

**Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan  
Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012**

---

<b>11.0</b>	<b>EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT COMPONENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>11.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>11.2</b>	<b>Effectiveness Assessment Results .....</b>	<b>1</b>
11.2.1	Assessment of Outcome Levels 1-4 (JURMP Annual Report Sections 2.0 through 6.0) .....	2
11.2.2	Assessment of JURMP Components and the JURMP as a Whole .....	4
11.2.3	Water Quality Assessment (Outcome Levels 5 and 6) .....	4
11.2.4	Integrated Assessment (Outcome Levels 1 through 6) .....	4
<b>11.3</b>	<b>Program Review and Modification .....</b>	<b>5</b>
 <b>Table 11.1: Sample Targeted Outcomes and Results Table .....</b>		<b>3</b>
<b>Table 11.2 – Planned Modifications to the JURMP Effectiveness Assessment Component .....</b>		<b>5</b>

## Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

---

### 11.0 EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT COMPONENT

#### 11.1 Introduction

As described in *JURMP Section 13.1*, the overall goal of the Effectiveness Assessment Component is to establish a strategy for ongoing assessment of program activities on a variety of temporal and spatial scales, and specific to particular areas of activity. Effectiveness assessment allows the County to demonstrate compliance with applicable Permit requirements, and to allocate resources toward the most effective programs and solutions. Several objectives continue to guide the County's assessment efforts:

- To demonstrate the success of stormwater program implementation, including whether or to what degree specific implementation targets have been met;
- To demonstrate compliance with minimum Permit requirements;
- To foster management effectiveness by ensuring the measurability of specific program activities;
- To provide an informational basis for relating stormwater program implementation outcomes (Outcome Level 1) to those measured in target audiences (Outcome Levels 2-4); and
- To demonstrate that intended outcomes are being achieved cost-effectively.

The County's overall approach has been described in previous submittals, and continues to be informed by considerable ongoing activity and coordination. During FY 2011-12, the County continued to work at the statewide level as co-chair of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Program Effectiveness Assessment Subcommittee.

Under the County's leadership, the CASQA Subcommittee is also continuing to update its May 2007 *Municipal Stormwater Program Effectiveness Assessment Guidance* to reflect new information, lessons learned, and the refinement of assessment concepts over the past several years. The current focus is to translate the framework and concepts of the current document to a more specific "how to" guidance for managers. All of this experience is being used to inform the next CASQA guidance update, planned for completion in early 2013.

#### 11.2 Effectiveness Assessment Results

*Permit Section I.1* establishes the standards that the County must meet in conducting its annual effectiveness assessments. This section describes the County's strategy for meeting those standards, identifies the locations where specific assessment results can be found throughout the remainder

## Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

---

of this JURMP Annual Report, and provides a general explanation of the results presented. More specific explanation of results is provided as applicable throughout the Annual Report.

### 11.2.1 Assessment of Outcome Levels 1-4 (JURMP Annual Report Sections 2.0 through 6.0)

*Permit Section I.1.a.(1)(a)* establishes a broad requirement for the County to annually assess the effectiveness of significant jurisdictional activities and BMPs implemented. Per *Permit Section I.1.a.(2)*, the County must also identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each significant activity or BMP. Moreover, *Permit Section I.1.a.(2)* requires that, where applicable and feasible, the County must utilize Outcome Levels 1-6 to assess to each of these items. Because each of these requirements is satisfied as applicable throughout each major JURMP Component, this section summarizes the locations of results, and describes their organization.

The County's annual assessment process is supported by regular program reviews. For each major JURMP component, applicable implementing managers are asked to complete a standardized Year-End Program Review Sheet. The purpose of these worksheets is to ensure that all JURMP elements and ancillary documentation are critically reviewed at least once per year, and that applicable recommendations are recorded and tracked to completion. The Year-End Program Review Sheets largely form the basis of the "Planned Modifications" tables that conclude most Annual Report sections.

In most sections of this Annual Report, results are presented almost entirely in tables. Central to each major section or sub-section is a "Targeted Outcomes and Results" table which presents a comprehensive listing both of program implementation results and an assessment of the effectiveness of those results. These tables are followed by additional tables that supply supporting information or analysis. In some cases, detailed data and information are also deferred to attachments.

Program activities and outcomes are presented and assessed within the context of comprehensive management strategies. In most sections, these strategies are introduced as a figure illustrating the primary strategic elements, and relating each to the first four levels of the assessment hierarchy (Outcome Levels 1-4). This allows the reader to better understand the inter-relationship of each of these pieces, and to anticipate the "Targeted Outcomes and Results" in the tables that follow.

## Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

**Table 11.1** provides an example of a “Targeted Outcomes and Results” table, in this case for the Streets, Roads, and Highways Sub-element. As shown, it consists of five columns, each of which is described below.

