

## C.15. Exempted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges

### Legal Authority

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 1337, and Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, D, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) requires MS4 operators, "to detect and remove (or require the discharger to the municipal separate storm sewer to obtain a separate NPDES permit for) illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1) provides that the Permittees shall prevent all types of illicit discharges into the MS4 except for certain non-stormwater discharges.

### Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.15.

Prohibition A.1. effectively prohibits the discharge of non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewer system. However, we recognize that certain types of non-stormwater discharges may be exempted from this prohibition if they are unpolluted and do not violate water quality standards. Other types of non-stormwater discharges may be conditionally exempted from Prohibition A.1. if the discharger employs appropriate control measures and BMPs prior to discharge, and monitors and reports on the discharge.

### Specific Provision C.15. Requirements

**Provision C.15.a. Exempted Non-Stormwater Discharges.** This section of the Permit identifies the types of non-stormwater discharges that are exempted from Discharge Prohibition A.1. if such discharges are unpolluted and do not violate water quality standards. If any exempted non-stormwater discharge is identified as a source of pollutants to receiving waters, the discharge shall be addressed as a conditionally exempted discharge and must meet the requirements of Provision C.15.b.

**Provision C.15.b. Conditionally Exempted Non-Stormwater Discharges.** This section of the Permit identifies the types of non-stormwater discharges that are conditionally exempted from Discharge Prohibition A.1. if they are identified by Permittees or the Executive Officer as not being sources of pollutants to receiving waters. To eliminate adverse impacts from such discharges, project proponents shall develop and implement appropriate pollutant control measures and BMPs, and where applicable, shall monitor and report on the discharges in accordance with the requirements specified in Provision C.15.b. The intent of Provision C.15.b.'s requirements is to facilitate Permittees in regulating these non-stormwater discharges to the storm drains since the Permittees have ultimate responsibility for what flows in those storm drains to receiving waters. For all planned discharges, the nature and characteristic of the discharge must be verified prior to the discharge so that effective

pollution control measures are implemented, if deemed necessary. Such preventative measures are cheaper by far than post-discharge cleanup efforts.

**Provision C.15.b.i.(1). Pumped Groundwater from Non Drinking Water Aquifers.** These aquifers tend to be shallower than drinking water aquifers and more subject to contamination. The wells must be purged prior to sample collection. Since wells are purged regularly, this section of the Permit requires twice a year monitoring of these aquifers. Pumped groundwater from non drinking water aquifers, which are owned and/or operated by Permittees who pump groundwater as drinking water, are conditionally exempted as long as the discharges meet the requirements in this section of the Permit.

**Provision C.15.b.i.(2). Pumped Groundwater, Foundation Drains, and Water from Crawl Space Pumps and Footing Drains.** This section of the Permit encourages these types of discharges to be directed to landscaped areas or bioretention units, when feasible. If the discharges cannot be directed to vegetated areas, it requires testing to determine if the discharge is uncontaminated. Uncontaminated discharges shall be treated, if necessary, to meet specified discharge limits for turbidity and pH.

**Provision C.15.b.ii. Air Conditioning Condensate.** Small air conditioning units are usually operated during the warm weather months. The condensate from these units are uncontaminated and unlikely to reach a storm drain or waters of the State because they tend to be low in volume and tend to evaporate or percolate readily. Therefore, condensate from small air conditioning units should be discharged to landscaped areas or the ground. Commercial and industrial air conditioning units tend to produce year-round continuous flows of condensate. It may be difficult to direct a continuous flow to a landscaped area large enough to accommodate the volume. While the condensate tends to be uncontaminated, it picks up contaminants on its way to the storm drain and/or waters of the State and can contribute to unnecessary dry weather flows. Therefore, discharges from new commercial and industrial air conditioning units should be discharged to landscaped areas, if they can accommodate the continuous volume, or to the sanitary sewer, with the local sanitary sewer agency's approval. If none of these options are feasible, air conditioning condensate can be directly discharged into the storm drain. If descaling or anti-algal agents are used to treat the air conditioning units, residues from these agents must be properly disposed of.

**Provision C.15.b.iii. Planned, Unplanned, and Emergency Discharges of the Potable Water System.** Potable water discharges contribute pollution to water quality in receiving waters because they contain chlorine or chloramines, two very toxic chemicals to aquatic life. Potable water discharges can cause erosion and scouring of stream and creek banks, and sedimentation can result if effective BMPs are not implemented. Therefore, appropriate dechlorination and monitoring of chlorine residual, pH and turbidity, particularly for planned discharges of potable water, are crucial to prevent adverse impacts in the receiving waters.

This section of the Permit requires Permittees to notify Water Board staff at least one week in advance for planned discharges of potable water with a flowrate of 250,000 gpd or more or a total 500,000 gallons or more. These planned discharges must meet specified discharge benchmarks for chlorine residual, pH, and turbidity.

To address unplanned discharges of potable water such as non-routine water line breaks, leaks, overflows, fire hydrant shearing, and emergency flushing, this section of the Permit requires Permittees to implement administrative BMPs such as source control measures, managerial practices, operations and maintenance procedures or other measures to reduce or prevent potential pollutants from being discharged during these events. This Provision also contains specific notification and monitoring requirements to assess immediate and continued impacts to water quality when these events happen.

This section of the Permit acknowledges that in cases of emergency discharge, such as from firefighting and disasters, priority of efforts shall be directed toward life, property, and the environment, in that order. Therefore, Permittees are required to implement BMPs that do not interfere with immediate emergency response operations or impact public health and safety. Reporting requirements for such events shall be determined by Water Board staff on a case-by-case basis.

**Provision C.15.b.iv. Individual Residential Car Washing.** Soaps and automotive pollutants such as oil and metals can be discharged into storm drains and waterbodies from individual residential car washing activities. However, it is not feasible to prohibit individual residential car washing because it would require too much resources for the Permittees to regulate the prohibition. This section of the Permit requires Permittees to encourage residents to implement BMPs such as directing car washwaters to landscaped areas, using as little detergent as possible, and washing cars at commercial car washing facilities.

**Provision C.15.b.v. Swimming Pool, Hot tub, Spa, and Fountain Water Discharges.** These types of discharges can potentially contain high levels of chlorine and copper. Permittees shall prohibit the discharge of such waters that contain chlorine residual, copper algaecide, filter backwash, or other pollutants to the storm drains or to waterbodies. High flow rates into the storm drain or waterbody could cause erosion and scouring of the stream or creek banks. These types of discharges should be directed to landscaped areas large enough to accommodate the volume or to the sanitary sewer, with the local sanitary sewer's approval. If these discharge options are not feasible and the swimming pool, hot tub, spa, or fountain water discharges must enter the storm drain, they must be dechlorinated to non-detectable levels of chlorine and they must not contain copper algaecide. Flow rate should be regulated to minimize downstream erosion and scouring. We strongly encourage local sanitary sewer agencies to accept these types of non-stormwater discharges, especially for new and rebuilt ones where a connection could be achieved with marginal effort. This Provision also requires Permittees to coordinate with local sanitary agencies in these efforts.

