

Appendix D

Watershed Management Area Analysis

This page intentional for printing purpose

Carlsbad Watershed Management Area Analysis



Lake Henshaw

October 3, 2014

*Prepared for:
San Diego County Copermittees*



Prepared by:

Geosyntec
consultants

engineers | scientists | innovators

RICK
ENGINEERING COMPANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. BACKGROUND.....1

1.2. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AREA ANALYSIS (WMAA)1

1.3. SCOPE OF WORK FOR REGIONAL WMAA2

1.4. PROJECT PROCESS3

1.5. REPORT ORGANIZATION.....4

1.6. TERMS OF REFERENCE4

2. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AREA CHARACTERIZATION 5

2.1. DOMINANT HYDROLOGIC PROCESSES6

2.1.1. *Datasets Used for identifying dominant hydrologic processes*7

2.1.2. *Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for identifying dominant hydrologic processes*8

2.1.3. *Results for identifying dominant hydrologic processes*.....12

2.1.4. *Limitations for identifying dominant hydrologic processes*13

2.2. STREAM CHARACTERIZATION14

2.2.1. *Datasets Used for stream characterization*14

2.2.2. *Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for stream characterization*14

2.2.3. *Results for stream characterization*.....18

2.2.4. *Limitations for stream characterization*19

2.3. LAND USES.....20

2.3.1. *Datasets Used for land uses*.....20

2.3.2. *Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for land uses*.....20

2.3.3. *Results for land uses*21

2.3.4. *Limitations*22

2.4. POTENTIAL CRITICAL COARSE SEDIMENT YIELD AREAS23

2.4.1. *Datasets Used for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas*23

2.4.2. *Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas*23

2.4.3. *Results for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas*.....26

2.4.4. *Limitations for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas*26

2.5. PHYSICAL STRUCTURES28

2.5.1. *Approach for identifying physical structures*28

2.5.2. *Results for identifying physical structures*28

3. TEMPLATE FOR CANDIDATE PROJECT LIST 29

4. HYDROMODIFICATION MANAGEMENT APPLICABILITY/EXEMPTIONS 31

4.1. ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS FOR HYDROMODIFICATION MANAGEMENT EXEMPTIONS31

4.1.1. *Exempt River Reaches*.....32

4.1.2. *Stabilized Conveyance Systems Draining to Exempt Water Bodies*32

4.1.3. *Highly Impervious/Highly Urbanized Watersheds and Urban Infill*32

4.1.4. *Tidally Influenced Lagoons*.....32

5. CONCLUSIONS..... 35

5.1. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AREA CHARACTERIZATION35

5.2. TEMPLATE FOR CANDIDATE PROJECT LIST36

5.3. HYDROMODIFICATION MANAGEMENT EXEMPTIONS36

6. REFERENCES..... 38

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

ATTACHMENT A	WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AREA CHARACTERIZATION
A.1	Dominant Hydrologic Process
A.2	Stream Characterization
A.3	Land Uses
A.4	Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas
A.5	Physical Structures
ATTACHMENT B	HYDROMODIFICATION MANAGEMENT APPLICABILITY/EXEMPTIONS
B.1	Additional Analysis for Hydromodification Management Exemptions
B.2	Hydromodification Management Applicability/Exemption Mapping
ATTACHMENT C	ELECTRONIC FILES
ATTACHMENT D	REGIONAL MS4 PERMIT CROSSWALK

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

%	percent
>	greater than
<	less than
BMP	Best Management Practice
CB	Coarse Bedrock
CEG	Certified Engineering Geologist
CIP	Capital Improvement Project
CLRP	Comprehensive Load Reduction Plan
CSI	Coarse Sedimentary Impermeable
CSP	Coarse Sedimentary Permeable
E_p	Erosion Potential
ET	Evapotranspiration
FB	Fine Bedrock
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIS	Flood Insurance Study
FSI	Fine Sedimentary Impermeable
FSP	Fine Sedimentary Permeable
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLU	Geomorphic Landscape Unit
HA	Hydrologic Area
HCP	Hydromodification Control Plan
HMP	Hydromodification Management Plan
HRU	Hydrologic Response Unit
HSA	Hydrologic Sub Area
HSG	Hydrologic Soil Group
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
JURMP	Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan
LDW	Land Development Workgroup
LID	Low Impact Development
MAP	Mean Annual Precipitation

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS continued

MHPA	Multiple Habitat Planning Area
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
NED	National Elevation Dataset
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
PDP	Priority Development Project
RCB	Reinforced Concrete Box
RCP	Reinforced Concrete Pipe
SCAMP	Southern California Aerial Mapping Project
SCCWRP	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
SD	San Diego
SDRWQCB	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
S _p	Sediment Supply Potential
SSURGO	Soil Survey Geographic Database
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WMA	Watershed Management Area
WMAA	Watershed Management Area Analysis
WQIP	Water Quality Improvement Plan
WURMP	Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

On May 8, 2013 the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region adopted Order No. R9-2013-0001; NPDES No. CAS 0109266, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds within the San Diego Region (Regional MS4 Permit). The Regional MS4 Permit, which became effective on June 27, 2013, replaces the previous MS4 Permits that covered portions of the Counties of San Diego, Orange, and Riverside within the San Diego Region. There were two main goals for the Regional MS4 Permit:

1. To have more consistent implementation, as well as improve inter-agency communication (particularly in the case of watersheds that cross jurisdictional boundaries), and minimize resources spent on the permit renewal process.
2. To establish requirements that focused on the achievement of water quality improvement goals and outcomes rather than completing specific actions, thereby giving the Copermittees more control over how their water quality programs are implemented.

To achieve the second goal, the Regional MS4 Permit requires that Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIPs) be developed for each Watershed Management Area (WMA) within the San Diego Region. As part of the development of WQIPs, the Regional MS4 Permit provides Copermittees an option to perform a Watershed Management Area Analysis (WMAA) through which watershed-specific requirements for structural BMP implementation for Priority Development Projects can be developed for each WMA. This report presents the Copermittees' approach and results for the regional elements of the WMAA developed for the San Diego County area.

1.2. Watershed Management Area Analysis (WMAA)

The Regional MS4 Permit, through inclusion of the WMAA, provides an optional pathway for Copermittees to develop an integrated approach for their land development programs by promoting evaluation of multiple strategies for water quality improvement and development of watershed-scale solutions for improving overall water quality in the watershed. The WMAA comprises the following three components as indicated in the Regional MS4 Permit:

1. Perform analysis and develop Geographic Information System (GIS) layers (maps) by gathering information pertaining to the physical characteristics of the WMA (referred to herein as WMA Characterization). This includes, for example, identifying potential areas of coarse sediment supply, present and anticipated future land uses, and locations of physical structures within receiving streams and upland areas that affect the watershed hydrology (such as bridges, culverts, and flood management basins).
2. Using the WMA Characterization results, compile a list of candidate projects that could potentially be used as alternative compliance options for Priority Development Projects. Such projects may include, for example, opportunities for stream or riparian area

rehabilitation, opportunities for retrofitting existing infrastructure to incorporate storm water retention or treatment, or opportunities for regional BMPs, among others. Prior to implementing these candidate projects the Copermittees must demonstrate that implementing such a candidate project would provide greater overall benefit to the watershed than requiring implementation of the onsite structural BMPs. Note, compilation or evaluation of potential projects was not performed as part of this regional effort. Identification and listing of candidate projects will be performed for each WMA through the WQIP process for WMAs that elect to submit the optional WMAA as part of the WQIP.

3. Additionally, using the WMA Characterization maps, identify areas within the watershed management area where it is appropriate to allow for exemptions from hydromodification management requirements that are in addition to those already allowed by the Regional MS4 Permit for Priority Development Projects. The Copermittees shall identify such cases on a watershed basis and include them in the WMAA with supporting rationale to support claims for exemptions.

1.3.Scope of Work for Regional WMAA

In July 2013, the Copermittees elected to fund a regional effort to develop elements of the regional WMAA for the 9 San Diego-area WMAs within the County of San Diego that are currently subject to the Regional MS4 Permit, which include:

- Santa Margarita River (for portion in San Diego County)
- San Luis Rey River
- Carlsbad
- San Dieguito River
- Los Peñasquitos
- Mission Bay & La Jolla Watershed
- San Diego River
- San Diego Bay
- Tijuana River (for portion in San Diego County)

The regional-level information developed through this effort is intended to provide consistency across WMAs and serve as the foundation for developing watershed-specific information for each WMA to be developed through the WQIP process. The regional effort scope of work included:

1. Development of GIS map layers that characterize the WMAs using data previously collected, readily available, and provided by the Copermittees, including:
 - a. Description of dominant hydrologic processes, such as areas where infiltration or overland flow likely dominates;
 - b. Description of existing streams in the watershed, including bed material and composition, and if they are perennial or ephemeral;

- c. Current and anticipated future land uses;
 - d. Potential coarse sediment yield areas; and
 - e. Locations of existing flood control structures and channel structures, such as stream armoring, constrictions, grade control structures, and hydromodification or flood management basins.
2. Development of a Microsoft® Excel (Excel) template for use by Copermittees to compile lists of candidate projects for an optional alternative compliance program.
 3. Development of additional criteria and analyses to support reinstating the following proposed exemptions that were originally developed in the approved 2011 Final Hydromodification Management Plan but not included in the Regional MS4 Permit unless provided by the Copermittees in the WMAA. In addition, development of the associated Hydromodification Applicability/Exemption Mapping.
 - a. Exempt River Reaches including:
 - i. San Diego River;
 - ii. Otay River;
 - iii. San Dieguito River;
 - iv. San Luis Rey River; and
 - v. Sweetwater River
 - b. Stabilized Conveyance Systems Draining to Exempt Water Bodies
 - c. Highly Impervious/Highly Urbanized Watersheds and Urban Infill, and
 - d. Tidally Influenced Lagoons (where data/study provided)

The scope of work for the regional effort excluded performing analysis within the following areas unless data was readily available, as Copermittees do not have jurisdiction over these areas:

1. State Lands;
2. U.S. Departments of Defense land;
3. U.S. National Forest land;
4. U.S. Department of Interior land and
5. Tribal land

Additional description of excluded areas, for the purposes of the Regional WMAA, is indicated in Section 2.3 Land Uses.

