**Town of Portola Valley**
**FY 2013/14 ANNUAL REPORT**

## Certification Statement

"I certify, under penalty of law, that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to ensure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted, is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

**Signature of Duly Authorized Representative:**

Howard 9/10/14

Name and Title Date

Public Works Director

## Table of Contents

**Section** **Page**

## Section 1 – Permittee Information

| Background Information | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Permittee Name:** | Town of Portola Valley | | | | |
| **Population:** | 4500 | | | | |
| **NPDES Permit No.:** | CAS612008 | | | | |
| **Order Number:** | R2-2009-0074R | | | | |
| **Reporting Time Period (month/year):** | July 2013 through June 2014 | | | | |
| **Name of the Responsible Authority:** | Howard Young | | | **Title:** | Public Works Director |
| **Mailing Address:** | 765 Portola Road | | | | |
| **City:** | Portola Valley | **Zip Code:** | 94028 | **County:** | San Mateo |
| **Telephone Number:** | 650-851-1700 x 214 | | **Fax Number: 650-851-4677** | | |
| **E-mail Address:** | hyoung@portolavalley.net | | | | |
| **Name of the Designated Stormwater Management Program Contact** (if different from above): | | | | **Title:** | |
| **Department:** | Public Works Department | | | | |
| **Mailing Address:** | | | | | |
| **City:** | | **Zip Code:** | | **County:** | |
| **Telephone Number:** | | | **Fax Number:** | | |
| **E-mail Address:** | | | | | |

## Section 2 - Provision C.2 Reporting Municipal Operations

### Program Highlights and Evaluation

Highlight/summarize activities for reporting year:

Summary:

**The Town of Portola Valley is a small rural community that consists of mainly affluent residential neighborhoods with large lots, tree covered areas, and large areas of open space. It has a small population of approximately 4,500. The entire Town staff consists of 13 employees. The Town being almost all single family residential, there were no regulated projects approved this reporting period. Please note that there are areas of Unincorportated San Mateo County using a Portola Valley address. These areas are not managed by the Town of Portola Valley but San Mateo County.**

**The Town performed its annual winterization inspections of each private development site per standards. BMP's and erosion control as discussed at all pre-construction meetings prior to work by a private contractor. There were no projects over 1 acre. BMP's and erosion control are enforced on any public projects as required. Again, being almost all single family residences, there were no regulated projects approved this reporting period. The Town inspects all unregulated projects also.**

**Refer to the C.2 Municipal Operations section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report for a description of activities implemented at the countywide and/or regional level.**

**The Town promoted and held its annual hazardous household waste cleanup day and Neighborhood Cleanup Day in May 2014.**

**The Town continues to perform enhanced litter pick up, leaf removal, drain inlet inspection, creek inspection, and street sweeping.**

**The Town continues to contract with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial inspections on behalf of the town.**

**There were no major violations or discharge.**

**The Town stopped using chemical weed control along our roads and trails this year in effort to be more environmentally friendly.**

**Town staff continues to attend storm water program meetings and new development subcommittee meetings with the challenges of a small staff.**

**The Town has been pro-active about BMP's, erosion control, water quality, and sustainability for many years.**

## C.2.a. ►Street and Road Repair and Maintenance

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Y** | Control of debris and waste materials during road and parking lot installation, repaving or repair maintenance activities from polluting stormwater |
| **Y** | Control of concrete slurry and wastewater, asphalt, pavement cutting, and other street and road maintenance materials and wastewater from discharging to storm drains from work sites. |
| **Y** | Sweeping and/or vacuuming and other dry methods to remove debris, concrete, or sediment residues from work sites upon completion of work. |

Comments: **These are standard procedures written into our bidding contract documents.**

## C.2.b. ►Sidewalk/Plaza Maintenance and Pavement Washing

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| Y | Control of wash water from pavement washing, mobile cleaning, pressure wash operations at parking lots, garages, trash areas, gas station fueling areas, and sidewalk and plaza cleaning activities from polluting stormwater |
| N/A | Implementation of the BASMAA Mobile Surface Cleaner Program BMPs |

Comments: **The Town of Portola Valley is small community and located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. We do not have any sidewalks and do not do any pressure washing.**

## C.2.c. ►Bridge and Structure Maintenance and Graffiti Removal

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| Y | Control of discharges from bridge and structural maintenance activities directly over water or into storm drains |
| Y | Control of discharges from graffiti removal activities |
| Y | Proper disposal for wastes generated from bridge and structure maintenance and graffiti removal activities |
| N/A | Implementation of the BASMAA Mobile Surface Cleaner Program BMPs for graffiti removal |
| Y | Employee training on proper capture and disposal methods for wastes generated from bridge and structural maintenance and graffiti removal activities. |
| Y | Contract specifications requiring proper capture and disposal methods for wastes generated from bridge and structural maintenance and graffiti removal activities. |

Comments: **The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. We do not have any sidewalks and do not do any pressure washing. There are no significant graffiti issues.**

## C.2.d. ►Stormwater Pump Stations

Does your municipality own stormwater pump stations: [ ] **Yes** [X] **No**

If your answer is **No** then skip to **C.2.e.**

Complete the following table for dry weather DO monitoring and inspection data for pump stations[1] (add more rows for additional pump stations). If a pump station is exempt from DO monitoring, explain why it is exempt.

| Pump Station Name and Location | First inspection Dry Weather DO Data | | Second inspection Dry Weather DO Data | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Date | mg/L | Date | mg/L |
| **n/a the Town does not own or operate any pump stations** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

[1] DO monitoring is exempted where all discharge from a pump station remains in a stormwater collection system or infiltrates into a dry creek immediately downstream.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Summarize corrective actions as needed for DO monitoring at or below 3 mg/L. Attach inspection records of additional DO monitoring for corrective actions: **n/a the Town does not own or operate any pump stations**

Summary: **n/a the Town does not own or operate any pump stations**

Attachments:

Complete the following table for wet weather inspection data for pump stations (add more rows for additional pump stations):

| **Pump Station Name and Location** | **Date** (2x/year required) | **Presence of Trash** (Cubic Yards) | **Presence of Odor** (Yes or No) | **Presence of Color** (Yes or No) | **Presence of Turbidity** (Yes or No) | **Presence of Floating Hydrocarbons** (Yes or No) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **n/a the Town does not own or operate any pump stations** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## C.2.e. ►Rural Public Works Construction and Maintenance

| Does your municipality own/maintain rural[2] roads: | X | **Yes** | | **No** |
|---|---|---|---|---|

If your answer is **No** then skip to **C.2.f**.

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| Y | Control of road-related erosion and sediment transport from road design, construction, maintenance, and repairs in rural areas |
| Y | Identification and prioritization of rural road maintenance based on soil erosion potential, slope steepness, and stream habitat resources |
| Y | No impact to creek functions including migratory fish passage during construction of roads and culverts |
| Y | Inspection of rural roads for structural integrity and prevention of impact on water quality |
| Y | Maintenance of rural roads adjacent to streams and riparian habitat to reduce erosion, replace damaging shotgun culverts and excessive erosion |
| Y | Re-grading of unpaved rural roads to slope outward where consistent with road engineering safety standards, and installation of water bars as appropriate |
| Y | Inclusion of measures to reduce erosion, provide fish passage, and maintain natural stream geomorphology when replacing culverts or design of new culverts or bridge crossings |

Comments including listing increased maintenance in priority areas: **All roads are inspected annually. No known road erosion problems or new roads in the last 10 years. The Town of Portola Valley is a small, rural community.**

[2] Rural means any watershed or portion thereof that is developed with large lot home-sites, such as one acre or larger, or with primarily agricultural, grazing or open space uses.

## C.2.f. ►Corporation Yard BMP Implementation

Place an **X** in the boxes below that apply to your corporations yard(s):

| | |
|---|---|
| | We do not have a corporation yard |
| | Our corporation yard is a filed NOI facility and regulated by the California State Industrial Stormwater NPDES General Permit |
| X | We have a **Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)** for the Corporation Yard(s) |

Place an **X** in the boxes below next to implemented SWPPP BMPs to indicate that these BMPs were implemented in applicable instances. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box. If one or more of the BMPs were not adequately implemented during the reporting fiscal year then indicate so and explain in the comments section below:

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Control of pollutant discharges to storm drains such as wash waters from cleaning vehicles and equipment |
| X | Routine inspection prior to the rainy seasons of corporation yard(s) to ensure non-stormwater discharges have not entered the storm drain system |
| X | Containment of all vehicle and equipment wash areas through plumbing to sanitary or another collection method |
| X | Use of dry cleanup methods when cleaning debris and spills from corporation yard(s) or collection of all wash water and disposing of wash water to sanitary or other location where it does not impact surface or groundwater when wet cleanup methods are used |
| X | Cover and/or berm outdoor storage areas containing waste pollutants |

Comments:

If you have a corporation yard(s) that is not an NOI facility, complete the following table for inspection results for your corporation yard(s) or attach a summary including the following information:

| **Corporation Yard Name** | **Inspection Date** (1x/year required) | **Inspection Findings/Results** | **Follow-up Actions** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Town Center Yard** | October 1, 2013 | None | None |
| **Town Center Yard** | April 1, 2014 | None | None |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

## Section 3 - Provision C.3 Reporting New Development and Redevelopment

### C.3.b.v.(2)(a) ►Green Streets Status Report

(All projects to be completed by December 1, 2014)

On an annual basis (if applicable), report on the status of any pilot green street projects within your jurisdiction. For each completed project, report the capital costs, operation and maintenance costs, legal and procedural arrangements in place to address operation and maintenance and its associated costs, and the sustainable landscape measures incorporated in the project including, if relevant, the score from the Bay-Friendly Landscape Scorecard.

Summary:

**The Town of Portola Valley does not have a green pilot street project within its jurisdiction.**

**The C.3 New Development and Redevelopment section of the SMCWPPP FY13-14 Annual Report includes a description of activities conducted at the countrywide or regional level.**

### C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting

Fill in attached table **C.3.b.v.(1)** or attach your own table including the same information.

