



**New Development Subcommittee  
Proposed Agenda  
June 7, 2011 – 1:30 to 3:30 pm  
Redwood Shores Library, Meeting Room B  
399 Marine Parkway  
Redwood City**

- 1. Introductions, Announcements, Minutes & Agree on Agenda – Matt Fabry, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Meet attendees, review and approve previous meeting summary, make announcements, and agree on agenda.*
- 2. Water Board Comments on Annual Report (Provisions C.3 and C.6) – Laura Prickett, All (20 min.)**  
*Objective: Review comments by Water Board staff on the Provision C.3 and C.6 sections of the Annual Reports submitted by agencies in San Mateo County.*  
*Action: Follow Water Board staff suggestions for your 2011 Annual Report.*
- 3. Status of Update to the Annual Report Form – Laura Prickett (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Hear about BASMAA's progress revising the Annual Report Form for agencies to complete and submit to the Regional Water Board by September 15.*
- 4. Consider Forming a Construction Work Group – Matt, All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Determine whether to form a work group to focus on construction site stormwater compliance issues, which would be made up of agency staff specifically involved in construction site stormwater compliance.*  
*Action: Identify a construction site inspector from your agency to participate.*
- 5. Review Updated Construction BMP Plan Sheet – Laura Prickett, All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Review the revised plan sheet and set deadline for submitting comments.*  
*Action: Provide comments on the plan sheet by deadline agreed to at June 7 meeting.*
- 6. Construction Site Stormwater Control Training – Laura Prickett, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Hear feedback on the April 26-28 Qualified SWPPP Developer/Practitioner training opportunity and request suggestions for August 10 construction site BMP training that will be offered by CalBIG.*  
*Action: Notify applicable staff of August 10 training session.*
- 7. Form Work Group to Plan New Development Workshop – Laura, All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Identify volunteers for work group and provide input on when/where to hold the workshop and topics to address.*  
*Action: Be prepared to provide input at the June 7 meeting.*

- 8. Update on C.3 Compliance Checklist for Development Projects – Laura, All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Review the revised checklist and identify next steps.*  
*Action: Consider using the completed checklist in your agency's project review process.*
- 9. Reminder to Provide Pre-Wet Season Notice before September 1 – Laura Prickett, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Reminder that the MRP requires that agencies, by September 1, remind site developers/ owners disturbing 1 acre or more of soil to prepare for the wet season.*  
*Permit compliance date: Provide this reminder in August.*
- 10. Construction General Permit Compliance – Laura Prickett, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Reminder that grandfathering of projects that were subject to the previous CGP ends September 2, 2011. Consider whether there is a need to develop a countywide list of "high risk" waterways to help in determining projects' risk level under the CGP.*  
*Permit compliance date: If you have a grandfathered capital project, assess risk by 9/2/11.*
- 11. Bay Area Hydromodification Model Discussion – Laura, All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Hear whether agencies have identified a need for upgrading the model to include more San Mateo County-specific data, and whether agencies have identified a need for training specifically for municipal staff to review BAHM outputs.*
- 12. Update on BASMAA Development Committee - Matt, Laura, All (5 min)**  
*Objective: Hear how the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association's Development Committee is proceeding on regional MRP tasks.*
- 13. New Hazardous Materials Notification Form – Matt, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Review new form that has been posted to [www.flowstobay.org](http://www.flowstobay.org), which should be completed by new hazmat facilities when they go into business.*  
*Action: Incorporate this form in your municipality's procedures for reviewing and approving new land uses that use and/or store hazardous materials.*
- 14. Municipal Case Studies – All (10 min.)**  
*Objective: Share information and hear how other municipalities are implementing Provisions C.3 and C.6 of the MRP.*
- 15. Next Meeting – Matt, All (5 min.)**  
*Objective: Schedule next meeting for August 2, 2011.*



# California Regional Water Quality Control Board

## San Francisco Bay Region



Linda S. Adams  
Acting Secretary for  
Environmental Protection

1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612  
(510) 622-2300 • Fax (510) 622-2460  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay>

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.  
Governor

April 11, 2011

To: Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Order No. R2-2009-0074) Permittees

*Sent via email to:*

Jim Scanlin, Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program: [jims@acpwa.mail.co.alameda.ca.us](mailto:jims@acpwa.mail.co.alameda.ca.us)

Geoff Brosseau, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association: [geoff@brosseau.us](mailto:geoff@brosseau.us)

Tom Dalziel, Contra Costa Clean Water Program: [tdalz@pw.cccounty.us](mailto:tdalz@pw.cccounty.us)

George Hicks, City of Fairfield: [ghicks@ci.gairfiled.ca.us](mailto:ghicks@ci.gairfiled.ca.us)

Kevin Cullen, Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District: [kcullen@fssd.com](mailto:kcullen@fssd.com)

Matt Fabry, San Mateo Countywide Pollution Prevention Program: [mfabry@ci.brisbane.ca.us](mailto:mfabry@ci.brisbane.ca.us)

Adam Olivieri, Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program: [awo@eoainc.com](mailto:awo@eoainc.com)

Jill Bicknell, Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program: [jcbicknell@eoainc.com](mailto:jcbicknell@eoainc.com)

Daniel Kasperson, City of Suisun: [dkasperson@suisun.com](mailto:dkasperson@suisun.com)

Sam Kumar, City of Vallejo: [skumar@ci.valejo.ca.us](mailto:skumar@ci.valejo.ca.us)

Lance Barnett, Vallejo Sanitation & Flood Control District: [lbarnett@vsfcd.com](mailto:lbarnett@vsfcd.com)

From: Thomas Mumley  
Assistant Executive Officer

**Subject: Review of Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit Provision C.3. New Development and Redevelopment Sections of 2010 Annual Reports**

We are sending this letter to all Permittees covered by the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP). It provides a summary of our review of sections of the 2010 Annual Reports associated with MRP Provision C.3., New Development and Redevelopment. Specifically, we reviewed the sections of the 2010 Annual Reports corresponding to the C.3. Provisions listed below, which contain annual reporting requirements:

- C.3.b.v.(1) – Regulated Projects as defined by Provision C.3.b.ii.
- C.3.h.iv.(1) – Operation and Maintenance (O&M) inspections of Regulated Projects.
- C.3.h.iv.(2) – Newly installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls.
- C.3.h.iv.(3) – Discussion of O&M inspection findings and effectiveness.

Each of the provisions listed above is discussed in detail below, including the findings of the 2010 Annual Reports review for Provision C.3. and our expectations for the 2011 Annual Reports. We also include a brief discussion of our review of the Provision C.2.d. Stormwater Pump Station and C.2.f. Corporation Yard BMP Implementation sections of the 2010 Annual Reports.

*Preserving, enhancing, and restoring the San Francisco Bay Area's waters for over 60 years*

**Provision C.3.b.v.(1)**Findings

Attachment A of the MRP contains a sample reporting table for Provision C.3.b.v.(1). The approved Annual Reporting Table template developed by the Bay Area Stormwater Management Association (BASMAA) and used by all Permittees is based on this sample reporting table and contains essentially the same information. Our review of the Provision C.3.b.v.(1) section of each Permittee's Annual Report focused on the completeness of the C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table for each Permittee (i.e., was information for each Regulated Project provided under every column heading and did the information reflect what was required in Provision C.3.b.v.(1) and Attachment A of the MRP?).

The completeness of the C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table varied greatly from Permittee to Permittee. However, certain required information seemed universally problematic for most Permittees. These problematic column entries are discussed separately below as well as inconsistent reporting conventions used by different Permittees:

- **Project Phase No.** – If a Regulated Project is being built in phases, report the applicable phase number. If the project is not being built in phases (i.e., has only one phase), enter n/a. Some Permittees incorrectly used this entry to report on the status of the planning approval process for the Regulated Project (i.e., entries included application dates, approval dates, “in construction,” “constructed”). Other Permittees left this entry blank so it is unclear whether the Regulated Project is being built in phases or not.
- **Total New and Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area** – Report the new and replaced impervious surface areas as two unique numbers. If there is no new impervious surface area, enter a “0”. Likewise, if there is no replaced impervious surface area, enter a “0”. About 90% of the Permittees reported one number only, which represents the new and replaced impervious surface areas added together. Specifically, we acknowledge the cities of Campbell, Los Gatos, Newark, San Jose, San Ramon, and Santa Clara, and the counties of Santa Clara and Contra Costa for providing both the new and replaced impervious surface areas for Regulated Projects.
- **Status of Project** – For private projects, report the Regulated Project's application submittal date, application deemed complete date, and final discretionary approval date. For public projects, report the Regulated Project's plans and specifications approval date. Most Permittees did not report all the required dates and some Permittees did not report any dates, but included descriptive entries instead, such as “building permit issued”, “under construction”, or “entitlements.” The required dates represent the minimum information that Permittees must report; any descriptive entries in addition to the required dates are informational and appreciated, but optional.
- **Hydraulic Sizing Criteria** – Report the specific sizing criteria used to design the stormwater treatment system(s) for each Regulated Project. These criteria are listed in Provision C.3.d. and can be referred to by name or simply as C.3.d.(1)(a), C.3.d.(1)(b), C.3.d.(2)(a), C.3.d.(2)(b), C.3.d.(2)(c), or C.3.d.(3).
- **Table Entries left blank** – Do not leave any table entry blank because that can be interpreted as “not applicable” or as an oversight (i.e., the Permittee did not fill in the required reporting information).

In some cases, the incompleteness of the C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Tables can be attributed to the fact that this first annual reporting year (FY 2009-10) encompasses requirements from two different permits, the previous countywide MS4 permits and the MRP. We understand that some of the required information for the C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table was not collected at the time the Regulated Projects were approved and therefore, not available for inclusion in the 2010 Annual Reports.

#### Expectations for 2011 Annual Reports

All the required information, including the specific entries discussed above, must be reported in the Provision C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table for each Regulated Project approved during fiscal year 2010-11. If a Permittee did not approve any Regulated Projects during Fiscal Year 2010-11, then the Permittee should state that in this section of the Annual Report.

#### **Provision C.3.h.iv.(1)**

##### Findings

Attachment G of the MRP contains a sample reporting table for Provision C.3.h.iv.(1). The approved Annual Reporting Table template developed by BASMAA and used by all Permittees is based on this sample reporting table and contains essentially the same information. Our review of the Provision C.3.h.iv.(1) section of each Permittee's Annual Report focused on the completeness of the C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table for each Permittee (i.e., was information for each O&M inspection provided under every column heading, and did the information reflect what was required in Provision C.3.h.iv.(1) and Attachment G of the MRP?)

Overall, the C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Tables were more complete than the C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Tables, although their completeness varied from Permittee to Permittee. Again, certain required information seemed universally problematic for most Permittees. These problematic column entries are discussed separately below as well as inconsistent reporting conventions used by different Permittees:

- Name of Facility/Site Inspected – Report the name of the facility or site that was inspected.
- Location of Facility/Site Inspected – Report the street address of the facility or site that was inspected (i.e., number and street and not just the name of the street). In the rare case that there is no street address, include the main street with cross streets so that the facility/site can be located on a map.
- Type of Inspection – Report the type of inspection (i.e., initial, routine, annual, follow-up). Do not just report that it was a “field” inspection because that is understood.
- Table Entries left blank – Do not leave any table entry blank because that can be interpreted as “not applicable” or as an oversight (i.e., the Permittee did not fill in the required reporting information).

