IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY APPROACH OPTIONS

The conservation team has identified five approach options that might be employed to develop an implementation strategy to achieve conservation savings. The Steering Committee may select any or all of these options in directing the conservation team to prepare a conservation implementation strategy.

Guidepost – This component provides guideposts to assist in the development of conservation plans by class of user. These guideposts will be developed to ensure that all users, in the aggregate, will achieve, the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd.
Guideposts are not goals and are not intended to be applied to an individual permit. Rather, they demonstrate the percent reduction that a class of users, in the aggregate, would need to reach to achieve the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd. Applicants' conservation plans would continue to receive an application-specific evaluation, but would take into consideration the aggregate reduction needed in that class of user.

PROS	CONS
• Flexibility to choose savings programs/BMPs	• Uncertainty over how much savings each individual user is responsible for
• Consistent with 4.3% savings estimate used for the PWS 27.9 mgd estimate in 2035	• Doesn't ensure savings goal will be met
• Focus on application-specific evaluation of Applicant's conservation plans	• Focuses on 37 MGD, not achieving more than 37 MGD
• Allows maximum flexibility in selection of BMPs and programs	• Doesn't provide guidance or specificity for specific users
• Consistent with permittee's CUP conservation plan	

Designated Projects – This component will include a list of water conservation projects that could be implemented by permittees to meet the CFWI Estimated Conservation Savings Goal of 37+ mgd goal within the CFWI region. This list would be similar to the list of water supply development projects in a regional water supply plan in that it functions as a list of options that could be selected by a permittee for implementation or inclusion in their water conservation plan. The list would include projects proposed by permittees and/or by the Conservation Team for possible implementation in the future. These projects may be regional, permittee-specific, or generic. A generic project is a project currently without a designating managing entity.

PROS	CONS
• Provides direction on projects seen as most beneficial/cost effective that could be selected for implementation	• May be difficult to forecast projects over long term
• Shows future path to meet goal	• Regional projects not typical for conservation
• Can use cost-share applications and estimated water savings values	• Doesn't ensure savings goal will be met
• May help with funding	• Doesn't independently mandate completion of all projects listed
• Actual savings could be more easily determined	• May not be consistent with permittee's current CUP conservation plan

Funding Opportunities – This component identifies ongoing funding programs that support additional BMP implementation, and options for increasing the effectiveness of the existing programs. A funding website for the CFWI region could be developed listing: District, state, and federal funding opportunities; website links; approximate funding amounts; and deadlines for application. This website would be updated over time as information changes and opportunities develop. (See grants.gov for example.) Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, could be identified to increase water provider participation in existing cost-share programs. Active outreach by WMD staff to water users for cooperative funding could be promoted. Increased funding opportunities could be explored, such as increasing state appropriations for regional projects and priority consideration for funding to identified projects. Note: Increased funding to WMD cost-share programs could also result in additional conservation efforts. This would be an issue for individual Governing Boards to consider.

<table>
<tr><td align="center">PROS</td><td align="center">CONS</td></tr>
<tr><td>

- Helps rural and smaller governments enact worthwhile projects
- Makes it as easy as possible for funding/grant opportunities for conservation to be utilized
- Districts seeing increased funding applications when reaching out to utilities directly
- Will most likely increase user participation in funding opportunities
- Public/private partnerships may help with funding
- Inexpensive to just provide information

</td><td>

- Need buy-in from DEP and Districts to secure more funding
- Doesn't ensure that savings goal will be met
- Actual available funding may still be limited

</td></tr>
</table>

Regional Education and Outreach – This component includes coordinating with the CFWI Communications and Outreach Team, Districts and stakeholders on consistent public service announcements, e.g., billboards, commercials, mailings, and social media accounts. Methods could be explored to reach out to the public and permittees on general and specific water conservation issues. Methods may be explored to evaluate estimated conservation savings resulting from regional education and outreach to determine effectiveness. Mechanisms to fund regional education and outreach could be explored. Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, of utility development and implementation of conservation programs and in increasing the public's participation in conservation could be identified. Barriers and challenges, as well as solutions, of increasing agriculture producers' and utilities participation in conservation could be identified.

<table>
<tr><td align="center">PROS</td><td align="center">CONS</td></tr>
<tr><td>

- Proper messaging can help garner public support for all other conservation work being done
- Education can be effective in achieving water savings
- All water use types can benefit
- Directly and indirectly necessary to achieve more conservation
- May be very effective in terms of both costs and savings

</td><td>

- Water savings and cost effectiveness from education and outreach are difficult to measure
- Funding uncertain; can be very expensive
- Doesn't ensure that savings goal will be met
- Relies on voluntary end-user behavior modification

</td></tr>
</table>