**The Town of Portola Valley did not approve any regulated projects during the reporting period 2013-2014.**

### C.3.e.v. ►Alternative or In-Lieu Compliance with Provision C.3.c.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(For FY 11-12 Annual Report and each Annual Report thereafter)* Is your agency choosing to require 100% LID treatment onsite for all Regulated Projects and not allow alternative compliance under Provision C.3.e.? | | **Yes** | X | **No** |

Comments (optional):

## C.3.e.vi ► Special Projects Reporting January 1 – June 30, 2014

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Has your agency received, but not yet granted final discretionary approval of, a development permit application for a project that has been identified as a potential Special Project based on criteria listed in MRP Provision C.3.e.ii(2) for any of the three categories of Special Projects (Categories A, B or C)? | | **Yes** | X | **No** |
| 2. Has your agency granted final discretionary approval of a project identified as a Special Project in the March 15, 2014 report? If yes, include the project in both the C.3.b.v.(1) Table, and the C.3.e.vi. Table. | | **Yes** | X | **No** |

If you answered "Yes" to either question,

1) Complete Table C.3.e.vi . below.
2) Attach narrative discussion of 100% LID Feasibility or Infeasibility for each project.

**The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. We do not have any sidewalks and do not do any pressure washing. There are no large graffiti issues.**

## C.3.h.iv. ► Installed Stormwater Treatment Systems Operation and Maintenance Verification Inspection Program Reporting

**(1)** Fill in attached table **C.3.h.iv.(1)** or attach your own table including the same information.

**The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated projects were approved or reported for 2013/2014. It does not have any projects that required treatment systems.**

**(2)** On an annual basis, provide a discussion of the inspection findings for the year and any common problems encountered with various types of treatment systems and/or HM controls. This discussion should include a general comparison to the inspection findings from the previous year.

Summary: **The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated projects were approved or reported for 2013/2014. It does not have any projects that required treatment systems.**

**(3)** On an annual basis, provide a discussion of the effectiveness of the O&M Program and any proposed changes to improve the O&M Program (e.g., changes in prioritization plan or frequency of O&M inspections, other changes to improve effectiveness program).

Summary: **The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated projects were approved or reported for 2013/2014. It does not have any projects that required treatment systems.**

| **(4)** During the reporting year, did your agency: | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| • Inspect all newly installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls within 45 days of installation? | | **Yes** | | **No** | **X** | **Not applicable. No new facilities were installed.** |
| • Inspect at least 20 percent of the total number of installed stormwater treatment systems or HM controls?[3] | | **Yes** | | **No** | **X** | **Not applicable. No treatment measures** |
| • Inspect at least 20 percent of the total number of installed vault-based systems? | | **Yes** | | **No** | **X** | **Not applicable. No vault systems.** |
| If you answered "No" to any of the questions above, please explain: **The Town of Portola Valley is small community which is located in a rural environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated projects were approved or reported for 2013/2014. It does not have any projects that required treatment systems.** | | | | | | |

## C.3.i. ►Required Site Design Measures for Small Projects and Detached Single Family Home Projects

On an annual basis, discuss the implementation of the requirements of Provision C.3.i, including ordinance revisions, permit conditions, development of standard specifications and/or guidance materials, and staff training.

Summary:

**BASMAA prepared standard specifications in four fact sheets regarding the site design measures listed in Provision C.3.i, as a resource for Permittees. We have modified local ordinances/policies/procedures and forms/checklists to require all applicable projects approved after December 1, 2013 to implement at least one of the site design measures listed in Provision C.3.i. We are using the following program and BASMAA products for C.3.i implementation:**

- **BASMAA's site design fact sheets**
- **The SMCWPPP C.3 Regulated Projects Checklist**
- **C.3.i guidance provided by the SMCWPPP C.3 Stormwater Technical Guidance document Appendix L**
- **Town collects stormwater requirements checklist for small projects**

[3] If there is only 1 treatment measure in the jurisdiction, the agency must inspect it every year.

## C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 1) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period

| Project Name Project No. | Project Location[10], Street Address | Name of Developer | Project Phase No.[11] | Project Type & Description[12] | Project Watershed[13] | Total Site Area (Acres) | Total Area of Land Disturbed (Acres) | Total New Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[14] | Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[15] | Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area[16] ($ft^2$) | Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area[17] ($ft^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Private Projects** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No private projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Projects** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No public projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Comments:

**The Town of Portola Valley did not approve any regulated projects during the reporting period 2013-2014. We are a small, rural Town with almost all projects consisting of single family homes, which are exempt from requirements for C.3 Regulated Projects.**

[10] Include cross streets
[11] If a project is being constructed in phases, indicate the phase number and use a separate row entry for each phase. If not, enter "NA".
[12] Project Type is the type of development (i.e., new and/or redevelopment). Example descriptions of development are: 5-story office building, residential with 160 single-family homes with five 4-story buildings to contain 200 condominiums, 100 unit 2-story shopping mall, mixed use retail and residential development (apartments), industrial warehouse.
[13] State the watershed(s) in which the Regulated Project is located. Downstream watershed(s) may be included, but this is optional.
[14] All impervious surfaces added to any area of the site that was previously existing pervious surface.
[15] All impervious surfaces added to any area of the site that was previously existing impervious surface.
[16] For redevelopment projects, state the pre-project impervious surface area.
[17] For redevelopment projects, state the post-project impervious surface area.

## C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 1) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period

| Project Name<br>Project No. | Project Location[10], Street Address | Name of Developer | Project Phase No.[11] | Project Type & Description[12] | Project Watershed[13] | Total Site Area (Acres) | Total Area of Land Disturbed (Acres) | Total New Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[14] | Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[15] | Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area[16] ($ft^2$) | Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area[17] ($ft^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

## C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period (private projects)

| Project Name<br>Project No. | Application Deemed Complete Date[18] | Application Final Approval Date[19] | Source Control Measures[20] | Site Design Measures[21] | Treatment Systems Approved[22] | Type of Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism[23] | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria[24] | Alternative Compliance Measures[25/26] | Alternative Certification[27] | HM Controls[28/29] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Private Projects** | | | | | | | | | | |
| No private projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | |

[18] For private projects, state project application deemed complete date. If the project did not go through discretionary review, report the building permit issuance date.
[19] For private projects, state project application final discretionary approval date. If the project did not go through discretionary review, report the building permit issuance date.
[20] List source control measures approved for the project. Examples include: properly designed trash storage areas; storm drain stenciling or signage; efficient landscape irrigation systems; etc.
[21] List site design measures approved for the project. Examples include: minimize impervious surfaces; conserve natural areas, including existing trees or other vegetation, and soils; construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces, etc.
[22] List all approved stormwater treatment system(s) to be installed onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility (e.g., flow through planter, bioretention facility, infiltration basin, etc.).
[23] List the legal mechanism(s) (e.g., O&M agreement with private landowner; O&M agreement with homeowners' association; O&M by public entity, etc…) that have been or will be used to assign responsibility for the maintenance of the post-construction stormwater treatment systems.
[24] See Provision C.3.d.i. "Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems" for list of hydraulic sizing design criteria. Enter the corresponding provision number of the appropriate criterion (i.e., 1.a., 1.b., 2.a., 2.b., 2.c., or 3).
[25] For Alternative Compliance at an offsite location in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(1), on a separate page, give a discussion of the alternative compliance site including the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(i) for the offsite project.
[26] For Alternative Compliance by paying in-lieu fees in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(2), on a separate page, provide the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(ii) for the Regional Project.
[27] Note whether a third party was used to certify the project design complies with Provision C.3.d.
[28] If HM control is not required, state why not.
[29] If HM control is required, state control method used (e.g., method to design and size device(s) or method(s) used to meet the HM Standard, and description of device(s) or method(s) used, such as detention basin(s), biodetention unit(s), regional detention basin, or in-stream control).

**C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 1) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period**

| Project Name<br>Project No. | Project Location[10], Street Address | Name of Developer | Project Phase No.[11] | Project Type & Description[12] | Project Watershed[13] | Total Site Area (Acres) | Total Area of Land Disturbed (Acres) | Total New Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[14] | Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[15] | Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area[16] ($ft^2$) | Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area[17] ($ft^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **The Town of Portola Valley did not approve any regulated projects during the reporting period 2013-2014. We are a small, rural Town with almost all projects consisting of single family homes, which are exempt from requirements for C.3 Regulated Projects.** | | | | | | | | | | | |

**C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period (public projects)**

| Project Name<br>Project No. | Approval Date[30] | Date Construction Scheduled to Begin | Source Control Measures[31] | Site Design Measures[32] | Treatment Systems Approved[33] | Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism[34] | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria[35] | Alternative Compliance Measures[36/37] | Alternative Certification[38] | HM Controls[39/40] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Public Projects** | | | | | | | | | | |
| No public projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | |

[30] For public projects, enter the plans and specifications approval date.
[31] List source control measures approved for the project. Examples include: properly designed trash storage areas; storm drain stenciling or signage; efficient landscape irrigation systems; etc.
[32] List site design measures approved for the project. Examples include: minimize impervious surfaces; conserve natural areas, including existing trees or other vegetation, and soils; construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces, etc.
[33] List all approved stormwater treatment system(s) to be installed onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility (e.g., flow through planter, bioretention facility, infiltration basin, etc.).
[34] List the legal mechanism(s) (e.g., maintenance plan for O&M by public entity, etc…) that have been or will be used to assign responsibility for the maintenance of the post-construction stormwater treatment systems.
[35] See Provision C.3.d.i. "Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems" for list of hydraulic sizing design criteria. Enter the corresponding provision number of the appropriate criterion (i.e., 1.a., 1.b., 2.a., 2.b., 2.c., or 3).
[36] For Alternative Compliance at an offsite location in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(1), on a separate page, give a discussion of the alternative compliance site including the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(i) for the offsite project.
[37] For Alternative Compliance by paying in-lieu fees in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(2), on a separate page, provide the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(ii) for the Regional Project.
[38] Note whether a third party was used to certify the project design complies with Provision C.3.d.
[39] If HM control is not required, state why not.
[40] If HM control is required, state control method used (e.g., method to design and size device(s) or method(s) used to meet the HM Standard, and description of device(s) or method(s) used, such as detention basin(s), biodetention unit(s), regional detention basin, or in-stream control).