#### Expectations for 2011 Annual Reports

All the required information, including the specific entries discussed above, must be reported in the Provision C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table for each O&M inspection conducted during Fiscal Year 2010-11.

In the 2010 Annual Reports, some Permittees stated they had Regulated Projects with installed stormwater treatment systems, but they did not inspect them during the reporting period (Fiscal Year 2009-10). These Permittees should be aware that Provision C.3.h.iv.(6) requires each Permittee to implement by December 1, 2010, a prioritized plan for inspecting all installed stormwater treatment systems and hydromodification management (HM) controls. This Provision further requires a minimum percentage of installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls to be inspected every year. Therefore, any Permittee with Regulated Projects that have installed stormwater treatment systems or HM controls must perform O&M inspections every year.

If a Permittee did not perform any O&M inspections during Fiscal Year 2010-11 because there are no Regulated Projects within the Permittee's jurisdiction, then the Permittee should state that in this section of the Annual Report. Likewise, if a Permittee did not perform any O&M inspections during Fiscal Year 2010-11 because no stormwater treatment systems or HM controls have been built yet for the Regulated Projects within the Permittee's jurisdiction, then the Permittee should state that in this section of the Annual Report.

### **Provision C.3.h.iv.(2)**

#### Findings

This Provision requires that each Permittee provide a list of newly installed (i.e., installed within the reporting fiscal year) stormwater treatment systems and HM controls to the local mosquito and vector control agency and the Water Board. This list must include the facility locations and a description of the stormwater treatment measures and HM controls installed.

Although this requirement is listed in Provision C.3.h.iv. "Reporting: Beginning with the 2010 Annual Report", it technically has a due date that falls after the Annual Report is due. That is, the "before the wet season" language in this provision implies the due date is September 30 of each year since the MRP defines the wet season as October 1 to April 30. The BASMAA Annual Report Template does not include reporting on this provision and therefore, none of the Permittees' Annual Reports addressed this provision.

From our discussions with the managers of each countywide program, we concluded that the method of compliance as well as the date of compliance with the notification requirements of this provision varied greatly. For example, some Permittees sent letters directly to the Water Board, but it is unclear whether those letters were also sent to the local mosquito and vector control agency. For other Permittees, the countywide program manager submitted the C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table to the local mosquito and vector control agency with a copy to the Water Board.

#### Expectations for 2011 Annual Reports

By September 30, 2011, Permittees must provide a list of stormwater treatment systems and HM controls installed during Fiscal Year 2010-11 to their local mosquito and vector control agencies and the Water Board. This list must include the facility locations and a description of the stormwater treatment systems and HM controls installed. If there were no stormwater treatment systems or HM controls installed within a Permittee's jurisdiction during Fiscal Year 2010-11, this list is not required to be submitted.

The list may be sent by mail or email individually by each Permittee or by the countywide program manager on behalf of the Permittees in the county. The list should be sent to the local mosquito and vector control agency with a copy to the Water Board; this provides Water Board staff verification that the list was sent to the local mosquito and vector control agency.

The C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table can be used as the required list for Provision C.3.h.iv.(2) only if a Permittee inspects all stormwater treatment systems and HM controls installed during the reporting fiscal year within the same fiscal year. Additionally, since the C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table is used to report all inspections, including inspections of existing stormwater treatment systems and HM controls (i.e., systems installed in prior reporting years), the Permittee should identify which of the inspected facilities/sites are the newly installed treatment systems or HM controls.

Although the due date for the Provision C.3.h.iv.(2) list is September 30, we recommend that it be added as a reporting element in BASMAA's Annual Reporting Template so that a separate reporting task/product will not be necessary for all Permittees that have newly installed treatment systems or HM controls. Additionally, Permittees that have no newly installed stormwater treatment systems or HM controls can mark this reporting element as "not applicable" so that there is no ambiguity why they did not submit a list to the Water Board and local vector control agency.

### **Provision C.3.h.iv.(3)**

#### Findings

This Provision requires each Permittee to discuss the O&M inspection findings for the year and any common problems encountered with various types of treatment systems and/or HM controls. It also requires each Permittee to discuss the effectiveness of the Permittee's O&M Program and any changes to improve the O&M Program.

Most Permittees satisfied the requirements of this Provision, although the discussions varied in length and detail. However, from some of the discussions in this section as well as notations in the C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table, it seems some Permittees may be using self-inspection by Regulated Projects to fulfill the inspection requirements of Provision C.3.h.

#### Expectations for 2011 Annual Reports

All Permittees with Regulated Projects that have installed stormwater treatment systems and/or HM controls must provide the discussions required in this Provision. The O&M Verification Program required in Provision C.3.h. requires all Permittees to regularly inspect all stormwater treatment systems and HM controls to verify that they are/were properly installed, operated, and maintained. Self-inspection by the Regulated Projects does not satisfy this requirement. Any Permittee that does not perform O&M inspections of installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls will be in noncompliance with the MRP.

If a Permittee did not inspect any Regulated Projects during Fiscal Year 2010–11 because there are no Regulated Projects within the Permittee's jurisdiction, then the Permittee should state that in this section of the Annual Reporting Template. Likewise, if a Permittee did not inspect any Regulated Projects during Fiscal Year 2010–11 because no stormwater treatment systems or HM controls have been built yet for the Regulated Projects within the Permittee's jurisdiction, then the Permittee should state that in this section of the Annual Reporting Template.

In conclusion, Provision C.3. reporting in the 2010 Annual Reports did not fully meet our expectations. However, we acknowledge that some of the shortcomings may be attributed to the difference in data collection and reporting requirements between the previous permits and the MRP. We appreciate the efforts Permittees have made to date, especially those that submitted the most complete C.3.b.v.(1) and C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Tables. For your information, we have attached Provision C.3. Completeness Review Tables, which tabulate the completeness of each Permittee's reporting for the C.3. sections discussed above. We have also attached an "explanation sheet" for the symbols used in the Tables.

Please note that these tables also include findings of our completeness review of the Provision C.2.d. Stormwater Pump Station and C.2.f. Corporation Yard BMP Implementation sections of the 2010 Annual Reports. We found no issues in the C.2.d. Stormwater Pump Station sections and found only a few minor issues (highlighted in the tables) in the C.2.f. Corporation Yard BMP Implementation sections. These issues can be resolved in the 2011 Annual Reports.

We look forward to working with Permittees in collectively improving Provision C.3. reporting in future Annual Reports. If you have any questions regarding our review and expectations, or to report inaccuracies in the Completeness Review Tables, please contact Sue Ma at [sma@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:sma@waterboards.ca.gov) or (510) 622-2386.

Enclosures:

MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., ACCWP (A-L)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., ACCWP (M-Z)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., CCCWP (A-Ma)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., CCCWP (Me-Z)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., SMCWPPP (A-H)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., SMCWPPP (I-Z)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., SCVURPPP (A-M)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., SCVURPPP (P-Z)  
MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3., Solano Co Permittees  
Explanation of Table Symbols used in Provision C.3. Completeness Review Tables

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (A – H)**

	Atherton	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Colma	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough
<b>C.2.d. Pump Station Data</b>										
Does the City own any pump stations?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
If yes, look at DO data (not required until 2010-11 Annual Report).	n/a	None	n/a	None	n/a	n/a	None	None	n/a	n/a
<b>C.2.f. Corp Yard BMPs</b>										
Does the City own any corp yards?	Unknown All 3 boxes unchecked but 2 corp yards listed	Owens 1	Owens 1	Owens 1	Owens 1	Owens 2	Owens but no indication of how many	Owens 1	Owens 1	Owens 1
If yes, coverage under State Ind Permit?	Unknown	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
If not covered, certify that corp yard(s) has current SWPPP ( <i>SWPPPs due 7/1/10</i> )	SWPPP is being developed and will be completed 1/1/2011.	Certified	Certified	Certified	Certified	Certified	Certified	n/a	Certified	Certified
Indicate which SWPPP BMPs have been implemented. Explain if not implemented.	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	All BMPs listed are checked	Cover outdoor storage area BMP not checked and no discussion	All BMPs checked except one that is not applicable	All BMPS listed checked
Fill out table on any corp yard inspections (minimum requirement is one inspection per corp yard before start of rainy season so inspection required prior to October 1.	Inspected 12/22/09 and minimal information on inspections included	Inspected 4/13/10 and details included	Inspected 6/4/09 and 12/14/10. Inspection details included	Inspected 9/21/09 and inspection details included	Inspected 5/19/10 and details included	Inspected 6/29-30/10 and inspection details included	No inspections	No inspections	Inspected 4/7/10 and inspection details included	Monthly inspections throughout the year. Inspection details included.
<b>C.3.b.v.(1) Regulated Projects</b>	Reporting Table not included and no indication whether any Regulated Projects were approved	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period. Entries below are from old C.3 reporting format for 5 private projects.	2 private	9 private	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period. Entries below from old C.3 reporting format for 1 private project.	No Regulated Projects approved during entire Annual reporting period (7/1/09 – 6/30/10)	3 private 1 public	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period. Entries below are from old C.3 reporting format for 1 private project.	No Regulated Projects approved during entire Annual reporting period (7/1/09 – 6/30/10)	No Regulated Projects approved during entire Annual reporting period (7/1/09 – 6/30/10)

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (A – H)**

	Atherton	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Colma	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough
Project Name and/or Number	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--
Project Location, Street Address	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✗	--	--
Name of Developer	---	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✗	--	--
Project Phase No.	--	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	--	✗ "Building Permit"	✓	--	--
Project Type & Description	--	Incomplete "commercial" "residential"	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	Incomplete "redevelopment"	--	--
Project Watershed	--	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✓	✗	--	--
Total Site Area	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✗ Negative values given	✗	--	--
Total Area of Land Disturbance	--	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✗ Negative values given	✗	--	--
Total New and/or Replaced Impervious Area	--	✗	✓	✓	✓	--	✗ Negative values given	✗	--	--
<i>Total New Imp Area</i>	--	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✗	✗	--	--
<i>Total Replaced Imp Area</i>	--	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✗	✗	--	--
Total Pre-Project Imp Area	--	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✗ Negative values given	✗	--	--
Total Post-Project Imp Area	--	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✗ Negative values given	✗	--	--
Status of Project	--	✓ "Tentative Map" "Project under design review stage"	✓ No dates given "Use permit approved, now seeking"	✓ No dates given "Approved, construction has not"	✓	--	✓ No dates given "Building Design Review"	✓ "Approved 9/09"	--	--