**Provision C.15.b.v.i. Irrigation Water, Landscape Irrigation, and Lawn or Garden Watering.** Fertilizers and pesticides can be washed off of landscaping and discharged into storm drains and waterbodies. However, it is not feasible to prohibit excessive irrigation because it would require too much resource for the Permittees to regulate such a prohibition. It is also not feasible for individual Permittees to ban the use fertilizers and pesticides. This section of the Permit requires Permittees to promote and/or work with potable water purveyors to promote measures that minimize runoff and pollutant loading from excess irrigation, such as conservation programs, outreach regarding overwatering and less toxic options for pest control and landscape management, the use of drought tolerant and native vegetation, and to implement appropriate illicit discharge response and enforcement for ongoing, large-volume landscape irrigation runoff to the storm drains.

**Provision C.15.b.vii.** requires Permittees to identify and describe additional types and categories of discharges not listed in Provision C.15.b., that they propose to conditionally exempt from Prohibition A.1., in periodic submittals to the Executive Officer.

**Provision C.15.b.viii.** establishes a mechanism to authorize under the Permit non-stormwater discharges owned or operated by the Permittees.

## Attachment J: Standard NPDES Stormwater Permit Provisions

### The following legal authority applies to Attachment J:

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 13377, and federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, D, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** Standard provisions, reporting requirements, and notifications are consistent to all NPDES permits and are generally found in federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.41.

**Attachment J** includes Standard Provisions. These Standard Provisions ensure that NPDES stormwater permits are consistent and compatible with USEPA's federal regulations. Some Standard Provision sections specific to publicly owned sewage treatment works are not included in Attachment J.

**Fact Sheet Attachment 6.1  
Construction Inspection Data**

**Construction Inspection Data**

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

Facility/Site Inspected	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Inches of Rain Since Last Inspection	Enforcement Response Level	Problem(s) Observed						Specific Problem(s)	Resolution			Comments/ Rationale for Longer Compliance Time	
					Erosion Control	Runoff Control	Sediment Control	Active Treatment System	Good Site Management	Non Stormwater Management		Illicit Discharge	Problems Fixed	Need More Time		Escalate Enforcement
Panoramic Views	2/28/09	Rain	2.4	Stop Work	x		x					Slope erosion control failed. Fiber rolls at the bottom of the hill flattened. Sediment laden discharge skipping protected stormdrains and entering unprotected stormdrains.				
Panoramic Views	2/28/09	Rain	0.1										x			Fiber rolls replaced. Silt fences added. More stormdrains protected. Streets cleaned. Slope too soggy to access.
Panoramic Views	3/15/09	Dry	1	Citation with Fine					x		x	Paint brush washing not designated	x			Street and storm drains cleaned. Slopes blanketed.
Panoramic Views	4/1/09	Dry	0.5	Citation with Fine							x	Concrete washout overflowed; Evidence of illicit discharge				
Panoramic Views	4/15/09	Dry	0										x			Concrete washout replaced; Storm drain and line cleaned.



## **Fact Sheet Attachment 10.1**

### **303(d) Trash Resolution and Staff Report February 2009**

Available at

**[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/2009/R2-2009-0008.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2009/R2-2009-0008.pdf)**

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **Provision C.3.b. Sample Reporting Table**

**Provision C.3.b. Sample Reporting Table  
Regulated Projects Approved During the Reporting Period 07/08 to 06/09  
City of Eden Annual Report FY 2008-09**

Name of Developer, Project Phase No., <sup>1</sup> Project Type & Description	Project Watershed <sup>2</sup>	Total Site Area, Total Area of Land Disturbed	Total New and/or Replaced Impervious Surface Area <sup>3</sup>	Total Pre- and Post-Project Impervious Surface Area <sup>4</sup>	Status of Project <sup>5</sup>	Source Control Measures	Site Design Measures	Treatment Systems Installed <sup>6</sup>	Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism	Hydraulic Sizing Criteria	Alter Comp Meas
avenly mes; ase 1; nstruction of 3 single-family nes and 45 /nhomes with nmercial ops and nderground king.	Runoff from site drains to Babbling Brook	25 acres site area, 21 acres disturbed	20 acres new	20 acres post-project	Application submitted 12/29/07, Application deemed complete 1/30/08, Project approved 7/16/08	Stenciled inlets, street sweeping, covered parking, car wash pad drains to sanitary sewer	Pervious pavement for all driveways, sidewalks, and commercial plaza	vegetated swales, detention basins,	Conditions of Approval require Homeowners Association to perform regular maintenance. Written record will be made available to City inspectors.	WEF Method	
als Galore velopment ; molition of p mall and king lot and nstruction of 3-unit 5-story opping mall h nderground king and ited outdoor king.	Runoff from site drains to Bargain River	5 acres site area, 3 acres disturbed	1 acre new, 2 acres replaced	3.5 acres pre-project, 4.5 acres post-project	Application submitted 7/9/08, Application deemed complete 8/2/08, Project approved 12/12/08	Stenciled inlets, trash enclosures, underground parking, street sweeping	One-way aisles to minimize parking footprint; roof drains to planter boxes	tree wells with bioretention; planter boxes with bioretention	Conditions of Approval require property owner (landlord) to perform regular maintenance. Written record will be made available to City inspectors.	BMP Handbook Method	\$ 250,000 to Reno Region Project sponsnc Riverw Found: 243 W. Way, E CA 95828 6789

**Provision C.3.b. Sample Reporting Table  
Regulated Projects Approved During the Reporting Period 07/08 to 06/09  
City of Eden Annual Report FY 2008-09**

Name of Developer, Project Phase No., <sup>1</sup> Project Type & Description	Project Watershed <sup>2</sup>	Total Site Area, Total Area of Land Disturbed	Total New and/or Replaced Impervious Surface Area <sup>3</sup>	Total Pre- and Post-Project Impervious Surface Area <sup>4</sup>	Status of Project <sup>5</sup>	Source Control Measures	Site Design Measures	Treatment Systems Installed <sup>6</sup>	Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism	Hydraulic Sizing Criteria	Alter Com; Meas
Fish Start Corporation; demolition of abandoned warehouse and construction of a factory building with 250 low-income rental housing units.	Runoff from site drains to Poor Man Creek	5 acres site area, 100,000 ft <sup>2</sup> disturbed	1 acre replaced	2 acres pre-project, 1 acre post-project	Application submitted 2/9/09, Application deemed complete 4/10/09; Project approved 6/30/09	Trash enclosures, underground parking, street sweeping, car wash pad drains to sanitary sewer	roof drains to landscaping	parking runoff flows to six bioretention units/gardens	Conditions of Approval require property owner (landlord) to perform regular maintenance. Written record will be made available to City inspectors.	BMP Handbook Method	r
City of Eden. Widening of C Blvd from 4 to 3 lanes.	Runoff from site drains to Congestion River	6 acres site area, 3 acres disturbed	2 acres new, 1 acre replaced	4 acres pre-project, 6 acres post-project	Application submitted 7/9/06, Application deemed complete 10/6/08, Project approved 12/9/08, Construction scheduled to begin 7/10/09	none	ABC Blvd sloped to drain runoff into landscaped areas in median	Runoff leaving underdrain system of landscaped median is pumped to bioretention gardens along either side of ABC Blvd	Signed statement from City of Eden assuming post-construction responsibility for treatment BMP maintenance.	WEF Method	r

**Table C.3.b. Footnotes**

being constructed in Phases, use a separate row entry for each Phase.

Watershed(s) that the Regulated Project drains to. Optional but recommended: Also state the downstream watershed(s).