## C.3.b.v.(1) ►Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 1) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period

| Project Name<br>Project No. | Project Location[10], Street Address | Name of Developer | Project Phase No.[11] | Project Type & Description[12] | Project Watershed[13] | Total Site Area (Acres) | Total Area of Land Disturbed (Acres) | Total New Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[14] | Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area ($ft^2$)[15] | Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area[16] ($ft^2$) | Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area[17] ($ft^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **The Town of Portola Valley did not approve any regulated projects during the reporting period 2013-2014. We are a small, rural Town with almost all projects consisting of single family homes, which are exempt from requirements for C.3 Regulated Projects.** | | | | | | | | | | | |

## C.3.h.iv. ►Table of Installed Stormwater Treatment Systems Operation and Maintenance Verification Inspection Program Reporting

Fill in table below or attach your own table including the same information.

**The Town of Portola Valley is a small, rural Town consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated/special projects were approved. Individual single family homes are exempt from requirements for C.3 Regulated Projects. No project required treatment systems.**

| Name of Facility/Site Inspected | Address of Facility/Site Inspected | Newly Installed? (YES/NO)[41] | Party Responsible[42] For Maintenance | Date of Inspection | Type of Inspection[43] | Type of Treatment/HM Control(s) Inspected[44] | Inspection Findings or Results[45] | Enforcement Action Taken[46] | Comments/Follow-up |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

[41] Indicate "YES" if the facility was installed within the reporting period, or "NO" if installed during a previous fiscal year.
[42] State the responsible operator for installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls.
[43] State the type of inspection (e.g., 45-day, routine or scheduled, follow-up, etc.).
[44] State the type(s) of treatment systems inspected (e.g., bioretention facility, flow-through planter, infiltration basin, etc…) and the type(s) of HM controls inspected, and indicate whether the treatment system is an onsite, joint, or offsite system.
[45] State the inspection findings or results (e.g., proper installation, improper installation, proper O&M, immediate maintenance needed, etc.).
[46] State the enforcement action(s) taken, if any.

## C.3.e.vi.Special Projects Reporting Table

**Reporting Period – January 1 – June 30, 2013**

| Project Name & No. | Permittee | Address | Application Submittal Date[47] | Status[48] | Description[49] | Site Total Acreage | Density DU/Acre | Density FAR | Special Project Category[50] | LID Treatment Reduction Credit Available[51] | List of LID Stormwater Treatment Systems[52] | List of Non-LID Stormwater Treatment Systems[53] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No special projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Category A:<br>Category B:<br>Category C:<br>Location:<br>Density:<br>Parking:<br><br>N/A | Category A:<br>Category B:<br>Category C:<br>Location:<br>Density:<br>Parking:<br><br>N/A | Indicate each type of LID treatment system and the percentage of total runoff treated<br><br>N/A | Indicate each type of non-LID treatment system and the percentage of total runoff treated. Indicate whether minimum design criteria met or certification received<br><br>N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**The Town of Portola Valley is a small, rural Town consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No regulated/special projects were approved. Individual single family homes are exempt from requirements for C.3 Regulated Projects. No project required treatment systems.**

[47] Date that a planning application for the Special Project was submitted.
[48] Indicate whether final discretionary approval is still pending or has been granted, and provide the date or version of the project plans upon which reporting is based.
[49] Type of project (commercial, mixed-use, residential), number of floors, number of units, type of parking, and other relevant information.
[50] For each applicable Special Project Category, list the specific criteria applied to determine applicability. For each non-applicable Special Project Category, indicate n/a.
[51] For each applicable Special Project Category, state the maximum total LID Treatment Reduction Credit available. For Category C Special Projects also list the individual Location, Density, and Minimized Surface Parking Credits available.
[52]: List all LID stormwater treatment systems proposed. For each type, indicate the percentage of the total amount of runoff identified in Provision C.3.d. for the Special Project's drainage area.
[53] List all non-LID stormwater treatment systems proposed. For each type of non-LID treatment system, indicate: (1) the percentage of the total amount of runoff identified in Provision C.3.d. for the Special Project's drainage area, and (2) whether the treatment system either meets minimum design criteria published by a government agency or received certification issued by a government agency, and reference the applicable criteria or certification.

# Section 4 – Provision C.4 Industrial and Commercial Site Controls

## Program Highlights

Provide background information, highlights, trends, etc.

**Note that the Town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the Town.**

**See Industrial and Commercial Site Controls sections of the program's FY13-14 Annual Report for a description of activities of the countrywide program and/or the BASMAA Municipal Operations Committee.**

## C.4.b.i. ► Business Inspection Plan

| Do you have a Business Inspection Plan? | X | **Yes** | | **No** |
|---|---|---|---|---|

If No, explain:

**The Town's Business Inspection Plan complies with the Countywide Template Industrial and Commercial Business Inspection Plan template. (Provision C.4.b.ii.). Being a rural town with very limited commercial establishments, the County inspects all facilities and there are no additional facilities to inspect.**

## C.4.b.iii.(1) ► Potential Facilities List

List below or attach your list of industrial and commercial facilities in your Inspection Plan to inspect that could reasonably be considered to cause or contribute to pollution of stormwater runoff.

**See attached potential inspection list for Portola Valley.**

**Note that the Town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the Town. Being a rural town with very limited commercial establishments, the County inspects all facilities and there are no additional facilities to inspect. Please also note that there are commercial facilities in unincorporated areas of San Mateo County using a Portola Valley address that may appear on the Portola Valley list. However, these are not within the Town of Portola Valley and under the jurisdiction of San Mateo County Environmental Health.**

## C.4.b.iii.(2) ►Facilities Scheduled for Inspection

List below or attach your list of facilities scheduled for inspection during the current fiscal year.

**See attached potential inspection list for Portola Valley.**

**Note that the Town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the Town. Being a rural town with very limited commercial establishments, the County inspects all facilities and there are no additional facilities to inspect. Please also note that there are commercial facilities in unincorporated areas of San Mateo County using a Portola Valley address that may appear on the Portola Valley list. However, these are not within the Town of Portola Valley and under the jurisdiction of San Mateo County Environmental Health.**

## C.4.c.iii.(1) ►Facility Inspections

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information. Indicate your violation reporting methodology below.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | X | Permittee reports multiple discrete violations on a site as one violation. |
| | | Permittee reports the total number of discrete violations on each site. |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Number of businesses inspected | 6 | |
| Total number of inspections conducted | 6 | |
| Number of violations (excluding verbal warnings) | 0 | |
| Sites inspected in violation | 0 | |
| Violations resolved within 10 working days or otherwise deemed resolved in a longer but still timely manner | 0 | |

Comments: **Note that the Town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the Town.**

**County Environmental Health (CEH): Food and Hazardous Material program inspectors conduct routine stormwater inspections at inventoried sites based on High, Medium, and Low priorities. If a violation or discharge is observed, a description of the violation is noted on the Inspection Report form, including comments and/or requirements that the facility must complete to clear the violation. If the violation is not cleared at the time of the inspection, a copy of the Inspection Report form is given to a stormwater technician for follow up.**

**No violations were observed.**

## C.4.c.iii.(2) ►Frequency and Types/Categories of Violations Observed

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| Type/Category of Violations Observed | Number of Violations |
|---|---|
| Actual discharge (e.g. active non-stormwater discharge or clear evidence of a recent discharge) | 0 |
| Potential discharge and other | 0 |

Comments:
**Violations are counted as one per site, regardless on the actual number of discrete violations observed/recorded.**

**Note that the town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the Town of Portola Valley.**

**No violations were observed.**

## C.4.c.iii.(2) ►Frequency and Type of Enforcement Conducted

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| | Enforcement Action (as listed in ERP)[48] | Number of Enforcement Actions Taken | % of Enforcement Actions Taken[49] |
|---|---|---|---|
| Level 1 | Verbal Warning | 0 | 100 |
| Level 2 | Warning notice or admin action | 0 | 100 |
| Level 3 | Admin. Action with penalty and / or cost recovery | 0 | 100 |
| Level 4 | Legal action | 0 | 100 |
| **Total** | | | |

[48] Agencies to list specific enforcement actions as defined in their ERPs.
[49] Percentage calculated as number of each type of enforcement action divided by the total number of enforcement actions.

## C.4.c.iii.(3) ►Types of Violations Noted by Business Category

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| Business Category[50] | Number of Actual Discharge Violations | Number of Potential/Other Discharge Violations |
|---|---|---|
| N/A | 0 | 0 |

## C.4.c.iii.(4) ►Non-Filers

List below or attach a list of the facilities required to have coverage under the Industrial General Permit but have not filed for coverage:

**No facilities have been identified as requiring Industrial General Permit coverage that have not filed for coverage.**

**No industries were identified as non-filers during scheduled inspections during this fiscal year.**

**Note that the town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the town.**

## C.4.d.iii ►Staff Training Summary

| Training Name | Training Dates | Topics Covered | No. of Inspectors in Attendance | Percent of Inspectors in Attendance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

[50] List your Program's standard business categories.

Note: Refer to County Annual Report for County Environmental Health inspector training summary.

## Section 5 – Provision C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

### Program Highlights

Provide background information, highlights, trends, etc.

**Refer to the C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report for description of activities at the countywide or regional level.**

**Continued inspection of creeks and public inlets and all projects.**

### C.5.c.iii ►Complaint and Spill Response Phone Number and Spill Contact List

List below or attach your complaint and spill response phone number and spill contact list.

| Contact | Description | Phone Number |
|---|---|---|
| Public Works Director, Howard Young | Town of Portola Valley, Public Works Department | 650-851-1700 x 214 |
| | | |

### C.5.d.iii ►Evaluation of Mobile Business Program

Describe implementation of minimum standards and BMPs for mobile businesses and your enforcement strategy. This may include participation in the BASMAA Mobile Surface Cleaners regional program or local activities.

Description:

**Refer to the C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report for a description of efforts by the Commercial, Industrial and Illicit Discharge (CII) Subcommittee and the BASMAA Municipal Operations Committee to address mobile businesses.**

**Note that the town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the town. County Environmental Health has initiated educational outreach to mobile food facilities.**

### C.5.e.iii ►Evaluation of Collection System Screening Program

Provide a summary or attach a summary of your collection screening program, a summary of problems found during collection system screening and any changes to the screening program this FY.