1.4. Project Process

The process for developing the Regional WMAA included close coordination with the Land Development Workgroup (LDW) at key points during the project. The LDW is composed of the 21 San Diego-area Copermittees and serves to develop and implement regional land development plans and programs necessary to support the requirements of the Regional MS4 Permit. The consultant team (Geosyntec Consultants and Rick Engineering Company) presented

preliminary project assumptions and methodologies proposed to be used to develop the Regional WMAA to meet the requirements of the Regional MS4 Permit in December 2013. The consultant team incorporated workgroup feedback from this meeting and subsequently presented the preliminary Regional WMAA project results to the LDW in March 2014, again to receive direction and incorporate input on the preliminary results. Subsequently, the draft report was released to the public in July 2014, by a public workshop that included Consultation Panel members from each of the WMAs on July 29, 2014. This version of the report including all of the input described above is being issued for optional inclusion into the respective WQIP Provision B.3 submittals to the SDRWQCB in December 2014.

1.5. Report Organization

This report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 provides the project background and purpose;
- Chapter 2 describes the technical basis for characterizing the WMAA;
- Chapter 3 describes the template that can be used by Copermittees to compile the list of candidate projects;
- Chapter 4 summarizes the analyses performed to support reinstating select exemptions from hydromodification control requirements for PDPs;
- Chapter 5 presents the WMAA conclusions;
- Chapter 6 presents the references used for the WMAA;
- Attachment A presents the exhibits and additional supporting information for watershed management area characterization;
- Attachment B presents the exhibits and additional supporting information for hydromodification management applicability/exemptions;
- Attachment C expands on the structure of the geodatabase that hosts the GIS data developed by the WMAA; and
- Attachment D provides a crosswalk between the Regional MS4 Permit requirements for WMAA and this report.

1.6. Terms of Reference

The work described in this report was conducted by Geosyntec Consultants (Geosyntec) and Rick Engineering Company (RICK) on behalf of the County of San Diego and the regional Copermittees.

2. Watershed Management Area Characterization

Watershed health and function are strongly influenced by hydrological and geomorphological processes occurring in the watershed. Both hydrological response and geomorphological response of the watershed are dependent on a variety of physical characteristics of the watershed. To this end, the Regional MS4 Permit specifies a set of data that is required to adequately characterize overall watershed processes as a foundation to enhancing integration and effectiveness of watershed management and water quality programs. The following GIS map layers were developed to characterize the hydrological and geomorphological processes within the Carlsbad WMA:

- **Dominant Hydrologic Processes:** A description of dominant hydrologic processes, such as areas where infiltration or overland flow likely dominates;
- **Stream Characterization:** A description of existing streams in the watershed, including bed material and composition, and if they are perennial or ephemeral;
- **Land Uses:** Current and anticipated future land uses;
- **Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas;** and
- **Physical Structures:** Locations of existing flood control structures and channel structures, such as stream armoring, constrictions, grade control structures, and hydromodification or flood management basins.

These GIS layers can be used to:

- Identify the nature and distribution of key macro-scale watershed processes;
- Identify potential opportunities and constraints for regional and sub-regional storm water management facilities that can play a critical role in meeting water quality, hydromodification, water supply, and/or habitat goals within the watershed;
- Assist with determining the most appropriate management actions for specific portions of the watershed; and
- Suggest where further study is appropriate.

2.1. Dominant Hydrologic Processes

The Regional MS4 Permit identifies in the provisions related to the WMAA that a description of dominant hydrologic processes within the watershed must be developed, with GIS layers (maps) as output. The Permit specifically calls for processes “*such as areas where infiltration or overland flow likely dominates.*” These particular aspects of the hydrological mechanics of watersheds are particularly important when attempting to understand the macro-scale opportunities for locating projects that take advantage of either capturing overland flow for treatment or for infiltration.

Investigation of the dominant hydrologic processes in the San Diego-area watersheds indicates that evapotranspiration (ET) is the most dominant hydrologic process for the region based on review of a published study (Sanford and Selnick, 2013). ET is the sum of evaporation and plant transpiration in the hydrologic cycle that transports water from land surfaces to the atmosphere. This conclusion is supported by comparing the 30-year average annual rainfall for the study area (San Diego County east of the peninsular divide) of between 15 and 18 inches per year (San Diego County, 2005) to the average annual ET rates. According to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) Reference Evapotranspiration Map (CIMIS, 1999), the study area (within Zones 4, 6, and 9) experiences annual reference ET of 46.6, 49.7 and 59.9 inches, respectively. Therefore, theoretically, if all of the annual precipitation for the San Diego-area watersheds remained stationary where it fell and did not either infiltrate or runoff to local waterbodies where it would be conveyed downstream ultimately to the ocean, it all would be consumed by ET. As such, the effect of ET on the overall hydrologic processes within the San Diego watersheds is a function of the temporal scale over which it acts. Precipitation events often produce runoff in these watersheds, particularly in the urbanized portions, based on the topography and land cover that tend to accelerate the conveyance of runoff downstream rather than collecting, storing, or spreading out that then would maximize the effect of ET.

Because this study is focused on developing information and mapping for the portion of the hydrologic process that informs watershed management decisions, i.e., locating beneficial projects in areas of greatest opportunity, the next tier of dominant hydrologic processes are studied and mapped by this project. As such, the study area was characterized, based on the methodology described in the following section, according to the predicted fate of runoff within the watersheds being either overland flow or infiltration after considering the effects of ET (as well as an intermediate category of interflow). Areas that were mapped as overland flow do not necessarily preclude infiltration but rather indicate the dominant expected process that runoff would experience if not intercepted for the express purpose of infiltrating storm water runoff. The Model BMP Design Manual will provide more detailed guidance and procedures for determining the potential for infiltrating captured storm water at the project level irrespective of the mapping produced in the WMAA. To reiterate, the WMAA mapping is to provide macro-scale processes for high-level analysis and to inform decisions affecting regional scales. Furthermore, the Model BMP Design Manual will indicate the degree to which site-scale BMPs can expect to benefit from ET or how ET is considered in the sizing of BMPs. In brief, typical storm water BMPs only store water for a few days and therefore are not really capable of significant volume disposal through ET. However, pervious area dispersion (i.e., directing storm water runoff to flat areas for spreading and infiltration) has appreciable benefits with regard to ET and is a practice promoted in the BMP Design Manual.

The processes of interest are further defined as follows:

Overland flow: This process can be thought of as the inverse of infiltration; precipitation reaching the ground surface that does not immediately soak in must run over the land surface (thus, “overland” flow). It reflects the relative rates of rainfall intensity and the soil’s infiltration capacity: wherever and whenever the rainfall intensity exceeds the soil’s infiltration capacity, some overland flow will occur. Most uncompacted, vegetated soils have infiltration capacities of one to several inches per hour at the ground surface, which exceeds the rainfall intensity of even unusually intense storms. In contrast, pavement and hard surfaces reduce the effective infiltration capacity of the ground surface to zero, ensuring overland flow regardless of the meteorological attributes of a storm, together with a much faster rate of runoff relative to vegetated surfaces.

Infiltration and groundwater recharge: These closely linked hydrologic processes are most apparent near ephemeral and perennial conveyances in the San Diego region. Their widespread occurrence is expressed by the common absence of surface-water channels on even steep (undisturbed) hillslopes. Thus, on virtually any geologic material on all but the steepest slopes (or bare rock), infiltration of rainfall into the soil is inferred to be widespread, if not ubiquitous. With urbanization, changes to the process of infiltration are also quite simple to characterize: some (typically large) fraction of that once infiltrating water is now converted to overland flow.

Interflow: Interflow takes place following storm events as shallow subsurface flow (usually within 3 to 6 feet of the surface) occurring in a more permeable soil layer above a less permeable substrate. In the storm response of a stream, interflow provides a transition between the rapid response from surface runoff and much slower stream discharge from deeper groundwater. In some geologic settings, the distinction between “interflow” and “deep groundwater” is artificial and largely meaningless; in others, however, there is a strong physical discrimination between “shallow” and “deep” groundwater movement. Development reduces infiltration and thus interflow as discussed previously, as well as reducing the footprint of the area supporting interflow volume.

The datasets used, methodology for creating the dominant hydrologic processes maps, and the results are described in the sections below.

2.1.1. Datasets Used for identifying dominant hydrologic processes

The following datasets were used in the analysis:

Dataset	Source	Year	Description
Elevation	USGS	2013	1/3 rd Arc Second (~10 meter cells) digital elevation model for San Diego County
Soils Data	SanGIS	2013	NRCS (SSURGO) Database for San Diego County downloaded from SanGIS
Land Cover	SanGIS	2013	Ecology-Vegetation layer for San Diego County downloaded from SanGIS


Dataset	Source	Year	Description
Geology	Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S.	2002	Geologic Map of the Oceanside 30'x60' Quadrangle, California, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 2, 1:100,000 scale.
	Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S.	2008	Geologic Map of the San Diego 30'x60' Quadrangle, California, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 3, 1:100,000 scale.
	Todd, V.R.	2004	Preliminary Geologic Map of the El Cajon 30'x60' Quadrangle, Southern California, United States Geological Survey, Southern California Aerial Mapping Project (SCAMP), Open File Report 2004-1361, 1:100,000 scale.
	Jennings et al.	2010	“Geologic Map of California,” California Geological Survey, Map No. 2 – Geologic Map of California, 1:750,000 scale
Groundwater Basins	SanGIS	2013	Groundwater Basins in San Diego County downloaded from SanGIS

2.1.2. Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for identifying dominant hydrologic processes

The methodology used to describe dominant hydrologic processes is based on recommendations included in the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project’s (SCCWRP) Technical Report 605 titled “Hydromodification Screening Tools: GIS-Based Catchment Analyses of Potential Changes in Runoff and Sediment Discharge” (SCCWRP, 2010). The foundation for this analysis was to incorporate the Report’s concept of grouping common hydrologic attributes into Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs). The report states the following:

“Grouping common hydrologic attributes across a watershed into a tractable number of Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs: a term first used by England and Holtan 1969) has become a well-established approach for condensing the near-infinite variability of a natural watershed into a tractable number of different elements. The normal procedure for developing HRUs is to identify presumptively similar rainfall–runoff characteristics across a watershed by combining spatially distributed climate, geology, soils, land use, and topographic data into areas that are approximately homogeneous in their hydrologic properties (Green and Cruise 1995, Becker and Braun 1999, Beven 2001, Haverkamp et al. 2005). As noted by Beighley et al (2005), this process of merging the landscape into discrete HRUs is a common and effective method for reducing model complexity and data requirements. Using watershed characteristics to predict runoff is the explicit task of hydrologic models, and there is a host of such models available for application to hydromodification evaluation. For purposes of “screening,” however, the goal is simplicity and ease of application even if the precision of the resulting analysis is crude.”