Total new impervious surface area and the total replaced impervious surface area, as applicable.

For new projects state both the pre-project impervious surface area and the post-project impervious surface area.

Application date; application deemed complete date; and final, major, staff-level discretionary review and approval date.

Stormwater treatment system(s) installed onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment system facility.

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 location and description of the site in accordance with Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(i) for the offsite project.

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).

If not required, state why not.

If 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), bioretention unit(s), regional detention basin, or in-stream control).

## Instructions for Provision C.3.b. Sample Reporting Table

1. **Project Name, Number, Location, and Street Address** – Include the following information:
  - Name of the project
  - Number of the project (if applicable)
  - Location of the project with cross streets
  - Street address of the project (if available)
2. **Name of Developer, Project Phase Number, Project Type, and Project Description** – Include the following information:
  - Name of the developer
  - Project phase name and/or number (only if the project is being developed in phases) – each phase should have a separate row entry
  - Type of development (i.e., new and/or redevelopment)
  - Description of development (e.g., 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)
3. **Project Watershed**
  - State the watershed(s) that the Project drains into
  - Optional but recommended: Also state the downstream watershed(s)
4. **Total Site Area and Total Area of Land Disturbed** – State the total site area and the total area of land disturbed.
5. **Total New and/or Replaced Impervious Surface Area**
  - State the total new impervious surface area
  - State the total replaced impervious surface area, as applicable
6. **Total Pre- and Post-Project Impervious Surface Area** – For redevelopment projects, state both the pre-project impervious surface area and the post-project impervious surface area.
7. **Status of Project** – Include the following information:
  - Project application submittal date
  - Project application deemed complete date
  - Final, major, staff-level discretionary review and approval date
8. **Source Control Measures** – List all source control measures that have been or will be included in the project.

9. **Site Design Measures** – List all site design measures that have been or will be included in the project.
10. **Treatment Systems Installed** – List all post-construction stormwater treatment system(s) installed onsite and/or at a joint stormwater treatment system facility.
11. **Operation and Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism** – List the legal mechanism(s) that have been or will be used to assign responsibility for the maintenance of the post-construction stormwater treatment systems.
12. **Hydraulic Sizing Criteria Used** – List the hydraulic sizing criteria used for the Project.
13. **Alternative Compliance Measures**
  - **Option 1: LID Treatment at an Offsite Location (Provision C.3.e.i.(1))** – On a separate page, give a discussion of the alternative compliance project including the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(i) for the offsite project.
  - **Option 2: Payment of In-Lieu Fees (Provision C.3.e.i.(2))** – On a separate page, provide the information specified in Provision C.3.b.v.(1)(m)(ii).
14. **HM Controls**
  - If HM control is not required, state why not
  - If HM control is required, state control method used (e.g., method to design and size device(s), method(s) used to meet the HM Standard, and description of device(s) or method(s) used, such as detention basin(s), bioretention unit(s), regional detention basins, or in-stream control)

# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **Provision C.3.g. Alameda Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements**



## Alameda Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

### 1. On-site and Regional Hydromodification Management (HM) Control Design Criteria

- a. *Range of flows to control:* Flow duration controls shall be designed such that post-project stormwater discharge rates and durations match pre-project discharge rates and durations from 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow<sup>123</sup> up to the pre-project 10-year peak flow, except where the lower endpoint of this range is modified as described in Section 6 of this Attachment.
- b. *Goodness of fit criteria:* The post-project flow duration curve shall not deviate above the pre-project flow duration curve by more than 10 percent over more than 10 percent of the length of the curve corresponding to the range of flows to control.
- c. *Allowable low flow rate:* Flow control structures may be designed to discharge stormwater at a very low rate that does not threaten to erode the receiving waterbody. This flow rate (also called  $Q_{cp}$ <sup>124</sup>) shall be no greater than 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow unless a modified value is substantiated by analysis of actual channel resistance in accordance with an approved User Guide as described in Section 6 of this Attachment.
- d. *Standard HM modeling:* On-site and regional HM controls designed using the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM<sup>125</sup>) and site-specific input data shall be considered to meet the HM Standard. Such use must be consistent with directions and options set forth in the most current BAHM User's Manual.<sup>126</sup> Permittees shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer that any modifications of the BAHM made are consistent with the requirements of this Attachment and Provision C.3.f.
- e. *Alternate HM modeling and design:* The project proponent may use a continuous simulation hydrologic computer model<sup>127</sup> to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff and to design HM controls. To use this method, the project proponent shall compare the

<sup>123</sup> Where referred to in this Order, the 2-year peak flow is determined using a flood frequency analysis procedure based on USGS Bulletin 17 B to obtain the peak flow statistically expected to occur at a 2-year recurrence interval. In this analysis, the appropriate record of hourly rainfall data (e.g., 35–50 years of data) is run through a continuous simulation hydrologic model, the annual peak flows are identified, rank ordered, and the 2-year peak flow is estimated. Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>124</sup>  $Q_{cp}$  is the allowable low flow discharge from a flow control structure on a project site. It is a means of apportioning the critical flow in a stream to individual projects that discharge to that stream, such that cumulative discharges do not exceed the critical flow in the stream.

<sup>125</sup> *The Bay Area Hydrology Model – A Tool for Analyzing Hydromodification Effects of Development Projects and Sizing Solutions*, Bicknell, J., D. Beyerlein, and A. Feng, September 26, 2006. Available at [http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/permit\\_c3\\_docs/Bicknell-Beyerlein-Feng\\_CASQA\\_Paper\\_9-26-06.pdf](http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/permit_c3_docs/Bicknell-Beyerlein-Feng_CASQA_Paper_9-26-06.pdf)

<sup>126</sup> *The Bay Area Hydrology Model – A Tool for Analyzing Hydromodification Effects of Development Projects and Sizing Solutions*, Bicknell, J., D. Beyerlein, and A. Feng, September 26, 2006. Available at [http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/permit\\_c3\\_docs/Bicknell-Beyerlein-Feng\\_CASQA\\_Paper\\_9-26-06.pdf](http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/permit_c3_docs/Bicknell-Beyerlein-Feng_CASQA_Paper_9-26-06.pdf)

<sup>127</sup> Such models include US EPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Surface Water Management Model (SWMM).

pre-project and post-project model output for a rainfall record of at least 30 years, and shall show that all applicable performance criteria in 1.a-e above are met.

## 2. Impracticability Provision

Where conditions (e.g., extreme space limitations) prevent a project from meeting the HM Standard for a reasonable cost, *and* where the project's runoff cannot be directed to a regional HM control within a reasonable time frame, *and* where an in-stream measure is not practicable, the project shall use (1) site design for hydrologic source control, *and* (2) stormwater treatment measures that collectively minimize, slow, and detain<sup>128</sup> runoff to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the project proponent shall provide for or contribute financially to an alternative HM project as set forth below:

- a. *Reasonable cost:* To show that the HM Standard cannot be met at a reasonable cost, the project proponent must demonstrate that the total cost to comply with both the HM Standard and the Provision C.3.d treatment requirement exceeds 2 percent of the project construction cost, excluding land costs. Costs of HM and treatment control measures shall not include land costs, soil disposal fees, hauling, contaminated soil testing, mitigation, disposal, or other normal site enhancement costs such as landscaping or grading that are required for other development purposes.
- b. *Regional HM controls:* A regional HM control shall be considered available if there is a planned location for the regional HM control and if an appropriate funding mechanism for a regional HM control is in place by the time of project construction.
- c. *In-stream measures practicability:* In-stream measures shall be considered practicable when an in-stream measure for the project's watershed is planned and an appropriate funding mechanism for an in-stream measure is in place by the time of project construction.
- d. *Financial contribution to an alternative HM project:* The difference between 2 percent of the project construction costs and the cost of the treatment measures at the site (both costs as described in Section 2.a of this Attachment) shall be contributed to an alternative HM project, such as a stormwater treatment retrofit, HM retrofit, regional HM control, or in-stream measure that is not otherwise required by the Water Board or other regulatory agency. Preference shall be given to projects discharging, in this order, to the same tributary, mainstem, watershed, then in the same municipality or county.

