

APPENDIX F

Completed Technical Ranking Forms

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 23
Issue Name: Beneficial Use of San Diego Formation
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board and 1998 Triennial Review

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form..

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0
j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	1			1
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	3			3
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	5			5
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	1		1
Total Score			76

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because completion of this issue would more accurately reflect the beneficial uses of the deeper water resource in the San Diego Formation. Regional Board Mission scored high because if this project was completed it would be protective of beneficial uses now and for future water resources. Category 3 factor (d) also applies because modification of a beneficial use triggers a need to modify water quality objectives. Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission scored the same in the Category 3 as they did in Category 2 for the same reasons discussed above. Category 7 factor (a) was scored due to the repeated interest in this issue expressed by the San Diego County Water Authority and the Sweetwater Authority. Category 9 factor (f) was scored because completion of this issue would directly address and/or impact sensitive aquifers in those basins underlain San Diego Formation. Category 11 factor (b) was scored because the SDCWA and Sweetwater Authority have prepared technical reports on this issue.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 46
Issue Name: Beneficial Uses along the Southern Boundary of the Salt Creek Area
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: Otay Mesa Ventures II, LLC

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	1	1	2
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	5			5
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			10

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored low because the issue does not contribute to a more true and accurate Basin Plan. Regional Board Mission scored low because completion of this issue is not consistent with the Regional Boards mission. Category 7 factor (a) scored high based on past experience that the issue proponent would supply all technical documents. The issue was proposed in 1992 and denied by the Regional Board because it failed to provide sufficient technical evidence to support deletion of water quality beneficial uses in the affected area. Category 11 factor (a) scored low because no technical information or data was submitted with the issue. Category 11 factor (b) scored low because this issue submittal was not well developed and did not contain well defined end points.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 12
Issue Name: Beneficial Use for a REC-1 Subcategory
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	1	5	5	30
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs and NPDES permits for discharges from non point sources to navigable waters, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	5			5
c. Public health issue.	5			5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			109

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because completion of this issue would more accurately reflect the attainable use of the receiving water. Regional Board Mission scored high because completion of the issue is consistent with the Regional Board Mission. Category 9 factors (a) and (b) were scored because this issue corresponds to identified Regional Board priorities and projects identified in the SWRCB strategic plan (See Staff Report). Category 9 factors (g) and (i) were scored because the issue would affect a 303d listed waterbody(ies) and addresses a TMDL under development by the Regional Board. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because of the high level of public interest in this issue. Category 10 factor (b) and (e) were scored because completion of this issue would have a positive affect on a receiving water intensely used by the public and one that has exceptional ecological significance. Category 11 factor (b) scored low because data is available for consideration but it has not been developed yet.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 45
Issue Name: Beneficial Uses of Shallow "Urban" Ground Water
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: Environmental Business Solutions

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	1	1	2
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	1	1	2
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			16

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. This Regional Board has amended the basin plan before regarding this issue but on a case by case basis. Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission scored low because although this issue would improved accuracy of the Basin Plan it would not delineate the precise locations for application. Category 3 factor (c) applies because change to a beneficial use can require a change in water quality objectives. Category 9 did not score at all because this issue was too vague and specific water bodies were not identified. Category 10 factor (a) scored a high because there is some assumed level of public interest. Category 11 factor (a) and (b) scored low because the proposal did not describe specific endpoint with defined outcomes.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 44
Issue Name: Beneficial Uses Designated in Chollas Creek
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: City of San Diego

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	3	1	4
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	3	1	4
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			21