The following process describes the methodology used to define Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs) and then relate the HRUs to the dominant hydrologic processes (i.e., overland flow, interflow, and groundwater recharge) in the Carlsbad WMA.



The first step is to define the HRUs. Once these are defined, the remaining steps determine the dominant hydrologic process.

1. **Integrate data sets used to determine HRU:** Categories for soil type, gradient, and land cover were defined based on readily available GIS datasets for the region and classifications found in relevant literature, as indicated below. The different combinations of these three categories comprise the distinct HRUs.

- **Soil Categories:** based on National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) classifications, which are commonly used to describe runoff/infiltration potential of soils on a regional scale. These categories include: A, B, C, and D. HSG A soils have the lowest runoff potential, while HSG D soils have the highest runoff potential.
- **Gradient Categories:** based on slope ranges found in a review of relevant literature identified in Chapter 6. The spatial processing of the slope categories utilized the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) National Elevation Dataset (NED). Slopes were grouped (bins) into the following ranges: 0% to 2%; 2% to 6%; 6% to 10%; and greater than 10%. The 2% and 6% slope thresholds were based on slope ranges included in Table A.1.1 (McCuen, 2005) presented in Attachment A.1. This table provides runoff coefficients as a function of slope, soil group, land cover, and return period and was used for subsequent steps in the mapping effort. The 10% slope threshold was used in SCCWRP’s Technical

Report 605 (SCCWRP, 2010) and is a logical cutoff since slopes steeper than 10% are assumed to be dominated by overland flow.

- **Land Cover Categories:** were defined using the Ecology Vegetation GIS map layer developed by the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego and SANDAG and downloaded from SanGIS (2013). The vegetation categories in the GIS layer were grouped (Table A.1.2 in Attachment A.1) to match the following categories used in SCCWRP's Technical Report 605 (SCCWRP, 2010): Agriculture/Grass; Developed; Forest; Scrub/Shrub, Other (Water), and Unknown.
2. **Evaluate Land Cover:** Land cover categories for Agriculture/Grass, Forest, Scrub/Shrub and Other were related to land use categories defined in Table A.1.1 as shown in Table A.1.3 in Attachment A.1. Relating a land use category for the Developed land cover category was not necessary because all Developed cover was assumed to have overland flow as its dominant hydrologic process.
 3. **Determine Hydrology Characteristics for Land Covers:** For each of the land cover/land use categories listed in Table A.1.3, the ratio of precipitation lost to evapotranspiration (i.e. an evapotranspiration coefficient) was estimated using Table A.1.1 using the process described below. Since precipitation is considered to be the sum of the resulting runoff, infiltration, and evapotranspiration, the coefficients for these three hydrologic pathways sum to one, as indicated below.

$$\text{Runoff Coefficient} + \text{Infiltration Coefficient} + \text{Evapotranspiration Coefficient} = 1$$

- i) **Estimate Evapotranspiration:** To estimate the evapotranspiration (ET) coefficient for each land cover, first the runoff coefficient was identified in Table A.1.1 for the highest runoff potential (i.e., Group D soil and 6%+ slope) and most common storm conditions (i.e., storm recurrence intervals less than 25 years). The infiltration for these high runoff conditions was assumed to be negligible, resulting in an infiltration coefficient of zero. Since the sum of the three coefficients should sum to one, the ET coefficient was assumed to be the remaining difference (i.e., ET Coefficient = 1 – Runoff Coefficient). The ET coefficient calculated for the highest runoff potential was then applied to all soil types and slopes within that land use category. The calculated ET coefficient for each applicable HRU is provided in Table A.1.4 in Attachment A.1. The ET coefficient for HRUs that have a Developed land cover or a gradient greater than 10% were not calculated since these HRUs were assumed to have overland flow as the dominant hydrologic process.
- ii) **Estimate Infiltration:** The infiltration coefficient for each applicable HRU (i.e., combination of soil, gradient, and land cover) was estimated by subtracting both the runoff coefficient, provided in Table A.1.1, and the ET coefficient, calculated in step 3(i), from one (i.e., Infiltration Coefficient = 1 – Runoff Coefficient – ET Coefficient). The calculated infiltration coefficient for each applicable HRU is provided in Table A.1.4 in Attachment A.1.
- iii) **Estimate Runoff:** For each applicable HRU, the runoff coefficient was divided by

the infiltration coefficient to obtain a ratio representing the potential for runoff or infiltration. The higher the ratio, the greater the potential for runoff to be a more dominant hydrologic process than infiltration. Similarly, the lower the ratio, the greater the potential for infiltration to be a more dominant hydrologic process than runoff. The calculated runoff to infiltration ratios are provided in Table A.1.4 in Attachment A.1.

4. **Associate Runoff and Infiltration to HRUs:** The following designations were assigned to each applicable HRU based on the runoff to infiltration ratio (i.e., runoff coefficient/infiltration coefficient). These designations were based on best engineering judgment with the underlying assumption that if a runoff or infiltration coefficient is more than 50% greater than its counterpart, then the prevailing process is considered dominant.
 - HRUs with runoff to infiltration ratios greater than 1.5 (3:2 ratio) were assumed to have relatively high runoff and overland flow was considered its dominant hydrologic process. These HRUs are designated by the letter “O” (Overland flow is dominant process) in Tables A.1.4 and A.1.5 in Attachment A.1.
 - HRUs with runoff to infiltration ratios less than 0.67 (2:3 ratio) were assumed to have relatively high infiltration and its dominant hydrologic process was either interflow or groundwater recharge, based on analysis described in subsequent steps. These HRUs are designated by the letter “I” (Interflow is dominant process) in Tables A.1.4 and A.1.5.
 - For HRUs with runoff to infiltration ratios between, and including, 1.5 and 0.67 it was uncertain whether it was dominated by overland flow or infiltration. These HRUs are designated by the letter “U” (Dominant process is uncertain) in Tables A.1.4 and A.1.5.
 - For HRUs that have a Developed land cover or a gradient greater than 10%, the runoff to infiltration ratios were not calculated because these HRUs were assumed to have overland flow as the dominant hydrologic process. These HRUs are designated by the letter “O” (Overland flow is dominant process) in Table A.1.5.
5. **Uncertain HRUs Assignment:** For HRUs with an uncertain designation (“U”) in Table A.1.5 in Attachment A.1, the underlying regional geology (Kennedy and Tan, 2002 & 2008; Todd, 2004 and Jennings et al., 2010) was used to evaluate whether overland flow or infiltration were dominant. If the underlying geology was considered impermeable, then these uncertain areas were considered to have overland flow as its dominant hydrologic process. If the underlying geology was considered permeable, then these uncertain areas were considered to be dominated by infiltration. The determination of whether a geologic unit is impermeable or permeable was based on desktop evaluation and the best professional judgment of a Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG). This analysis was performed in GIS and is illustrated in the flowchart above.

6. **Associate Infiltration HRUs with Known Groundwater Basins:** For HRUs with relatively high infiltration and have a designation of “I” in Table A.1.5 in Attachment A.1, the presence or absence of a regional groundwater basin (SanGIS, 2013) underlying these areas determined whether the dominant hydrologic process was designated as interflow or groundwater recharge. The groundwater recharge hydrologic process was assigned as dominant for those applicable areas which had an underlying groundwater basin. The interflow hydrologic process was assigned as dominant for those applicable areas which did not have an underlying groundwater basin directly below it. This analysis was performed in GIS and is illustrated in the flowchart above.
7. **Resulting HRU Data:** The resulting GIS map of dominant hydrologic processes was reviewed by engineering professionals familiar with the hydrology in the County of San Diego to confirm that the mapping is consistent with their experience working in the region.

2.1.3. Results for identifying dominant hydrologic processes

The resulting GIS map showing the spatial distribution of dominant hydrologic processes (i.e., overland flow, interflow, and groundwater recharge) within the Carlsbad WMA is provided in Attachment A.1. An ArcMap document file which presents the results from each step of the methodology is included in Attachment C, as well as a Google Earth KMZ file. Based on this analysis, overland flow is the predominant hydrologic process in this WMA, which is consistent with the experience of engineering professionals familiar with the hydrology of the County of San Diego.

Summary of Deliverables for Dominant Hydrologic Processes

Format	Item	Description	Location
Report	Figure	"Dominant Hydrologic Processes"	Attachment A.1
GIS	Map Group Title	Hydrologic Processes	Attachment C
	Map Layer Title	Soil Land Cover Slope Hydrologic Response Unit Initial Rating Permeability Groundwater Basin Dominant Hydrologic Processes	
	Geodatabase Feature Dataset	HydrologicProcesses	
	Geodatabase Feature Class	HRUAnalysis	
	Geodatabase Geometry Type	Polygon	
KMZ ¹	KMZ File Name	Dominant Hydrologic Processes	Attachment C
¹ To enhance the utilization of this data, the Dominant Hydrological Processes map is provided in both traditional GIS file format (ESRI software license purchase required) and as a Google Earth KMZ (Keyhole Markup Language/Zipped) file that can be viewed with the free download version of Google Earth (http://www.google.com/earth/).			

2.1.4. Limitations for identifying dominant hydrologic processes

The resulting GIS map layer only lists the dominant hydrological process (i.e., an HRU assigned a dominant process of overland flow can also experience small amounts of infiltration) and provides a useful, rapid framework to perform screening-level analysis that is appropriate for watershed-scale planning studies. When more precise estimates are required for a particular site and subarea it is recommended that this analysis be augmented with site-specific analysis.