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (A – H)**

	Atherton	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Colma	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough
			grading and later building permit	begun						
Application Submittal Date	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--
Appl. Deemed Complete Date	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--
Discretionary Approval Date	--	X	X	X	Yes	--	X	✓	--	--
Public Projects - Plans & Specs Approval Date	--	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	X	n/a	--	--
List Source Control Measures	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--
List Site Design Measures	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--
List Treatment Systems Approved	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	X "TBD in progress"	X	--	--
Specify O&M Responsibility Mechanism	--	✓	✓ for 1 "TBD prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy"	X "TBD"	✓ "O&M Agreement"	--	X "Discussing with Menlo Park Fire District"	✓	--	--
State Hydraulic Sizing Criteria	--	✓	✓	X "Volume based"	✓	--	X "TBD in progress"	X	--	--
Alternative Compliance Measures	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	X "TBD in progress"	Left blank	--	--
Alternative Certification Projects	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	X "TBD"	Left blank	--	--
HM Controls	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	Left blank	--	--
Control Method used	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	Left blank	--	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(1) O&amp;M Inspections</b>	"First Regulated Project came online 8/09 and not due to for	3 Regulated Projects inspected	No C.3 treatment systems installed so	1 Regulated Project inspected	No C.3 treatment systems installed so far	2 Regulated Projects inspected	2 Regulated Projects inspected	<b>Table not filled out but no indication that there are no</b>	"No Stormwater Treatment systems were installed in	<b>Table not filled out because "No projects approved during MRP period" but no</b>

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (A – H)**

	Atherton	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Colma	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough
	inspection until 2014"		far					projects in City	previous years"	indication that there are no projects in City
Name of Facility/Site Inspected	--	X	--	✓	--	✓	X	--	--	--
Site Location / Street Address	--	✓	--	✓	--	X	✓	--	--	--
Responsible Party for Maintenance	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
Date of Inspection	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
Type of Inspection	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
Types of Treatment System or HM Control Inspected	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓ "Storing piping and DI" "DI"	--	--	--
Inspection Findings or Results	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓ "Okay"	--	--	--
State Enforcement Action Taken	--	Left blank	--	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	--	--	--
Comments	--	None	--	✓	--	None	None	--	--	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(2) Notifications</b>										
On annual basis before wet season, submit list of newly installed treatment and/or HM control systems to WB and Mosquito Abatement. Include locations and descriptions.	--	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(3) Discussions</b>										
C.3.h.iv.(3)(a) Discuss inspections findings and common problems found with various types of treatment systems and/or HM controls. Include comparison to inspection findings from previous year.	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	X No discussion. Entry talks about street sweeping.	--	Table not filled out because "No projects approved during MRP period" but no indication that there are no projects in City.

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (A – H)**

	Atherton	Belmont	Brisbane	Burlingame	Colma	Daly City	East Palo Alto	Foster City	Half Moon Bay	Hillsborough
C.3.h.iv.(3)(b) Discuss effectiveness of O&M Program and proposed changes to improve.	--	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	<p align="center">✗</p> <p><i>No discussion. Entry talks about future training</i></p>	--	<p><b>Table not filled out because "No projects approved during MRP period" but no indication that there are no projects in City.</b></p>

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (I – Z)**

	Menlo Park	Millbrae	Pacifica	Portola Valley	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Carlos	San Mateo	San Mateo County	San Mateo Flood	South San Francisco	Woodside
so inspection required prior to October 1).			actions noted	and no follow-up actions identified					5/20/10 No violations noted.		actions listed	actions noted
<b>C.3.b.v.(1) Regulated Projects</b>	22 private 3 public	3 private	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period. Entries below are from old C.3 reporting format for 12 private projects	No Regulated Projects but entries below filled out for single-family homes	4 private 1 public	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period Entries below are from old C.3 reporting format for 6 private projects	No Regulated Projects approved during MRP period. 1 <sup>st</sup> half-yearly report does not include C.3. reporting table attachment Unclear whether any Regulated Projects were approved in FY 2009-10	7 private 1 public	5 private	n/a to the District	2 private	No projects "which require to be listed under C.3. of the Permit"
Project Name and/or Number	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Project Location, Street Address	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Name of Developer	✓	✗ "n/a"	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Project Phase No.	✓	n/a	✗	n/a	✗ "complete"	✗	--	✗ "Planning Approval" Construction "Building Permit Review"	✗ "Completed" "Pending final approval"	--	✓	--
Project Type & Description	✓	Incomplete "Retail Store"	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Project Watershed	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	--	✓	✓	--	✓ "San Francisco Bay"	--

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (I – Z)**

	Menlo Park	Millbrae	Pacifica	Portola Valley	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Carlos	San Mateo	San Mateo County	San Mateo Flood	South San Francisco	Woodside
Total Site Area	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Total Area of Land Disturbance	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Total New and/or Replaced Impervious Area	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
<i>Total New Imp Area</i>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✗	✗	--	✗	--
<i>Total Replaced Imp Area</i>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✗	✗	--	✗	--
Total Pre-Project Imp Area	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✓	✓ for some Others state "~ 100%"	--	✓	--
Total Post-Project Imp Area	✓	✗ "Same"	✗	✓	✓	✗	--	✓	✓ for some Others state "~ 70%"	--	✓	--
Status of Project	✓ Just deemed complete dates	✓ "Planning Approval"	✓ "under construction" Application submittal date	✗ Detailed description of projects given	✗ "8/20/10"	✓	--	✓	✓ "Completed" Missing all entries listed below for one project	--	✓ "Applied" and "Approved" dates given	--
<i>Application Submittal Date</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✓	✗	--	✓	--
<i>Appl. Deemed Complete Date</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	--	✓	✗	--	✗	--
<i>Discretionary Approval Date</i>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	--	✓	✗	--	✓	--
<i>Public Projects - Plans &amp; Specs Approval Date</i>	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	✓	n/a	--	n/a	--
List Source Control Measures	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
List Site Design Measures	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
List Treatment Systems Approved	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Specify O&M Responsibility	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (I – Z)**

	Menlo Park	Millbrae	Pacifica	Portola Valley	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Carlos	San Mateo	San Mateo County	San Mateo Flood	South San Francisco	Woodside
Mechanism			"TBD"									
State Hydraulic Sizing Criteria	✓	✗	✗ "unknown"	✗	✓	✗	--	✓	✓	--	✗ "Flow-based sizing"	--
Alternative Compliance Measures	n/a	Left blank	n/a	Left blank	Left blank	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	--
Alternative Certification Projects	n/a	Left blank	n/a	Left blank	Left blank	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	--
HM Controls	n/a	Left blank	✓ "will apply"	Left blank	Left blank	n/a	--	n/a	n/a Treatment measures listed under HM controls	--	n/a	--
Control Method used	n/a	Left blank	"tbd"	Left blank	Left blank	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(1) O&amp;M Inspections</b>	25 Regulated Projects inspected	No inspections "Property owners are required to inspect and maintain their treatment measures periodically"	No inspections "No projects installed stormwater treatment systems during reporting period" Unclear if there are treatment systems installed to date	No Regulated Projects Town performs winterization inspections of all sites between Oct 1 – April 15	23 Regulated Projects inspected	"No inspections were completed during the reporting period. Staff expects to achieve the inspection goal by Dec 2010"	No inspections "Inspection program not yet established" Unclear if any treatment systems have been installed to date.	6 Regulated Projects inspected	5 Regulated Projects inspected	n/a to the District	17 Regulated Projects inspected	No Regulated Projects "which require to be listed under C.3. of the Permit"
Name of Facility/Site Inspected	✗	--	--	--	✓	--	--	✗	✓	--	✗	--
Site Location / Street Address	✓	--	--	--	✓	--	--	✓	✗	--	✓	--
Responsible Party for	✓	--	--	--	✓	--	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (I – Z)**

	Menlo Park	Millbrae	Pacifica	Portola Valley	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Carlos	San Mateo	San Mateo County	San Mateo Flood	South San Francisco	Woodside
Maintenance												
Date of Inspection	✓	--	--	--	✗	--	--	✓	✓ only for some	--	✓	--
Type of Inspection	✓	--	--	--	✗	--	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Types of Treatment System or HM Control Inspected	✓	--	--	--	✓	--	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Inspection Findings or Results	✓	--	--	--	✗	--	--	✓	✓ only for some "newly installed May 2010" "approved"	--	✓	--
State Enforcement Action Taken	n/a	--	--	--	n/a	--	--	n/a	n/a	--	✓	--
Comments	✓	--	--	--	None	--	--	None	✓	--	✓	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(2) Notifications</b>												
On annual basis before wet season, submit list of newly installed treatment and/or HM control systems to WB and Mosquito Abatement. Include locations and descriptions.	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
<b>C.3.h.iv.(3) Discussions</b>												
C.3.h.iv.(3)(a) Discuss inspection findings and common problems found with various types of treatment systems and/or HM controls. Include comparison to inspection findings from previous year.	✓	✗ "Property owners are required to conduct inspections. This system was in place last year as well"	✗ "n/a"	--	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--

**MRP 2009-10 Annual Report Review for Completeness, Provisions C.2. & C.3.  
San Mateo Permittees (I – Z)**

	Menlo Park	Millbrae	Pacifica	Portola Valley	Redwood City	San Bruno	San Carlos	San Mateo	San Mateo County	San Mateo Flood	South San Francisco	Woodside
C.3.h.iv.(3)(b) Discuss effectiveness of O&M Program and proposed changes to improve.	✓	✗ "Millbrae currently does not verify the effectiveness of the O&M Program"	✗ "Although no projects have been approved this period that trigger the O&M requirement, the City has implemented a new O&M tracking method . . ."	--	✓	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--

2009-2010  
C.3. MRP Annual Report Review  
& Expectations for  
2010-1011 Annual Report

Presentation to  
Permittees' Management Committees  
Sue Ma

1

C.3. Sections Reviewed

- C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table on Regulated Projects
- C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table on O&M Inspections
- C.3.h.iv.(2) List of Newly Installed Treatment Systems
- C.3.h.iv.(3) Discussion of O&M Inspection Findings and Effectiveness

2

C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table

- Completeness varied greatly from Permittee to Permittee
- First annual reporting year encompasses requirements from previous permit & MRP
- Some Regulated Projects approved prior to MRP adoption when there was no requirement to collect all the data

3

C.3.b.v.(1) Reporting Table  
Problematic Column Entries

- Project Phase No. – If a Regulated Project is being built in phases, report the applicable phase number. If not, enter n/a.
- Total New and Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area – Report the new and replaced impervious surface areas as two unique numbers.
- Status of Project – Report application submittal and deemed complete dates and discretionary approval date for private projects and the plans and specs approval date for public projects.
- Hydraulic Sizing Criteria – Report specific sizing criteria as listed in Provision C.3.d.
- Table Entries left blank – Do not leave any entries blank.