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored medium because if the proposal is true for a segment of Chollas Creek it would make the Basin Plan a more accurate document. The proposal would trigger the need for a Use Attainability Analysis (UAA). The burden for providing the UAA would rest with the project proponent. Regional Board Mission scored low because beneficial uses are presumed to be accurate until information is submitted to document otherwise. The Regional Board conducted field observations in 2002 during TMDL development identifying WARM and WILD beneficial uses in the Creek. Category 3 factor (c) also applies because modification of a beneficial use designation triggers a need to modify the water quality objectives for the receiving water. Identical scores were assigned under Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission for the same reasons list under Category 2 factor (b). Category 9 factors (g) and (i) were scored because Chollas Creek is on the 303d list of impaired waterbodies. Category 10 factor (a) and (c) were scored because there is significant political interest the water quality requirements of Chollas Creek and Chollas Creek is in an environmental justice area of San Diego County. Category 11 factors (a) and (b) scored low because the issue lacks detail and supportive evidence.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 32
Issue Name: Beneficial Use of Ground Water Recharge (GWR) in the San Luis Rey River Watershed
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: City of Oceanside and San Luis Rey Municipal Water District

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	3			3
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	5			5
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	5			5

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	5		5
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	1		1
Total Score			61

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because completion of this issue would more accurately reflect the uses of ground water making the Basin Plan a more true and accurate document. Regional Board Mission scored high because if this project was completed it would be protective of beneficial uses now and in the future. Category 7 factor (a) scored medium because the City of Oceanside and San Luis Rey Water District have already submitted technical document to the Regional Board. Category 9 factor (f) was scored because the aquifer beneath the San Luis Rey River has been designated as a sensitive aquifer area by DHS. Category 10 factor (j) was scored because ground waters are currently being used for drinking water. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because there is an interest in this issue by area water purveyors. Category 10 factor (d) was scored because reclaimed water may be used to recharge the basin. Category 11 factor (b) was scored because the City of Oceanside and San Luis Rey MWD have prepared technical reports on this issue.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 47

Issue Name: Beneficial Uses of Loveland and Sweetwater Reservoirs

Category: Beneficial Use

Submitted By: Sweetwater Authority

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

Criteria	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	
	1	2	3	S c o r e
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	0	1	1
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	0	1	1
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	
	1	2	3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	5			5

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	0		0
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			9

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored a zero and Regional Board Mission scored a low because a drinking water reservoir should be able to meet REC-1 standards regardless of any activity restrictions placed on the reservoir. Category 3 factor (c) also applies, Improve Basin Plan scored a zero and Regional Board Mission scored a zero for the same reasons described above. Category 9 factor (j) was scored because it would impact drinking water supplies. Category 11 factor (a) scored low because the issue was not well defined. Category 11 factor (c) scored zero because it was only submitted by one party.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 43
Issue Name: Designation of South San Diego Bay as an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
Category: Beneficial Use
Submitted By: Environmental Health Coalition

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	3	3	12
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits, including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	5			5
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			30

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve the Basin Plan scored medium because the specific area would benefit from the extra layer of regulation provided by ASBS. Regional Board Mission ranked medium because the issue is consistent with the Regional Boards Mission. Category 8 factor (c) was scored because the issue covers a single watershed/waterbody. Category 9 factor (e) was scored because this issue is likely to deal with rare and endangered species. Category 10 factors (b) and (e) were scored because the issue deals with waters intensively used by the public and waters of outstanding statewide significance, and waters of exceptional recreation, or ecological significance. This issue did not contain detailed information or related data therefore it scored low in Category 11 factor (a) and (b).

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 22
Issue Name: Section 401 Water Quality Certification Policy and Procedures
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board and UCSD Natural Reserve System

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

Criteria	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	
	1	2	3	S c o r e
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	1	5	5	30
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	5			5
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	5		5
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	1		1
Total Score			79

Discussion

Category 4 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored because completion of this issue would provide greater detail in the basin plan to the regulated community. Regional Board Mission scored high because when the regulated community is well informed they know exactly what is expected of them to protect water quality. Category 9 factor (a) was scored because the 401 certification program was identified as an applicable program under the "loss of aquatic habitat" regional priority. Category 9 factors (d, g, and h) were scored because the 401 certification process occurs within sensitive waterbodies, most often on the 303d list for impairment and if not on the 303d list for impairment the water bodies are suspected for impairment. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because much of the regulated community is affected by the 401 certification program and public interest is high. Category 10 factor (b) was scored because this issue affects waterbodies intensively used by the public. Category 10 factor (e) was scored because the 401 certification program directly impacts waters of exceptional ecological significance. Category 11 factor (b) scored high because anytime the Regional Board turns regulatory practice into policy it benefits the discharge by clarifying what is required and promotes consistent application of the requirements by Regional Board staff.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 30
Issue Name: Seasonal Opening of Coastal Lagoon Mouths
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	1	5	5	30
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			64