2.2.Stream Characterization

For the purpose of WMAA, the Regional MS4 Permit requires a description of existing streams in the watershed, including bed material and composition, and if they are perennial or ephemeral. Under the Regional WMAA, this analysis was prepared for 27 streams throughout the San Diego Region agreed upon by the consultant team and Copermittees. Within the Carlsbad WMA, stream characterization and detailed mapping is provided for Buena Vista Creek, Agua Hedionda Creek, San Marcos Creek, Encinitas Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Escondido Creek as shown on the exhibit titled "Watershed Management Area Streams" located in Attachment A.2.

2.2.1. Datasets Used for stream characterization

The following data were referenced for the purpose of stream characterization:

- USGS National Hydrography Dataset, downloaded from USGS November 2013
- USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles, compiled image of quadrangles covering San Diego County, various dates
- Floodplains: "National Flood Hazard Layer," provided by Federal Emergency Management Agency October 2012
- Various datasets provided by Copermittees depicting existing storm water conveyance infrastructure within their jurisdictions.
- Aerial photography by Digital Globe dated 2012

2.2.2. Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for stream characterization

The analysis was prepared by digitizing each of the 27 streams based on review of data listed above. Within the pre-existing datasets depicting streams, floodplains, or infrastructure, no single dataset included a complete, accurate alignment of each stream. Digitizing the streams based on review of all of the data listed above allowed creation of GIS linework with a continuous corrected alignment for each stream. The following data were recorded as GIS attributes for each stream as the stream was digitized:

- River name
- Reach type (engineered or natural, constrained or un-constrained)
- Bed material
- Bank material
- Hydrographic category (perennial or intermittent)

The attributes listed above were collected manually based on interpretation of the reference data. Assumptions used in making the interpretations are listed below. The *Hydrographic Category* section below will provide the rationale as to why perennial and intermittent were the hydrographic categories chosen for this WMAA and not perennial and ephemeral.

Note that stream classification was not prepared within areas of Federal/State/Indian lands unless data was readily available. Stream lines were prepared within these areas for continuity, but some data fields were not populated within these areas.

Reach Type

Streams were classified as either engineered or natural, and either constrained or un-constrained. See the exhibit titled, "Watershed Management Area Streams by Reach Type" in Attachment A.2. The purpose of this exercise was to identify whether the stream has been modified by human activity within the stream itself, which may include addition of crossing structures, stabilization of banks, dredging, or any other human activity. This aids the identification of physical structures including stream armoring, constrictions, grade control, and other modifications as required by the Regional MS4 Permit.

Classification of the streams as either “**engineered**” or “**natural**” was based on the following criteria:

Engineered

- A classification of "engineered" was assigned where the stream itself has been modified by human activity.
- All culvert/bridge/pipe crossings either provided in the Copermittees’ storm water conveyance system data or clearly visible on the aerial photo have been assigned as engineered within the limits of the crossing.
- If the Copermittees did not provide storm water conveyance system data for the dirt road crossings/dip sections the streams have been assigned as engineered within the limits of the crossing. These crossings may or may not have culverts.
- If the Copermittees’ storm water conveyance system data stated the facility is a detention or desilting basin, they were assigned as engineered.
- Golf courses have been assigned as engineered.
- If aerial photography showed large water bodies (lake, pond, irrigation pond, etc.) they were assigned as engineered.
- If the storm water conveyance system data provided by the Copermittees has identified the stream as “rockbs”, the assumption has been made that these streams have rocks on their bottom and the sides (“bs”), and have been assigned as engineered.
- Sand mining operations have been assigned as engineered. Sand mining is an operation that is in continuous flux and does not typically result in a discrete, engineered geometry in any given channel cross section until restoration is implemented at the conclusion of the sand mining operation. It is assigned as engineered to acknowledge human alteration of the stream.

Natural

- Streams that have no apparent alteration within the stream itself by human activity have been assigned as natural.

Classification of the streams as either “**constrained**” or “**un-constrained**” was based on the following criteria:

Constrained

- All culvers/bridge/pipe crossings either provided in the Copermittees' storm water conveyance system data or clearly visible on the aerial photo have been assigned as constrained.
- If the Copermittees did not provide storm water conveyance system data for the dirt road crossings/dip sections the streams have been assigned as constrained. These crossings may or may not have culverts.
- If the Copermittees' storm water conveyance system data stated the facility is a detention or desilting basin, they were assigned as constrained.
- Golf courses have been assigned as constrained if located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodway based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" data.
- The USGS National Hydrographic Dataset in their hydrographic category had assigned some reaches as artificial paths. In these situations and if the aerial photography shows large water bodies (lake, pond, irrigation pond, etc.) these streams have been assigned as constrained.
- Sand mining operations located within the FEMA floodway based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" have been assigned as constrained.

Un-constrained

- Golf courses have been assigned as un-constrained if not located within the FEMA floodway based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" data.
- Sand mining operations not located within the FEMA floodway based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" data have been assigned un-constrained.
- If the stream is located within the FEMA floodway based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" and there is available land in the floodway fringe (the area between the floodway and the 100-year floodplain) the area has been assigned un-constrained. Note that there may be only one side or both sides of the stream with available land in the floodway fringe therefore a note was added as to which side of the stream is constrained and un-constrained.
- If the stream is located within a FEMA 100-year floodplain based on the "National Flood Hazard Layer" data with no floodway and the FEMA floodplain width is not within an existing development or bordered by roads have been assigned as un-constrained.

Bed Material and Bank Material

The following bed and bank materials were identified:

- Concrete
- Riprap
- Pipe / culvert
- Earth

The assumptions made to identify the streams bed and bank materials were based on the following criteria:

- If the data provided by the Copermittees provided information about the stream bed and bank material, the provided data was used for the bed and bank material.
- Generally the data provided by the Copermittees did not identify the crossing type (pipe, box culvert, bridge with or without piers, etc.) or the material (RCP, RCB, earth, riprap, concrete, etc.). In that case, all culvert/bridge/pipe crossings were assigned as pipe/culvert for the bed and bank material.
- If the Copermittees did not provide data for the dirt road crossings/dip sections the bed and bank material have been assigned as pipe/culvert. These crossings may or may not have culverts.
- If the Copermittees' storm water conveyance system data stated the facility is a detention or desilting basin, the bed and bank material have been assigned as earth.
- If aerial photography showed large water bodies (lake, pond, irrigation pond, etc.) they were assigned as earth bed and bank material. The USGS National Hydrographic Dataset in their hydrographic category had assigned some of these types of reaches as artificial paths.
- Sand mining operations within the stream have been assigned as earth for bed and bank material.
- If the Copermittees did not provide data for the stream material the bed and bank material have been assigned based on the aerial photography.

See exhibits titled, "Watershed Management Area Streams by Bed Material" in Attachment A.2.

After stream bed and bank material was classified, earthen reaches were further classified by geologic group. This was accomplished by intersecting the streams with the geologic group layer that had been prepared for use in the dominant hydrologic process and potential coarse sediment yield analyses. The result is displayed in exhibits titled, "Watershed Management Area Streams by Geologic Group" in Attachment A.2.

Hydrographic Category

Streams were classified as "perennial" or "intermittent." See exhibits titled, "Watershed Management Area Streams by Hydrographic Category" in Attachment A.2. Classification was obtained from the USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). The definitions of these categories in the USGS National Hydrography Dataset are:

- **Perennial:** Contains water throughout the year, except for infrequent periods of severe drought.
- **Intermittent:** Contains water for only part of the year, but more than just after rainstorms and at snowmelt.

While the specific Regional MS4 Permit language requested classification of perennial or ephemeral, rather than perennial or intermittent, the data that was referenced in order to classify streams did not include "ephemeral" streams. For reference, the USGS National Hydrography Dataset definition of "ephemeral" is: "contains water only during or after a local rainstorm or heavy snowmelt." None of the stream reaches in the study were classified as ephemeral in the NHD dataset, therefore none are classified as ephemeral in the WMAA product. The City of San Diego provided a map titled "City of San Diego Stream Survey" dated April 3, 2013 prepared by AMEC that shows streams that are "dry" and streams that are "flowing". This information in conjunction with the other parameters listed in this section was used to determine if a stream was perennial or intermittent.

USGS NHD includes hydrographic category classification for many of the streams. However data was not available for all reaches of all streams. In order to classify reaches of streams that did not already contain this data in NHD, these assumptions were made:

- The USGS NHD information for the stream hydrographic category has been used when available.
- When USGS NHD has "artificial paths" for portions of the stream, the hydrographic category of the upstream portion of the stream have been assigned to the stream unless other assumptions took precedence.
- If aerial photography shows large waterbody (lake, pond, irrigation pond, etc.) perennial has been assumed for the hydrographic category.
- For ponded areas shown on the aerial photography and if the USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles shows cross hatching for the area, intermittent has been assigned unless the upstream portion of the stream was assigned as perennial pursuant to the USGS National Hydrography Dataset then assigned perennial for the ponded area.
- USGS has a dashed line for intermittent streams. USGS has a solid line for perennial streams. In some situations this information was used to assist in the determination of assigning perennial or intermittent to a stream.

2.2.3. Results for stream characterization

The 27 streams and data are contained in a GIS file titled "SD_Regional_WMAA_Streams" located in Attachment C. The streams are shown in watershed maps included in Attachment A.2.

Summary of Deliverables for Stream Characterization

Format	Item	Description	Location
Report	Title of Figures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Watershed Management Area Streams" • "Watershed Management Area Streams by Hydrographic Category" • "Watershed Management Area Streams by Bed Material" • "Watershed Management Area Streams by Geologic Group" • "Watershed Management Area Streams by Reach" 	Attachment A.2

Format	Item	Description	Location
		Type"	
GIS	Map Group Title	Not Grouped	Attachment C
	Map Layer Title	SD_Regional_WMAA_Streams	
	Geodatabase Feature Dataset	Streams	
	Geodatabase Feature Class	SD_Regional_WMAA_Streams	
	Geodatabase Geometry Type	Line	
KMZ ¹	KMZ File Name	SD_Regional_WMAA_Streams	Attachment C
¹ To enhance the utilization of this data, the Stream Characterization map is provided in both traditional GIS file format (ESRI software license purchase required) and as a Google Earth KMZ (Keyhole Markup Language/Zippered) file that can be viewed with the free download version of Google Earth (http://www.google.com/earth/).			

