| Plan F | $\$ 40,000$ | 110 | $\$ 25,000$ | 55 | $\$ 455 / E S$ |

Only cost-effective plans are carried forward for Incremental Cost Analysis.

## Decision-making Summary

- Identify, measure and, where necessary, rank and weight ecosystem services
- Identify outcome and cost thresholds
- Conduct cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis
- Screen out clearly inferior alternatives
- Present tradeoffs for policy makers to consider when choosing among alternatives


## Ecosystem Services within the Regulatory Framework

- Impairment Identified
- Sedimentation of the lagoon
- Ecosystem Services Lost - Loss of Saltwater Marsh
- Regulatory Driver - TMDL
- Quantify Waste Load Allocations
- Identify Numeric Targets
- Implementation Plan for Restoration Blueprint
- Meet Waste Load Allocations
- Restore Beneficial Uses of the Lagoon
- Ecosystem Services to Prioritize Restoration Alternatives



## Questions?

