

APPENDIX D

Ranking Process

RANKING PROCESS

Initial Question Screening

A series of eight specific questions are shown in the Initial Question Form (Table 2). Every Basin Plan issue submitted during the 2004 Triennial Review was screened using the Initial Questions. Any issue that produced a “yes” answer to questions A, B, or C received an initial ‘high’ priority and was later scored as described below. Any issue that produced a “yes” answer to questions D, E, F, G, or H were removed from further ranking. Any issue that answered “no” to all eight questions was put through the technical ranking process and scored.

Initial Questions A-H are:

A. Is the issue an administrative clarification or update to existing text in the Basin Plan?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue received an initial high rank because issues that would make the Basin Plan a current and correct document are considered a high priority.

If the answer was “no,” then question B was asked.

B. Is the issue a State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB), USEPA or court ordered mandate or is it required by State or federal statute?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue received an initial high rank because the SWRCB, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, or the court has mandated that the Regional Board address the issue through a Basin Plan amendment.

If the answer was “no,” then question C was asked.

C. Does the issue involve designating beneficial uses or water quality objectives for waterbody(ies) previously unidentified or unnamed in the Basin Plan?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue received an initial high rank because identification of previously unidentified or unnamed waterbody(ies) was given high priority by the Regional Board to ensure that the Basin Plan is a current and correct document.

If the answer was “no,” then question D was asked.

D. Is the issue a TMDL?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue was removed from consideration because Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) projects are addressed with TMDL program resources and not Basin Plan resources.

If the answer was “no,” then question E was asked.

E. Can the issue be addressed by a Regional Board program without a Basin Plan amendment?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue was removed from consideration because it does not require a basin plan amendment and can be investigated under a different Regional Board program.

If the answer was “no,” then question F was asked.

F. Does the issue fall primarily under the purview of another regulatory agency thus not requiring a basin plan amendment?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue was removed from consideration because the issue can be addressed by a regulatory agency other than the Regional Board, and does not require a basin plan amendment.

If the answer was “no,” then question G was asked.

G. Has the issue already been addressed or project completed?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue was removed from consideration because no further investigation is needed and a basin plan amendment is not required.

If the answer was “no,” then question H was asked.

H. Is the proposed change to the Basin Plan prohibited by State or federal laws or regulations?

If the answer was “yes,” then the issue was removed from consideration because a Basin Plan amendment to effect the proposed change to the Basin Plan amendment would violate applicable State and federal laws and regulations.

If the answer was “no,” then the issue was forwarded to the technical ranking process. Issues forwarded to the technical ranking process answered “no” to all eight initial questions.

Technical Ranking

Any issue not ranked ‘high’ or removed by the *Initial Questions* was evaluated and scored using the technical ranking criteria. The Technical Ranking Form (Table 3) shows the criteria used in this evaluation. The technical ranking criteria are made up of eleven categories. Each category has specific factors that reflect important considerations regarding the need to investigate an issue for a Basin Plan amendment.

Technical Ranking Categories

The technical ranking categories addressed the core elements of an effective Basin Plan: accurate designation of beneficial uses, scientifically based water quality objectives and effective implementation plans and policies for achieving the water quality objectives (see CWC section 13050(j)). The technical ranking categories also include other factors such as public interest in the issue, the geographic scope of the issue (i.e. did the issue address a single water body or multiple water bodies region-wide), and the perceived impact on water quality that would result from adoption of a basin plan amendment pertaining to the issue.

The specific categories included in the Technical Ranking Form (Table 3) are:

Category 1: *Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies.* Identified and scored issues that addressed conformance with SWRCB plans and policies.

Category 2: *Beneficial Uses.* Identified and scored issues that addressed the addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use.

Category 3: *Water Quality Objective.* Identified and scored issues that addressed the addition, modification, or deletion of a water quality objective.

Category 4: *Implementation – Policy.* Identified and scored issues that addressed addition or modification of a Basin Plan implementation policy.

Category 5: *Implementation – Discharge Prohibition.* Identified and scored issues that addressed addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.