In addition to the 27 streams that were subject of detailed analysis, NHD streams have been included on maps and within the geodatabase for reference. The NHD stream alignments have not been corrected and in some cases may be inconsistent with the existing infrastructure. The NHD streams are contained in a GIS file titled, "SD_NHD_Streams."

2.2.4. Limitations for stream characterization

- Only a desktop analysis was performed and no field verification was conducted.
- Infrastructure is only based on storm water conveyance system data provided by Copermittees or clearly visible on aerial photography. If the Copermittee used a numbering or lettering system for describing bed and bank material for example, since the metadata was not provided the bed and bank material could not be verified.
- In some instances concrete channels cannot be identified on aerial photography if it is filled with sediment and/ or vegetation.

2.3.Land Uses

For the purpose of the WMAA, the Regional MS4 Permit requires a description of current and anticipated future land uses. This is presented in the final GIS deliverable as "Land Use Planning" and includes the following representations of land uses in the watersheds: existing land uses, planned land uses, developable lands, redevelopment and infill areas, floodplains, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) designated areas, and areas not within the Copermittees' jurisdictions (tribal lands, state lands, and federal lands).

2.3.1. Datasets Used for land uses

The following existing regional datasets were referenced to meet this requirement:

- Municipal boundaries: "Municipal_Boundaries" dated August 2012, available from SanGIS/SANDAG
- Ownership: "Parcels" dated December 2013, available from SanGIS/SANDAG
- Existing land use: "SANGIS.LANDUSE_CURRENT" dated December 2012, available from SanGIS/SANDAG (existing land use)
- Planned land use: "PLANLU" (Planned Land Use for the Series 12 Regional Growth Forecast (2050)), dated December 2010, available from SanGIS/SANDAG
- Developable land: "DEVABLE" (Land available for potential development for the Series 12 Regional Growth Forecast), dated December 2010, available from SanGIS/SANDAG
- Redevelopment and infill areas: "REDEVINF" (Redevelopment and infill areas for the Series 12 Regional Growth Forecast), dated December 2010, available from SanGIS/SANDAG
- Floodplains: "National Flood Hazard Layer" provided by Federal Emergency Management Agency October 2012
- Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), total of four datasets available from SanGIS/SANDAG: "MHPA_SD," dated 2012, (Multiple Habitat Planning Areas for City of San Diego); "MSCP_CN," dated 2009 (designations of the County of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program South County Subregional Plan); "MSCP_EAST_DRAFT_CN," dated 2009 (draft East County MSCP Plan); and "Draft_North_County_MSCP_Version_8.0_Categories," dated 2008 (draft North County MSCP Plan)

2.3.2. Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for land uses

The existing regional datasets for existing land use, planned land use, developable land, redevelopment and infill areas, floodplains, and MSCP designated areas were referenced with no modifications. Areas not within the Copermittees' jurisdictions (tribal lands, state lands, and federal lands) were compiled from SanGIS parcel data (December 2013) based on the "ownership" value. The owners listed below were excluded from the Copermittees jurisdictions and represent the "Federal/State/Indian" layer, which is displayed on various maps included in Attachment A.2.

- Bureau of Land Management
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Indian Reservations
- Military Reservations

- Other Federal
- State
- State of California Land Commission
- State Parks
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Forest Service

When available, relevant data from these areas was included in analyses (e.g., developable land areas within Federal/State/Indian areas). Stream lines were prepared within these areas for continuity. However, stream classification (e.g., bed and bank material) was not prepared within these areas unless data was readily available (e.g., hydrographic category data available from NHD)

2.3.3. Results for land uses

The existing regional datasets are compiled into the Geodatabase in a group titled, "Land Use Planning." Current and anticipated future land uses are depicted in watershed maps included in Attachment C. Federal/State/Indian Lands are also referenced on all other map exhibits included in Attachment A.2.

Summary of Deliverables for Land Uses

Format	Item	Description	Location
Report	Title of Figures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Existing Land Use" • "Planned Land Use" • "Developable Land" • "Redevelopment and Infill Areas" 	Attachment A.3
GIS	Map Group Title	Land Use Planning	Attachment C
	Map Layer Title	Municipal Boundaries Federal/State/Indian Lands SanGIS_ExistingLandUse SanGIS_PlannedLandUse SanGIS_DevelopableLand SanGIS_RedevelopmentandInfill FEMA Floodplain MHPA_SD MSCP_CN MSCP_EAST_DRAFT_CN Draft_North_County_MSCP_Version_8_Categories	
	Geodatabase Feature Dataset	LandUsePlanning	
	Geodatabase Feature Class	SanGIS_MunicipalBoundaries Federal_State_Indian_Lands SanGIS_ExistingLandUse SanGIS_PlannedLandUse	

Format	Item	Description	Location
		SanGIS_DevelopableLand SanGIS_RedevelopmentandInfill FEMA_NFHL SanGIS_MHPA_SD SanGIS_MSCP_CN SanGIS_MSCP_EAST_DRAFT_CN SanGIS_Draft_North_County_MSCP_Version_8_Categories	
	Geodatabase Geometry Type	Polygon	
KMZ ¹	KMZ File Name	Municipal Boundaries Federal/State/Indian Lands Floodplains Due to file size limitations, SanGIS land use datasets were not converted to KMZ.	Attachment C
¹ To enhance the utilization of this data, the Land Uses map is provided in both traditional GIS file format (ESRI software license purchase required) and as a Google Earth KMZ (Keyhole Markup Language/Zip) file that can be viewed with the free download version of Google Earth (http://www.google.com/earth/).			

2.3.4. Limitations

Some jurisdictions may have compiled GIS land use layers that include more detailed or more current information than the regional datasets available from SanGIS. SanGIS layers were selected for the Regional WMAA to provide consistent land use characterization region-wide, and to provide for repeatability of GIS analyses when a land use layer is required for input data. The definition of non-Copermittee areas identified in this document as "Federal/State/Indian Lands" is for the Regional WMAA. Some WQIPs may define non-Copermittee areas differently.

2.4.Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas

The Regional MS4 Permit identifies in the provisions related to the WMAA that potential coarse sediment yield areas within the watershed be identified, with GIS layers (maps) as output. With regard to the function and importance of coarse sediment, SCCWRP Technical Report 667 titled “Hydromodification Assessment and Management in California” states the following:

“Coarse sediment functions to naturally armor the stream bed and reduce the erosive forces associated with high flows. Absence of coarse sediment often results in erosion of in-channel substrate during high flows. In addition, coarse sediment contributes to formation of in-channel habitats necessary to support native flora and fauna.”

This report identifies the potential critical coarse sediment yield areas for the Carlsbad WMA in compliance with this permit provision. The applied datasets and methodologies for identifying the coarse sediment yield areas, along with their respective results, are described in the sections below.

2.4.1. Datasets Used for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas


The following datasets were used in the analysis

Dataset	Source	Year	Description
Elevation	USGS	2013	1/3 rd Arc Second (~10 meter cells) digital elevation model for San Diego County
Land Cover	SanGIS	2013	Ecology-Vegetation layer for San Diego County downloaded from SanGIS
Geology	Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S.	2002	Geologic Map of the Oceanside 30’x60’ Quadrangle, California, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 2, 1:100,000 scale.
	Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S.	2008	Geologic Map of the San Diego 30’x60’ Quadrangle, California, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 3, 1:100,000 scale.
	Todd, V.R.	2004	Preliminary Geologic Map of the El Cajon 30’x60’ Quadrangle, Southern California, United States Geological Survey, Southern California Areal Mapping Project (SCAMP), Open File Report 2004-1361, 1:100,000 scale.
	Jennings et al.	2010	“Geologic Map of California,” California Geological Survey, Map No. 2 – Geologic Map of California, 1:750,000 scale

2.4.2. Methodology/Assumptions/Criteria for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas

The methodology used to identify coarse sediment yield areas is based on Geomorphic

Landscape Unit (GLU) methodology presented in the SCCWRP Technical Report 605 titled “Hydromodification Screening Tools: GIS-Based Catchment Analyses of Potential Changes in Runoff and Sediment Discharge” (SCCWRP, 2010). Geomorphic Landscape Units characterize the magnitude of sediment production from areas through three factors judged to exert the greatest influence on the variability on sediment-production rates: geology types, hillslope gradient, and land cover. The GLU approach provides a useful, rapid framework to identify sediment-delivery attributes of the watershed. The process to integrate these factors into GLUs is indicated in the flow chart below.



The following steps were used to define Geomorphic Landscape Units (GLUs), which were then related to the coarse sediment and critical coarse sediment yield areas in the Carlsbad WMA.

1. **Integrate data sets used to determine GLU:** Categories for geology, gradient, and land cover were defined based on readily available GIS datasets for the region and classifications found in relevant literature listed in Chapter 6. The different combinations of these categories make up distinct GLUs.
 - **Geologic Categories:** based on methodology listed in Attachment A.4.1 of Attachment A.4. Resulting geologic categories from this analysis are: Coarse Bedrock (CB), Coarse Sedimentary Impermeable (CSI), Coarse Sedimentary Permeable (CSP), Fine Bedrock (FB), Fine Sedimentary Impermeable (FSI), Fine Sedimentary Permeable (FSP), and Other (O). An exhibit showing the regional geology groupings is presented in Attachment A.4.
 - **Land cover categories:** defined using the Ecology Vegetation GIS map layer developed by the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego and SANDAG which

were downloaded from SanGIS (2013). The vegetation categories in the GIS layer were grouped (Table A.1.2 in Attachment A.1) to match the following categories used in SCCWRP's Technical Report 605 (SCCWRP, 2010): Agriculture/Grass; Developed; Forest; Scrub/Shrub, Other (Water) and Unknown.