## 3. Record Keeping

Permittees shall collect and retain the following information for all projects subject to HM requirements:

- a. Site plans identifying impervious areas, surface flow directions for the entire site, and location(s) of HM measures;
- b. For projects using standard sizing charts, a summary of sizing calculations used;
- c. For projects using the BAHM, a listing of model inputs;

<sup>128</sup> Stormwater treatment measures that detain runoff are generally those that filter runoff through soil or other media and include bioretention units, bioswales, basins, planter boxes, tree wells, media filters, and green roofs.

- d. For projects using custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves);
- e. For projects using the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM Project (name, location, date of start up, entity responsible for maintenance); and
- f. A listing, summary, and date of modifications made to the BAHM, including technical rationale. Permittees shall submit this list and explanation annually with the Annual Report. This may be prepared at the Countywide Program level and submitted on behalf of participating Permittees.

#### 4. HM Control Areas

Applicable projects shall be required to meet the HM Standard when such projects are in areas of HM applicability shown in the Alameda Permittees' HM Map.<sup>129</sup> (available at [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf)). Plans to restore a creek reach may reintroduce the applicability of HM requirements; in these instances, Permittees may add, but shall not delete, areas of applicability accordingly.

To assist in location and evaluation of project applicability, the Alameda Permittees' HM Map depicts a number of features including the following:

- Hardened channels and culverts at least 24 inches in diameter (green solid or dashed lines);
- Natural channels (red lines);
- Boundaries of major watersheds (light blue lines); and
- Surface streets and highways (gray or black lines).

These data are of varying age, precision and accuracy and are not intended for legal description or engineering design. Watersheds extending beyond the County boundaries are shown for illustration purposes only. Project proponents are responsible for verifying and describing actual conditions of site location and drainage.

#### 5. Alameda Permittees' HM Map is color-coded as follows:

- a. **Solid pink areas** – Solid pink designates hilly areas, where high slopes (greater than 25 percent) occur. The HM Standard and all associated requirements apply in areas shown in solid pink on the map. In this area, the HM Standard does *not* apply if a project proponent demonstrates that all project runoff will flow through enclosed storm drains, existing concrete culverts, or fully hardened (with bed and banks continuously concrete-lined) channels to the tidal area shown in light gray.
- b. **Purple/red hatched areas** – These are upstream of areas where hydromodification impacts are of concern because of factors such as bank instability, sensitive habitat, or restoration projects. The HM Standard and all associated requirements apply in areas

<sup>129</sup> The watercourses potentially susceptible to hydromodification impacts are identified based on an assessment approach developed by Balance Hydrologics (2003).

shown in purple/red (printer-dependant) hatch marking on the map. Projects in these areas may be subject to additional agency reviews related to hydrologic, habitat or other watershed-specific concerns.

- c. **Solid white areas** – Solid white designates the land area between the hills and the tidal zone. This area may be susceptible to hydromodification unless the site is connected to storm drains that discharge to the tidal area. The HM Standard and all associated requirements apply to projects in solid white areas *unless* a project proponent demonstrates that all project runoff will flow through fully hardened channels.<sup>130</sup> Short segments of engineered earthen channels (length less than 10 times the maximum width of trapezoidal cross-section) can be considered resistant to erosion if located downstream of a concrete channel of similar or greater length and comparable cross-sectional dimensions. Plans to restore a hardened channel may affect the HM Standard applicability in this area.
- d. **Solid gray areas** – Solid gray designates areas where streams or channels are tidally influenced or primarily depositional near their outfall in San Francisco Bay. The HM Standard does not apply to projects in this area. Plans to restore a hardened channel may affect the HM Standard applicability in this area.
- e. **Dark gray, Eastern County area** – Dark gray designates the portion of eastern Alameda County that lies outside the discharge area of this NPDES permit. This area is in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's jurisdiction.

## 6. Potential Exceptions to Alameda Permittees' HM Map Designations

The Program may choose to prepare a User Guide<sup>131</sup> to be used for evaluating individual receiving waterbodies using detailed methods to assess channel stability and watercourse critical flow. This User Guide would reiterate and collate established stream stability assessment methods that have been presented in the Program's HMP.<sup>132</sup> After the Program has collated its methods into a User Guide format, received approval of the User Guide from the Executive Officer,<sup>133</sup> and informed the public through such process as an electronic mailing list, the Permittees may use the User Guide to guide preparation of technical reports for the following: implementing the HM Standard using in-stream or regional HM controls; determining whether certain projects are discharging to a watercourse that is less susceptible (from point of discharge to the Bay) to hydromodification (e.g., would have a lower potential for erosion than set forth in these requirements); and/or determining if a watercourse has a higher critical flow and project(s) discharging to it are eligible for an alternative Qcp for the purpose of designing on-site or regional measures to control flows draining to these channels (i.e., the actual threshold of erosion-causing critical flow is higher than 10 percent of the 2-year pre-project flow). In no case shall the design value of Qcp exceed 50 percent of the 2-year pre-project flow.

<sup>130</sup> In this paragraph, *fully hardened channels* include enclosed storm drains, existing concrete culverts, or channels whose bed and banks are continuously concrete-lined to the tidal area shown in light gray on the map.

<sup>131</sup> The User Guide may be offered under a different title.

<sup>132</sup> The Program's HMP has undergone Water Board staff review and been subject to public notice and comment.

<sup>133</sup> The User Guide shall not introduce a new concept, but rather reformat existing methods; therefore, Executive Officer approval is appropriate.