4

C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table

- More complete than C.3.b.v.(1) Table
- Problematic Columns – Name & Address of facility inspected
- Some Permittees did not do inspections even though they have Regulated Projects
- Some entries and discussion for C.3.h.iv.(3) imply that some Permittees are relying on self-inspections by Regulated Projects

5

C.3.h.iv.(2) List of Newly Installed  
Treatment Systems & HM Controls

- List must be submitted to local mosquito agency & Water Board before rainy season – September 30
- Discrepancy in due date with Annual Report so this Provision not part of AR Template
- Methods of compliance & dates of compliance varied
  - Individual letters from Permittees
  - Lists submitted by countywide program managers

6

## Expectations for 2011 Annual Report

- All required information must be reported in C.3.b.v.(1) & C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Tables
- Include these statements in the Reporting Tables as applicable:
  - No Regulated Projects approved in FY 2010–11
  - No O&M inspections because there are no Regulated Projects within the Permittee's jurisdiction
  - No O&M inspections because no treatment systems or HM controls have been built yet

7

## Expectations for 2011 Annual Report

- Provide local mosquito agency with list of treatment systems and HM controls installed in reporting year
- List may be sent (mail or email) individually or by countywide program to mosquito agency with copy to Water Board
- C.3.h.iv.(1) Reporting Table can be used only if:
  - Permittee inspects all systems installed during reporting period within the same reporting year, and
  - Permittee identifies the new treatment systems and HM controls in the Reporting Table

8

## Expectations for 2011 Annual Report

- C.3.h. Provisions with required implementation by December 1, 2010 will require certification in 2011 Annual Report that due dates have been met:
  - C.3.h.ii.(4) – Written plan (and implementation of the plan) describing O&M (including inspections) of all Permittee-owned Regional Projects and regional HM controls
  - C.3.h.ii.(5) – Database or tabular format of all Regulated Projects with specific required fields
  - C.3.h.ii.(6) – Prioritized plan for inspecting all treatment systems and HM controls that meets minimum inspection frequencies

9

## Next Steps

- Letter will go out to all Permittees
  - Discussion of findings
  - Discussion of expectations for 2011 Annual Report
  - 2010 Annual Report Review Tables for C.3. – highlighted entries indicate missing, incomplete, or incorrect information
- No plans to issue NOVs for C.3. reporting because of challenges in reporting already discussed
- Permittees with a lot of highlighted entries in Annual Report Review Tables may become higher priority candidates for future inspections

10

## 2009-2010 MRP Annual Report Review & Expectations for 2010-2011 Annual Report

Presentation to  
Permittees' Management Committees  
Selina T. Louie

Updated 4/5/11

1

## Annual Report – C.6. Construction Site Controls

16

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

C.6.e.iii.1.a, b, c ▶ Site/Inspection Totals		
Number of sites disturbing < 1 acre of soil requiring storm water runoff quality inspection (i.e. High Priority) (C.6.e.iii.1.a)	Number of sites disturbing > 1 acre of soil (C.6.e.iii.1.b)	Total number of storm water runoff quality inspections conducted (C.6.e.iii.1.c)
A	B	C

C.6.e.ii.(2)(b) – High priority sites

- Soil erosion potential or soil type
- Site slope
- Project size and type
- Sensitivity of receiving waterbodies
- Proximity to receiving waterbodies
- Non-stormwater discharges
- Any other relevant factors

Municipality Dependent

Should consider including :

- Sites pulling grading permit
- C.3. sites

All site ≥ 1 acre

$$A+B=C$$

Total number of inspections conducted for the reporting year

18

## Inactive Sites ≥ 1 Acre and High Priority Sites

- If site using temporary erosion and sediment controls:
  - Inspect monthly until site is completely stabilized, usually with the growth of vegetation
- If violations are found during monthly inspections:
  - Implement Enforcement Response Plan
  - Require developer/owner to implement corrective actions
  - Conduct follow-up inspections to ensure implementation of adequate corrective actions

19

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

C.6.e.ii.1.d ▶ Construction Activities Storm Water Violations		
BMP Category	Number of Violations <sup>1</sup>	% of Total Violations <sup>2</sup>
Erosion Control		
Riv-in and Run-off Control		
Sediment Control		
Active Treatment Systems		
Good Site Management		
Non Stormwater Management		
<b>Total</b>		100%

<sup>1</sup>Count one violation in a category for each site and inspection regardless of how many violations/problems occurred in the BMP category.

<sup>2</sup>Percentage calculated as number of violations in each category divided by total number of violations in all six categories.

For each inspection, count only one violation in a category regardless of how many violations were found for that category.

20

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

For example: January 7, 2010 at Site A

BMP Category	Violations	Count for Tracking
Erosion Control	4 Separate Areas (Entrance, park 3, Lot 8, & Lot 12)	1
Sediment Control	12 Separate Points (Lots 7-18)	1
Good Site Management	4 Separate Issues (Paint buckets, packs of mortar uncovered, trash, concrete washout)	1

These specific areas should be noted in the inspection form and used during the follow-up inspection to ensure that all violations have been corrected. They don't get tabulated for the Annual Report.

These numbers get tabulated for the Annual Report.

21

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

C.6.e.ii.1.e ▶ Construction related storm water enforcement actions			
	Enforcement Action (as listed in ERP) <sup>1</sup>	Number Enforcement Actions Taken	% Enforcement Actions Taken <sup>2</sup>
Level 1			
Level 2			
Level 3			
Level 4			
<b>Total</b>			100%

Note:

<sup>1</sup>Agencies should list the specific enforcement actions as defined in their ERP.

<sup>2</sup>Percentage calculated as number of each type of enforcement action divided by the total number of enforcement actions.

List municipality's specific enforcement levels per Enforcement Response Plan.

22

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

C.6.e.ii.1.f, g ▶ Illicit Discharges			
			Number
Number of illicit discharges, actual and those inferred through evidence (C.6.e.ii.1.f)			
Number of sites with discharges, actual and those inferred through evidence (C.6.e.ii.1.g)			

Site	Date	Illicit Discharge	Count for Tracking
The Cove	1/4/2010	Corner of 12 <sup>th</sup> and River (sediment)	2
		Outside of main driveway (sediment)	
Paradise	2/7/2010	Inside bioretention unit A (sediment)	1
The Cove	5/9/2010	River and Flow (cleaning mortar pan)	3
		Creek and Plume (granite grindings) Plume and Flow (landscape material hosed)	

Count number of discharge points. In this example, there are 6 Illicit Discharges.

23

## Filling out C.6. in the Annual Report Continued

C.6.e.iii.1.h.   Violation Correction Times		Number	Percent
Violations fully corrected within 10 business days after violations are discovered or otherwise considered corrected (C.6.e.iii.1.g.)			%
Violations not fully corrected within 30 days after violations are discovered (C.6.e.iii.1.i.)			%
Total number of violations for the reporting year <sup>1</sup>			100%

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup>Total number of violations equals the number of initial enforcement actions (i.e., one violation issued for several problems during an inspection of a site). It does not equal the total number of enforcement actions because one violation issued at a site may have a second enforcement action for the same violation at the next inspection if it is not corrected.  
<sup>2</sup>Calculated as number of violations fully corrected in a timely period after the violations are discovered divided by the total number of violations for the reporting year.  
<sup>3</sup>Calculated as number of violations not fully corrected within 30 days after the violations are discovered divided by the total number of violations for the reporting year.

For sites that need more than 10 working days to completely resolve violations, please explain why (i.e. too unstable to approach...)

Footnotes are directions for filling out the form.

Get rid of the footnotes that provide directions for filling out the form, especially if you are using new footnotes in the Annual Report.

24

## C.6. Electronic or Tabular Format for Inspections

When we talked about the electronic or tabular format, the number one complaint was that we didn't provide an example of the format.

25

## Electronic or Tabular Format for Inspections

Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit  
Order No. R2-2009-0074

NYDES No. CAS612008  
Appendix E: Fact Sheet

Table 6 - Construction Inspection Data

Facility/Site Inspected	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Inches of Rain Since Last Inspection	Enforcement Response Level	Problem(s) Observed						Specific Problem(s)	Resolution			Comments/ Rationale for Longer Compliance Time		
					Erosion Control	Run-Off Control	Sediment Control	Active Treatment	Good Site Management	Non-Stormwater Management		Illicit Discharge	Problems Fixed	Violations Closed		Enforcement	
Panorama Views	9/30/08	Dry	0	Written Notice								Emergency not stabilized					
Panorama Views	10/15/08	Dry	0.5														50' of driveway milled
Panorama Views	11/15/08	Rain	3	Stop Work								Uncovered graded into eroding. Sediment entering a stream that didn't have adequate protection.					
Panorama Views	11/15/08	Drizzling	0.25														Lots blanketed. Storm drains pumped. Street cleaned.
Panorama Views	12/1/08	Dry	4	Verbal Warning								Pottery potty next to stream.					Pottery potty moved away from stream.
Panorama Views	1/15/09	Rain	3.25	Written Warning								Fiber rolls need maintenance. Tire wash water flowing into street.					Fiber rolls replaced.
Panorama Views	1/25/09	Dry	0														

Fact Sheet Page App E-52 & E-53 Date: October 14, 2009

We did. It got negotiated out of the MRP and dumped into the Fact Sheet.

26

## Information Required in the Electronic/Tabular Format

### Fill out one row per inspection

- Facility /Site Inspected – Straight Forward
- Inspection Date – Straight Forward
- Weather During Inspection – Straight Forward
- Has there been rainfall with runoff since last inspection?
  - Negotiated language
  - Did rain flow down the street to the storm drain at anytime between inspections?
  - Site dependent (slope)
    - May need to ask this as a question during inspection
- Enforcement Response Level – Enforcement action taken; Use individual Enforcement Response Plan

27

## Information Required in the Electronic/Tabular Format, Continued

- Problems Observed Using Illicit Discharge and the Six BMP Categories
  - Illicit Discharge - Any discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer and/or waterbody that is not composed entirely of stormwater, except discharges pursuant to an NPDES permit. Count number of discharge points (Slide 24)
  - Erosion Control – Soil cover
  - Run-On and Run-Off Control – Diversion of off-site drainage around or through the project
  - Sediment Control – Perimeter controls and entrance stabilization to prevent sediment discharges from the site

28

## Information Required in the Electronic/Tabular Format, Continued

- Problems Observed Using Illicit Discharge and the Six BMP Categories, Continued
  - Active Treatment System – Flocculant addition, then more settling and filtration before discharge
  - Good Site Management – “Housekeeping” including but not limited to management of stockpiles, storage and handling of chemicals and construction materials, management of waste storage area, trash, and sanitation facilities, management of vehicles and service areas
  - Non Stormwater Management – Including but not limited to street, tire and vehicle washing, and washing of construction equipment such as paint brushes and pans, mortar, and grout pans and equipment

29

## Information Required in the Electronic/Tabular Format, Continued

- Specific Problems –List specific problems (ie. Entrance not rocked; porta potty located upstream of stormdrain; mortar bags left out uncovered)
- Resolution of Problems noted using the following three standardized categories: Problems Fixed, Need More Time, and Escalate Enforcement
  - Problems Fixed– Corrective actions taken within the timeframe specified by the inspector
  - When the inspector returns at the end of the specified timeframe and the violations are still not corrected
    - Need More Time, if there is a valid reason. Note that the General Construction Permit requires supplies to be kept on site
    - Escalate Enforcement, if there is not valid reason

30

## Information Required in the Electronic/Tabular Format, Continued

- Comments, which shall include all Rationales for Longer Compliance Time, all escalation in enforcement discussions, and any other information that may be relevant to that site inspection.
  - Such as discussions on site status, discussions on corrective actions, and type of inspection (pre rainy, monthly/routine, reinspection, complaint, etc.)
  - If violations are fixed immediately or the same day, say so in this column

31

## Review of Electronic or Tabular Format for Inspections

32

## C.6.e.ii.(4) Data from 18 Permittees

- Alameda
- Alameda County
- Concord
- Contra Costa County
- Cupertino
- Daly City
- Dublin
- Fremont
- Menlo Park
- Millbrae
- Newark
- Orinda
- Palo Alto
- Redwood City
- San Jose
- Santa Clara County
- Union City
- Walnut Creek

33

## Results from Data Review

- A BIG thank you to the Permittees who resorted their data!
  - Asked a number of Permittees to resort their data for more efficient review (by site and then by date)
- Recognize the challenge of tracking data under two different permits.
- When reviewing data for compliance with inspection requirements, recordation of information, and tallying of numbers, just evaluated December 2009 – April 2010
  - Did look at all of the data submitted

34

## Results from Data Review, Cont.

- 7 out of the 18 Permittees had the electronic or tabular format exactly as required by the MRP and then a bit more
- 14 out of the 18 Permittees inspected as required (monthly inspections, recording violations, follow-up on violations) in the MRP
  - Very liberal in giving credit even though some of these 14 Permittees may have missed a month or two for a few sites. And we also know that at least two of these Permittees didn't inspect as required.