- **Gradient Categories:** based on slope ranges found in a review of relevant literature (GLU methodology applied in California) listed in Chapter 6. The spatial processing of the slope categories utilized the USGS National Elevation Dataset (NED). Slope ranges used include: 0% to 10%, 10% to 20%, 20% to 40%, and greater than 40%.
2. **GLU Union Results:** GIS mapping exercise for the study area resulted in 166 GLUs within the 9 WMAs in San Diego County. Table A.4.2 in Attachment A.4 provides the list of the 166 GLUs.

For implementing hydromodification management performance standards in the Regional MS4 Permit, the Copermitees need to identify Critical Coarse Sediment Yield areas in the study region. To provide information on the identification of Critical Coarse Sediment yield, the study assumed that critical coarse sediment would be generated from GLUs that are composed of geologic units likely to generate coarse sediment (based on the methodology listed in Step 3) and have the potential for high relative sediment production (as estimated using the methodology listed in Step 4).

3. **Define Pertinent Geologic groups:** the geologic groups (Attachment A.4.1) considered in this study to have the potential to generate coarse sediment are Coarse Bedrock (CB), Coarse Sedimentary Impermeable (CSI), and Coarse Sedimentary Permeable (CSP). An exhibit showing the regional geologic grouping is presented in Attachment A.4.
4. **Relate GLU to Sediment Production:** For assigning GLUs with a relative sediment production, the following methodology was utilized:
 - Conducted quantitative analysis to assign relative sediment production. Analysis was performed based on the assumption that sediment production from an area is proportional to the soil loss from the area, as evaluated using standard soil loss equation. Detailed analysis steps are documented in Attachment A.4.2;
 - To validate the quantitative assignment above, a qualitative field assessment was conducted for 40 sites. Site selection and findings from the field assessment is documented in Attachment A.4.3.
 - The result of the field assessment indicated a 65% match between field conditions and the quantitative assignments. The mismatches are attributed to differences in percent land cover as assumed for the quantitative analysis and those observed in the field. As such, the quantitative assignments were considered to be valid for the purposes of assigning relative sediment production.

2.4.3. Results for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas

The resulting GIS maps showing the spatial distribution of geologic grouping and critical coarse sediment yield areas within the Carlsbad WMA are provided in Attachment A.4. An ArcMap document which presents the results from each step of the methodology is included in Attachment C. Based on this analysis it was estimated that 8.1% of the study area is a potential critical coarse sediment yield area.

As a result of the regional-scale datasets, and commensurate data resolution, used to map the potential critical coarse sediment yield areas, some areas may have been mapped that in reality do not produce critical coarse sediment as they are existing developed areas. As such, an opportunity for jurisdictions to incorporate more refined data into the preliminary WMAA GIS dataset based on local knowledge and review of current aerial images was provided. The City of Escondido, the City of Encinitas, the City of Del Mar, and the County of San Diego provided augmented data in the Carlsbad WMA in their respective jurisdictional areas.

Summary of Deliverables for Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas

Format	Item	Description	Location
Report	Figures	“Geologic Grouping” "Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas"	Attachment A.4
GIS	Map Group Layer Name	Potential Coarse Sediment Yield	Attachment C
	Map Layer Title	Geologic Grouping Land Cover Slope Category Geomorphic Landscape Unit Potential Coarse Sediment Yield Area Relative Sediment Production Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Area	
	Geodatabase Feature Dataset	PotentialCoarseSedimentYield	
	Geodatabase Feature Class	GLUAnalysis PotentialCoarseSedimentYieldAreas PotentialCriticalCoarseSedimentYieldAreas	
	Geodatabase Geometry Type	Polygon	
KMZ ¹	KMZ File Name	Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas	Attachment C

¹ To enhance the utilization of this data, the Geomorphic Landscape Unit Analysis is provided in both traditional GIS file format (ESRI software license purchase required) and as a Google Earth KMZ (Keyhole Markup Language/Zipped) file that can be viewed with the free download version of Google Earth (<http://www.google.com/earth/>).

2.4.4. Limitations for identifying potential critical coarse sediment yield areas

The resulting GIS layers were developed using regional datasets and provide a useful, rapid framework to perform screening-level analysis that is appropriate for watershed-scale planning studies. The methodology used to identify potential coarse sediment yield areas does not account for instream sediment supply and sediment production from mass failures like landslides which

are difficult to estimate on a regional scale without performing extensive field investigation. This data set also does not account for potential existing impediments that may hinder delivery of coarse sediment to receiving waters or downstream locations within the watershed as this was beyond the scope of a regional study. Where more precise estimates are required for a particular site or subarea it is recommended that this analysis be augmented with site-specific analysis. It is also recognized that this regional data set is a function of the inherent data resolution and therefore may not conform to all site conditions, or does not reflect changes to particular areas that have occurred since the underlying data was developed. As such, the WMAA data for the potential critical coarse sediment yield areas should be verified in the field according to the procedures outlined in the Model BMP Design Manual and/or jurisdiction specific BMP Design Manual.

2.5. Physical Structures

The Regional MS4 Permit requires the Copermitees to identify information regarding locations of existing flood control structures and channel structures, such as stream armoring, constrictions, grade control structures, and hydromodification or flood management basins with GIS layers (maps) as output, for each WMA being analyzed for the purpose of developing watershed-specific requirements for structural BMP implementation. This study identified the physical structures using a desktop-level analysis for the stream(s) identified in Section 2.2 in compliance with this permit provision.

2.5.1. Approach for identifying physical structures

The intent of this portion of the WMAA project was to provide an initial assessment of the structures of interest for the stream(s) identified in Section 2.2. This desktop-level analysis was conducted primarily as a visual survey of aerial imagery and FEMA flood insurance study (FIS) profiles where available. The collected information was entered into a GIS layer for inclusion into the overall WMAA geodatabase containing the characterization layers required by the Regional MS4 Permit. To support overall WMA characterization, the information derived in this task provides insight into water and sediment movement through the watershed (SCCWRP, 2012), the opportunities and limitations for infrastructure retrofits and also informs efforts to identify appropriate locations for habitat or riparian area rehabilitation in relation to proximate infrastructure. Specific information regarding how the survey was performed and the attributes of the generated data is presented in Attachment A.5. Note that concrete channels, pipes/culverts, riprap or other artificial stream armoring, and basins have also been identified in the linework generated for the streams (see Section 2.2).

2.5.2. Results for identifying physical structures

The resulting GIS mapping provided in Attachment A.5 shows the spatial locations of the physical structures within the mapped stream(s).

Summary of Deliverables for Physical Structures

Format	Item	Description	Location
Report	Figure	Watershed Management Area Streams by Reach Type with Channel Structures	Attachment A.5
GIS	Map Group Layer Name	Channel Structures	Attachment C
	Map Layer Title	Channel Structures	
	Geodatabase Feature Dataset	ChannelStructures	
	Geodatabase Feature Class	ChannelStructures	
	Geodatabase Geometry Type	Point	
KMZ ¹	Kmz File Name	ChannelStructures	Attachment C

¹ To enhance the utilization of this data, the Physical Structures map is provided in both traditional GIS file format (ESRI software license purchase required) and as a Google Earth KMZ (Keyhole Markup Language/Zipped) file that can be viewed with the free download version of Google Earth (<http://www.google.com/earth/>).

3. Template for Candidate Project List

The Regional MS4 Permit requires each WMA to use the results from the WMA characterization to compile a list of candidate projects that could potentially be used as alternative compliance options for Priority Development Projects should an agency or jurisdiction opt to develop an alternative compliance program. Copermittees must first conclude that implementing such a candidate project would provide greater overall benefit to the watershed than requiring implementation of structural BMPs onsite prior to implementing these candidate projects as alternative compliance projects.

The Copermittees elected to identify potential candidate projects as a separate effort from this regional project, and therefore the process for identifying candidate projects is not documented in this report. Instead, this project only developed a template, in a spreadsheet format, for use by the Copermittees to compile lists of potential candidate projects. The template is intended to enhance regional consistency of the information that is gathered for candidate projects. The template spreadsheet file was distributed to the Copermittees on January 28, 2014. A table of the template components is indicated below:

Column	Primary Heading	Secondary Heading	Guidance for Completing the Project List
A	Project Identifier	-	Unique identifier for the project.
B	Watershed Management Area	-	Dropdown menu to select the watershed management area the project is located in
C	Hydrologic Area (HA)	-	Dropdown menu to select the hydrologic area the project is located in Select a WMA in column B for HA (Column C) dropdown menu to activate.
D	Hydrologic Subarea (HSA)	-	Dropdown menu to select the hydrologic subarea the project is located in. Select a HA in column C for HSA (Column D) dropdown menu to activate.
E	Jurisdiction	-	Dropdown menu to select the jurisdiction the project is located in. Select a HSA in column D for Jurisdiction (Column E) dropdown menu to activate.
F	Project Name	-	Indicate the name of the project.
G	Ownership	Type	Dropdown menu to select if the project is a public project, private project, or public-private partnership.
H	Ownership	Ownership Information	List the details for the owner.
I	Project Location	Address	List the address of the project site.
J	Project Location	APN	List the APN of the parcel.
K	Project Location	Latitude	List the latitude of the project site.
L	Project Location	Longitude	List the longitude of the project site.