Description:

**The Town is rural in nature with many trees. Our drainage system consists of pipes and mostly natural swales. Collection screening would not be applicable in this setting as most of the items would be natural tree leaves.**

## C.5.f.iii.(1), (2), (3) ►Spill and Discharge Complaint Tracking

Spill and Discharge Complaint Tracking (fill out the following table or include an attachment of the following information)

| | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Discharges reported (C.5.f.iii.(1)) | 1 | |
| Discharges reaching storm drains and/or receiving waters (C.5.f.iii.(2)) | 0 | 100 |
| Discharges resolved in a timely manner (C.5.f.iii.(3)) | 1 | 100 |

Comments:

**If spills occur, the Public Works Department takes the complaint and responds. We are a small rural community. Our storm drain system consists mostly of open ditches. If spills are detected, efforts are made to contain the spill by BMP's.**

**The only illicit discharge was auto fluids from a wrecked car and the discharge was contained an cleaned up.**

## C.5.f.iii.(4) ►Summary of major types of discharges and complaints

Provide a narrative or attach a table and/or graph.

**The Town of Portola Valley is small and rural in environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No significant reports.**

## Section 6 – Provision C.6 Construction Site Controls

### C.6.e.iii.1.a, b, c ►Site/Inspection Totals

| Number of High Priority Sites (sites disturbing < 1 acre of soil requiring storm water runoff quality inspection) (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 (include only High Priority Site and sites disturbing 1 acre or more) (C.6.e.iii.1.c) |
|---|---|---|
| # | # | # |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

Comments:

**No projects that disturb greater than 1 acre of land and no high priority projects. The Town of Portola Valley is small and rural in environment consisting of mainly residential neighborhoods. No significant reports were found, this is similar and typical for the Town on a yearly basis. The Town performs winterization inspections of all sites, including those that disturb less than 1 acre of land and are not high priority projects. Inspections are performed between Oct 1- April 30. Typical minor issues that required re-inspection are: Worn or deteriorated erosion control products.**

**In addition to the reported numbers in this section, for projects that disturbed less than 1 acre of land and were not high priority sites. 30 sites were visited.**

## C.6.e.iii.1.d ►Construction Activities Storm Water Violations

| BMP Category | Number of Violations[51] excluding Verbal Warnings | % of Total Violations[52] |
|---|---|---|
| Erosion Control | 0 | 100 |
| Run-on and Run-off Control | 0 | 100 |
| Sediment Control | 0 | 100 |
| Active Treatment Systems | 0 | 100 |
| Good Site Management | 0 | 100 |
| Non Stormwater Management | 0 | 100 |
| **Total[53]** | | **100%** |

[51] Count one violation in a category for each site and inspection regardless of how many violations/problems occurred in the BMP category. For example, if during one inspection at a site, there are 2 erosion control violations, only 1 violation would be counted for this table.

[52] Percentage calculated as number of violations in each category divided by total number of violations in all six categories.

[53] The total number of violations may count more than one violation per inspection, since some inspections may result in violations in more than one category. For example, during one inspection of a site, there may have been both an erosion control violation and a sediment control violation. For this reason, the total number of violations in this table may not match the total number of enforcement actions reported in Table C6.e.iii.1.e.

## C.6.e.iii.1.e ►Construction Related Storm Water Enforcement Actions

| | Enforcement Action (as listed in ERP)[54] | Number Enforcement Actions Issued | % Enforcement Actions Issued[55] |
|---|---|---|---|
| Level 1[56] | Verbal warning | 0 | 100 |
| Level 2 | Warning notice or admin action | 0 | 100 |
| Level 3 | Admin action with penalty and/or cost recovery | 0 | 100 |
| Level 4 | Legal action | 0 | 100 |
| **Total** | | **0** | **100%** |

## C.6.e.iii.1.f, g ►Illicit Discharges

| | Number |
|---|---|
| Number of illicit discharges, actual and those inferred through evidence at high priority sites and sites that disturb 1 acre or more of land (C.6.e.iii.1.f) | 0 |
| Number of sites with discharges, actual and those inferred through evidence at high priority sites and sites that disturb 1 acre or more of land (C.6.e.iii.1.g) | 0 |

[54] Agencies should list the specific enforcement actions as defined in their ERPs.
[55] Percentage calculated as number of each type of enforcement action divided by the total number of enforcement actions.
[56] For example, Enforcement Level 1 may be Verbal Warning.

## C.6.e.iii.1.h, i ►Violation Correction Times

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Violations (excluding verbal warnings) fully corrected within 10 business days after violations are discovered** or otherwise considered corrected in a timely period (C.6.e.iii.1.h) | 0 | 0%[57] |
| **Violations (excluding verbal warnings) not fully corrected within 30 days after violations are discovered** (C.6.e.iii.1.i) | 0 | 0%[58] |
| **Total number of violations (excluding verbal warnings) for the reporting year[59]** | 0 | 100% |
| **Comments:** | | |

## C.6.e.iii.(2) ►Evaluation of Inspection Data

Describe your evaluation of the tracking data and data summaries and provide information on the evaluation results (e.g., data trends, typical BMP performance issues, comparisons to previous years, etc.).

Description:

**The Town had typical minor BMP performance issues, consisting of worn or deteriorated erosion control materials. All minor similar issues to previous years.**

## C.6.e.iii.(2) ►Evaluation of Inspection Program Effectiveness

Describe what appear to be your program's strengths and weaknesses, and identify needed improvements, including education and outreach.

Description:

**Strengths: Standard Public Works Inspection. Winterization letter is sent out as a reminder. Public Works inspection is scheduled with each project with a permit. Inspection and follow-up to take place.**

**The Town has a very good construction program. We inspect all projects utilizing MRP requirements. Our inspections used the revised storm water construction inspection forms and inspection data tracking tools, revised operating procedures and provided training to inspectors, conducted inspections with the new forms. Refer to the C.6 Construction Site Control section of countywide program's FY 13-14 Annual Report for a description of activities at the countywide or regional level.**

[57] 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.
[58] 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.
[59] The total number of violations reported in the table of Violation Correction Times equals the number of initial enforcement actions. I.e., This assumes one violation is issued for several problems during an inspection at a site. The total number of violations in the table of Violation Correction Times may 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.

## C.6.f ►Staff Training Summary

| Training Name | Training Dates | Topics Covered | No. of Inspectors in Attendance | Percent of Inspectors in Attendance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Municipal Maintenance Stormwater workshop | 5/23/13 | Regulatory review / Municipal Maintenance | 2 | 100% |
| CALBIG – Construction Site Stormwater Compliance | 10/10/12 | Construction Site Stormwater Compliance | 2 | 100% |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

# Section 7 – Provision C.7. Public Information and Outreach

## C.7.b.ii.1 ►Advertising Campaign

Summarize advertising efforts. Include details such as messages, creative developed, and outreach media used. The detailed advertising report may be included as an attachment. If advertising is being done by participation in a countywide or regional program, refer to the separate countywide or regional Annual Report.

Summary:

**The Town of Portola Valley regularly posts messages and responds to inquiries on hazardous waste reduction via our community listserv. The following separate report developed by BASMAA summarizes the activities of the Regional Youth Litter Campaign:**

- **BASMAA Be the Street Youth Litter Campaign Report**

## C.7.b.iii.1 ►Pre-Campaign Survey

*(For the Annual Report following the pre-campaign survey)* Summarize survey information such as sample size, type of survey (telephone survey, interviews etc.). Attach a survey report that includes the following information. If survey was done regionally, refer to a regional submittal that contains the following information:

**Information on the pre-campaign survey for the BASMAA Regional Youth Litter Campaign was provided in the FY 11-12 Annual Report.**

Place an **X** in the appropriate box below:

| | |
|---|---|
| | Survey report attached |
| X | Reference to regional submittal: |

## C.7.b.iii.2 ►Post-Campaign Survey

*(For the Annual Report following the post-campaign survey)* Discuss the campaigns and the measureable changes in awareness and behavior achieved. Provide an update of outreach strategies based on the survey results. If survey was done regionally, refer to a regional submittal that contains the following information:

**Information on the post-campaign survey for the BASMAA Regional Youth Litter Campaign was provided in the BASMAA FY 13-14 Annual Report.**

Place an **X** in the appropriate box below:

| | |
|---|---|
| | Survey report attached |
| X | Reference to regional submittal: |

## C.7.c ►Media Relations

Summarize the media relations effort. Include the following details for each media pitch in the space below, AND/OR refer to a regional report that includes these details:

- Topic and content of pitch
- Medium (TV, radio, print, online)
- Date of publication/broadcast

Summary:

**The following separate report developed by BASMAA summarizes media relations efforts conducted during FY 13-14:**

**• BASMAA Media Relations Final Report FY 13-14**

**This report and any other media relations efforts conducted countywide is included within the C.7 Public Information and Outreach section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report.**

## C.7.d ►Stormwater Point of Contact

Summary of any changes made during FY 13-14:

**No change**

## C.7.e ►Public Outreach Events

Describe general approach to event selection. Provide a list of outreach materials and giveaways distributed.
Use the following table for reporting and evaluating public outreach events

**The following outreach events were conducted on a countywide level by SMCWPPP and are described in detail in the Public Information and Outreach section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report:**

- **California Coastal Cleanup Day in San Mateo County, September 21, 2013**
- **San Mateo County Fair, June 7-15, 2013**

**The Town of Portola Valley promoted the California Coastal Cleanup Day and the County Fair through posters and Facebook.**

| **Event Details** | **Description** (messages, audience) | **Evaluation of Effectiveness** |
|---|---|---|
| Provide event name, date, and location. Indicate if event is local, countywide or regional. | Identify type of event (e.g., school fair, farmers market etc.), type of audience (school children, gardeners, homeowners etc.) and outreach messages (e.g., Enviroscape presentation, pesticides, stormwater awareness) | Provide general staff feedback on the event (e.g., success at reaching a broad spectrum of the community, well attended, good opportunity to talk to gardeners etc.). Provide other details such as:<br>• Estimated overall attendance at the event.<br>• Number of people that visited the booth, comparison with previous years<br>• Number of brochures and giveaways distributed<br>• Results of any spot surveys conducted |
| Portola Valley/Woodside Earth Fair; April 26, 2014; 765 Portola Road Portola Valley, California 94028; event is local | Earth Fair; families; toxics disposal, Less toxic cleaning & pest control | SMCWPPP provided a table and chairs for the event. The Be the Street photobooth s o event drew mostly families with young children interested in saying "no" to litter. Adults had questions about proper disposal of CFLs and medications and appreciated the information. People also liked the information on the car wash discount coupon program and gardeners liked the OWOW information. Parents and children liked the activity guides, erasers and |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | sponges. Total people that visited booth: 84 |
| | | |

## C.7.f. ►Watershed Stewardship Collaborative Efforts

Summarize watershed stewardship collaborative efforts and/or refer to a regional report that provides details. Describe the level of effort and support given (e.g., funding only, active participation etc.). State efforts undertaken and the results of these efforts. If this activity is done regionally refer to a regional report.