35

## Results from Data Review, Cont.

- Of the 158 violations counted (counted as one violation per inspection) in the 18 data sets, 125 violations had clear correction dates
  - 42 violations were corrected the same day
  - 23 violations were corrected after a day
  - 16 violations were corrected after 2 days
  - 11 violations were corrected after 3 days
- 92
- 92 out of the 125 violations that had clear correction dates happened within 3 days
- 76 of those 92 violations that had clear correction dates within 3 days are credited to Cupertino, Fremont, San Jose, and Walnut Creek

36

## Results from Data Review, Cont.

- 3 out the 18 Permittees submitted an amendment to their Annual Report as a result of the data request
- 2 out of the 18 Permittees' electronic/tabular data matched the data (# of high priority sites, # of sites  $\geq 1$  acres, # of violations, etc.) reported in their respective Annual Report
- 10 Permittees inspected beyond the rainy season (October - April) with 3 Permittees inspecting year round
- Illicit Discharges - 38 discharges from 21 sites
- Enforcement Actions
  - Level 1 - 1,198
  - Level 2 - 83
  - Level 3 - 17
  - Level 4 - 35

37

## Results from Data Review - Cont.

- Kudos to Alameda, Cupertino, Fremont, San Jose, and Walnut Creek for having robust data sets
- Robust data set significantly enhanced our understanding of how the Permittee was implementing its program and the quality of the program
- Data set consistently included at least three of the following:
  - Discussions on corrective actions
  - Frequent inspections, including inactive sites
  - Prompt follow-up on inspections
  - Noted stage of construction, which showed inspection from grading through full site stabilization with landscaping of installation of permanent erosion control measures

38

## Results from Data Review - Cont.

- Areas that need some work:
  - Data matching Annual Reports
  - Establishing and inspecting high priority sites
  - Understanding the inspection frequency and re inspection requirements
  - Understanding what is a violation
  - Understanding the BMP categories
  - Counting violations per BMP category
  - Counting illicit discharges
  - Tracking data accurately

39

## Electronic or Tabular Format Example

Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit Order No. R2-2009-0074 NYDES No. CAS612008 Appendix E: Fact Sheet

Table 6 - Construction Inspection Data

Facility/Site Inspected	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Inches of Rain Since Last Inspection	Enforcement Response Level	Problem(s) Observed										Specific Problem(s)	Resolution			Comments/ Rationale for Longer Compliance Time				
					Erosion Control	Sediment Control	Sediment Control	Stormwater Management	Good Site Management	Illicit Discharge	Driveway not stabilized	SR of driveway needed	Lots blanketed. Storm drains impacted. Street cleaned.	Porta potty moved away from storm drain.		Fiber rolls replaced.							
Paramaric Views	9/30/08	Dry	0	Written Notice																			
Paramaric Views	10/15/08	Dry	0.5																				
Paramaric Views	11/15/08	Rain	3	Stop Work																			
Paramaric Views	11/15/08	Drizzling	0.25																				
Paramaric Views	12/1/08	Dry	4	Verbal Warning																			
Paramaric Views	1/15/09	Rain	3.25	Written Warning																			
Paramaric Views	1/25/09	Dry	0																				

Fact Sheet

Page App E-32 & E-33

Date: October 14, 2009

40

## Permittees' Enhancements to Electronic or Tabular Format Example

41

# Daly City and Millbrae

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Enter 1 per inspection Enter 1 for each site	Site Name	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Rain with Runoff Since Prev. Inspection? Y/N	<b>ANSWER ONCE PER SITE: Project Disturbs 1 acre or more? (Y/N/See Previous Entry?)</b> Erosion Control Sediment Control Run-off & Runoff Active Treatment Site Mgt. Non Stormwater Mgt. Inlet Discharge								
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26		
Specific Problem(s) (Ref 13-19)	Resolution (Ref 21) Problem Fixed Needs More Time Escalate Enforcement	Comments (including rationale for longer compliance times) (Ref 21)			Enforcement Response Level (Ref 21) Verbal Warning Written Warning Notice to Comply Stop Work Order Notice to Comply with a penalty Legal Action			Violation Corrected? (Ref 21) Within 10 Business Days NOT corrected within 30 days					

Took the example in the Fact Sheet and made it easier for Annual Reporting and more informative.

# Alameda

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14			
Enter 1 per inspection Enter 1 for each site	Site Name	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Rain with Runoff Since Prev. Inspection? Y/N	<b>ANSWER ONCE PER SITE: Project Disturbs 1 acre or more? (Y/N/See Previous Entry?)</b> Erosion Control Sediment Control Run-off & Runoff Active Treatment Site Mgt. Non Stormwater Mgt. Inlet Discharge											
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26					
Specific Problem(s) (Ref 13-19)	Resolution (Ref 21) Problem Fixed Needs More Time Escalate Enforcement	Comments (including rationale for longer compliance times) (Ref 21)			Enforcement Response Level (Ref 21) Verbal Warning Written Warning Notice to Comply Stop Work Order Notice to Comply with a penalty Legal Action			Violation Corrected? (Ref 21) Within 10 Business Days NOT corrected within 30 days								
					No. of sites disturbing ≥ 1 acre		EC Violations		RER Violations		AT Violations		SM Violations		NS Violations	
					Total violations		Total violations		Total violations		Total violations		Total violations		Total violations	
					For all violations, percentage in each category		100%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

A - B = # of Sites < 1 acre/ High Priority Sites

Format efficiently provides the information necessary for the Annual Report. And it can clearly provide the necessary information to demonstrate MRP compliance.

# Daly City

15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26					
Specific Problem(s) (Ref 13-19)	Resolution (Ref 21) Problem Fixed Needs More Time Escalate Enforcement	Comments (including rationale for longer compliance times) (Ref 21)			Enforcement Response Level (Ref 21) Verbal Warning Written Warning Notice to Comply Stop Work Order Notice to Comply with a penalty Legal Action			Violation Corrected? (Ref 21) Within 10 Business Days NOT corrected within 30 days								
					Summary of enforcement actions		Timeframe of corrections		Total NOT corrected within 30 days		Total timely corrections		Percentage of sites with timely corrections		Percentage of sites NOT corrected in 30 days	
					Total enforcement actions		Percentage within enforcement category		0%		100%		0%		0%	

Format efficiently provides the information necessary for the Annual Report. And it can clearly provide the necessary information to demonstrate MRP compliance.

# Walnut Creek

Inspection Date	Permit Number	Project Name	SWPPP project? (Y/N/Not Applicable)	Date of Inspection	Inspection Type	Inspection Status	Erosion Control Level (Ref 21)	Site Management	Sediment Control	Erosion Control	Runoff/Runoff Control	Treatment System	Non Site Discharge
08/05/2009	00P-08-009	14521% Main St. Remodel and Expansion	0	08/05/2009	Pre-Rain	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
08/19/2009	00P-08-009	Artchis Residence	0	08/19/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 1	1	0	0	0	0	0
08/26/2009	00P-08-009	Artchis Residence	0	08/26/2009	Pre-Rain	Clear	Level 1	0	1	1	0	0	0
09/02/2009	00P-08-009	Artchis Residence	0	09/02/2009	Follow-up	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
09/09/2009	00P-08-017	Carra Place Subdivision	1	09/09/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
09/16/2009	00P-08-009	Deary Rd. Townhomes	0	09/16/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
09/23/2009	00P-08-009	Deary Rd. Townhomes	0	09/23/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
09/30/2009	00P-08-009	Deary Rd. Townhomes	0	09/30/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
10/07/2009	00P-08-009	Deary Rd. Townhomes	0	10/07/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 1	0	0	1	1	0	0
10/14/2009	00P-08-009	Deary Rd. Townhomes	0	10/14/2009	Monthly	Clear	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0

"SWPPP" Column tracks the number of sites disturbing ≥ 1 acre

"Inspection Type" Column keep track of the types of inspections.

# Walnut Creek Cont.

Date of Inspection	Inspection Type	Problem Description	Inspection Notes	Outcome
08-05-2009	Pre-Rain	No issue observed	Contractor had to alter an erosion control and sediment controls on site	No issue
07-01-2009	Monthly	Material storage inadequate	Site works were complete. Contractor was finishing minor interior work (garage). Ordered parking sub-contractor to follow BMPs for storing parts in designated storage bin. Building is closed in for the winter. There are some areas of bare soil need to be protected. Perimeter control were inadequate. Contractor needed to bring in additional erosion/sediment control materials.	Fixed Immediately
08-28-2009	Pre-Rain	Need perimeter control. Contractor had install straw wattles on the slope.	Contractor brought in additional materials to secure the site. Bare slopes had been stabilized with straw wattles, additionally contractor applied straws and tackifiers. Silt fencing were re-installed per spec.	Need More Time
10-01-2009	Follow-up	No issue observed	This project is site (no construction activity). We don't know when will re-start.	No issue
07-17-2009	Monthly	No issue observed	No construction activity observed today. Central Contra Costa Sanitary District issued a Stop Work Order for working without permit. Contractor dug deeper and suspended to damage the line.	No issue
08-12-2009	Monthly	No issue observed	Contractor continued to follow BMPs for concrete works. They completed forming for new curb, gutter and sidewalk. Brought erosion/sediment control materials on-site.	No issue
08-01-2009	Monthly	No issue observed	No construction activity planned for the winter months. Contractor needs to obtain Building permit approval. Internal contractor to install straw wattles.	Fixed Immediately
08-24-2009	Monthly	Straw wattles were not installed properly.	Building closed in for the winter. It is a fairly flat site with on-site drainage system. There are areas of bare soil.	Fixed Immediately
08-28-2009	Pre-Rain	Need perimeter control. Filler fabric must be secured and repaired when torn.	Contractor installed erosion/sediment control per approved plan. Debris was hauled away and materials were stored inside a shed. Minor work for wattles and building works completed.	No issue

Data is a continuation from previous slide. "Problem Description", "Inspection Notes", and "Outcome" columns give the reader understanding of the inspections and the Permittee's program.