# ATTACHMENT C

## Provision C.3.g. Contra Costa Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

### Contra Costa Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

#### 1. Demonstrating Compliance with the Hydromodification Management (HM) Standard

Contra Costa Permittees shall ensure that project proponents shall demonstrate compliance with the HM Standard by demonstrating that any one of the following four options is met:

- a. *No increase in impervious area.* The project proponent may compare the project design to the pre-project condition and show that the project will not increase impervious area and also will not facilitate the efficiency of drainage collection and conveyance.
- b. *Implementation of hydrograph modification IMPs.* The project proponent may select and size IMPs to manage hydrograph modification impacts, using the design procedure, criteria, and sizing factors specified in the Contra Costa Clean Water Program's *Stormwater C.3 Guidebook*. The use of flow-through planters shall be limited to upper-story plazas, adjacent to building foundations, on slopes where infiltration could impair geotechnical stability, or in similar situations where geotechnical issues prevent use of IMPs that allow infiltration to native soils. Limited soil infiltration capacity in itself does not make use of other IMPs infeasible.
- c. *Estimated post-project runoff durations and peak flows do not exceed pre-project durations and peak flows.* The project proponent may use a continuous simulation hydrologic computer model such as USEPA's Hydrograph Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF) to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff, including the effect of proposed IMPs, detention basins, or other stormwater management facilities. To use this method, the project proponent shall compare the pre-project and post-project model output for a rainfall record of at least 30 years, using limitations and instructions provided in the Program's *Stormwater C.3 Guidebook*, and shall show that the following criteria are met:
  - i. For flow rates from 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year runoff event (0.1Q<sub>2</sub>) to the pre-project 10-year runoff event (Q<sub>10</sub>), the post-project discharge rates and durations shall not deviate above the pre-project rates and durations by more than 10 percent over more than 10 percent of the length of the flow duration curve.
  - ii. For flow rates from 0.5Q<sub>2</sub> to Q<sub>2</sub>, the post-project *peak flows* shall not exceed pre-project peak flows. For flow rates from Q<sub>2</sub> to Q<sub>10</sub>, post-project peak flows may exceed pre-project flows by up to 10 percent for a 1-year frequency interval. For example, post-project flows could exceed pre-project flows by up to 10 percent for the interval from Q<sub>9</sub> to Q<sub>10</sub> or from Q<sub>5.5</sub> to Q<sub>6.5</sub>, but not from Q<sub>8</sub> to Q<sub>10</sub>.

d. *Projected increases in runoff peaks and durations will not accelerate erosion of receiving stream reaches.* The project proponent may show that, because of the specific characteristics of the stream receiving runoff from the project site, or because of proposed stream restoration projects, or both, there is little likelihood that the cumulative impacts from new development could increase the net rate of stream erosion to the extent that beneficial uses would be significantly impacted. To use this option, the project proponent shall evaluate the receiving stream to determine the relative risk of erosion impacts and take the appropriate actions as described below and in Table A-1. Projects 20 acres or larger in total area shall not use the medium risk methodology in (d)ii below.

i. **Low Risk.** In a report or letter report, signed by an engineer or qualified environmental professional, the project proponent shall show that all downstream channels between the project site and the Bay/Delta fall into one of the following *low-risk* categories.

(1) Enclosed pipes.

(2) Channels with continuous hardened beds and banks engineered to withstand erosive forces and composed of concrete, engineered riprap, sackcrete, gabions, mats, and such. This category excludes channels where hardened beds and banks are not engineered continuous installations (i.e., have been installed in response to localized bank failure or erosion).

(3) Channels subject to tidal action.

(4) Channels shown to be aggrading (i.e., consistently subject to accumulation of sediments over decades) and to have no indications of erosion on the channel banks.

ii. **Medium Risk.** Medium risk channels are those where the boundary shear stress could exceed critical shear stress as a result of hydrograph modification but where either the sensitivity of the boundary shear stress to flow is low (e.g., an oversized channel with high width to depth ratios) or where the resistance of the channel materials is relatively high (e.g., cobble or boulder beds and vegetated banks). In *medium-risk* channels, accelerated erosion due to increased watershed imperviousness is not likely but is possible, and the uncertainties can be more easily and effectively addressed by mitigation than by additional study.

In a preliminary report, the project proponent's engineer or qualified environmental professional shall apply the Program's *Basic Geomorphic Assessment*<sup>134</sup> methods and criteria to show each downstream reach between the project site and the Bay/Delta is either at *low-risk* or *medium-risk* of accelerated erosion due to watershed development. In a following, detailed report, a qualified stream geomorphologist<sup>135</sup> shall use the Program's Basic Geomorphic Assessment methods and criteria, available information, and current field data to evaluate each *medium-risk* reach. For each *medium-risk* reach, the detailed report shall show one of the following:

<sup>134</sup> Contra Costa Clean Water Program *Hydrograph Modification Management Plan*, May 15, 2005, Attachment 4, pp. 6-13. This method must be made available in the Program's *Stormwater C.3 Guidebook*.

<sup>135</sup> Typically, detailed studies will be conducted by a stream geomorphologist retained by the lead agency (or, on the lead agency's request, another public agency such as the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District) and paid for by the project proponent.

- (1) A detailed analysis, using the Program's criteria, showing the particular reach may be reclassified as *low-risk*.
- (2) A detailed analysis, using the Program's criteria, confirming the *medium-risk* classification, and:
  - (a) A preliminary plan for a mitigation project for that reach to stabilize stream beds or banks, improve natural stream functions, and/or improve habitat values, and
  - (b) A commitment to implement the mitigation project timely in connection with the proposed development project (including milestones, schedule, cost estimates, and funding), and
  - (c) An opinion and supporting analysis by one or more qualified environmental professionals that the expected environmental benefits of the mitigation project substantially outweigh the potential impacts of an increase in runoff from the development project, and
  - (d) Communication, in the form of letters or meeting notes, indicating consensus among staff representatives of regulatory agencies having jurisdiction that the mitigation project is feasible and desirable. In the case of the Regional Water Board, this must be a letter, signed by the Executive Officer or designee, specifically referencing this requirement. (This is a preliminary indication of feasibility required as part of the development project's Stormwater Control Plan. All applicable permits must be obtained before the mitigation project can be implemented.)

**iii. High Risk.** High-risk channels are those where the sensitivity of boundary shear stress to flow is high (e.g., incised or entrenched channels, channels with low width-to-depth ratios, and narrow channels with levees) or where channel resistance is low (e.g., channels with fine-grained, erodible beds and banks, or with little bed or bank vegetation). In a *high-risk* channel, it is presumed that increases in runoff flows will accelerate bed and bank erosion.

To implement this option (i.e., to allow increased runoff peaks and durations to a high-risk channel), the project proponent must perform a comprehensive analysis to determine the design objectives for channel restoration and must propose a comprehensive program of in-stream measures to improve channel functions while accommodating increased flows. Specific requirements are developed case-by-case in consultation with regulatory agencies having jurisdiction. The analysis will typically involve watershed-scale continuous hydrologic modeling (including calibration with stream gauge data where possible) of pre-project and post-project runoff flows, sediment transport modeling, collection and/or analysis of field data to characterize channel morphology including analysis of bed and bank materials and bank vegetation, selection and design of in-stream structures, and project environmental permitting.

## 2. IMP Model Calibration and Validation

The Program shall monitor flow from Hydrograph Modification Integrated Management Practices (IMPs) to determine the accuracy of its model inputs and assumptions. Monitoring

shall be conducted with the aim of evaluating flow control effectiveness of the IMPs. The Program shall implement monitoring where feasible at future new development projects to gain insight into actual versus predicted rates and durations of flow from IMP overflows and underdrains.

At a minimum, Permittees shall monitor five locations for a minimum of two rainy seasons. If two rainy seasons are not sufficient to collect enough data to determine the accuracy of model inputs and assumptions, monitoring shall continue until such time as adequate data are collected.