Category 6: *Implementation – Monitoring Strategy.* Identified and scored issues that addressed addition or modification to a water quality monitoring strategy.

Category 7: Stakeholder/Partnership Resources. Identified and scored issues that included a commitment of stakeholder resources towards collection, coordination, or development of water quality data.

Category 8: Geographic Scope. Identified and scored the level of impact the issue will have ranging from a single water bodies region-wide.

Category 9: Significance of Water Quality Issue. Identified and scored issues that addressed aspects of water quality not found explicitly in the Water Code definition and not directly addressed in Categories 1 - 8.

Category 10: Social Considerations. Identified and scored issues that addressed the social aspects of water quality.

Category 11: Other Considerations. Identified and scored issues that were well thought out, and have public, Regional Board, SWRCB, or USEPA support.

Technical Ranking Factors

The specific factors contained in each category included the following:

Category 1 - Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies contained two factors:

- 1a. *Issue described a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with SWRCB plan or policy*
- 1b. *Issue described how SWRCB plan or policy is implemented within the San Diego Region.*

This category ranked issues pertaining to the following formally adopted SWRCB plans and policies:

- A. California Ocean Plan.
- B. California Thermal Plan.
- C. Statewide Water Quality Control Plan – Inland Surface Waters Plan (ISWP) and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan (EBEP).
- D. Implementation Policy (Phase 1 of ISWP/EBEP).
- E. Brownfields Policy.
- F. State Policy for Water Quality Control (1972).
- G. Areas of Special Biological Significance - Resolution No. 74-28.
- H. Pollutant Policy Document.
- I. Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California - Resolution No. 95-84.
- J. Water Quality Control Policy on the Use and Disposal of Inland Waters used for Power Plant Cooling – Resolution No. 75-58.
- K. Water Quality Enforcement Policy Resolution No. 2002-0040.
- L. Maintain High Quality Water – Resolution No. 68-16.

- M. Policy Regarding Water Reclamation – Resolution No. 77-1.
- N. Sources of Drinking Water Policy – Resolution No. 88-63.
- O. Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement Policy – Resolution No. 92-49.
- P. Policy on the Disposal of Shredder Waste - Resolution No. 87-22.
- Q. Nonpoint Source Management Plan - Resolution No. 88-123.

Factor 1a identifies an issue that addressed some aspect of the Basin Plan that needs to be changed to conform with a SWRCB plan or policy. This type of change would typically be the result of a recently modified SWRCB plan or policy or adoption of a new SWRCB plan or policy. Factor 1b identifies an issue that would clarify how a SWRCB plan or policy is applied specifically in the San Diego Region.

Category 2 - *Beneficial Uses* contained three factors:

- 2a. *Issue described water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).*
- 2b. *Issue described water quality information that indicated a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).*
- 2c. *Issue described revision of a beneficial use definition.*

This category was used to rank issues involving designation of a new beneficial use, modification of an existing beneficial use, or deletion of a beneficial use. Factor 2a was used to rank issues where the need for a beneficial use change is supported by water quality data. Factor 2b identified issues where the need for a beneficial use change is supported by information but water quality data is lacking. Factor 2c was used to rank issues that involve a revision to a beneficial use definition.

Category 3 - *Water Quality Objectives* contained four factors:

- 3a. *Issue described a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).*
- 3b. *Issue described water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).*
- 3c. *Issue described water quality information that indicated a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).*
- 3d. *Issue described change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).*

Factor 3a was used to rank issues that addressed a change in water quality criteria promulgated by USEPA or the latest scientific knowledge on the

identifiable effects of a pollutant that might trigger the need to modify an existing water quality objective or establish a new water quality objective. Factor 3b was used to rank issues that described the need to change a water quality objective based on water quality data. Factor 3c was used to rank issues that described the need to change a water quality objective based on information where actual data is lacking. Factor 3d was used to rank issues involving a change to a beneficial use designation or definition, which would trigger the need to change a water quality objective.