Column	Primary Heading	Secondary Heading	Guidance for Completing the Project List
M	Project Origination/ Originator	Name	List the name of the report/organization/individual that provided the idea for the project. Potential origination sources: WQIP, WMAA, JURMPs, WURMPs, CLRPs, IRWM, MSCP, MHPA, Other.
N	Project Origination/ Originator	Contact Information	Link or report title if the proposed project is from a report [or] contact information if from an organization/individual.
O	Project Category	-	Drop Down menu to select the project category; In addition to the 6 project categories explicitly listed in the Regional MS4 Permit, the drop down menu also has a category "Other project types allowed by the MS4 Permit". Example for "Other" project types are agency CIP programs such as Green Streets, LID conversions (medians, parks), agency filter installation, etc.
P	Specific Project Type	-	List the subcategory of the project; for example, list Regional BMP type (i.e. infiltration basin, wetland, etc.).
Q	Potential Pollutant	-	Identify the potential pollutant(s) that can be treated by the proposed project.
R	Project Size & Parameters	Contributing Drainage Area (acres)	List the contributing drainage area to the project.
S	Project Size & Parameters	Parcel Size (acres)	List the size of the parcel the project is located on.
T	Project Size & Parameters	Project Footprint (acres)	List the size of the project footprint.
U	Project Size & Parameters	Parameters (with units as necessary)	Parameters needed to quantify benefits from the project; i.e. for an infiltration basin, list the water quality volume, long-term infiltration rate, depth of the basin, etc.
V	Regulatory Requirement	-	Indicate if the project is proposed to meet particular regulatory requirement such as TMDL, etc.
W	Project Timeline	-	Indicate if a project must be implemented by certain date to meet a grant deadline or other time commitment.
X	Other Notes	-	List any other relevant notes; for example, when retrofitting existing infrastructure project category is selected, input parameters needed to quantify benefits from existing infrastructure into this column as these will be needed to estimate additional benefits that can be used for alternative compliance. If N/A is selected in any dropdown menus, add additional explanation in here

4. Hydromodification Management Applicability/Exemptions

Hydromodification, which is caused by both altered storm water flow and altered sediment flow regimes, is largely responsible for degradation of creeks, streams, and associated habitats in the San Diego Region. The purpose of the hydromodification management requirements in the Regional MS4 Permit is to maintain or restore more natural hydrologic flow regimes to prevent accelerated, unnatural erosion in downstream receiving waters.

In some cases, priority development projects may be exempt from hydromodification management requirements if the project site discharges runoff to receiving waters that are not susceptible to erosion (e.g., a lake, bay, or the Pacific Ocean) either directly or via hardened systems including concrete-lined channels or existing underground storm drain systems.

The March 2011 Final Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) identified certain exemptions from hydromodification management requirements by presenting "HMP applicability criteria." The Regional MS4 Permit maintains some of these HMP applicability criteria. However, some of the applicability criteria are not included under the Regional MS4 Permit unless the area or receiving water is mapped in the WMAA. The intent of this Section is to provide mapping of areas exempt from hydromodification management requirements, and provide supporting technical analyses for exemptions that are recommended by the WMAA.

4.1. Additional Analysis for Hydromodification Management Exemptions

This section documents additional analysis performed to further evaluate the following exemptions that were already approved by the San Diego Regional Board with the 2011 Final HMP. This study only provides additional analysis, data, and rationale for supporting or eliminating the following existing exemptions and does not propose or study any new exemptions:

- Exempt River Reaches
- Stabilized Conveyance Systems Draining to Exempt Water Bodies
- Highly Impervious Watersheds and Urban Infill and
- Tidally Influenced Lagoons

4.1.1. Exempt River Reaches

There are no river reaches currently recommended for exemption from hydromodification management requirements in the Carlsbad WMA. Potential river reach exemptions may be studied using the recommended approach documented in the Regional WMAA. Refer to the Regional WMAA for the criteria and an example exemption studies that were prepared for the five river reaches included in the San Diego County Final HMP dated March 2011. However, any future proposed HMP exemptions would need to be approved through the WQIP Annual Update process (Regional MS4 Permit Section F.1.2.c.).

4.1.2. Stabilized Conveyance Systems Draining to Exempt Water Bodies

There are no stabilized conveyance systems currently recommended for exemption from hydromodification management requirements in the Carlsbad WMA. If engineered conveyance systems that are stabilized with materials other than concrete, such as riprap, turf reinforcement mat, or vegetation, including rehabilitated stream systems, are identified as potential candidates for exemption, they may be studied and may be recommended exempt if they meet specific criteria presented in the Regional WMAA for this exemption. Refer to the Regional WMAA for the criteria and an example study that was prepared for Forester Creek in the San Diego River WMA. However, any future proposed HMP exemptions would need to be approved through the WQIP Annual Update process (Regional MS4 Permit Section F.1.2.c.).

4.1.3. Highly Impervious/Highly Urbanized Watersheds and Urban Infill

Based on evaluation of the highly impervious/highly urbanized watershed and urban infill exemptions presented in the March 2011 Final HMP, and comparison with more recent research prepared for the Ventura County Hydromodification Control Plan (Ventura County HCP) (Final Draft dated September 2013), resurrection of these exemptions from the March 2011 Final HMP was not recommended by the Regional WMAA. The research prepared in support of the Ventura County HCP determined lower thresholds of additional impervious area (ranging from 0.44% to 1.65%) than the limit presented in the San Diego County Final HMP dated March 2011 (3%). No areas within the Carlsbad WMA are currently recommended for highly impervious/highly urbanized watershed or urban infill exemption.

4.1.4. Tidally Influenced Lagoons

4.1.4.1. History

The March 2011 Final HMP, approved by the SDRWQCB under the 2007 MS4 Permit, provides the following exemption from hydromodification management requirements under Section 6.1, HMP Applicability Requirements:

- "Figure 6-1, Node 6 – For projects discharging runoff directly to a tidally-influenced lagoon, potential exemptions may also be granted. Exemptions related to runoff discharging directly to tidally-influenced areas were drafted based upon precedent set in the Santa Clara HMP. Regarding the potential exemption, additional analysis would be required to assess the effects of the freshwater / saltwater balance and the resultant effects on lagoon-system biology. This assessment, which would be required by other permitting

processes such as the Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, etc., must be provided by a certified biologist or other specialist as approved by the governing municipality. Such discharges would include an energy dissipation system (riprap, etc.) designed to mitigate 100-year outlet velocities based upon a free outfall condition. Such a design would be protective of the channel bed and bank from an erosion standpoint."

4.1.4.2. Status under 2013 Regional MS4 Permit

The Regional MS4 Permit language discussing exemptions from hydromodification management does not specifically include "tidally influenced lagoons" or "tidally influenced areas." However, areas identified by Copermitees as appropriate for an exemption may be identified in the optional WMAA incorporated into the WQIP.

4.1.4.3. Research and Results

Discharges to tidally influenced lagoons were not automatically exempted from hydromodification management based on the March 2011 Final HMP. The March 2011 Final HMP provided the potential for the governing municipality to grant exemptions if analyses were prepared to assess the effects of the freshwater / saltwater balance and the resultant effects on lagoon-system biology and to assess the energy dissipation at the outfall.

In 2012 the City of Carlsbad's Land Development Engineering Division commissioned a study to examine seven major drainage areas contributing to three lagoons within the City of Carlsbad (Buena Vista, Agua Hedionda, and Batiquitos Lagoon). Each of the seven major drainage areas includes a continuous network of non-erodible storm water conveyance facilities that serves a majority of the drainage area. The study is titled, "Hydromodification Exemption Analyses for Select Carlsbad Watersheds," prepared by Chang Consultants, dated June 10, 2013. The study identifies certain areas where HMP exemptions can be applied and provides the supporting facility sizing, discharge conditions, and biologic/technical studies. A copy of the study text and hydromodification exemption maps is provided in Attachment B.1.4. The study makes the following conclusions regarding the lagoons and systems draining into each lagoon:

- "Agua Hedionda Lagoon and Batiquitos Lagoon are tidally-influenced, so the direct outlets into these lagoons satisfy an exemption criteria (criteria number 6 from Figure 12). Each of outlets into these two lagoons has proper energy dissipation, so the outlets meet required exemption criteria number 2. Finally, as-built plans along with hydrologic and hydraulic analyses show that the main public drainage facilities can convey the 10-year flows to the outlets. In most cases, the underground storm drain alone has capacity for the 10-year flow. In some cases, the combination of underground and overland flow is needed to convey the flow. Where overland flow occurs, the flow is primarily conveyed within improved public streets and will not occur over natural unlined streams. This satisfies the criteria to ensure the 10-year flow does not enter natural areas subject to erosion prior to reaching the ultimate drainage system outlet."
- "Buena Vista Lagoon is not tidally-influenced, but the outlets into this lagoon meet an exemption criterion (criterion number 7) because the lagoon is a stabilized conveyance with capacity for the ultimate 10-year flow. Each of outlets into this lagoon has proper energy dissipation, so the outlets meet required exemption criterion number 2. Furthermore, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses show that the 10-year flow is

conveyed by the underground storm drain alone in most areas, and the combination of the underground storm drain and improved public streets in the remaining areas."

4.1.4.4. Recommendation

Storm water conveyance systems and their respective drainage areas that have been identified in the study titled, "Hydromodification Exemption Analyses for Select Carlsbad Watersheds," prepared by Chang Consultants, dated June 10, 2013, should be exempt from hydromodification management requirements. The study, approved by the City of Carlsbad, has demonstrated that the areas are appropriate for an exemption. The storm water conveyance systems have been identified as "recommended for exemption" on the exhibits in Attachment C.1 of this report titled, "Water Bodies and Systems Exempt or Potentially Exempt from Hydromodification Management Requirements." These storm water conveyance systems and their respective drainage areas and the June 2013 study should be adopted into the Carlsbad Watershed Management Area Analysis.

Buena Vista Lagoon is recommended to be an exempt water body because the study concluded that it is a stabilized conveyance system. Direct discharges to Buena Vista Lagoon may be exempt if proper energy dissipation is provided at the outfall. Energy dissipation was confirmed for the systems that are recommended to be exempt. For other systems discharging directly to Buena Vista Lagoon, the project proponent must determine if proper energy dissipation exists. Analysis of the freshwater / saltwater balance and the resultant effects on lagoon-system biology would not be required.