Evaluate effectiveness by describing the following:

- Efforts undertaken
- Major accomplishments

Summary:

**A summary of efforts conducted by SMCWPPP to work with Watershed Stewardship Groups on a countywide level is included within the Public Information and Outreach section of the SMCWPPP FY 12-13 Annual Report.**

## C.7.g. ►Citizen Involvement Events

List the types of events conducted (e.g., creek clean up, storm drain inlet marking, native gardening etc.). Use the following table for reporting and evaluating citizen involvement events.

**The following involvement events were conducted on a countywide level by SMCWPPP and are described in detail in the Public Information and Outreach section of the SMCWPPP FY 12-13 Annual Report:**

- **California Coastal Cleanup Day in San Mateo County, September 21, 2013"**

**The Town of Portola Valley promoted the California Coastal Cleanup Day through posters and Facebook.**

| Event Details | Description | Evaluation of effectiveness |
|---|---|---|
| Provide event name, date, and location. Indicate if event is local, countywide or regional | Describe activity (e.g., creek clean-up, storm drain marking etc.) | Provide general staff feedback on the event.<br>Provide other evaluation details such as:<br>• Number of participants. Any change in participation from previous years.<br>• Distance of creek or water body cleaned<br>• Quantity of trash/recyclables collected (weight or volume). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Number of inlets marked.<br>• Data trends |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

## C.7.h. ►School-Age Children Outreach

Summarize school-age children outreach programs implemented. A detailed report may be included as an attachment.
Use the following table for reporting school-age children outreach efforts.

| Program Details | Focus & Short Description | Number of Students/Teachers reached | Evaluation of Effectiveness |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provide the following information:<br>Name<br>Grade or level (elementary/ middle/ high) | Brief description, messages, methods of outreach used | Provide number or participants | Provide agency staff feedback. Report any other evaluation methods used (quiz, teacher feedback etc.). Attach evaluation summary if applicable. |
| Ormondale Elementary; 3/27/2013 | Banana Slug Stringband | 310 | This program was implemented by the County Program and well attended |
| Woodside High School (serves Portola Valley); 2/10/13 and 4/20/13 | Environmental Health High School Presentation | 53 | This program was implemented by the County Program and well attended |
| | | | |

## Section 8 - Provision C.8 Water Quality Monitoring

### C.8 ►Water Quality Monitoring

State below if information is reported in a separate regional report. Municipalities can also describe below any Water Quality Monitoring activities in which they participate directly, e.g. participation in RMP workgroups, fieldwork within their jurisdictions, etc.

Summary

**During FY 13-14, we contributed through SMCWPPP to the BASMAA Regional Monitoring Coalition (RMC). In addition, we contributed financially to the Regional Monitoring Program for Water Quality in the San Francisco Estuary (RMP) and were represented at RMP committees and work groups. Monitoring efforts and results are documented in a separate report submitted March 15 of each year, as required in Provision C.8. For additional information on monitoring activities conducted by the Program, BASMAA RMC and the RMP, see SMCWPPP's March 2014 Integrated Monitoring Report, Part A.**

# Section 9 – Provision C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Controls

## C.9.b ►Implement IPM Policy or Ordinance

Report implementation of IPM BMPs by showing trends in quantities and types of pesticides used, and suggest reasons for increases in use of pesticides that threaten water quality, specifically organophosphates, pyrethroids, carbaryl, and fipronil. A separate report can be attached as evidence of your implementation.

**Trends in Quantities and Types of Pesticides Used**[60]

| Pesticide Category and Specific Pesticide Used | Amount[61] | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY 09-10 | FY 10-11 | FY 11-12 | FY 12-13 | FY 13-14 |
| **Organophosphates** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Product or Pesticide Type A** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Product or Pesticide Type B** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Pyrethroids** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Product or Pesticide Type X** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Product or Pesticide Type Y** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Carbaryl** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Fipronil** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## C.9.c ►Train Municipal Employees

| | |
|---|---|
| Enter the number of employees that applied or used pesticides (including herbicides) within the scope of their duties this reporting year. | 1 |
| Enter the number of these employees who received training on your IPM policy and IPM standard operating procedures within the last 3 years. | 1 |
| Enter the percentage of municipal employees who apply pesticides who have received training in the IPM policy and IPM standard operating procedures within the last three years. | 100% |

[60] Includes all municipal structural and landscape pesticide usage by employees and contractors.
[61] Weight or volume of the product or preferably its active ingredient, using same units for the product each year. The active ingredients in any pesticide are listed on the label. The list of active ingredients that need to be reported in the pyrethroids class includes: allethrin, bifenthrin, beta-cyfluthrin, bioallethrin, cyfluthrin, cypermethrin, cyphenothrin, deltamethrin, esfenvalerate, etofenprox, fenpropathrin, gamma-cyhalothrin, imiprothrin, lambda-cyhalothrin, metofluthrin, permethrin, phenothrin, prallethrin, resmethrin, sumithrin (d-phenothrin), tau-fluvalinate, tefluthrin, tetramethrin, tralomethrin, cis-permethrin, and zeta-cypermethrin.

## C.9.d ►Require Contractors to Implement IPM

| Did your municipality contract with any pesticide service provider in the reporting year? | X | **Yes** | | **No** |
|---|---|---|---|---|

If yes, attach one of the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Contract specifications that require adherence to your IPM policy and standard operating procedures, OR |
| | Copy(ies) of the contractors' IPM certification(s) or equivalent, OR |
| | Equivalent documentation. |

If **Not attached**, explain:

**The Town of Portola Valley verifies IPM contractor performance by hiring professionals that certify they are properly trained and use IPM. The Town uses Clark Pest Control and Animal Damage Control. Clark's services were not used in FY13-14 as they are only called upon at various times. Animal Damage Control was used in FY13-14 and must abide by the Town's San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP) Model Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Policy, which is attached.**

**Town will also consider modifying future contracts that provide service to adhere to IPM.**

## C.9.e ►Track and Participate in Relevant Regulatory Processes

Summarize participation efforts, information submitted, and how regulatory actions were affected **OR** reference a regional report that summarizes regional participation efforts, information submitted, and how regulatory actions were affected.

Summary:

**During FY 13-14, we participated in regulatory processes related to pesticides through SMCWPPP, BASMAA and CASQA. For additional information, see the regional report submitted by BASMAA on behalf of all MRP Permittees.**

## C.9.f ►Interface with County Agricultural Commissioners

| Did your municipal staff observe any improper pesticide usage or evidence of improper usage (e.g., pesticides in storm drain systems, along street curbs, or in receiving waters) during this fiscal year? | | **Yes** | X | **No** |
|---|---|---|---|---|

If yes, provide a summary of improper pesticide usage reported to the County Agricultural Commissioner and follow-up actions taken to correct any violations. A separate report can be attached as your summary.

## C.9.h.ii ►Public Outreach: Point of Purchase

Provide a summary of public outreach at point of purchase, and any measurable awareness and behavior changes resulting from outreach (here or in a separate report); **OR** reference a report of a regional effort for public outreach in which your agency participates.

Summary:

**See the C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Control section of the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report for information on point of purchase public outreach conducted countywide and regionally.**

## C.9.h.vi ►Public Outreach: Pest Control Operators

Provide a summary of public outreach to pest control operators and landscapers and reduced pesticide use (here or in a separate report); **OR** reference a report of a regional effort for outreach to pest control operators and landscapers in which your agency participates.

Summary:

**See the C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Control section the SMCWPPP FY 13-14 Annual Report for a summary of our participation in and contributions towards countywide and regional public outreach to pest control operators and landscapers to reduce pesticide use.**

## Section 10 - Provision C.10 Trash Load Reduction

### C.10.a.iii ► Minimum Full Trash Capture

Provide the following:

1) Descriptions of actions/tasks completed towards achieving the Minimum Full Trash Capture requirement in provision C.10.a.iii. Include the:
   - Total number and types of full capture devices (publicly and privately-owned) installed to-date;
   - Total land area (acres) and land areas within each trash generation category (i.e., very high, high, moderate and low) treated by full capture devices (or other types of devices for non-population based Permittees), in comparison to the MRP-required full capture requirements in Attachment J to the MRP; and,
   - Percentage of jurisdictional land areas with very high, high, moderate and low trash generation rates treated by full capture devices.
2) A narrative summary of maintenance activities implemented for each device, group of devices, or device type, including descriptions of typical maintenance frequencies and issues associated with maintaining these devices.

**Descriptions of Actions/Tasks (Conducted or Planned)**:

**The Town of Portola Valley is exempt from MRP Permit Provision C.10.a.iii due having a population of 4,353 (2010 Census) and 9 acres of retail/wholesale land. As a result, the Town of Portola Valley does not currently have, nor plans to install trash full capture devices.**

## C.10.b.iii ► Trash Hot Spot Assessment

Provide the volume of material removed during each MRP-required Trash Hot Spot cleanup during each fiscal year, and the dominant types of trash (e.g., glass, plastics, paper) removed and their sources in FY 2013-14 to the extent possible.

| Trash Hot Spot | FY 13-14 Cleanup Date | Volume of Trash Removed (cubic yards) | | | | Dominant Type(s) of Trash in FY 2013-14 | Trash Sources in FY 2013-14 (where possible) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FY 2010-11 | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | | |
| PVY01 Ford Field Parking Lot | 7/1/2013 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.02 | 0.02 | Sports balls, Convenience/fast food items and construction debris | pedestrian users |

## C.10.c ►Long-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan

Provide descriptions of significant revisions made to your Long-term Trash Load Reduction Plan submitted to the Water Board in February 2014. Describe significant changes made to primary or secondary trash management areas (TMA), trash generation maps, control measures, or time schedules identified in your plan.

| Description of Significant Revision(s) | Associated TMA |
|---|---|
| N/A | |

## C.10.d ► PART A - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (Jurisdictional-wide Actions)

Provide a description of each jurisdictional-wide trash control measure implemented to-date. Identify the dominant trash source(s) and dominant type(s) of trash addressed by each control measure. For each jurisdictional-wide measure, identify the trash assessment method(s) used to demonstrate on-going reductions, summarize the results of the assessment(s), and estimate the associated reduction of trash within your jurisdictional area.