Category 4 - Implementation-Policy contained fourteen factors:

- 4a. Issue addressed identification of background water quality.*
- 4b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.*
- 4c. Issue addressed enforcement.*
- 4d. Issue addressed water reclamation.*
- 4e. Issue addressed non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.*
- 4f. Issue addressed waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.*
- 4g. Issue addressed issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.*
- 4h. Issue addressed issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.*
- 4i. Issue addressed issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.*
- 4j. Issue addressed establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.*
- 4k. Issue addressed criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.*
- 4l. Issue addressed specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.*
- 4m. Issue described/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.*
- 4n. Issue addressed development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.*

This category was based on Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the SWRCB Administrative Procedures Manual, which described a generalized list of 14 implementation programs that may be used to ensure attainment of water quality objectives and protection of beneficial uses. This category was used to rank issues that involved an implementation plan modification of the Basin Plan.

Category 5 - *Implementation-Discharge Prohibition* contained two factors:

- 5a. Issue involved addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.*
- 5b. Issue established criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.*

California Water Code section 13243 provides that Regional Boards may specify certain conditions or areas in the Basin Plan where the discharge of waste, or certain types of waste, is not permitted. This category was used to rank issues that involved addition, modification, or deletion of a Basin Plan discharge prohibition. Factor 5a addressed issues that described the addition of a new discharge prohibition, or the modification or deletion of an existing prohibition. Factor 5b addressed issues that described establishing exceptions to a prohibition.

Category 6 – *Implementation-Monitoring Strategy* contained four factors:

- 6a. Issue described ambient monitoring strategy.*
- 6b. Issue described the types of self-monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.*
- 6c. Issue described special project monitoring.*
- 6d. Issue described Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.*

This category was used to rank issues that involved addition, modification, or deletion of a Basin Plan implementation monitoring strategy. These four factors described the types of monitoring strategies developed to monitor waste discharges or ambient water quality described in the Basin Plan.

Category 7 - *Stakeholder/Partnership Resources*, contained one factor:

- 7a. Stakeholders proposed to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.*

This category was used to evaluate the degree to which stakeholders proposed to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed for the Regional Board to evaluate the issue and develop a Basin Plan amendment. Factor 7a addressed issues where the stakeholder presented completed studies or proposed to develop all technical studies to support the issue.

Category 8 - Geographic Scope contained three factors:

- 8a. Issue was of Region Wide scale.*
- 8b. Issue was of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale.*
- 8c. Issue was of single watershed/waterbody scale.*

This category was used to consider the geographic scale of an issue. Factor 8a was used to rank issues that addressed water quality on a region wide scale. Factor 8b was used to rank issues that addressed water quality in more than one hydrologic unit or watershed. Factor 8c was used to rank issues that addressed water quality in a single watershed or waterbody.

Category 9 - Significance of Water Quality Issue contained ten factors:

- 9a. Regional priority.*
- 9b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.*
- 9c. Public health issue.*
- 9d. Rare and endangered species.*
- 9e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)*
- 9f. Sensitive aquifer.*
- 9g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.*
- 9h. Waters with suspected impairment.*
- 9i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.*
- 9j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.*

Factor 9a addressed issues that directly effect one or more of the following regional priorities:

1. Ambient Monitoring for surface water
2. Beach closures
3. Loss of aquatic habitat
4. Degradation of municipal and domestic groundwater supplies
5. Complaint response and follow-up
6. Development of TMDLs
7. CEQA document reviews
8. Establishment of San Diego Bay sediment cleanup levels

Factor 9b was used to rank issues that pertained to one or more of the 26 key strategic projects identified in the SWRCB Strategic Plan. The 26 key strategic projects are:

1. Employee training and Retention – Develop and implement employee training and retention programs that ensure employees have the tools and support they need to be successful. Develop technical training programs related to Regional Board activities.