Permittees shall conduct the IMP monitoring as described in the IMP Model Calibration and Validation Plan in Section 5 of this Attachment. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Executive Officer by June 15 of each year following collection of monitoring data. If the first year's data indicate IMPs are not effectively controlling flows as modeled in the HMP, the Executive Officer may require the Program to make adjustments to the IMP sizing factors or design, or otherwise take appropriate corrective action. The Permittees shall submit an IMP Monitoring Report by August 30 of the second year<sup>136</sup> of monitoring. The IMP Monitoring Report shall contain, at a minimum, all the data, graphic output from model runs, and a listing of all model outputs to be adjusted, with full explanation for each. Board staff will review the IMP Monitoring Report and require the Program to make any appropriate changes to the model within a 3-month time frame.

### **3. Stormwater C.3 Guidebook and IMP Design Criteria**

The Current Contra Costa Clean Water Program C.3 Guidebook, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition (September 2008) shall be implemented until the expiration of this permit (November 2014). Any significant changes in the designs of the IMPs, their sizing factors or manner of implementation shall be approved by the Water Board.

### **4. IMP Model Calibration and Validation Plan Objective**

Monitoring shall be conducted with the aim of evaluating flow control effectiveness of the IMPs. The IMPs were redesigned in 2008 to meet a low flow criterion of 0.2Q<sub>2</sub>, not 0.1Q<sub>2</sub>, which is current HMP standard for Contra Costa County. The Program shall implement monitoring at future new development projects at a minimum of five locations and for a minimum of two rainy seasons to gain insight into actual versus predicted rates and durations of flow from IMP overflows and underdrains. If two rainy seasons are not sufficient to collect enough data to determine the accuracy of model inputs and assumptions, monitoring shall continue until such time as adequate data are collected.

- a. The Dischargers Shall Identify and Establish Monitoring Sites – Program staff shall work with municipal Co-Permittees to identify potential monitoring sites on development projects that implement IMPs. Proposed sites shall be identified during review of planning and zoning applications so that monitoring stations can be designed and constructed as part of the development project. Monitoring shall begin after the development project is complete and the site is in use.**

Criteria for appropriate sites include, but are not limited to, the following:

<sup>136</sup> If the monitoring extends beyond 2 years, an IMP Monitoring Report shall be submitted by August 30 annually until model calibration and validation is complete.



- To ensure applicability of results, the development project and IMPs should be typical of development sites and types of IMPs foreseen throughout the County. In particular, at least one each of the infiltration planter, flow-through planter, and *dry* swale shall be selected for monitoring.
  - The area tributary to the IMP should be clearly defined, should contain and direct runoff at all rainfall intensities to the IMP. Two monitoring locations shall contain tributary areas that are a mix of pervious and impervious areas to test the pervious area simplifying assumptions used in the HMP, Table 14, Attachment 2, page 49. If no such locations are constructed by the monitoring period, modeling of mixed (pervious and impervious) tributary areas can substitute for direct monitoring of this type of location.
  - The site shall be easily accessible at all times of day and night to allow inspection and maintenance of measurement equipment.
  - Hourly rain gauge data representative of the site's location shall be available.
- b. Documentation of Monitoring Sites** – The Dischargers shall record and report (i.e., document) pertinent information for each monitoring site. Documentation of each monitoring site shall include the following:
- Amount of tributary area;
  - Condition of roof or paving;
  - Grading and drainage to the IMP, including calculated time of concentration.
  - Locations and elevations of inlets and outlets;
  - As-built measurements of the IMP including depth of soil and gravel layers, height of underdrain pipe above the IMP floor or native soil;
  - Detailed specifications of soil and gravel layers and of filter fabric and other appurtenances; and
  - Condition of IMP surface soils and vegetation.
- c. Design, Construction, and Operation of Monitoring Sites** – The Dischargers shall ensure that IMPs selected for monitoring are equipped with a manhole, vault, or other means to install and access equipment for monitoring flows from IMP overflows and underdrains.
- Development of suitable methods for monitoring the entire range of flows may require experiment. The Program and Water Board are interested in the timing and duration of very low flows from underdrains, as well as higher flows from IMP overflows. The Dischargers shall ensure that equipment is configured to measure the entire range of flows and to avoid potential clogging of orifices used to measure low flows.
- The Dischargers shall ensure that construction of IMPs is inspected carefully to ensure that IMPs are installed as designed and to avoid potential operational problems. For example, gravel used for underdrain layers should be washed free of fines, and filter fabric should be installed without breaks.

The Dischargers shall ensure that, following construction, artificial flows are applied to the IMP to verify the IMP and monitoring equipment are operating correctly and to resolve any operational problems prior to measuring flows from actual rain storms.

The Dischargers shall ensure that monitoring equipment is properly maintained. Maintenance of monitoring equipment will require, initially, inspections during and after storms that produce runoff. The inspection and maintenance schedule may be adjusted as additional experience is gained.

- d. Data to be Obtained** – The Dischargers shall collect the following data for each IMP, during the monitoring period:
- Hourly rainfall and more frequent rainfall data where available;
  - Hourly IMP outflow and 15-minute outflow for all time periods in which sub-hourly rainfall data are available;
  - Hourly IMP inflow (if possible) and more frequent inflow (if possible) when sub-hourly rainfall data are available; and
  - Notes and observations.
- e. Evaluation of Data** – The principal use of the monitoring data shall be a comparison of predicted to actual flows. The Dischargers shall ensure that the HSPF model is set up as it was to prepare the curves in Attachment 2 of the HMP, with appropriate adjustments for the drainage area of the IMP to be monitored and for the actual sizing and configuration of the IMP. Hourly rainfall data from observed storms shall be input to the model, and the resulting hourly predicted output recorded. Where sub-hourly rainfall data are available, the model shall be run with, and output recorded for, 15-minute time steps.

The Dischargers shall compare predicted hourly outflows to the actual hourly outflows. As more data are gathered, the Dischargers may examine aggregated data to characterize deviations from predicted performance at various storm intensities and durations.

Because high-intensity storms are rare, it will take many years to obtain a suitable number of events to evaluate IMP performance under overflow conditions. Underdrain flows will occur more frequently, but possibly only a few times a year, depending on rainfall and IMP characteristics (e.g., extent to which the IMP is oversized, and actual, rather than predicted, permeability of native soils). However, evaluating a range of rainfall events that do *not* produce underflow will help demonstrate the effectiveness of the IMP.

## 5. Record Keeping and Reporting

Permittees shall collect and retain the following information for all projects subject to HM requirements:

- a. Site plans identifying impervious areas, surface flow directions for the entire site, and location(s) of HM measures;
- b. For projects using standard sizing charts, a summary of sizing calculations used;
- c. For projects using the BAHM, a listing of model inputs;

- d. For projects using custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves);
  - e. For projects using the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM project (name, location, date of start up, entity responsible for maintenance); and
  - f. A list and thorough technical explanation of any changes in design criteria for HM Controls, including IMPs. Permittees shall submit this list and explanation annually with the Annual Report.
6. The current Contra Costa Clean Water Program C.3 Guidebook, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition (C.3 Guidebook) (September 2008) design approach and IMPs shall be used to comply with Provision C.3.g flow requirements until this permit expires and is reissued, pending model verification studies as described below. The IMPs shall be an implementation option as the flow control implementation for development projects up to a footprint of 30 acres
- By April 1, 2014, the Contra Costa Clean Water Program shall submit a proposal containing one or a combination of the following three options (a.-c.) for implementation after the expiration and reissuance of this permit:
- a. Present model verification monitoring results demonstrating that the IMPs are sufficiently oversized and perform to meet the 0.1Q2 low flow design criteria; or
  - b. Present study results of Contra Costa County streams geology and other factors that support the low flow design criteria of 0.2Q2 as the limiting HMP design low flow; or
  - c. Propose redesigns of the IMPs to meet the low flow design criteria of 0.1Q2 to be implemented during the next permit term.