| Control Measure | Summary Description of Control Measure & Dominant Trash Sources and Types | Assessment Method(s) | Summary of Assessment Results To-date | Estimated % Trash Reduced |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single-Use Carryout Bag Policies | On January 23, 2013, the Town adopted an ordinance banning single use. The ordinance was modeled after San Mateo County's ordinance adopted on October 23, 2012.<br>See copy attached.<br><br>The majority of this trash source comes from pedestrian litter. | On behalf of all SMCWPPP Permittees, the County of San Mateo conducted assessments evaluating the effectiveness of the single use plastic bag ban in municipalities within San Mateo County. Assessments conducted by the County included audits of businesses and surveys of customer bag usage at many businesses in San Mateo County. Additionally, the number of complaints by customers was also tracked by the County. The results of assessments conducted by these cities are assumed to be representative of all SMCWPPP Permittees, given the consistency between the scope, implementation, and enforcement of the ordinances among the municipalities.<br>The City/County developed its % trash reduced estimate using the following assumptions:<br>1.) Single use plastic bags comprise 8% of the trash discharged from stormwater conveyances, based on the Regional Trash Generation Study conducted by BASMAA;<br>2) 95% of single use plastic bags distributed in the City/County are affected by the implementation of the ordinance, based on the County of San Mateo's Environmental Impact Report; and<br>3) Of the bags affected by the ordinance, there are now 90% less bags being distributed, based on customer complaints received by the County of San Mateo's Department of Environmental Health Services. This is conservative estimate given that in FY 13-14 Environmental Services only received complaints about 4, of the over 1900 businesses in San Mateo County that are affected by the single-use plastic bag ordinances | Results of assessments conducted by the County of San Mateo on behalf of all municipalities in San Mateo County indicate that the City's/County's ordinance is effective in reducing the number of single use plastic bags in stormwater discharges. This preliminary conclusion is based on the very small number of complaints received from customers about businesses in San Mateo County that are continuing to use single use plastic bags after ordinances were adopted. Assuming single use bags are 8% of the trash observed in stormwater discharges, the City/County concludes that there has been a 7% (i.e., 8% x 86% effectiveness in reducing bags) reduction in trash in stormwater discharges as a result of the City's/County's ordinance. | An assumed 7% reduction of stormwater trash is a result of ordinance implementation. |

## C.10.d ► PART A - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (Jurisdictional-wide Actions)

Provide a description of each jurisdictional-wide trash control measure implemented to-date. Identify the dominant trash source(s) and dominant type(s) of trash addressed by each control measure. For each jurisdictional-wide measure, identify the trash assessment method(s) used to demonstrate on-going reductions, summarize the results of the assessment(s), and estimate the associated reduction of trash within your jurisdictional area.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Polystyrene Foam Food Service Ware Policies | The Town of Portola Valley has adopted an ordinance 2012- 395 banning food vendors from providing prepared food in disposable food service containers made from expanded polystyrene foam. Food vendors are defined as any vendor, business, organization, entity, group or individual, including a licensed retail food establishment that provides prepared food at a retail level. The ordinance will became effective October 25, 2012. Through follow-up site visits, Town staff members have verified that approximately 90% of regulated food vendors are in full compliance with the ordinance.<br><br>The majority of this trash source comes from pedestrian litter. | Although the Town has adopted and implemented an ordinance prohibiting the distribution of EPS food ware by food vendors, evaluations of the effectiveness of the ordinance have not yet been conducted. For the purpose of estimating trash reductions in stormwater discharges associated with the ordinance, the results of assessments conducted by the cities of Los Altos and Palo Alto were used to represent the reduction of trash associated with theTown's ordinance. Assessments conducted by these cities were conducted prior to and following the effective date of their ordinances, and include audits of businesses and/or assessments of EPS food ware observed on streets, storm drains and local creeks. The results of assessments conducted by these cities are assumed to be representative of the effectiveness of the Town's ordinance because the implementation (including enforcement) of the Town's ordinance is similar to the City of Los Altos' and Palo Alto's.<br><br>The Town developed its % trash reduced estimate using the following assumptions:<br>1.) EPS food ware comprises 6% of the trash discharged from stormwater conveyances, based on the Regional Trash Generation Study conducted by BASMAA;<br>2) 80% of EPS food ware distributed by food vendors or sold via stores in the City/County is affected by the implementation of the ordinance; and<br>3) There is now 95% less EPS food ware being distributed, sold and/or observed in the environment, based on assessments conducted by the City of Palo Alto and City of Los Altos. | Results of assessments that are representative of the Town, but were conducted by the cities of Los Altos and Palo Alto, indicate that Town's ordinance is effective in reducing EPS food ware in stormwater discharges. This conclusion is based on the following assessment result - an average of 95% of businesses affected by the ordinance are no longer distributing EPS food ware post-ordinance. Based on these results, the estimated average reduction of EPS food ware in stormwater discharges is 90%. Assuming EPS food ware is 6% of the trash observed in stormwater discharges, the City/County concludes that there has been a 5% (i.e., 6% x 90%) reduction in trash in stormwater discharges as a result of the ordinance. | An assumed 5% reduction of stormwater trash is a result of ordinance implementation. |

## C.10.d ► PART A - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (Jurisdictional-wide Actions)

Provide a description of each jurisdictional-wide trash control measure implemented to-date. Identify the dominant trash source(s) and dominant type(s) of trash addressed by each control measure. For each jurisdictional-wide measure, identify the trash assessment method(s) used to demonstrate on-going reductions, summarize the results of the assessment(s), and estimate the associated reduction of trash within your jurisdictional area.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public Education and Outreach Programs Targeted at Trash Reduction and Implemented post-MRP Adoption | On behalf of the City/County, SMCWPPP and BASMAA also implemented public education and outreach actions at the countywide and regional scales that were targeted at reducing the impacts of trash on local water bodies. For descriptions of these activities, please see Section 7 of the Program's Annual Report. | BASMAA conducted post-campaign surveys in FY 13-14 to assess the effectiveness and impacts of their youth litter campaign "Be the Street". The methods used by BASMAA are described in Appendix 16 of the Program's Annual Report. | Reductions (i.e., trends) in the levels of trash in stormwater discharges that occur as a result of the implementation of Public Education and Outreach campaigns and programs are very difficult to measure. Both the inherent spatial and temporal variability in trash generation and the timeframes by which behavior change occurs as a result of education and outreach largely governs our ability to link this control measure to water quality outcomes. That said, changing littering behaviors is paramount to the long-term success of trash management programs. As described in Section 7 of the Program's Annual Report, the City/County has spent significant resources on local, county-wide, and public education and outreach programs that are slowly reducing the generation of trash at its source. Based on the results of assessments conducted by BASMAA in FY 13-14 to assess the effectiveness and impacts of their youth litter campaign "Be the Street" (see Program's Section 7), a modest conservative load reduction associated with public education and outreach programs is assumed . | An assumed 1% reduction in trash is a result of public education and outreach program implementation. |

## C.10.d ► PART B - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (TMA Specific Actions)

**Complete the following trash control measure implementation and assessment summary for <u>each</u> primary trash management area (TMA) identified in your Long-term Plan. Include the following information:**

- Identify the total jurisdictional area and the % of that area that generates very high (VH), high (H), moderate (M), or low (L) levels of trash;
- Identify the dominant trash source(s) and dominant type(s) of trash addressed or to-be addressed in the TMA;
- Include the area currently treated by full capture devices, the quantity and type of devices installed to-date, and the % of jurisdictional area that generates very high (VH), high (H), moderate (M), and low (L) levels of trash after accounting for reductions via full capture devices;
- Summarize control measures other than full capture devices implemented to-date, distinguishing between implementation that began pre- and post-MRP effective date. If not implemented in the entire TMA, describe generation category targeted and % of TMA addressed;
- Provide the % of the jurisdictional area that generates very VH, H, M or L levels of trash after accounting for all control measures implemented to-date;
- Describe the methods used to evaluate the effectiveness of control measures other than full capture devices, and any assessment results to-date. If the method was not implemented in the entire TMA, describe generation category targeted and %of TMA addressed; and
- Provide an estimate of the % of trash reduced in the TMA and jurisdiction-wide.

## C.10.d ► PART B - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (TMA Specific Actions)

| TMA ID | TMA Area (Acres) | Dominant Sources | Dominant Types | | % TMA in Each Trash Generation Category | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | VH | H | M | L |
| TMA 1 | 5 | pedestrian litter | sports balls, plastic bottles, food packaging | Baseline Generation (Pre-MRP) | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Trash Full Capture Devices | | Summary Descriptions of Full Trash Capture Devices (Quantity and Type) | | After taking into account Full Capture Devices | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Total Area (Acres) | 0 | NA | | | | | | |
| % of TMA | 0 | | | | | | | |
| % of VH/H/M | 0 | | | | | | | |

**Summary Descriptions of Control Measures Implemented Since MRP Adoption, Other than Full Capture Devices**

-Street sweeping (on-going measure):bi-monthly street sweeping on arterial roads.
-On-land (on-going measure): roadside trash pickup service that twice per month on main arterials. This Town program contracts to a private firm to provide 2 laborers to come out on a routine bi-weekly basis to walk and pick up trash on the Towns arterial roads and its shoulders. Time spent is approximately 16 work-hours per visit or 384 work-hours per year.
-Stormdrain inlet maintenance (on-going measure): Town Maintenance crew inspects and cleans each storm drain twice per year on approx. 425 rural type storm drains.

**Assessment Methods for Control Measures Other than Full Capture Devices**

As part of the City's Long-Term Trash Reduction Plan, we worked collaboratively with other SMCWPPP Permittees to develop our Pilot Trash Assessment Strategy (Strategy), which was submitted to the Water Board in Feb 2014. For areas where control measures other than full capture devices have been implemented, visual on-land trash assessment is the method used to determine the current level of trash in a TMA. Assessments are conducted using a protocol developed by BASMAA member agencies. For each TMA assessed, sites are selected using a probabilistic sample draw to randomly pick sites in a TMA and allow for extrapolation of results within an applicable TMA. Additionally, trash assessment sites may also be targeted to specific streets and properties (these results are not extrapolated). Changes in the level of trash observed via on-land assessments, along with the associated trash generation rates are then used to calculate reductions in trash to-date. The results of the assessments conducted in FY 13-14 are presented below. Additional information on the Strategy, the results of initial assessments, and the method used to calculate % reductions can be found in the Program's FY 13-14 Annual Report.