2. E-Government – Develop and implement a comprehensive e-Government Plan that identifies key initiatives related to providing services to employees, other agencies, and watershed interests through the Water Boards’ Intranet and Internet. These initiatives will be selected based on their ability to improve services and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Board Members and staff. Incorporate education and outreach components identified through the Public Education and Outreach Project.
3. Priority Setting – Establish priority setting processes at the State and Regional Board levels to facilitate use of limited funds for the highest priority efforts. Develop the criteria that will be used on a consistent basis to guide priority setting. Develop the supporting processes to help re-prioritize when changes occur due to funding or program challenges.
4. Watershed Management – Identify, and whenever possible, resolve internal constraints within the State and Regional Boards that may inhibit implementation of the watershed management approach. The intent of this project is to focus on how best to facilitate broader implementation of watershed management throughout the State and Regional Boards.
5. Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Initiative – Develop and implement a plan to achieve measurable and continuing increases in the rate of compliance with State and federal laws.
6. Environmental Justice – Develop and implement a plan to integrate Environmental Justice activities into all State and Regional Board programs areas.
7. Cross Media/Cross-Organizational – Facilitate coordination of individual Cal/EPA BDO and Resource Agency departmental approaches. Track, monitor and report on the effectiveness of cross-media/cross-organizational efforts.
8. Employee Recruitment – Develop a recruitment plan and supporting processes that ensure we have the depth and breadth of employees we need to fulfill our program obligations.
9. Employee Innovation – Develop processes that will help encourage and reward the development and implementation of innovative ideas generated by employees.

10. Nonpoint Source (NPS) – Help dischargers implement and understand management measures that prevent NPS pollution. Educate Californians about their role in preventing NPS pollution. Coordinate and facilitate the efforts of other State agencies that have NPS authorities, programs and responsibilities to product an effective statewide NPS program.
11. Listing of Impaired Water Bodies – Evaluate readily available information and generate a list of waters that are not attaining water quality standards. Update the existing 303(d) listing. Develop an early intervention list for waters outside of the 303(d) list.
12. TMDL Development and Implementation – Develop TMDLs for specific water body and pollutant combinations. Establish an offset program. Operate within planning schedules identified by the 303(d) list and Watershed Management Initiative (WMI) Chapters.
13. Cross-Border – Support the Cal/EPA Boarder Initiative focused on the California/Mexico Boarder. Focus on restoring and protecting public health and the environment of the Boarder region with specific focus on the Tijuana River, the New River, Pacific Ocean off San Diego County, Tecate Creek, and the Alamo River. Provide technical assistance to the State of Baja California.
14. Clean Beaches – Develop and implement a comprehensive Clean Beaches Initiative Plan that incorporates a watershed approach. The plan includes distribution of funding for local assistance projects aimed at reducing pathogen contamination at beaches. It also includes development of a rapid indicator that will reduce the time lag between detecting bacterial indicators and communicating details of the health risk to the public. Future research goals include development of source identification tools. This project will help protect public health at ocean beaches. By doing so, we will protect the local economy dependent upon tourism, and the quality of life for beach going Californians.
15. Effluent Dominated Waters - Determine how to provide protection of water quality in effluent dominated waters (EDWs). Provide guidance and, if appropriate, a SWRCB policy for water quality control, or Regional Board basin plan amendments.
16. Drinking Water Well – Enable stakeholders to review trends in drinking water well data and assess the susceptibility of drinking water resources with respect to real and potential threats to groundwater. Help water purveyors and private well owners understand their next

steps to ensure drinking water quality. Prioritize Board regulatory, clean-up and pollution prevention actions.