Discussion

Category 4 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission scored high because completion of this issue would put into place a Regional Board policy that documents the requirements for protection of water quality and aquatic life during the operation of opening the mouth of a lagoon. Anytime the Regional Board clarifies a process for obtaining requirements the discharger benefits by having clear direction on what is required and the Regional Board benefits by being able to apply the requirements consistently. Category 9 factors (g and h) were scored because most lagoons are on the 303d list for impairment or are suspected for impairment but don't yet have the data to support listing them. Category 10 factors (a, b, and e) were scored because of the level of recreation around lagoons and beaches and the significant wildlife present within a lagoon environment. Category 11 factor (b) scored low because this project has not been developed, therefore significant work may be required to complete it.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 33
Issue Name: General Stream Flow Diversion and In-Stream Treatment Policy
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	1	3	3	12
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	5			5
c. Public health issue.	5			5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			56

Discussion

Category 4 factor (m) applies. This issue would clarify the implementation of water quality objectives in a stream when REC-1 standards can not be met and an emergency human health issue exists. This issue scored medium under Improve Basin Plan because a policy regarding this issue is not required to get compliance with water quality objectives but provides clarification to the regulated community. The benefit of this issue is to clarify the terms under which an interim exception can be made to meeting REC-1 beneficial use criteria for purposes of protecting public health at the downstream end of the watershed. This issue scored medium under Regional Board Mission because in order to protect public health and water quality at the bottom of the watershed (the Pacific Ocean) stream flow diversions cause a temporary impact to ecological life. Category 9 factors (a) and (b) were scored because implementation of flow diversion policy would recognize the most pressing water quality and human health issue by laying out conditions under which a diversion would be permissible. Category 9 factors (g) and (i) were scored because stream flow diversion would directly impact 303d listed waterbodies and waterbodies currently under review by the TMDL program for bacteria impairment. Category 10 factors (a) and (b) were scored because of the impacts this issue will have on public beaches. Category 11 factor (b) scored low because the issue did not describe the work required to develop the policy.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 34
Issue Name: Constructed Wetlands Policy
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	1	5	5	30
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			51

Discussion

Category 4 factor (m) applies. Improve Basin plan scored high because completion of the issue would allow more precision when applying water quality objectives. Regional Board Mission scored high because a basin plan amendment that clarifies for the discharger and Regional Board staff what is required to protect water quality from a particular discharge promotes clear communication and an understanding of the requirements early in the permitting process. Completion of this issue would clarify the requirements for a natural wetland and one that is constructed for the sole purpose of best management practices (BMPs). It would identify what water quality objectives and beneficial uses would apply to a constructed wetland for the purposes of BMPs. Category 9 factor (g) was scored because this issue would affect waterbodies listed on the 303d list for impairment because wetlands are typically constructed to mitigate impacts to the impaired waterbody from the discharge. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because the regulated community involved with stormwater and SUSMP requirements would be affected by this amendment. Category 11 factor (b) scored medium because the entire complexity of this issue may not be apparent at the time of the basin plan amendment.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 20
Issue Name: Pollution Prevention Policy
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Environmental Health Coalition

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	1	5	5	30
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score				S c o r e
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission		
	1	2	3		
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0				
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)					
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0				0
8. Geographic Scope					
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5				5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0				0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0				0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)					
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:					
a. Regional priority.	0				0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0				0
c. Public health issue.	5				5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0				0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	5				5
f. Sensitive aquifer.	5				5
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5				5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5				5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0				0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	5				5

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	5		5
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	1		1
Total Score			84