**Summary of Assessment Results To-date**

In July 2014, a total of 1 sites or 900 linear feet (100%) of streets and sidewalks were assessed in this TMA using the on-land visual assessments. Only areas with M, H or VH generation rates were assessed. Based on the results of these assessments, the area in this TMA where control measures other than full capture devices are implemented was determined have a 100% moderate level of trash. The results to the right include not only the reduction observed via on-land assessments, but also via full capture devices (as applicable).

| After taking into account all New or Enhanced (post-MRP) Control Measures | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **Estimated % Trash Reduction <u>in TMA</u> due to New or Enhanced Post-MRP actions** | 0% |
| **Estimated % Trash Reduction <u>Jurisdiction-wide</u> due to New or Enhanced Post-MRP actions** | 0% |

## C.10.d ► PART B - Trash Control Measure Implementation and Assessment (TMA Specific Actions)

| TMA ID | TMA Area (Acres) | Dominant Sources | Dominant Types | | % TMA in Each Trash Generation Category | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | VH | H | M | L |
| TMA 2 | 5785 | pedestrian litter | sports balls, plastic bottles, food packaging | Baseline Generation (Pre-MRP) | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Trash Full Capture Devices | | Summary Descriptions of Full Trash Capture Devices (Quantity and Type) | | After taking into account Full Capture Devices | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Total Area (Acres) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| % of TMA | 0 | | | | | | | |
| % of VH/H/M | 0 | | | | | | | |

**Summary Descriptions of Control Measures Implemented Since MRP Adoption, Other than Full Capture Devices**

-Street sweeping (on-going measure):bi-monthly street sweeping on arterial roads.
-On-land (on-going measure): roadside trash pickup service that twice per month on main arterials. This Town program contracts to a private firm to provide 2 laborers to come out on a routine bi-weekly basis to walk and pick up trash on the Towns arterial roads and its shoulders. Time spent is approximately 16 work-hours per visit or 384 work-hours per year.
-Stormdrain inlet maintenance (on-going measure): Town Maintenance crew inspects and cleans each storm drain twice per year on approx. 425 rural type storm drains.

**Assessment Methods for Control Measures Other than Full Capture Devices**

As part of the City's Long-Term Trash Reduction Plan, we worked collaboratively with other SMCWPPP Permittees to develop our Pilot Trash Assessment Strategy (Strategy), which was submitted to the Water Board in Feb 2014. For areas where control measures other than full capture devices have been implemented, visual on-land trash assessment is the method used to determine the current level of trash in a TMA. Assessments are conducted using a protocol developed by BASMAA member agencies. For each TMA assessed, sites are selected using a probabilistic sample draw to randomly pick sites in a TMA and allow for extrapolation of results within an applicable TMA. Additionally, trash assessment sites may also be targeted to specific streets and properties (these results are not extrapolated). Changes in the level of trash observed via on-land assessments, along with the associated trash generation rates are then used to calculate reductions in trash to-date. The results of the assessments conducted in FY 13-14 are presented below. Additional information on the Strategy, the results of initial assessments, and the method used to calculate % reductions can be found in the Program's FY 13-14 Annual Report.

**Summary of Assessment Results To-date**

On-land visual assessments were not conducted in this TMA in FY 13-14 and therefore no load reductions associated control measures other than full capture devices are assumed to have occurred. Assessments may be conducted in subsequent years.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | After taking into account all New or Enhanced (post-MRP) Control Measures | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Estimated % Trash Reduction in TMA due to New or Enhanced Post-MRP actions** | TMA generates a level of trash that does not adversely affect water quality and therefore no |

| | |
|---|---|
| | reductions are needed. |
| **Estimated % Trash Reduction <u>Jurisdiction-wide</u> due to New or Enhanced Post-MRP actions** | NA |

## C.10.d ► PART C – Estimated Overall Trash Load Reduction

For Population-based Permittees, provide an estimate of the overall trash reduction percentage achieved to-date within the jurisdictional area of your municipality that generates problematic trash levels (i.e., Very High, High or Moderate trash generation). Base the estimate on the information presented in C.10.d – Parts A and B and creek/shoreline cleanups not reported in C.10.b.iii. Provide a statement regarding the confidence in the estimate and challenges and/or successes in measuring progress towards the 40% trash reduction target described in provision C.10.

**Discussion of Trash Reduction Estimate:**

The preliminary trash load reduction estimates presented in this section provide the best available estimate of trash reduction from the Town's municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4). These estimates were developed consistent with the trash reduction framework developed in collaboration with Water Board staff in 2013-14, and the Pilot SMCWPPP Trash Assessment Strategy submitted to the Water Board in February 2014. All estimates are based on available information collected by the Town, should be considered preliminary at this time, and are subject to revision by Permittees based on additional information on the effectiveness of trash controls, the magnitude and extent of trash control measure implementation, and/or the levels of trash discharged from the Town's MS4.

Trash reduction estimates were based on initial data collection efforts that began in FY 13-14 and utilize the verified levels of baseline trash generation in the Town. Reductions associated with jurisdictional-wide trash control measures, trash full capture devices, other TMA-specific control measures, and trash cleanup events in local creeks and shorelines are included. Reductions associated with jurisdictional-wide actions are based on a combination of data collection and observations applicable to the Town. Reductions associated with trash full capture devices assume that trash generated in areas treated by effectively maintained devices reduce trash to a level of "no adverse impacts" to local water bodies. For control measures other than full capture devices, all reductions estimates are based on empirical observations of current trash levels (i.e., on-land visual assessments) and associated reductions in applicable trash management areas. Reductions associated with creek and shoreline cleanups are based on the amount of trash removed via these cleanups in FY 13-14, in comparison to baseline trash generation in the Town.

In addition to what was reported in Section C.10.a.iii, the Town also removed trash from TMA #1 (i.e. Rissotti Field Parking lot). In FY 12-13 and FY 13-14, the Town removed approximately 0.5 CY (approx. 80-100 gallons) of trash each year. This is approximately equal to the estimated trash generation from this TMA. We estimated that 50% of this material may have reached the storm drains system if not removed via the Town's actions. Therefore, we assume that the Town's actions resulted in a 50% reduction in trash with this TMA.

Trash is not a significant presence in the Town of Portola Valley and clean up events remove only a very moderate amount of trash. Having started out as a very littler free town which takes pride in minimal visible trash, achieving a 40% reduction rate is challenging due to the nature of the calculation (i.e., % reduction). The Town will continue to focus its efforts on keeping the Town litter free with existing control measures that appear to be working.

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated % Trash Reduction due to Jurisdictional-wide Actions | 7% (single-use bag) + 5% (polystyrene) + 1% (public education) = 13% (total) |
| Estimated % Trash Reduction due to Trash Full Capture Devices (All TMAs) | 0% |
| Estimated % Trash Reduction due to Other Control Measures (All TMAs) | 0% |
| **SubTotal for Above Actions** | **13%** |
| Estimated % Trash Reduction due to Creek/Shoreline Cleanups (All TMAs) | 50% |
| **Total Estimated % Trash Reduction in FY 13-14** | **63%** |

Section 11 - Provision C.11 Mercury Controls

## C.11.a.i ►Mercury Recycling Efforts

List below or attach lists of efforts to promote, facilitate, and/or participate in collection and recycling of mercury containing devices and equipment at the consumer level (e.g., thermometers, thermostats, switches, bulbs).

**Please refer to SMCWPPP's FY 2013/14 Annual Report for details regarding countywide efforts to promote and facilitate collection and recycling of mercury containing devices and equipment at the consumer level through San Mateo County Health Department's Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program and Very Small Quantity Generator Business Collection (VSQG) Program.**

**Household Hazardous Waste collection day, sponsored by San Mateo County, on October 2013 was held at Portola Valley Town Center.**

**The Town's Sustainability Coordinator works with San Mateo County Business Program to provide outreach and education for local businesses on recycling materials, lowering green house gas emissions and recycling of batteries and lightbulbs.**

## C.11.a.ii ►Mercury Collection

Provide an estimate of the mass of mercury collected through these efforts, or provide a reference to a report containing this estimate.

Please refer to the FY 13-14 SMCWPPP Annual Report for an estimate of the mass of mercury collected through the San Mateo County Health Department's Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program and Very Small Quantity Generator Business Collection (VSQG) Program.

| Mercury Containing Device/Equipment | Total Amount of Devices Collected | Estimated Mass of Mercury Collected |
|---|---|---|
| Fluorescent Lamps[62] (linear feet) | | |
| CFLs[63] (each) | | |
| Thermostats[64] (each) | | |
| Thermostats (lbs) | | |
| Thermometers (each) | | |
| Switches (lbs) | | |
| **Total Mass of Mercury Collected During FY 2013-2014:** | | |

[62] Only linear fluorescent lamps should be included

[63] Only compact fluorescent lamps should be included

[64] Thermostats can be reported by quantity or by pounds. Whichever unit is used, please avoid double-counting.

**C.11.b ►Monitor Methylmercury**
**C.11.c ►Pilot Projects to Investigate and Abate Mercury Sources in Drainages**
**C.11.d ►Pilot Projects to Evaluate and Enhance Municipal Sediment Removal and Management Practices**
**C.11.e ►Conduct Pilot Projects to Evaluate On-Site Stormwater Treatment via Retrofit**
**C.11.f ►Diversion of Dry Weather and First Flush Flows to POTWs**
**C.11.g ►Monitor Stormwater Mercury Pollutant Loads and Loads Reduced**
**C.11.h ►Fate and Transport Study of Mercury In Urban Runoff**
**C.11.i ►Development of a Risk Reduction Program Implemented Throughout the Region**
**C.11.j ►Develop Allocation Sharing Scheme with Caltrans**

State below if information is reported in a separate regional report. Municipalities that participate directly in regional activities to can provide descriptions below.