# Cupertino

Site Name	Inspection Date	Specific Problems	Inspection Type/Project Completion Date
1		Grad-All damaging straw wattles and inlet protection, replace all damaged wattles and inlet fabric, do not park over drainage inlets, have a readily available soil binder onsite, remove litter and debris around site	
2 Apple Valco	11/20/09	Return Inspection, inlet protection fixed, damaged wattles replaced	Monthly
3 Apple Valco	11/23/09	Replace torn gravel bags and sweep up loose gravel, replace damaged wattles, keep construction vehicles off inlets, good housekeeping (remove litter and construction debris)	Follow-up
4 Apple Valco	12/16/09	Return Inspection, litter picked up, damaged wattles replaced, street swept	Monthly
6 Apple Valco	12/17/09	Return Inspection, litter picked up, damaged wattles replaced, street swept	Follow-up
15 Las Palmas	3/24/10	Final inspection. Periodic site inspections and a drive-by inspection was done in December to ensure the site did not cause any problems.	Final
16 Roseboof	10/12/09	Re-rock construction ingress/egress, employ jetter dust control, have at ready a soil binder.	Monthly
17 Roseboof	10/14/09	Return Inspection, entrance rock reloaded and debris removed	Follow-up
18 Roseboof	11/20/09	Replace damaged straw wattles along perimeter	Monthly
19 Roseboof	11/23/09	Return Inspection, dirt piles removed, damaged wattles replaced	Follow-up

"Specific Problems" column provide descriptive discussions. "Final" jotted in the Inspection Type/Project Completion Date Column clearly states that the project is complete and no further inspection is required.

## San Jose

Site Name	Inspection Date	Notes
CP-0005 Story Rd / Canter Rd (Happy Hollow Park Zoo)	03/03/2010	Rain today, no sediment runoff found. Building and landscape completed. <u>Final</u> construction activities.  No areas of concern at this time
CP-0005 Story Rd / Canter Rd (Happy Hollow Park Zoo)	04/22/2010	Project completed, park in full operation.
CP-0007 Tully Rd / Los Lagos Golf Course (Coyote Creek Trail)	08/12/2009	Project complete.
CP-0008 Branham Ln, 330 (Edenvale Community Center)	11/23/2009	Site is in vertical building stage. Preparing to asphalt parking lot. Erosion controls are being maintained. Perimeter controls around site are also maintained. Informed contractor of upcoming rain event. Also to follow proper discharge methods of ponded water on site.
CP-0008 Branham Ln, 330 (Edenvale Community Center)	12/14/2009	Site is in surface paving stage with vertical building construction in progress. Perimeter controls are being maintained as work progresses. Drop inlets are not active and are being protected. Entrance is being paved. No sediment observed at street and gutters. Informed contractor of upcoming rain event and to prepare site for possible runoff.  No areas of concern at this time

“Notes” column discussion on what the inspector saw as well as the phase of construction.

## Expectations for 2010-2011 Annual Report for C.6.

- Fill in each slot in the Annual Report with something; if not applicable, say so
- Delete footnotes providing directions for filling out the Annual Report (Slide 25)
- Ensure that the data is accurate and there is documentation
- Define high priority sites (Slide 19)
- Inspect all sites disturbing greater than one acre of soil and all high priority sites at least once a month from October through April
  - Inspect from the grading through the installation of permanent landscaping/permanent stabilization

49

## Expectations for 2010-2011 Annual Report for C.6., Continued

- Inspect inactive sites  $\geq$  acre and high priority sites until the sites is completely stabilized (Slide 20)
- Record violations regardless of when they get corrected
- Verify implementation of corrective actions
- Count only one violation for each BMP category regardless of how many violations for each category (Slides 21-22)
- Fill in the Enforcement Levels per respective ERP (Slide 23)

50

## Expectations for 2010-2011 Annual Report for C.6., Continued

- Count each illicit discharge into a storm drain or waterbody as a violation (Slide 24)
- Discuss specific violations and sites that have violations needing more than 10 working days for corrective actions (Slide 25)
- Put some thought into the Evaluation and Effectiveness sections

51

## Expectations for 2010-2011 Annual Report for C.6., Continued

- Fill out tracking data electronic or tabular format for all inspections in compliance with C.6. (Slides 29-33)
  - Use one row per inspection
  - If violations are fixed immediately or the same day, use the same row for inspection and reinspection and state clearly that the violations were fixed immediately or the same day (Slide 47)
  - Need to clearly see how many days from violation to compliance
  - Clearly identify sites as high priority or  $\geq$  1 acre (Slide 44)
  - Provide enough information to demonstrate compliance with C.6.

52



Module 1: Training Overview and Stormwater Regulations (3)

Module 2: Erosion Processes and Sediment

Module 3: Permit Requirements/SWPPP's (2)

ATS

Erosion Control Calculation

**7. Would you be interested in attending another workshop on construction site stormwater controls?**

Yes (34)

No (1)

It Depends

Bring actual materials to show effectiveness of BMPs – Do's and Don'ts.

**8. Suggestion for future topics?**

Expand the example section of the BMPs

Updates as regulatory requirements/BMP methodology evolves.

Refresher course.

Corp yard SWPPP updates & BMPs.

Small, single family home developments & small commercial projects.

More Inspector training.

Linear permit/ATS.

None

Case studies of actual construction activities.

Dealing with sediment during removal of BMPs

Work along creeks

Rain gardens & designs for storm water flows in urban infill sites.

Tech info on soil stabilization.

**9. General Comments?**

Flowed well, good time management

Great Seminar

Nice setting

Very knowledgeable presenters

Good lunch

Good presentation

Speakers need to stay behind the podium so we can see the screen.

Very good instructors!

Had glass in lunch food.

Thank You!

Dry but good.

Instructors did a good job of making a very dry topic somewhat interesting.

Keep up the good work.

Great workshop at great location.

Provide more hands-on practical, site specific reviews.

Gravel bags don't work during the wet season – causes overall flooding.

## QSD/QSP Training Day 2: April 27

---

### Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 14  
Total Completed Survey: 14 (100%)

Number of Day 2 attendees: 40

PAGE: EVALUATE TRAINING BY SAN MATEO COUNTYWIDE WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM AND APWA-SILICON VALLEY

#### 1. Module 5: Construction Site Monitoring - Tanya Bilezikjian

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Useful	57.1%	8
Useful	42.9%	6
Not Useful	0.0%	0
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>0</b>

#### 2. Module 6: Reporting Requirements - Scott Taylor

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Useful	57.1%	8
Useful	42.9%	6
Not Useful	0.0%	0
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>0</b>

#### 3. Module 7: SMARTS and PRDs - Tanya Bilezikjian

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Useful	50.0%	7
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>0</b>

**3. Module 7: SMARTS and PRDs - Tanya Bilezikijan**

Useful	42.9%	6
Not Useful	7.1%	1
<b>answered question</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>0</b>

**4. Group Exercises - Reporting and SWPPP Map Prep**

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Useful	42.9%	6
Useful	57.1%	8
Not Useful	0.0%	0
<b>answered question</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>0</b>

**5. Which topics presented on Day 2 (April 27) were most beneficial?**

	Response Count
	11 (responses listed at end of summary)
<b>answered question</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>3</b>

**6. Which topics presented on Day 2 (April 27) were the least beneficial?**

	Response Count
	4 (responses listed at end of summary)
<b>answered question</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>10</b>

**7. Would you be interested in attending another workshop on construction site stormwater controls?**

	answered question	13
	skipped question	1
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Yes	46.2%	6
No	0.0%	0
Maybe	38.5%	5
I answered this on the Day 1 evaluation form and have not changed my answer.	15.4%	2

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SOLICITING COMMENTS:

**Responses to Question 5** (Which topics presented on Day 2 (April 27) were most beneficial?):

- cannot differentiate
- The group exercises were great. They were extremely helpful.
- The group exercise
- Reporting Requirements (Module 6)
- Modules 5, 6, 7 and lunch.
- group exercises
- The entire class was very useful and I learned a lot.
- site monitoring (Module 5)
- topic 5 and 6
- The group exercises really helped to synthesize what we learned!
- Module 7 (SMARTS and PRDs)

**Responses to Question 6** (Which topics presented on Day 2 (April 27) were the least beneficial?):

- For the SMARTS portion of the training, both the slides in the handouts and those in the powerpoint presentation were unreadable. It did not provide much benefit to the training.
- None
- Group exercise was the least.
- None

**Responses to Question 8** (Suggestion for future topics?)

- More different kinds of practical examples for design projects.
- Maybe another follow up class with more hands on examples.
- More hands on activities and group discussions. The do's and don't s in the field really helps us understand which BMPs to use and why on various sites.

**Responses to Question 9** (General Comments?)

- Instructors did a good job of stating and restating important information. There was a lot to retain, and the repetition solidified the concepts for me.
- Presenters were good and knowledgeable. Handouts and Powerpoint slides were poor to useless (illegible) in many cases. Lunch was very good.
- Had a hard time reading the small print on a good portion of the handouts, and there was also a lot of small print on the overhead slides...
- Thanks!!

### C.3 and C.6 Development Review Checklist

Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (MRP)  
 Stormwater Controls for Development Projects  
 San Mateo County Water Pollution Prevention Program

INSERT CITY SPECIFIC INFO HERE  
 ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
 PHONE \_\_\_\_\_  
 FAX \_\_\_\_\_  
 WEB (for those who allow download etc) \_\_\_\_\_

Applicability of C.3 and C.6 Stormwater Requirements

**1. Enter Project Data** (For "C.3 Regulated Projects," data will be reported in the municipality's stormwater Annual Report.)

1.1 Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Project Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1.3 Project APN: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Watershed: \_\_\_\_\_

1.4 Applicant/Agent Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant/Agent Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

1.5 Applicant/Agent Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1.6 Development type: (check all that apply)  
 Residential    Commercial    Industrial    Mixed-Use    Streets, Roads, etc.  
 'Redevelopment' as defined by MRP: creating, adding and/or replacing exterior existing impervious surface on a site where past development has occurred<sup>1</sup>  
 'Special land use categories' as defined by MRP: (1) auto service facilities<sup>2</sup>, (2) retail gasoline outlets, (3) restaurants<sup>3</sup>, (4) uncovered parking area (stand-alone or part of a larger project)

1.7 Project Description<sup>4</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_

1.8 Is the site a "High Priority Site" that disturbs less than 1 acre (43,560 sq.ft.) of land?  Yes    No  
 ▪ "High Priority Sites" are sites that require a grading permit, are adjacent to a creek, or are otherwise high priority for stormwater protection during construction (see Provision C.6.e.ii(2)).

1.9 Total Area of Site: \_\_\_\_\_ sq.ft. ; Total Area of Land Disturbed: \_\_\_\_\_ sq.ft.  
 ▪ If less than 5,000 sq.ft. of impervious surface is created/replaced, skip to Item 3. Otherwise, continue to Item 2.1.  
 ▪ If 1 acre (43,560 sq.ft.) or more of land is disturbed, obtain coverage under the state's Construction General Permit at <https://smarts.waterboards.ca.gov/smarts/faces/SwSmartsLogin.jsp>. Submit to the municipality a copy of your Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) before a grading or building permit will be issued.