Discussion

Category 4 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because it is the Regional Board's philosophy to prevent pollution rather than treat it at the end of the pipe. Regional Board Mission scored high because pollution prevention is a large part of our mission. Category 9 factor (c) was scored because public health is greatly affected by urban runoff and pollution prevention would help educate the public. Category 9 factor (g) and (h) were scored because this policy would help prevent pollutants from getting into 303d listed waterbodies and those suspected for impairment. Category 9 factor (f) and (j) were scored because if this policy was followed then all receiving water would benefit. Category 9 factor (e) was scored because urban runoff is an issue for ASBS locations. Category 10 factor (a) and (b) were scored because preventing pollution will have a positive impact on all receiving waters. Category 11 factor (b) scored high because this issue was worked on before, most of the documents are already prepared thus minimal work would be required to complete the issue.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 48
Issue Name: Desalinization Plants
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: Sierra Club

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	1	1	1	2
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	1		1
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			5

Discussion

Category 4 factor (I) applies. This issue would involve an amendment to the Basin Plan to add desalination plants to Chapter 4 as one of the industrial waste generators that contribute significant impacts to water quality in the San Diego region. This issue scored low in all scored categories because there is only one desalination plant in the San Diego region and it is only at the pilot project stage. Identifying desalination plants as a significant industrial discharger during this Triennial Review period is premature.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 11
Issue Name: Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Management Plan and Water Quality Objective for Chloride
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: County of San Diego

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	1	5	5	30
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	5			5
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	5		5
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	5		5
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	5		5
Total Score			110

Discussion

Category 3 factor (b) and Category 4 factor (m) applies. This issue scored in both categories because adoption of a TDS Management Plan may cause modification of water quality objective(s). Evaluation of the chloride water quality objective is a component of this issue. Improve Basin Plan scored high in both categories because the issue would change the Basin Plan so that it accurately reflects designation of the total dissolved solids (TDS) water quality objective. Regional Board Mission scored high in both categories because a more accurate reflection of the TDS water quality objective would allow for a more true protection of water quality and its beneficial use. Category 9 factor (a) was scored because this issue is consistent with the Regional Boards priority on reclamation. Category 9 factor (g) was scored because waters have been listed on the 303(d) list for impairment due to TDS. Category 9 factor (h) was scored because waters affected by this issue may be suspected of impairment for TDS, but there was not enough information to actually list the waterbody. Category 10 factor (a) and (b) were scored because this issue is expected to attract significant public interest and because this issue will affect waterbodies intensively used by the public. Category 11 factors (a), (b), and (c) were scored because this issue was well presented, well developed, and submitted by more than two individual

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 27
Issue Name: Erosion and Sediment Control Policy
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: USEPA Region 9

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	1	5	5	30
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	1		1
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			71

Discussion

Category 4 factor (m) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because completion of this issue would provide greater clarification to the regulated community and Regional Board staff on how turbidity standards are implemented, what measures are used to control turbidity when standards are exceeded, and would state the clear goal of attaining the turbidity standard and the clean sediment criteria. Regional Board Mission scored high because a more accurate reflection of the turbidity standard would allow for a more true protection of water quality and its beneficial uses. Category factors 9 (g) and (h) were scored because sediment is the reason most of the waterbodies in the San Diego Region became listed for impairment. Category 9 factor (i) was scored because the Regional Board received a grant to start work on a TMDL to address sedimentation in coastal lagoons. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because of interest this issue will generate from the stormwater regulated community and the interest of USEPA. Category 10 factor (b) was scored because of the high recreational use of coastal lagoons which are impacted by sediment. Category 10 factor (e) was scored because the Regional Board considers its few coastal lagoons as areas with exceptional ecological significance. Category 11 factor (a) scored high because the goals of this issue were clearly stated and the outcome is clear. Category 11 factor (b) scored low due to the lack of data on this issue.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 42
Issue Name: Precautionary Principle
Category: Implementation Plan
Submitted By: Environmental Health Coalition

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	1	1	5	10
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	5			5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			5
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	0		0
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	5		5
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			35