17. Septic Systems – Pursuant to AB 885, assess impacts and develop siting, design, construction and performance standards for on-site wastewater disposal systems. Focus on failing, reconstructed and new systems, and those subject to major repair.
18. Seawater Intrusion – Fund projects to stabilize groundwater basins or reverse seawater intrusion through means such as water conservation, water reclamation, or other local water supply development to reduce groundwater pumping or recharge over drafted aquifers. Seek funding to leverage local efforts in the Salinas Valley to halt and potentially reverse seawater intrusion.
19. Brownfields – Develop a process to locate and track groundwater cleanup sites, so those sites in recognized Brownfields may be easily identified. Coordinate efforts with Department of Toxic Substances Control.
20. Water Rights Improvement – Develop and implement improvements to the application, hearing, compliance, and licensing components of the water rights process.
21. Water Transfer – Prepare a guide to inform all stakeholders of the appropriate analyses and procedures related to the water transfer process.
22. Water Recycling – Allocate Proposition 13 grant funds to support the construction of new recycling facilities, increasing the number of water recycling projects. Allocate grant funds to support water recycling research that will identify technology and processes to effectively detect and remove problem constituents, making water safe for reuse at the lowest cost. Work collaboratively with grantees to help assure the public that water is safe for reuse.
23. Water Quality/Water Rights Coordination – Facilitate coordination, communication, and data sharing among the SWRCB Divisions and the Regional Boards. Ensure that State and Regional Board actions are in accord and do not result in unintended impacts on other Board efforts.
24. Public Education/Outreach – Develop and implement a comprehensive public education/outreach plan that helps individuals understand the effect of their actions and/or inaction on water quality and their responsibility to help maintain water quality. The plan will detail how

the State and Regional Boards will work with local, state, and private entities to leverage best practices and share resources (e.g. coordinate development of materials, obtain best practices examples from other states). The plan will also highlight education/outreach efforts focuses on environmental justice.

25. Surface Water Ambient Monitoring – Coordinate surface water monitoring efforts so that they are comprehensive, non-duplicative, and appropriately funded. Create an ambient monitoring program that addressed all hydrologic units of the State using: consistent and objective monitoring, sampling, and analytical methods; consistent data quality assurance protocols; and centralized data management. Document ambient water quality conditions in potentially clean and polluted areas. The scale of these assessments ranges from site-specific to statewide. Identify specific water quality problems preventing the State and Regional Board and the public from realizing the beneficial uses of water in targeted watersheds.
26. Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment – Facilitate coordination, communication, and data sharing among various groundwater programs and agencies. Compile groundwater information and data widely so that it can be used by multiple programs and agencies, and is accessible to all stakeholders. Assess groundwater susceptibility.
27. System for Water Information Management (SWIM 2) – Provide automated tools and standardized business processes to improve the State and Regional Boards’ ability to enhance and preserve the quality of the state’s waters. This will be done by building a comprehensive, integrated, appropriately accessible system with consistent, reliable data. The system will expand existing system capabilities to include licensing and monitoring programs. It will automate manual processes, allowing electronic submissions of reports and importing of relevant data. It will make data Internet accessible. The system will provide tools for integrated watershed assessment and management. The system will also include the functionality currently included in the Geographic Environmental Information Management System – (GEMS (also known as Geo Tracker).

Factor 9c through 9h were used to rank issues that may lead to Basin Plan amendments that have a direct positive effect on public health, rare and endangered species, ASBS, sensitive aquifer(s), waterbody(ies) listed on the CWA 303(d) list for impairment, and waters with suspected impairment. Factor 9i was used to rank issues related to a TMDL currently under development by the Regional Board. Factor 9j was used

to rank issues that may lead to Basin Plan amendments that have a positive direct effect on a water body actively used as a drinking water supply.

Category 10 - *Social Considerations* included five factors:

- 10a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.*
- 10b. Water body intensively used by the public.*
- 10c. Environmental Justice.*
- 10d. Water reclamation.*
- 10e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.*

Factors in category 10 were developed to incorporate social considerations into the ranking process. Factor 10a evaluated the level of public acceptability of the issue and its outcome. Factor 10b evaluated the significance of the water body addressed by the issue. Factor 10c evaluated waterbodies in lower socioeconomic locations of the San Diego region affected by the issue. Factor 10d evaluated the issue’s effect on water reclamation. Factor 10e evaluated the issue’s effect on waterbodies with exceptional recreation or ecological significance.