**2. Is the project a "C.3 Regulated Project" per MRP Provision C.3.b?**

2.1 Enter the amount of impervious surface created and/or replaced by the project (if the total amount is 5,000 sq.ft. or more):

Type of Impervious Surface	Pre-Project Impervious Surface (sq.ft.)	Existing Impervious Surface to be Removed (sq.ft.)	New Impervious Surface to be Constructed (sq.ft.)
Roof area(s) – excluding any portion of the roof that is vegetated ("green roof")			
Impervious sidewalks, patios, paths			
Impervious driveway and uncovered parking <sup>6</sup>			
Streets (public)			
Streets (private)			
<b>Total Impervious Surfaces:</b>			
<b>Total New Impervious Surface (including new surface replacing old)</b>			

<sup>1</sup> Roadway projects that replace existing impervious surface are subject to C.3 requirements only if one or more lanes of travel are added.  
<sup>2</sup> See Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes [here](#)  
<sup>3</sup> Restaurants described by SIC code 5812: Retail sale of prepared food and drinks for on-premise or immediate consumption.  
<sup>4</sup> Project description examples: 5-story office building, industrial warehouse, residential with five 4-story buildings for 200 condominiums, etc.  
<sup>5</sup> Per the MRP, pervious pavement underlain with pervious soil or pervious storage material, such as a gravel layer sufficient to hold at least the volume of rainfall runoff specified in MRP Provision C.3.d is not an impervious surface.  
<sup>6</sup> Uncovered parking includes top level of a parking structure.

**2. Is the project a “C.3 Regulated Project” per MRP Provision C.3.b? (continued)**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
2.2 In Item 2.1, does the Total New Impervious Surface equal 10,000 sq.ft. or more? <i>If YES, skip to Item 2.5 and check “Yes.” If NO, continue to Item 2.3.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 Does the Item 2.1 Total New Impervious Surface equal 5,000 sq.ft. or more, but less than 10,000 sq.ft? <i>If YES, continue to Item 2.4. If NO, skip to Item 2.5 and check “No.”</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 Is the project a “Special Land Use Category” per Item 1.6? For uncovered parking, check YES only if there is 5,000 sq.ft or more uncovered parking. <i>If NO, go to Item 2.5 and check “No.” If YES, go to Item 2.5 and check “Yes.”</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5 Is the project a C.3 Regulated Project? <i>If YES, skip to Item 4; if NO, continue to Item 3.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3. Projects that are NOT C.3 Regulated Projects**

If you answered NO to Item 2.5, or the project creates/replaces less than 5,000 sq. ft. of impervious surface (see Item 1.8), then the project is NOT a C.3 Regulated Project, and stormwater treatment is not required, BUT the municipality may determine that source controls and site design measures are required. Skip to Item 6.1.

**4. Projects that ARE C.3 Regulated Projects**

If you answered YES to Item 2.5, then the project is a C.3 Regulated Project. The project must include appropriate site design measures and source controls AND hydraulically sized stormwater treatment measures. Items 4.1 and 4.2 will help you determine the applicability of Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater treatment requirements. IF FINAL DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL IS GRANTED ON OR AFTER **DECEMBER 1, 2011**, LID REQUIREMENTS APPLY, except for “Special Projects.”

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
4.1 Is this project a “Special Project” (including urban infill, high density, or transit oriented development) per the criteria included in Appendix J of the C.3 Technical Guidance? <i>If YES, some non-LID treatment is allowed; skip to Item 5.1. If NO, continue to Item 4.2.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2 Is it feasible to treat the full C.3.d amount of runoff with infiltration or rainwater harvesting and use, per the LID Feasibility Criteria in Appendix I of the C.3 Technical Guidance? <i>Unless final discretionary approval is granted before 12/1/11, a NO answer means that stormwater treatment may be met through biotreatment; a YES answer means that stormwater treatment must be met through rainwater harvesting and reuse or infiltration. In either case, continue to Item 5.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5. Is the project a Hydromodification Management (HM) Project?**

If you answered NO to Item 2.2, the project is too small to be an HM project. Skip to Item 6. Otherwise, continue to Item 5.1

- 5.1 Does the project create and/or replace 1 acre (43,560 sq. ft.) or more of impervious surface? (Refer to Item 2.1.)
  - YES. *Continue to Item 5.2.*
  - NO. *Skip to Item 5.5 and check “No.”*
- 5.2 Is the total impervious area increased over the pre-project condition?
  - YES. *Continue to Item 5.3.*
  - NO. *The project is NOT required to incorporate HM measures. Skip to Item 5.5 and check “No.”*
- 5.3 Is the site located in an HM Control Area per the HM Control Areas map (Appendix H of the C.3 Technical Guidance)?
  - YES. *Skip to Item 5.5 and check “Yes.”*
  - NO. *Attach map, indicating project location. Skip to Item 5.5 and check “No.”*
  - Further analysis required. *Continue to Item 5.4.*
- 5.4 Has an engineer or qualified environmental professional determined that runoff from the project flows only through a hardened channel or enclosed pipe along its entire length before emptying into a waterway in the exempt area?
  - YES. *Attach signed statement by qualified professional. Go to Item 5.5 and check “No.”*
  - NO. *Go to Item 5.5 and check “Yes.”*
- 5.5 Is the project a Hydromodification Management Project?
  - YES. *The project is subject to HM requirements (described in Section 11 of this form). Continue to Item 6.*
  - NO. *The project is EXEMPT from HM requirements. Continue to Item 6.*

# Implementation of C.3 and C.6 Stormwater Requirements

## 6. Select appropriate source controls *(Applies to C.3 Regulated Projects; for other projects required at municipality discretion<sup>7</sup>)*

Check if project has these features		Features that require source control measures	Source Control Measures (Local Source Control List for detailed requirements)	Is source control measure included in project plans?		Plan Sheet No.
Yes	No			Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Storm Drain	Mark on-site inlets with the words "No Dumping! Flows to Bay" or equivalent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Floor Drains	Plumb interior floor drains to sanitary sewer <sup>8</sup> [or prohibit].	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parking garage	Plumb interior parking garage floor drains to sanitary sewer. <sup>8</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retain existing vegetation as practicable.</li> <li>▪ Select diverse species appropriate to the site. Include plants that are pest- and/or disease-resistant, drought-tolerant, and/or attract beneficial insects.</li> <li>▪ Minimize use of pesticides and quick-release fertilizers.</li> <li>▪ Use efficient irrigation system; design to minimize runoff.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pool/Spa/Fountain	Provide connection to the sanitary sewer to facilitate draining. <sup>8</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Food Service Equipment (non-residential)	Provide sink or other area for equipment cleaning, which is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connected to a grease interceptor prior to sanitary sewer discharge.<sup>8</sup></li> <li>▪ Large enough for the largest mat or piece of equipment to be cleaned.</li> <li>▪ Indoors or in an outdoor roofed area designed to prevent stormwater run-on and run-off, and signed to require equipment washing in this area.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refuse Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide a roofed and enclosed area for dumpsters, recycling containers, etc., designed to prevent stormwater run-on and runoff.</li> <li>▪ Connect any drains in or beneath dumpsters, compactors, and tallow bin areas serving food service facilities to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Outdoor Process Activities <sup>9</sup>	Perform process activities either indoors or in roofed outdoor area, designed to prevent stormwater run-on and runoff, and to drain to the sanitary sewer. <sup>8</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Outdoor Equipment/Materials Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cover the area or design to avoid pollutant contact with stormwater runoff.</li> <li>▪ Locate area only on paved and contained areas.</li> <li>▪ If storage area will contain non-hazardous liquids, roof the area, drain to sanitary sewer<sup>8</sup>, and contain by berms or similar.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vehicle/Equipment Cleaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roofed, pave and berm wash area to prevent stormwater run-on and runoff, plumb to the sanitary sewer<sup>8</sup>, and sign as a designated wash area.</li> <li>▪ Commercial car wash facilities shall discharge to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vehicle/Equipment Repair and Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Designate repair/maintenance area indoors, or an outdoors area designed to prevent stormwater run-on and runoff and provide secondary containment. Do not install drains in the secondary containment areas.</li> <li>▪ Prohibit floor drains unless connected to wastewater pretreatment systems prior to discharging to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> <li>▪ Connect containers or sinks used for parts cleaning to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fuel Dispensing Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fueling areas shall have impermeable surface, such as portland cement concrete, that is a) minimally graded to prevent ponding and b) separated from the rest of the site by a grade break to prevent stormwater run-on.</li> <li>▪ Fueling area canopy must extend at least 10 ft in each direction from each pump and drain away from fueling area.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Loading Docks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cover and/or grade to minimize run-on to and runoff from the loading area.</li> <li>▪ Position downspouts to direct stormwater away from the loading area.</li> <li>▪ Drain water from loading dock areas to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> <li>▪ Install door skirts between the trailers and the building.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fire Sprinklers	Design for discharge of fire sprinkler test water to landscape or sanitary sewer. <sup>8</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Miscellaneous Drain or Wash Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Drain condensate of air conditioning units to landscaping. Large air conditioning units may connect to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> <li>▪ Roof drains shall drain to unpaved area where practicable.</li> <li>▪ Boiler drain lines, roof top equipment, and washing and/or steam cleaning activities shall drain to the sanitary sewer.<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<sup>7</sup> See MRP Provision C.3.a.i(7) for non-C.3 Regulated Projects and Provision C.3.c.i(1) for C.3 Regulated Projects.

<sup>8</sup> Any connection to the sanitary sewer system is subject to sanitary district approval.

<sup>9</sup> Businesses that may have outdoor process activities/equipment include machine shops, auto repair, industries with pretreatment facilities.

**7. Select appropriate site design measures** (Applies to C.3 Regulated Projects; for other projects required at municipality discretion<sup>10</sup>)

Municipal staff will indicate which site design measures have been considered, and which are included in the plans.

**7.1 Are appropriate site design measures included in project plans?**

Was the site design measure discussed with applicant?		Is the site design measure included in project plans?		Plan Sheet No.	Site Design Measures
Yes	No	Yes	No		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Protect sensitive areas, including wetland and riparian areas, and minimize changes to the natural topography.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Minimize land disturbance and impervious surface (especially parking lots).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Minimize impervious areas from being directly connected to the storm drain system (for example, direct runoff from roof downspouts and other impervious surfaces to landscaped areas where feasible).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Install rain barrel or cistern to capture and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Design areas of "micro-detention" in landscaping to retain rainfall runoff onsite, where appropriate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Maximize permeability by clustering development and preserving open space, where appropriate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concentrate development density, where appropriate, to reduce impervious surface on a watershed basis.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Use permeable pavement surfaces where feasible.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Self-treating area (see Section 4.2 of the C.3 Technical Guidance)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Self-retaining area (see Section 4.3 of the C.3 Technical Guidance)

**8. Use construction best management practices (BMPs) (applies to all projects).**

**8.1 Are construction BMPs included in project plans?**

Yes	No	Best Management Practice (BMP)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attach the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's construction BMP plan sheet to project plans and require contractor to implement the applicable BMPs on the plan sheet.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Temporary erosion controls to stabilize all denuded areas until permanent erosion controls have been established.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Delineate with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide notes, specifications, or attachments describing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction, operation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls, including inspection frequency;</li> <li>▪ Methods and schedule for grading, excavation, filling, clearing of vegetation, and storage and disposal of excavated or cleared material;</li> <li>▪ Specifications for vegetative cover and mulch, including methods and schedules for planting and fertilization;</li> <li>▪ Provisions for temporary and/or permanent irrigation.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perform clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Use sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering and obtain all necessary permits.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Protect all storm drain inlets in the vicinity of the site using sediment controls such as berms, fiber rolls, or filters.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trap sediment on-site, using BMPs such as sediment basins or traps, earthen dikes or berms, silt fences, check dams, soil blankets or mats, covers for soil stock piles, etc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Divert on-site runoff around exposed areas and divert off-site runoff around the site (e.g., swales and dikes).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Protect adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Limit construction access routes and stabilize designated access points.