Discussion

Category 4 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan ranked low because State Board Resolution No. 68-16 already requires that high quality waters of the State be maintained to the maximum extent possible. The Precautionary Principal Policy, in principal, already exists in the Basin Plan. Improve Basin Plan scored low because this issue would improve the Basin Plan minimally. Regional Board Mission scored high because the precautionary principal would protect water quality now and in the future. Category 9 factor (c) was scored because implementation of this principal would help obtain good scientific data for risk assessments. Categoror 10 was not scored because the Regional Board has not been presented with this information before and it therefore has not generated interest. Category 11 factors (a) and (c) were scored high because of the well understood objective of this issue and its ease of implementation.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 28
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Floating Material
Issue Topic: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	5			5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	5		5
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			71

Discussion

Category 3 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because the Basin Plan is currently incomplete with regards to a water quality objective for trash. Clarification of the standard for receiving waters with regards to trash will make the Basin Plan a more true and accurate document. Regional Board Mission scored high because regulation of trash provides protection of the beneficial uses of the States waters now and for future generations. Category 9 factors (c) and (h); and Category 10 factors (a), (b), (c), and (e) were scored because trash on beaches and in many surface waters is a growing area of concern in our region. Category 11 factor (a) and (b) scored medium because the project does not require substantial additional work to complete. Other Regional Boards have developed water quality objectives for trash that can be used as a guide.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 26
Issue Name: Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI)
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board and USEPA Region 9

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

Criteria	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	S c o r e
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	3			3
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	5			5
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	5			5
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	1		1
Total Score			72

Discussion

Category 3 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because currently the water quality objectives are limited to water chemistry. The IBI incorporates an overall assessment of the waterbodies' health. Refinement of the IBI will improve the scientific accuracy and defensibility of regulatory actions with respect to the protection of beneficial uses. Having an objective that better reflects the health of the waterbody makes the Basin Plan a more true and correct document. Regional Board Mission scored high because providing a direct assessment of the waterbodies health allows the Regional Board to develop accurate numeric and narrative criteria, milestone, or endpoint to support the beneficial uses of the waterbody. Category 7 ranked medium because a large portion of the data on existing waterbody biological population is collected by citizen monitoring. Category 9 factors (d) and (e) were scored because the IBI will allow a better understanding of the biological community in a waterbody. Category 9 factors (g) and (h) were scored because the IBI would affect water bodies currently on the 303(d) list and those suspected of impairment. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because USEPA strongly supports the IBI concept and has prepared significant guidance on it. Category 11 factor (a) scored well defined endpoints and significant information was provided to allow a good understanding of the issue. Category 11 factor (b) scored medium due to the nature of the work that is required by this issue. Category 11 factor (c) scored low because this issue was supported by two interested parties.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 7
Issue Name: Water Quality Objectives for Bacteria Indicators
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: 1998 Triennial Review, County of Orange and USEPA Region 9

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	1	5	5	30
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	5			5
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	5		5
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	3		3
Total Score			141

Discussion

Category 2 factor (b) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because establishing a water quality objective for bacteria will provide the means to more accurately designate the REC-1 beneficial use. Regional Board Mission scored high because the Regional Board's ability to more accurately designate beneficial uses is consistent with the Regional Board's mission to preserve and enhance waters of the state. Category 3 factor (a) applies because USEPA has new criteria out for enterococcus and e-coli. Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission scored high for the same reasons as described under Category 2. Category 4 factor (m) also applies because the Regional Board would develop a policy for implementation of the water quality objective. Improve Basin Plan and Regional Board Mission scored high for the same reasons as described under Category 2 and 3. Category 9 factor (a) was scored because this issue has been identified by the Regional Board as a priority, factor (c) because addressing the bacteria issue would reduce the impacts to public health, factor (g) because bacteria is an issue in listed waterbodies, and factor (i) because a bacteria TMDL is underway. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because this issue has already received elevated public interest, factor (b) because the issues affects waterbodies intently used by the public (e.g. beaches), and factor (e) because the issue of impacts due to bacteria affects waters of outstanding statewide significance. Category 11 factor (b) scored high because the water quality objective is ready but the beneficial use section is not. Category 11 factor (c) score medium because the issue was submitted by three interested parties.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 25
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Hydromodification
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	
	1	2	3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	0			0
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	5			5
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	5			5
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	5			5
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	0			0
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:	0		0
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	5		5
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	0		0
Total Score			73