## ATTACHMENT D

### Provision C.3.g. Fairfield-Suisun Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

#### Fairfield-Suisun Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

##### 1. On-site and Regional Hydromodification Management (HM) Control Design Criteria

- a. *Range of flows to control:* Flow duration controls shall be designed such that post-project stormwater discharge rates and durations match pre-project discharge rates and durations from 20 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow<sup>137</sup> up to the pre-project 10-year peak flow.
- b. *Goodness of fit criteria:* The post-project flow duration curve shall not deviate above the pre-project flow duration curve by more than 10 percent over more than 10 percent of the length of the curve corresponding to the range of flows to control.
- c. *Allowable low flow rate:* Flow control structures may be designed to discharge stormwater at a very low rate that does not threaten to erode the receiving waterbody. This flow rate (also called  $Q_{cp}$ <sup>138</sup>) shall be no greater than 20 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow.
- d. *Standard HM modeling:* On-site and regional HM controls designed using the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM<sup>139</sup>) and site-specific input data shall be considered to meet the HM Standard. Such use must be consistent with directions and options set forth in the most current BAHM User Manual.<sup>140</sup> Permittees shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer that any modifications of the BAHM made are consistent with this Attachment and Provision C.3.g.

<sup>137</sup> Where referred to in this Order, the 2-year peak flow is determined using a flood flow frequency analysis procedure based on USGS Bulletin 17 B to obtain the peak flow statistically expected to occur at a 2-year recurrence interval. In this analysis, the appropriate record of hourly rainfall data (e.g., 35–50 years of data) is run through a continuous simulation hydrologic model, the annual peak flows are identified, rank ordered, and the 2-year peak flow is estimated. Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>138</sup>  $Q_{cp}$  is the allowable low flow discharge from a flow control structure on a project site. It is a means of apportioning the critical flow in a stream to individual projects that discharge to that stream, such that cumulative discharges do not exceed the critical flow in the stream.

<sup>139</sup> See [www.bayareahydrologymodel.org](http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org), Resources

<sup>140</sup> *The Bay Area Hydrology Model User Manual* is available at <http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org/downloads.html>.

- e. *Alternate HM modeling and design:* The project proponent may use a continuous simulation hydrologic computer model<sup>141</sup> to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff and to design HM controls. To use this method, the project proponent shall compare the pre-project and post-project model output for a rainfall record of at least 30 years, and shall show that all applicable performance criteria in 1.a–c above are met.
- f. *Sizing Charts:* The Program developed design procedures, criteria, and sizing factors for infiltration basins and bioretention units, based on a low flow rate that exceeds the allowable low flow rate. After the Program has modified its sizing factors<sup>142</sup> to the allowable criteria, received approval of the modified sizing factors from the Executive Officer,<sup>143</sup> and informed the public through such mechanism as an electronic mailing list, project proponents may meet the HM Standard by using the Program's design procedures, criteria, and sizing factors for infiltration basins and/or bioretention units.

## 2. Impracticability Provision

Where conditions (e.g., extreme space limitations) prevent a project from meeting the HM Standard for a reasonable cost, *and* where the project's runoff cannot be directed to a regional HM control within a reasonable time frame, *and* where an in-stream measure is not practicable, the project shall use (1) site design for hydrologic source control, *and* (2) stormwater treatment measures that collectively minimize, slow, and detain<sup>144</sup> runoff to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, if the cost of providing site design for hydrologic source control and treatment measures to the maximum extent practicable does not exceed 2% of the project cost (as defined in "2.a." below), the project proponent shall provide for or contribute financially to an alternative HM project as set forth below:

- a. *Reasonable cost:* To show that the HM Standard cannot be met at a reasonable cost, the project proponent must demonstrate that the total cost to comply with both the HM Standard and the Provision C.3.d. treatment requirement exceeds 2 percent of the project construction cost, excluding land costs. Costs of HM and treatment control measures shall not include land costs, soil disposal fees, hauling, contaminated soil testing, mitigation, disposal, or other normal site enhancement costs such as landscaping or grading that are required for other development purposes.
- b. *Regional HM controls:* A regional HM control shall be considered available if there is a planned location for the regional HM control and if an appropriate funding mechanism for a regional HM control is in place by the time of project construction.
- c. *In-stream measures practicability:* In-stream measures shall be considered practicable when an in-stream measure for the project's watershed is planned and an appropriate funding mechanism for an in-stream measure is in place by the time of project construction.

<sup>141</sup> Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>142</sup> Current sizing factors and design criteria are shown in Appendix D of the FSURMP HMP.

<sup>143</sup> The modified sizing factors will not introduce a new concept but rather make an existing compliance mechanism more stringent; therefore, Executive Officer approval is appropriate.

<sup>144</sup> Stormwater treatment measures that detain runoff are generally those that filter runoff through soil or other media, and include bioretention units, bioswales, basins, planter boxes, tree wells, media, filters, and green roofs.

- d. *Financial contribution to an alternative HM project:* The difference between 2 percent of the project construction costs and the cost of the treatment measures at the site (both costs as described in Section 2.a of this Attachment) shall be contributed to an alternative HM project, such as a stormwater treatment retrofit, HM retrofit, regional HM control, or in-stream measure. Preference shall be given to projects discharging, in this order, to the same tributary, mainstem, watershed, then in the same municipality or county.

### 3. Record Keeping

Permittees shall collect and retain the following information for all projects subject to HM requirements:

- a. Site plans identifying impervious areas, surface flow directions for the entire site, and location(s) of HM measures;
- b. For projects using standard sizing charts, a summary of sizing calculations used;
- c. For projects using the BAHM, a listing of model inputs;
- d. For projects using custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves);
- e. For projects using the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM project (name, location, date of start up, entity responsible for maintenance); and
- f. A listing, summary, and date of modifications made to the BAHM, including technical rationale. Permittees shall submit this list and explanation annually with the Annual Report.

### 4. HM Control Areas

Applicable projects shall be required to meet the HM Standard when such projects discharge into the upstream reaches of Laurel or Ledge wood Creeks, as delineated in the Fairfield-Suisun Permittees' HM Maps (available at [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf)). Plans to restore a creek reach may reintroduce the applicability of HM requirements; in these instances, Permittees may add, but shall not delete, areas of applicability accordingly.