Summary

**A summary of SMCWPPP and regional accomplishments for these sub-provisions are included within the C.11 Mercury Controls section of Program's FY 13-14 Annual Report and March 2014 Integrated Monitoring Report, Parts B and C.**

## Section 12 - Provision C.12 PCBs Controls

### C.12.a.ii,iii ►Ongoing Training

*(For FY 10-11 Annual Report and Each Annual Report Thereafter)* List below or attach description of ongoing training development and inspections for PCB identification, including documentation and referral to appropriate regulatory agencies (e.g. county health departments, Department of Toxic Substances Control, California Department of Public Health, and the Water Board) as necessary.

Description:

**Note that the town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the town.**

### C.12.b ►Conduct Pilot Projects to Evaluate Managing PCB-Containing Materials and Wastes during Building Demolition and Renovation Activities
### C.12.c ►Pilot Projects to Investigate and Abate On-land Locations with Elevated PCB Concentrations
### C.12.d ►Conduct Pilot Projects to Evaluate and Enhance Municipal Sediment Removal and Management Practices
### C.12.e ►Conduct Pilot Projects to Evaluate On-Site Stormwater Treatment via Retrofit
### C.12.f ►Diversion of Dry Weather and First Flush Flows to POTWs
### C.12.g ►Monitor Stormwater PCB Pollutant Loads and Loads Reduced
### C.12.h ►Fate and Transport Study of PCBs In Urban Runoff
### C.12.i ►Development of a Risk Reduction Program Implemented Throughout the Region

State below if information is reported in a separate regional report. Municipalities that participate directly in regional activities to can provide descriptions below.

Summary

**A summary of SMCWPPP and regional accomplishments for these sub-provisions are included within the C.12 PCBs Controls section of Program's FY 13-14 Annual Report and March 2014 Integrated Monitoring Report, Parts B and C.**

# Section 13 - Provision C.13 Copper Controls

## C.13.a.iii.(2) ►Training, Permitting and Enforcement Activities

*(FY 11-12 Annual Report and each Annual Report thereafter)* Provide summaries of activities implemented to manage waste generated from cleaning and treating of copper architectural features, including copper roofs, during construction and post-construction including. :

- Development of BMPs on how to manage the water during and post construction
- Requiring the use of appropriate BMPs when issuing building permits
- Educating installers and operators on appropriate BMPs
- Enforcement actions taken again noncompliance

- **Town utilizes the handout developed by the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program "Requirements for Architectural Copper"**
- **Development of BMPs. The Countywide Program collaborated with BASMAA to develop BMPs to manage waste generated from cleaning and treating of copper architectural features, including copper roofs, during construction and post construction.**
- **Permitting Procedures to Require the BMPs. The Countywide Program updated its Stormwater Requirements Checklist to include the architectural copper BMPs in the list of source controls measures that may apply to projects.**
- **Educate Installers and Operators. The Countywide Program, in collaboration with the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program, prepared an educational flyer on the BMPs.**
- **Town staff members did not attend BMP'straining for CALBIG – Construction Site Stormwater Compliance held on 10/09/13 and the Municipal Maintenance Stormwater workshop held on 4/23/14. Although Town staff did not attend either workshops, the current staff has been with the Town many years, and has taken previous program wide training courses in the past.**
- **During the permitting process staff distributes the informational flyer on architectural copper to project applicants and/or contractors installing and/or maintaining architectural copper. The handout is also posted on the Towns website**
- **Enforcement Actions against Noncompliance: No enforcement actions required.**

**Supporting Documents:**

Flyer on Architectural Copper BMPs

## C.13.d.iii ►Industrial Sources Copper Reduction Results

Based upon inspection activities conducted under Provision C.4, highlight copper reduction results achieved among the facilities identified as potential users or sources of copper, facilities inspected, and BMPs addressed.

Summary

**Note that the town contracts with San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to perform industrial, business, hazmat, and food facility inspections on behalf of the town.**

**None. The Town of Portola Valley is a small rural town consisting mostly of residential neighborhoods.**

## Section 14 - Provision C.14 PBDE, Legacy Pesticides and Selenium Controls

Note: There are no reporting requirements in the FY 13-14 Annual Report for Section C.14.

## Section 15 - Provision C.15 Exempted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges

### C.15.b.iii.(1), C.15.b.iii.(2) ► Planned and Unplanned Discharges of Potable Water

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Is your agency a water purveyor? | | **Yes** | X | **No** |
| If **No**, skip to C.15.b.vi.(2): | | | | |
| If **Yes**, Complete the attached reporting tables or attach your own table with the same information. Provide any clarifying comments below. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

### C.15.b.vi.(2) ► Irrigation Water, Landscape Irrigation, and Lawn or Garden Watering

Provide implementation summaries of the required BMPs to promote measures that minimize runoff and pollutant loading from excess irrigation. Generally the categories are:

- Promote conservation programs
- Promote outreach for less toxic pest control and landscape management
- Promote use of drought tolerant and native vegetation
- Promote outreach messages to encourage appropriate watering/irrigation practices
- Implement Illicit Discharge Enforcement Response Plan for ongoing, large volume landscape irrigation runoff.

Summary:

**The Town Council in March 2010 adopted a new Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance. The Ordinance is more streamlined and simplified than the State Model Ordinance and it is at least as effective as the Model Ordinance because it includes water budget parameters and values and landscape parameters that are consistent with the Model Ordinance. By using the same water budget parameters as the Model Ordinance, the Town's ordinance will be as effective as the Model Ordinance in developing landscaping water budgets. By using the same landscape parameters as the Model Ordinance, for among other things, slope restrictions and width restrictions for turf, irrigation times, and minimum mulch requirements the Town's Ordinance will be at least as effective as the Model Ordinance in achieving water savings.**

**The Town's Water Ordinance is designed to achieve a 25% savings on outdoor water use. The Ordinance includes a default turf restriction of 25% or 1,000 sf whichever is smaller and requires that at least 80% of the plants in non-turf landscape areas be native plants, low-water using plants, or no-water using plants (unless the applicant elects to perform a water budget).**

**The Town Council also adopted an Indoor Water Ordinance that applies to all new construction and permitted kitchen and bath remodels. The indoor Water Ordinance is designed to achieve a 20% water savings in indoor water use.**

## C.15.b.iii.(1) ►Planned Discharges of the Potable Water System

| Site/ Location | Discharge Type | Receiving Waterbody(ies) | Date of Discharge | Duration of Discharge (military time) | Estimated Volume (gallons) | Estimated Flow Rate (gallons/day) | Chlorine Residual (mg/L) | pH (standard units) | Discharge Turbidity[65] (NTU) | Implemented BMPs & Corrective Actions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None/N.A | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

[65] Monitor the receiving water for turbidity if necessary and feasible. Include data in this column if available.

## C.15.b.iii.(2) ►Unplanned Discharges of the Potable Water System[66]

| Site/ Location | Discharge Type | Receiving Waterbody(ies) | Date of Discharge | Discharge Duration (military time) | Estimated Volume (gallons) | Estimated Flow Rate (gallons/day) | Chlorine Residual (mg/L)[67] | pH (standard units) [52] | Discharge Turbidity (Visual) [52], | Implemented BMPs & Corrective Actions | Time of discharge discovery | Regulatory Agency Notification Time[68] | Inspector arrival time | Responding crew arrival time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None/N.A. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[66] This table contains all of the unplanned discharges that occurred in this FY.
[67] Monitoring data is only required for 10% of the unplanned discharges. If you monitored more than 10% of your unplanned discharges, report all of the data collected.
[68]. Notification to Water Board staff is required for unplanned discharges where the chlorine residual is >0.05 mg/L and total volume is ≥ 50,000 gallons. Notification to State Office of Emergency Services is required after becoming aware of aquatic impacts as a result of unplanned discharge or when the discharge might endanger or compromise public health and safety.

# San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP)
# Model Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Policy

## GOAL

The *Town of Portola Valley* seeks to protect the health and safety of its employees and the general public, the environment and water quality, as well as to provide sustainable solutions for pest control, through the reduced use of pesticides on property owned or managed by the *Town of Portola Valley* to the maximum extent feasible.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Employees implementing pest management operations will use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques that emphasize non-pesticide alternatives and, when necessary, employ the least toxic chemicals. Preference will be given to contractors who implement IPM. The *Town of Portola Valley* departments and their contractors that apply pesticides will develop and maintain an active IPM Plan to ensure the long-term prevention and suppression of pest problems with minimum negative impacts on the health and safety of the community and environment. The *Town of Portola Valley* will track employee and contractor pesticide use and prepare an annual report summarizing pesticide use and evaluating pest control activities performed.

The *Town of Portola Valley* shall encourage pilot projects to demonstrate landscape and structural pest control alternatives, seeking to use the most recent technology, best management practices and least toxic methods for all pest control measures. Pilot projects should include an objective analysis of the effectiveness of the alternative techniques applied.

The *Town of Portola Valley* will review its purchasing procedures, contracts or service agreements with pesticide applicators and employee training practices to determine what changes can be made to support the goal of pesticide reduction and promote the purchase and use of the least harmful chemicals.

The *Town of Portola Valley* will perform educational outreach and/or support Countywide or regional efforts to educate residential and commercial pesticide users on a) goals and techniques of IPM, and b) pesticide related water quality issues.

## BACKGROUND

Pesticides are defined as: any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any pest. Pests can be insects, rodents and other animals, unwanted plants (weeds), bacteria or fungi. The term pesticide applies to herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, rodenticides, molluscicides and other substances used to control pests. Antimicrobial agents are not included in this definition of pesticides. In general, the intent of antimicrobial agents is to reduce or mitigate the growth or development of microbial organisms. They are used to avoid health hazards and include in-door cleaning, spa and swimming pools, medical sterilizer and sanitizer products.

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an ecosystem-based strategy that focuses on long-term prevention of pests or their damage through a combination of techniques such as biological control, habitat manipulation, modification of cultural practices, and use of resistant varieties. Pesticides are used only after monitoring indicates they are needed according to established guidelines, and treatments are made with the goal of removing only the target organism. Pest control materials are selected and applied in a manner that minimizes risks to human health, beneficial and nontarget organisms, and the environment.

IPM techniques could include biological controls (e.g., ladybugs and other natural enemies or predators); physical or mechanical controls (e.g., hand labor or mowing); cultural controls (e.g., mulching, discing, or alternative plant type selection); and reduced risk chemical controls (e.g., soaps or oils).

The *Town of Portola Valley* owned or managed property includes but is not limited to parks and open space, roadsides, landscaped medians, flood control channels and other outdoor areas, as well as municipal buildings and structures.