Discussion

Category 3 factor (b) applies and was chosen over category 3 factor (c) because the water quality objective for hydromodification would use the data available with the work conducted for development of Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI). Improve Basin Plan scored high because this issue takes into account physical as well as chemical impacts to beneficial uses. Regional Board Mission scored high because this issue gives the Regional Board another tool to protect beneficial uses and allows a more comprehensive evaluation of the health of the receiving water. Category 9 factor (a) was scored because it is consistent with the Regional Board priorities for protecting loss of aquatic habitat. Category 9 factors (d) and (e) would apply because the issue is protective of endangered species and would apply in areas designated as ASBS. Category 9 factors (g) and (h) were scored because the issue would likely impact waterbodies on the 303(d) list and other waters with suspected impairment. Category 10 factor (a) was scored because the Regional Board is aware of interest by the public in establishing an objective for hydromodification. Category 11 factor (a) scored high because this issue has well defined endpoints and significant information was provided to allow a good understanding of the issue. Category 11 factor (b) scored medium due to the nature of the work that is required by this issue.

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 24
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Nutrients in Surface Waters
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: County of Orange, USEPA Region 9, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Watermaster - Santa Margarita River Watershed

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			
	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	3			3
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	5			5
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	0			0
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	5			5
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	5			5
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:			
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	0		0
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	5		5
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	5		5
Total Score			74

Discussion

Category 3 factor (a) applies. Improve Basin Plan scored high because completion of this issue would make the Basin Plan a more true and accurate document. Regional Board Mission scored high because completion of this issue is consistent with the Regional Boards mission. Category 7 was scored based on the Regional Board's knowledge of some interested party groups within the Santa Margarita River Watershed that are active with regards to this issue. Category 9 factor (a) was scored because this issue is on the Regional Board Priority list. Category 9 factor (g) was scored because this issue would affect 303(d) listed waterbodies. Category 9 factor (i) was scored because this issue is related to a Regional Board TMDL currently underway. Category 10 factor (a) scored high because there is a lot of interest related to this issue throughout the environmental community. Category 10 factor (d) was scored because recycled water producers and purveyors may be impacted by this issue. Category 11 factor (a) and (b) were scored as medium because this issue lacked specifics. Category 11 factor (c) scored 5 because the issue was submitted by more than one interested party

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

Issue Number: 31
Issue Name: Water Quality Objective for Copper at Shelter Island Yatch Basin
Category: Water Quality Objective
Submitted By: Shelter Island Marina Owners and Operators

See Appendix D of the 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Report for a detailed description of the technical ranking form.

	(Column 1 + Column 2) x Column 3 =			Score
Criteria	Applicability	Improve Basin Plan	Regional Board Mission	S c o r e
	1	2	3	
	Yes - 1 No - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Not at All - 0	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low/No - 1	
1. Formally Adopted SWRCB Plans and Policies				
a. Issue describes a change needed to make Basin Plan conform with State Board plans or policies.	0			0
b. Issue describes how State Board plans or policies are implemented within the San Diego Region.	0			0
2. Beneficial Use				
a. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of a beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or a deletion of beneficial use designation(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes revision of a beneficial use definition.	0			0
3. Water Quality Objective				
a. Issue describes a change in water quality criteria indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
b. Issue describes water quality data indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
c. Issue describes water quality information that indicates a need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	1	5	5	30
d. Issue describes change in beneficial use designation or definition indicating need for addition, modification, or deletion of water quality objective(s).	0			0
4. Implementation - Policy				
a. Issue addresses identification of background water quality.	0			0
b. Issue clarifies existing Regional Board procedures or administration of regulatory programs.	0			0
c. Issue addresses enforcement.	0			0
d. Issue addresses water reclamation.	0			0
e. Issue addresses non-point source control programs including applicability and acceptance of management practices.	0			0
f. Issue addresses waiver policy amendment or update to the types of waivers granted.	0			0
g. Issue addresses issuance of NPDES permits including stormwater runoff permitting.	0			0
h. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges to groundwater.	0			0
i. Issue addresses issuance of WDRs for discharges of irrigated agricultural return flows.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