Agua Hedionda Lagoon and Batiquitos Lagoon are not shown as exempt water bodies because the study examined site specific characteristics at the outfalls of interest (for the seven drainage areas) that could potentially result in localized effects. For other systems discharging directly to Agua Hedionda Lagoon or Batiquitos Lagoon, if exemption is desired, a study similar to the study prepared for the City of Carlsbad must be conducted to determine if exemption is appropriate. The study must consider the resultant effects on lagoon-system biology and assess energy dissipation at the outfall, as described in the March 2011 Final HMP.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Watershed Management Area Characterization

The WMA Characterization data was developed using available regional data to further understand the macro-scale watershed characteristics and processes in the Carlsbad WMA. The Regional MS4 Permit allows for flexibility in complying with land development requirements when using the information developed in the WMAA to improve water quality planning and implementation associated with land development. This dataset will assist with identifying the opportunities and constraints for projects and management decisions based on a watershed scale (rather than piecemeal project identification without context within the watershed) and provides Copermittees the ability to exercise the option to create an alternative compliance program that offers the opportunity to develop watershed-specific alternatives to universal onsite structural BMP implementation. The characterization data includes:

Characterization Data	Utilization Potential
<p>Dominant Hydrologic Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overland flow • Infiltration • Interflow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify areas for enhanced infiltration or collection of storm water for treatment • Implement management measures that correspond to pre-development conditions – promotes long-term channel stability and health • Increases understanding of the natural functioning of the watershed and what has been (or is at risk of being) altered by urbanization.
<p>Stream Characterization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach type • Bed material • Bank material • Hydrographic category • Channel Structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary dataset that can be used to conduct stream power evaluations • Identify channel systems for preservation or restoration • Identification of appropriate space for channel processes to occur (e.g., flood plain connectivity) • Insight to sensitivity of receiving stream reach • Indicates the features within channels that affect water and sediment movement through the watershed

Characterization Data	Utilization Potential
<p>Land Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing • Future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foresight (identifies relative risks, opportunities, or constraints) in comparing future to existing land uses, i.e., areas that may be more/less vulnerable to adverse impacts to changes in storm water runoff associated with development • Encourage infill development
<p>Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of areas or function that contributes critical sediment within the watershed to stream armoring/stability • Assist with identifying potentially susceptible stream reaches that require uninterrupted coarse sediment supplies to remain stable • Dual goal of open space conservation

Regarding the identification of the potential critical coarse sediment yield areas in the WMAA using readily available regional datasets, it is anticipated that when more precise estimates for potential critical coarse sediment yield areas are required for a particular site or subarea that this regional study will be augmented with site-specific analysis. Development projects must avoid critical sediment yield areas or implement measures that allow critical coarse sediment to be discharged to receiving waters, such that there is no net impact to the receiving water to meet the requirements of the Regional MS4 permit. As such, projects should consult the Model BMP Design Manual and/or jurisdiction specific BMP Design manual for options to meet the Regional MS4 Permit requirements. It is anticipated that the data will not be static but will be enhanced over time through future studies or field assessments that will refine what is currently a macro-level data set.

5.2. Template for Candidate Project List

It is anticipated the Copermittees that elect to develop alternative compliance programs will conduct a separate exercise to nominate potential candidate projects for inclusion into the WQIPs using the template developed for this project.

5.3. Hydromodification Management Exemptions

Attachment B.2 presents hydromodification management applicability/exemption mapping for the Carlsbad WMA. The mapping includes receiving waters that are exempt based on the Regional MS4 Permit or recommended exempt based on studies.

Receiving waters that are **exempt** based on the Regional MS4 Permit include:

- The Pacific Ocean
- Lakes and Reservoirs
- Existing underground storm drains or concrete-lined channels draining directly to the ocean

Receiving waters or conveyance systems that are **recommended exempt** in the Carlsbad WMA based on studies that were provided to the Regional WMAA for this purpose include:

- Buena Vista Lagoon
- Existing underground storm drains or concrete-lined channels discharging directly to Buena Vista Lagoon, and localized outfalls to Agua Hedionda Lagoon and Batiquitos Lagoon. These systems were identified based on the City of Carlsbad's study of Buena Vista Lagoon, Agua Hedionda Lagoon and Batiquitos Lagoon. These systems may not represent all discharges to the above-listed bodies. Additional systems may be considered exempt if there is no evidence of erosion at the outfall of the conveyance system, the resultant effects on lagoon-system biology have been evaluated for tidally-influenced lagoon outfalls, and any other criteria determined by the local jurisdiction.

6. References

- Becker, A. and P. Braun. 1999. Disaggregation, aggregation and spatial scaling in hydrological modeling. *Journal of Hydrology* 217:239-252.
- Beighley, R.E., T. Dunne and J.M. Melack. 2005. Understanding and modeling basin hydrology: Interpreting the hydrogeological signature. *Hydrological Processes* 19:1333-1353.
- Beven, K.J. 2001. *Rainfall-Runoff Modelling, The Primer*. John Wiley. Chichester, UK.
- Brown and Caldwell. 2011. Final Hydromodification Management Plan Prepared for County of San Diego, California.
- Chang Consultants. 2013. Hydromodification Exemption Analyses for Select Carlsbad Watersheds. Study prepared for City of Carlsbad, California.
- County of San Diego, 2010. Impervious Surface Coefficients for General Land Use Categories for Application within San Diego County. County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
- England, C.B. and H.N. Holtan. 1969. Geomorphic grouping of soils in watershed engineering. *Journal of Hydrology* 7:217-225.
- Fischenich, C. 2001. Stability Thresholds for Stream Restoration Materials. USAE Research and Development Center ERDC TN-EMRRP-SR-29, 10 pp.
- Geosyntec Consultants. 2013. Ventura County Hydromodification Control Plan (HCP) Prepared for Ventura Countywide Stormwater Quality Management Program.
- Greene, R.G. and J.F. Cruise. 1995. Urban watershed modeling using geographic information system. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management - ASCE* 121:318-325.
- McCuen, R.H. 2005. *Hydrologic Analysis and Design*. 3rd Edition. Pearson Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. pp 378.
- Haverkamp, S., N. Fohrer and H.-G. Frede. 2005. Assessment of the effect of land use patterns on hydrologic landscape functions: A comprehensive GIS-based tool to minimize model uncertainty resulting from spatial aggregation. *Hydrological Processes* 19:715-727.
- Hawley, R.J., and Bledsoe, B.P. 2011. "How do flow peaks and durations change in suburbanizing semi-arid watersheds? A southern California Study," *Journal of Hydrology*, Elsevier, Vol 405, pp 69-82.
- Hawley, R.J., and Bledsoe, B.P. 2013. "Channel enlargement in semiarid suburbanizing watersheds: A southern California case study," *Journal of Hydrology*, Elsevier, Vol 496, pp 17-30.
- Hoag, J.C., and Fripp, J. 2005. Streambank Soil Bioengineering Considerations for Semi-Arid Climates. Riparian/Wetland Project Information Series No. 18, May 2005, 15 pp.
- Jennings, C.W., Gutierrez, C., Bryant, W., Saucedo, G., and Wills, C., 2010. "Geologic Map of California," California Geological Survey, Map No. 2 – Geologic Map of California, 1:750,000 scale.
http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/cgs_history/PublishingImages/GMC_750k_MapRele

ase_page.jpg

- Kennedy, M.P., and Peterson, G.L., 1975. "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW1/4 Escondido 7.5 minute quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology, Bulletin 200, 1:24,000 scale.
- Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S., 1977. "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach, and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," California Division of Mines and Geology, Map Sheet 29, 1:24,000 scale.
- Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S., 2002. "Geologic Map of the Oceanside 30'x60' Quadrangle, California," California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 2, 1:100,000 scale. <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/RGM/oceanside/oceanside.html>
- Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, S.S., 2008. "Geologic Map of the San Diego 30'x60' Quadrangle, California," California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map No. 3, 1:100,000 scale. <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/RGM/sandiego/sandiego.html>
- National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). U.S. Department of Agriculture. n.d. SSURGO computerized soils and interpretive maps (automating soil survey maps). Soil Data Mart. Online Database. <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/County.aspx?State=CA>.
- RBF Consulting, 2013. Santa Margarita Regional Hydromodification Management Plan. Prepared for Riverside County Copermittees
- Renard, K.G., G.R. Foster, G.A. Weesies, D.K. McCool and D.C. Yoder, 1997. Predicting Soil Erosion by Water. A guide to conservation planning with Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook No. 703.
- Rodgers, T.H., 1965. "Geologic Atlas of California - Santa Ana Sheet," California Geological Survey, Map No. 019, 1:250,000 scale. <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/GAM/santaana/santaana.html>
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2013. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds within the San Diego Region. Order No. R9-2013-0001. NPDES No. CAS0109266.
- Sanford, W.E. and D.L. Selnick, 2013. Estimation of evapotranspiration across the conterminous United States using a regression with climate and land-cover data. Journal of the American Water Resources Association, Vol.49, No.1.
- SanGIS, 2013. <http://www.sangis.org/download/index.html>
- Santa Paula Creek Watershed Planning Project: Geomorphology and Channel Stability Assessment. Final Report, 2007. Prepared by Stillwater Sciences for Santa Paula Creek Fish Ladder Joint Powers Authority and California Department of Fish and Game.
- SCCWRP, 2010. Hydromodification Screening Tools: GIS-based Catchment analyses of Potential Changes in Runoff and Sediment Discharge. Technical Report 605.
- SCCWRP, 2012. Hydromodification Assessment and Management in California. Eric D. Stein; Felicia Federico; Derek B. Booth; Brian P. Bledsoe; Chris Bowles; Zan Rubin; G.

- Mathias Kondolf and Ashmita Sengupta. Technical Report 667
- Soar, P.J., and Thorne, C.R., 2001. Channel Restoration Design for Meandering Rivers. US Army Corps of Engineers, Final Report, ERDC/CHL CR-01-1. September 2001.
- State Water Resources Control Board (2009). Order 2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002: National Pollutant Discharges Elimination System (NPDES) California General Permit for Storm Water Discharge Associated with Construction and Land Disturbing
- Stillwater Sciences and TetraTech. 2011. Watershed Characterization Part 2: Watershed Management Zones and Receiving-Water Conditions. Report prepared for California State Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, 52 pp.
- Strand, R.G. 1962. "Geologic Atlas of California - San Diego-El Centro Sheet," California Geological Survey, Map No. 015, 1:125,000 scale.
<http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/GAM/sandiegoelcentro/sandiegoelcentro.html>
- Todd, V.R., 2004. "Preliminary Geologic Map of the El Cajon 30'x60' Quadrangle, Southern California," United States Geological Survey, Southern California Areal Mapping Project (SCAMP), Open File Report 2004-1361, 1:100,000 scale.
<http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2004/1361/>
- USGS, 2013. National Elevation Dataset