<sup>10</sup> See MRP Provision C.3.a.i(6) for non-C.3 Regulated Projects and Provision C.3.c.i(2)(a) for C.3 Regulated Projects.

**8. Use construction BMPs (applies to all projects) – continued**

**8.1 Are construction BMPs included in project plans?**

Yes	No	Best Management Practice (BMP)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where washwater is contained and treated.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Store, handle, and dispose of construction materials and wastes properly to prevent their contact with stormwater.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Contractor shall train and provide instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding construction BMPs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Control and prevent the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, washwater or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.

**8.2 Is the project a C.3 Regulated Project? (Refer to Item 2.5.)**

- YES. Continue to Item 9.
- NO. Do not complete sections 9 & 10. Municipal staff may use sections 11 – 15.

**9. Include stormwater treatment measures (applies to C.3 Regulated Projects) – MRP Provisions C.3.c.(2)(b); C.3.d.i; C.3.e.ii**

**9.1 Are appropriate stormwater treatment measures included? (Municipal staff will indicate which information is required.)**

Is Info Applicable / Required?		Have Plans been Reviewed and Accepted?			Information that may be required
Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If project is a “ <b>Special Project</b> ” (refer to Item 4.1) do plans show that the Special Project Criteria <sup>11</sup> are met? Plans reviewed by _____ Date Reviewed _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If project is a “ <b>Special Project</b> ,” plans may show non-LID measures hydraulically sized to treat C.3.d amount of runoff. Indicate the number of non-LID measures by type, the hydraulic sizing method <sup>12</sup> , and percentage of project treated:  <u>Non-LID Treatment</u> <u>No. of units</u> <u>Hydraulic sizing method<sup>10</sup></u> <u>% of project treated</u>  Media filter  Tree well filter  Plans reviewed by _____ Date Reviewed _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Results of <b>LID feasibility/infesibility analysis</b> : <sup>13</sup> Stormwater treatment of the C.3.d amount of runoff using infiltration or rainwater harvesting/use is (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> feasible <input type="checkbox"/> infesible Plans reviewed by _____ Date Reviewed _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If <b>infesibility</b> is demonstrated above, plans must show biotreatment measures hydraulically sized to treat C.3.d amount of runoff from entire project. Indicate the number of biotreatment measures by type, and the hydraulic sizing method:  <u>Biotreatment Measures</u> <u>No. of units</u> <u>Hydraulic sizing method<sup>10</sup></u>  Bioretention area  Flow-through planter  Vegetated buffer strip  Other (specify): _____ Plans reviewed by _____ Date Reviewed _____

**9. Include stormwater treatment measures (applies to C.3 Regulated Projects) – continued**

<sup>11</sup> Refer to the Special Projects Criteria in Appendix J of the C.3 Technical Guidance.

<sup>12</sup> Indicate which of the following Provision C.3.d.i hydraulic sizing methods were used. Volume based approaches: 1(a) Urban Runoff Quality Management approach, or 1(b) 80% capture approach (recommended volume-based approach). Flow-based approaches: 2(a) 10% of 50-year peak flow approach, 2(b) Percentile rainfall intensity approach, or 2(c) 0.2-Inch-per-hour intensity approach (recommended flow-based approach). If a combination flow and volume design basis was used, indicate which flow-based and volume-based criteria were used.

<sup>13</sup> Refer to Feasibility/Infesibility Criteria for Rainwater Harvesting/Use, Infiltration and Evapotranspiration (C.3 Technical Guidance Appendix I)

**9.1 Are appropriate stormwater treatment measures included?** -- MRP Provisions C.3.c.(2)(b); C.3.d.i; C.3.e.ii

Is Info Applicable / Required?		Have Plans been Reviewed and Accepted?			Information that may be required																		
Yes	No	Yes	No	NA																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If <b>feasibility</b> is demonstrated above, plans must show LID treatment measures (non-biotreatment) hydraulically sized to treat the C.3.d amount of runoff from entire project. Indicate the number of non-biotreatment measures by type, and hydraulic sizing method:																		
					<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>LID Treatment Measure (non-biotreatment)</u></th> <th><u>No. of units</u></th> <th><u>Hydraulic sizing method<sup>10</sup></u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rainwater harvesting and use</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bioinfiltration</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Infiltration trench</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dry well</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Other (specify): _____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>LID Treatment Measure (non-biotreatment)</u>	<u>No. of units</u>	<u>Hydraulic sizing method<sup>10</sup></u>	Rainwater harvesting and use			Bioinfiltration			Infiltration trench			Dry well			Other (specify): _____		
<u>LID Treatment Measure (non-biotreatment)</u>	<u>No. of units</u>	<u>Hydraulic sizing method<sup>10</sup></u>																					
Rainwater harvesting and use																							
Bioinfiltration																							
Infiltration trench																							
Dry well																							
Other (specify): _____																							
					Plans reviewed by _____ Date Reviewed _____																		

**9.2 Is the project a Hydromodification Management Project?** (Refer to Item 5.5.)

- YES. Continue to Item 10.
- NO. Do not complete section 10. Municipal staff may use sections 11 & 12.

**10. Incorporate HM Controls (applies to HM Projects).**

**10.1 Is required HM Project information included?** -- MRP Provision C.3.g and Attachment E

Is Item Required?		Is Item in Plans?			Required HM Project Information
Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site plans with pre- and post-project impervious surface areas, surface flow directions of entire site, locations of flow duration controls and site design measures per HM site design requirement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Soils report or other site-specific document showing soil types at all parts of site
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If project uses the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM), a list of model inputs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If project uses custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves), goodness of fit, and (allowable) low flow rate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If project uses the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM project (name, location, date of start up, entity responsible for maintenance).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the project uses alternatives to the default BAHM approach or settings, a written description and rationale.

**11. Stormwater Inspections of Construction Sites During the Wet Season (for municipal staff use only):**

If the answer is "Yes" to either of the following questions, refer this project to construction site inspection staff, to add to their list of projects that require stormwater inspections at least monthly during the wet season (October 1 through April 30).

- |      |   | Yes                      | No                       |
|------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 11.1 | Does the project disturb 1 acre (43,560 sq.ft.) or more of land? (See Item 1.9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11.2 | Is the site a High Priority Site? (See Item 1.8)                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**12. Confirm Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Submittals (for municipal staff use only):**

*The following questions apply to C.3 Regulated Projects and Hydromodification Management Projects.*

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
12.1 Was maintenance plan submitted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.2 Was maintenance plan approved?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.3 Was maintenance agreement submitted? (Date executed:_____)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.4 Indicate the dates on which the Applicant submitted annual reports for project O&M: _____			

**13. Comments (for municipal staff use only):**

---



---



---



---

**14. NOTES (for municipal staff use only):**

Section 1 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 2 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 3 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 4 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 5 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 7 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 8 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 9 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 10 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 11 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

Section 12 Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

**15. Project Close-Out (for municipal staff use only):**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
15.1 Were final Conditions of Approval met?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.2 Was initial inspection of the completed treatment/HM measure(s) conducted? (Date of inspection:_____)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.3 Was maintenance plan submitted? (Date executed:_____)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.4 Was project information provided to staff responsible for O&M verification inspections? (Date provided to inspection staff:_____)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of staff confirming project is closed out: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of O&M staff receiving information: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendices**

- Appendix A: O&M Agreement
- Appendix B: O&M Annual Report Form

[[ == Date ==]]

[[== Name of Project Developer or Owner ==]]

[[== Mailing Address ==]]

Reference: [[== Insert project name and address, and/or project number ==]]

Dear [[== Insert Name of Developer or Owner ==]]

This letter is an official notice regarding the above-referenced project, which has received a development permit from [[== Name of Jurisdiction ==]]. Please be advised that the project is subject to the [[== Name of Jurisdiction ==]]'s stormwater control requirements, as well as applicable State requirements.

Appropriate stormwater best management practices are required throughout the year, but are of particular concern during the wet season (which the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit defines as October 1 through April 30). The purpose of this letter is to remind you to prepare the above-referenced construction site for the coming wet season.

Failure to implement effective best management practices that prevent construction site discharges of pollutants, and impacts on beneficial uses of receiving waters, is a violation of the [[== Name of Jurisdiction ==]]'s stormwater ordinance and subject to enforcement action. Violations may also result in enforcement action by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Information regarding stormwater best management practices is available on the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's website, [www.flowstobay.org](http://www.flowstobay.org) (click on "Business," then "Construction"). For more information regarding this correspondence, please contact [[== Insert name and contact information for local contact ==]].

Sincerely,

[[== Name and Title ==]]

**SAN MATEO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**  
**2000 ALAMEDA de las PULGAS, SUITE 100**  
**SAN MATEO, CA 94403**  
**(650) 372-6200**

**HAZARDOUS MATERIALS NOTIFICATION FORM**

BUSINESS NAME: _____	BUSINESS TYPE: _____
BUSINESS ADDRESS: _____	CITY: _____ ZIP CODE: _____
BUSINESS CONTACT: _____	PHONE #: _____

**Pursuant to Government Code Section 65850.2 and the Health and Safety Code, please answer the following questions regarding a new business or modifications to an existing business:**

- |  | <u>YES</u>               | <u>NO</u>                |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does your business use and/or store a hazardous material (e.g., solvents, waste oil) at or above 55 gallons, 500 pounds or 200 cubic feet at any time during the year?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does your business use and/or store an extremely hazardous substance (EHS) or radioactive material in any amount during the year? The list of EHS's is found in 40 CFR Chapter 1, Part 355, Appendix A.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does your business use and/or store a regulated substance above the threshold quantity (TQ) at anytime during the year? The list of regulated substances and TQ's is found in the California Code of Regulations Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, Section 2770.5. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Does your business emit any toxic air contaminants identified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB)? This list is available from the CARB website.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Does your business own and/or operate an underground storage tank system for storage of fuel products and/or other hazardous substances?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Does your business own and/or operate an aboveground storage tank system (includes containers 55 gallons or greater) for petroleum product storage with a total storage capacity greater than 1,320 gallons?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Does your business generate hazardous waste (e.g., used solvents, waste oil) during the year?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Does your business discharge contaminated wastewater generated on-site into the storm sewer drainage system?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**If you answered yes to any of these questions you must contact San Mateo County Environmental Health. Please call (650) 372-6200 if you have any questions and/or for further assistance.**

Applicant Name: _____	Phone #: _____
Signature: _____	Date: _____
County Sign-off: _____	Date: _____