j. Issue addresses establishment of water quality based effluent limitations.	0			0
k. Issue addresses criteria for determining compliance with effluent limitations and water quality objectives.	0			0
l. Issue addresses specified types of discharges, including agricultural runoff, erosion control, and vessel waste.	0			0
m. Issue describes/clarifies implementation, application, or interpretation of water quality objectives.	0			0
n. Issue addresses development of a policy that provides guidance on development and implementation of a TMDL.	0			0
5. Implementation - Discharge Prohibition				
a. Issue involves addition, modification, or deletion of a discharge prohibition.	0			0
b. Issue establishes criteria under which exceptions to a prohibition may be granted.	0			0
6. Implementation - Monitoring Strategy				
a. Issue describes ambient monitoring strategy.	0			0
b. Issue describes the types of self monitoring required under WDRs and NPDES permits.	0			0
c. Issue describes special project monitoring.	0			0
d. Issue describes Regional Board compliance/inspection monitoring.	0			0

Criteria	Column 1 = Score			S c o r e
	Applicability 1	Improve Basin Plan 2	Regional Board Mission 3	
	High/Yes - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 No - 0			
7. Stakeholder/Partnership Resources (high, medium, low, no)				
a. Stakeholders propose to collect, coordinate, or develop all data, information, or technical studies needed to support issue.	5			5
8. Geographic Scope				
a. Issue is of Region Wide scale (5 pts).	0			0
b. Issue is of multiple Hydrologic Units/Watersheds scale (3 pts).	0			0
c. Issue is of single watershed/waterbody scale (1 pt).	1			1
9. Significance of Water Quality Issue (yes, no)				
Issue will directly address and/or impact one or more:				
a. Regional priority.	0			0
b. Key projects in SWRCB Strategic Plan.	0			0
c. Public health issue.	0			0
d. Rare and endangered species.	0			0
e. Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).	0			0
f. Sensitive aquifer.	0			0
g. CWA 303(d) listed waterbody.	0			0
h. Waters with suspected impairment.	0			0
i. Related to a TMDL currently under development.	5			5
j. Waters actively used for a drinking water supply.	0			0

2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review Technical Ranking Form

10. Social Considerations (yes, no)			
Level of:			
a. Public interest, community acceptability, political interest.	5		5
Issue will directly address and/or impact:			
b. Water body intensively used by the public.	5		5
c. Environmental justice.	0		0
d. Water reclamation.	0		0
e. Waters of outstanding statewide significance or waters of exceptional recreation or ecological significance.	0		0
11. Other Considerations (high, medium, low, no)			
a. Proposal presentation.	3		3
b. Proposal readiness.	3		3
c. Issue submitted by more than one interested party.	5		5
Total Score			62

Discussion

Category 3 factor (c) applies because the issue describes water quality information related to the need for a site specific water quality objective for copper at the Shelter Island Yatch Basin in San Diego Bay. Improve the Basin Plan scored high because this change would make the Basin Plan a more true and accurate document. If a new standard is protective of beneficial uses then that standard should be modified. Regional Board Mission scored high because a modification to this objective would make the objective presumably more accurate and therefore presumably more protective of water quality and its beneficial uses. Category 7 scored high because the studies needed to support this issue are supported by stakeholder resources. Category 8 factor (c) was scored because this issue is site specific to Shelter Island Yatch Basin. Category 9 factor (i) was scored because this is related to a TMDL currently under development. Category 10 factor (a) and (b) were scored because this issue has and will attract great public interest and affects a waterbody intensively used by the public. Category 11 factor (a) scored medium because this issue was formally written up with detailed narrative descriptions but it was presented to the Regional Board during the June 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review public hearing. Category 11 June 2004 Basin Plan Triennial Review public hearing. Category 11 factor (b) scored medium because the study is currently being conducted by proponents and data not yet available. Category 11 factor (c) scored high because the issue was submitted by more than one interested party.