**Table 11.1: Sample Targeted Outcomes and Results Table**

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
FY 2011-12 Targets (T) ⊙	Implementation Result (R <sub>I</sub> ) ☑	Assessment Result (R <sub>A</sub> ) ⊞	Next Fiscal Year Targets ⊙	Explanation 📄
Inspect all improved County-maintained streets, roads, and highways (T = 3,736 curb-miles)	All improved (curbed and guttered) segments were inspected at least once (R <sub>I</sub> = 3,736 curb-miles)	R <sub>A</sub> = Complete	Inspect all improved County-maintained streets, roads, and highways	During FY 2011-12, 33,022 road inspections were conducted to determine maintenance and cleaning needs. Major County-maintained roads were generally inspected twice monthly and minor roads every other month. <b>Table 4.2.5</b> provides a breakdown of inspection numbers and road station debris removal statistics.

**Column 1 → FY 2011-12 Target (T).** Where possible and appropriate, the County attempts to establish measurable targets for the activities and practices that comprise its program. In many cases, targets are dictated by Permit requirements. In others, they are based on experience or a desired change in the applicable target audience. In some cases, targets are absent either because they do not apply or insufficient data or experience are available to support their establishment.

**Column 2 → Implementation Result (R<sub>I</sub>).** This column presents the direct result of implementing the activity or evaluation. In many cases, implementation results are presented with corresponding targets or assessment results. However, they are not always followed by an evaluation.

**Column 3 → Assessment Result (R<sub>A</sub>).** This column relates the targeted outcome to the implementation result. Assessment results are typically expressed as “Completion,” “Confirmation,” “% Completion,” or “% Success.” Assessment only occurs when both Targeted Measurable Outcomes have been established and Implementation Results obtained.

## Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

---

In cases where the targeted outcome is either “completion” or “confirmation,” Implementation Results ( $R_I$ ) and Assessment Results ( $R_A$ ) are presented as a single result ( $R_{I+A}$ ). “Completion” is generally targeted for discrete tasks or activities such as updating a guidance manual or a source inventory. “Confirmation” is generally used in for ongoing sets of activity that do not have discrete endpoints, such as operating a hotline. In all other cases, the Assessment Result ( $R_A$ ) describes the relationship of the target ( $T$ ) and the Implementation Result ( $R_I$ ). For example, if  $T = 25$  inspections and  $R_I$  is 23 inspections conducted, then  $R_A$  is the percentage of targeted inspections conducted, or 92.0% completion.

**Column 4 → Next Fiscal Year Targets.** Where possible, the “Targeted Outcomes and Results” tables identify and explain activities that the County intends to implement in the upcoming fiscal year. This provides a tentative blueprint for ongoing implementation and helps to provide continuity from year to year.

**Column 5 → Explanation.** This column provides any explanation needed for the current year targets or results, or FY 2010-09 targets. In some cases, explanation boxes have been widened to encompass multiple columns to save space.

### 11.2.2 Assessment of JURMP Components and the JURMP as a Whole

*Permit Section I.1.a.(1)(b)* and *(c)* require that the County annually assess the effectiveness of each major component of the JURMP (Development Planning, Industrial and Commercial, Residential, IDDEC, and Education). As previously described, the County believes that the presentation of results throughout this JURMP Annual Report sufficiently demonstrates successful program implementation for each major JURMP Component, and that their cumulative presentation serves as an indicator of the effectiveness of the JURMP as a whole.

### 11.2.3 Water Quality Assessment (Outcome Levels 5 and 6)

*Permit Section I.1.a(4)* requires that, as applicable and feasible, Water Quality Assessment methods be considered in the annual evaluation of jurisdictional activities / BMPs and the JURMP as a whole. The County does not currently consider annual reviews of such methods either applicable or feasible to the assessment of its JURMP as a whole.

### 11.2.4 Integrated Assessment (Outcome Levels 1 through 6)

## Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2011-2012

---

The County does not currently consider the use of Integrated Assessment methods to be either applicable or feasible as part of an annual JURMP assessment process. Once a longer-term record has been established, and assuming that suitable assessment methodologies can be developed, the County may do so in the future.

### **11.3    Program Review and Modification**

In accordance with *Permit Section I.1.b*, the County has reviewed the results of its JURMP effectiveness assessment and other relevant information to identify modifications needed to maximize JURMP effectiveness and achieve compliance with *Permit Section A*. As shown in **Table 11.2** no additional modifications or improvements to the JURMP Effectiveness Assessment Component are currently planned.

**Table 11.2 – Planned Modifications to the JURMP Effectiveness Assessment Component**

Target Date	JURMP Section(s)	Planned Modification(s)
<b>A. JURMP Modifications</b>		
N/A	13.0	The JURMP Effectiveness Assessment Component was updated in June 2010. No further modifications are necessary at this time.
<b>B. Ancillary Program Documentation</b>		
N/A		