

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	4600	COUNTY	San Diego
APPLICANT	The Regents of the University of California	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$499,874
PROJECT TITLE	La Jolla Shores Coastal Watershed Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$694,036

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop the La Jolla Shores Coastal Watershed Management Plan that will protect and improve water quality in two Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) offshore of La Jolla Shores.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score:** 15

**Comment:** The work plan is clear and supports the proposed tasks. It includes specific planning activities that would reduce discharges and improve water quality thus resulting in better support of marine life in the ASBS. If implemented, the steps outlined in each element could achieve the stated objectives. The roles in work plan implementation are also documented. Budget and schedule are consistent with the work plan.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** Boundaries of the region are well defined and supported. The applicant has provided a thorough description of the region including a map and discussion of water quality conditions in the two ASBS. The table of relevant regional efforts is concise and useful for understanding the region's description.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal lists five regional planning objectives. The applicant clearly explains how they are determined. The objectives include groundwater seepage and over-irrigation issues, which affect storm water and dry season runoff. The proposal includes statewide priorities of Regional Water Board Watershed Management Initiatives, State Water Board NPS Pollution plan goals, and TMDL implementation. The Plan did not address water supply and groundwater management.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal includes several integrated management strategies. The applicant indicates they will follow the CCA program guidance and Watershed Assessment Action Plan outline to develop water management strategies. The objectives of the plan briefly touch on multiple strategies as listed in the guidelines. Additional points would have been awarded if the applicant discussed additional strategies that could be considered and some of the synergistic effects integrated water management could have in the region.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal explains how an institutional structure will be used to implement the plan. The proposal includes a self-evaluation component. The proposal lacks a schedule of implementation after plan adoption and only mentions that the plan will be updated every five years. The institutional structure to ensure post-adoption implementation is not explained. More points would have been awarded if the discussion included a general timeline for events post adoption of the plan.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 10

**Comment:** The proposal addresses how the plan will assess current impacts and discusses potential benefits from plan implementation. The ICWMP benefits, which include urban runoff characterization, surveys of near shore circulation and bioavailability of runoff pollutants, and a publicly available GIS map of project results and a public participation program, are well documented. The ICWMP itself is not implementing any projects, but will make CEQA determinations before it is adopted by the City of San Diego.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposal indicates that limited amounts of data are currently available. As part of the work items proposed for grant funding, data will be collected to determine constituents of concern in runoff. Additional studies will be done to understand the bio-availability of constituents of concern in ASBSs as well as constituent movement within the ASBS through analysis of currents, sediments, and water quality.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** Data management includes a process with public participation, which will strongly support statewide data needs by proposing to provide a statewide model for coastal data management and dissemination.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 4

**Comment:** The applicant will use the current stakeholder groups involved in the local NPDES permit implementation. The applicant also includes a public process in the work plan that will allow public interaction and participation in plan development. This process will help identify additional stakeholders, but it is not clear how this group will function in fulfilling its mission. Outreach beyond the local area to involve regional stakeholders would also be beneficial.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3

**Comment:** The applicant explains that there are no disadvantaged communities in the project area; however, disadvantaged communities will benefit from the planning efforts because of the enhanced recreational opportunities, health and preservation of the ASBS resources, and open public beach access. The proposal needs to better document the presence and participation of the referenced disadvantaged communities.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The applicant lists existing local planning efforts, and explains how they relate with the proposed ICWMP. The list is comprehensive and the appropriate planning agencies appear to be involved.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposed plan includes the proper local entities for plan implementation and provides for additional stakeholder identification and participation through a public process. The applicant lists the appropriate State Agencies and has consulted with them in preparing the application. The applicant also intends to coordinate with other ASBS managers and states that the process for that will be addressed early in the plan development.

**TOTAL SCORE: 81**