Category 11 - *Other Considerations* included three factors:

- 11a. Proposal presentation.*
- 11b. Proposal readiness.*
- 11c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.*

Factor 11a was used to evaluate issues that are well thought out with clearly presented goals and objectives. Factor 11b was used to evaluate issues that are not only well presented but supported by relevant data. Factor 11c was used to evaluate issues that are supported by more than one interested party.

Score Equation

The score equation used for Categories 1-6 on the *Technical Ranking Form* (Table 3) is:

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Applicability +	Improve Basin Plan	* Regional Board Mission	= Score

Column 1 on the *Technical Ranking Form* contains the first variable of the score equation called Applicability. Each issue was reviewed and a determination was made as to the appropriate category and the most applicable factor within the category. The most

applicable factor scored one point, the remaining factors within a category were not scored. Once an applicable factor was scored the evaluation continued on to Column 2. Column 2 contained the second variable of the score equation called Improve Basin Plan. Points were scored based on the degree to which such a basin plan amendment would improve the Basin Plan. Five points were given to issues that would highly improve the Basin Plan. Three points were given for a medium improvement and one point was given to an issue that would provide little improvement to the Basin Plan. Zero points were given to issues that provided no improvement to the Basin Plan. Column 3 on the *Technical Ranking Form* contains the third variable of the Score equation called Regional Board Mission. Points were given for the degree to which the issue supported our mission statement:

Our mission is to preserve, enhance and restore the quality of California’s water resources, and ensure their proper allocation and efficient use for the benefit of present and future generations.

A score of 5 points were given to issues that would highly conform to our mission, three points were given for medium conformance, and one point was given to issues that had low conformance. Points from Column 1 and Column 2 were added together and then multiplied by the points awarded in Column 3. The results were recorded in Column 4.

The score equation for Categories 7-11 on the *Technical Ranking Form* (Table 3) is:

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Applicability			= Score

Categories 7-11 addressed other perspectives for scoring the issues including public interest in the issue, the geographic scope of the issue, and the perceived impacts on water quality that would result from adoption of a Basin Plan amendment pertaining to the issue. Points were given based only on the applicability of each factor. Scores were based on a scale of 5, 3, 1, or zero for high agreement/yes, medium agreement, low agreement or an answer of no, respectively. Improvement to the Basin Plan and conformance with the Regional Board mission statement were not used in the score of these points.

The sums of all points awarded in the eleven categories were the total scores and recorded at the bottom of Column 4. The individual score sheets for the issues that were scored with the *Technical Ranking Form* can be found in Appendix F.

Assignment of Numeric Scores to Generalized Ranks

After scores had been assigned to those issues that went through the technical ranking process, the point scores were evaluated and point ranges for generalized ranks of high, medium, low were established. The resulting point ranges are described in the matrix below.

Point Ranges	Generalized Rank
≥ 100	High
70-99	Medium
≤ 69	Low

Assigning Scores to Issues Determined to be High Priorities Based on Initial Questions A, B, or C.

The issues that were determined to be high priorities under Initial Questions A, B, or C were evaluated a second time in order to assign them a numerical score and determine their relative rank. This step was necessary because so many issues (25 of 62) were determined to be a high priority based on Initial Questions A, B and C. Numerical scores had to be assigned to these issues so they could be ranked relative to each other and to the issues that were scored in the technical ranking process.

Using best professional judgment, each of these issues were re-assigned a generalized ranking of high, medium or low, and assigned the lowest numeric score of the category. An issue assigned a high general rank received a base score of 100, an issue assigned a medium general rank received a base score of 70, and an issue assigned a low general rank received a base score of zero. Additional points were added to the base score in consideration of several factors including 1) the benefit the Regional Board would derive from a Basin Plan Amendment on the issue, 2) the Regional Board’s legal authority to adopt a Basin Plan amendment on the issue, 3) the geographic scale of the issue (i.e. affects single waterbody or waterbodies region wide), and 4) the perceived level of public interest in the issue.

A completed Initial Question Form for each issue that received an initial ‘high’ priority is in Appendix E. Technical Ranking Forms were not completed for these issues.