## ATTACHMENT E

### Provision C.3.g. San Mateo Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

#### San Mateo Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

##### 1. On-site and Regional Hydromodification Management (HM) Control Design Criteria

- a. *Range of flows to control:* Flow duration controls shall be designed such that post-project stormwater discharge rates and durations match pre-project discharge rates and durations from 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow<sup>145</sup> up to the pre-project 10-year peak flow.
- b. *Goodness of fit criteria:* The post-project flow duration curve shall not deviate above the pre-project flow duration curve by more than 10 percent over more than 10 percent of the length of the curve corresponding to the range of flows to control.
- c. *Allowable low flow rate:* Flow control structures may be designed to discharge stormwater at a very low rate that does not threaten to erode the receiving waterbody. This flow rate (also called  $Q_{cp}$ <sup>146</sup>) shall be no greater than 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow.
- d. *Standard HM modeling:* On-site and regional HM controls designed using the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM<sup>147</sup>) and site-specific input data shall be considered to meet the HM Standard. Such use must be consistent with directions and options set forth in the

<sup>145</sup> Where referred to in this Order, the 2-year peak flow is determined using a flood flow frequency analysis procedure based on USGS Bulletin 17 B to obtain the peak flow statistically expected to occur at a 2-year recurrence interval. In this analysis, the appropriate record of hourly rainfall data (e.g., 35–50 years of data) is run through a continuous simulation hydrologic model, the annual peak flows are identified, rank ordered, and the 2-year peak flow is estimated. Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>146</sup>  $Q_{cp}$  is the allowable low flow discharge from a flow control structure on a project site. It is a means of apportioning the critical flow in a stream to individual projects that discharge to that stream, such that cumulative discharges do not exceed the critical flow in the stream.

<sup>147</sup> See [www.bayareahydrologymodel.org](http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org), Resources

most current BAHM User Manual.<sup>148</sup> Permittees shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer that any modifications of the BAHM made are consistent with the requirements of Provision C.3.g.

- e. *Alternate HM modeling and design:* The project proponent may use a continuous simulation hydrologic computer model<sup>149</sup> to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff and to design HM controls. To use this method, the project proponent shall compare the pre-project and post-project model output for a rainfall record of at least 30 years, and shall show that all applicable performance criteria in 1.a.–c. above are met.

## 2. Impracticability Provision

Where conditions (e.g., extreme space limitations) prevent a project from meeting the HM Standard for a reasonable cost, *and* where the project's runoff cannot be directed to a regional HM control within a reasonable time frame, *and* where an in-stream measure is not practicable, the project shall use (1) site design for hydrologic source control, *and* (2) stormwater treatment measures that collectively minimize, slow, and detain<sup>150</sup> runoff to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, , if the cost of providing site design for hydrologic source control and treatment measures to the maximum extent practicable does not exceed 2% of the project cost (as defined in "2.a." below), the project proponent shall provide for or contribute financially to an alternative HM project as set forth below:

- a. *Reasonable cost:* To show that the HM Standard cannot be met at a reasonable cost, the project proponent must demonstrate that the total cost to comply with both the HM Standard and the Provision C.3.d treatment requirement exceeds 2 percent of the project construction cost, excluding land costs. Costs of HM and treatment control measures shall not include land costs, soil disposal fees, hauling, contaminated soil testing, mitigation, disposal, or other normal site enhancement costs such as landscaping or grading that are required for other development purposes.
- b. *Regional HM controls:* A regional HM control shall be considered available if there is a planned location for the regional HM control and if an appropriate funding mechanism for a regional HM control is in place by the time of project construction.
- c. *In-stream measures practicability:* In-stream measures shall be considered practicable when an in-stream measure for the project's watershed is planned and an appropriate funding mechanism for an in-stream measure is in place by the time of project construction.
- d. *Financial contribution to an alternative HM project:* The difference between 2 percent of the project construction costs and the cost of the treatment measures at the site (both costs as described in Section 2.a of this Attachment shall be contributed to an alternative HM project, such as a stormwater treatment retrofit, HM retrofit, regional HM control, or

<sup>148</sup> The Bay Area Hydrology Model User Manual is available at <http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org/downloads.html>

<sup>149</sup> Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>150</sup> Stormwater treatment measures that detain runoff are generally those that filter runoff through soil or other media, and include bioretention units, bioswales, basins, planter boxes, tree wells, media filters, and green roofs.



in-stream measure. Preference shall be given to projects discharging, in this order, to the same tributary, mainstem, watershed, then in the same municipality, or county.

### 3. Record Keeping

Permittees shall collect and retain the following information for all projects subject to HM requirements:

- a. Site plans identifying impervious areas, surface flow directions for the entire site, and location(s) of HM measures;
- b. For projects using standard sizing charts, a summary of sizing calculations used;
- c. For projects using the BAHM, a listing of model inputs;
- d. For projects using custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves);
- e. For projects using the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM project (name, location, date of startup, entity responsible for maintenance); and
- f. A listing, summary, and date of modifications made to the BAHM, including technical rationale. Permittees shall submit this list and explanation annually with the Annual Report. This may be prepared at the Countywide Program level and submitted on behalf of participating Permittees.

### 4. HM Control Areas

Applicable projects shall be required to meet the HM Standard when such projects are in the HM control areas shown in the San Mateo Permittees' HM Map (available at [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mrp/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf)). Plans to restore a creek reach may reintroduce the applicability of HM requirements; in these instances, Permittees may add, but shall not delete, areas of applicability accordingly.

The HM Standard and all associated requirements apply in areas that are shown in green on the map and noted in the map's key as *areas subject to HMP*. The other areas are exempt from the HM Standard because they drain to hardened channels or low gradient channels (a characteristic applicable to San Mateo County's particular shoreline properties), or are in highly developed areas. Plans to restore a hardened channel may affect areas of applicability.

Areas shown in the San Mateo Permittees' HM Map may be modified as follows:

- b. **Street Boundary Interpretation** – Streets are used to mark the boundary between areas where the HM Standard must be met and exempt areas. Parcels on the boundary street are considered within the area exempted from the hydromodification requirements. Nonetheless, there might be cases where the drainage from a particular parcel(s) on the boundary street drains westward into the hydromodification required area and, as such, any applicable project on such a parcel(s) would be subject to the hydromodification requirements.

- c. **Hardened Channel/Drainage to Exempt Area** – If drainage leaving a proposed project subject to the HM Standard is determined to flow only through a hardened channel and/or enclosed pipe along its entire length before directly discharging into a waterway in the exempt area or into tidal waters, the project would be exempted from the HM Standard and its associated requirements. The project proponent must demonstrate, in a statement signed by an engineer or qualified environmental professional, that this condition is met.
- d. **Boundary Re-Opener** – If the municipal regional permit or future permit reissuances or amendments modify the types of projects subject to the hydromodification requirements, the appropriate location for an HMP boundary or boundaries will be reevaluated at the same time.

## ATTACHMENT F

### Provision C.3.g. Santa Clara Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

#### Santa Clara Permittees Hydromodification Management Requirements

##### 1. On-site and Regional Hydromodification Management (HM) Control Design Criteria

- a. *Range of flows to control:* Flow duration controls shall be designed such that post-project stormwater discharge rates and durations match pre-project discharge rates and durations from 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow<sup>151</sup> up to the pre-project 10-year peak flow, except where the lower endpoint of this range is modified as described in Section 5 of this Attachment.
- b. *Goodness of fit criteria:* The post-project flow duration curve shall not deviate above the pre-project flow duration curve by more than 10 percent over more than 10 percent of the length of the curve corresponding to the range of flows to control.
- c. *Allowable low flow rate:* Flow control structures may be designed to discharge stormwater at a very low rate that does not threaten to erode the receiving waterbody. This flow rate (also called  $Q_{ep}$ <sup>152</sup>) shall be no greater than 10 percent of the pre-project 2-year peak flow unless a modified value is substantiated by analysis of actual channel resistance in accordance with an approved User Guide as described in Section 5 of this Attachment.
- d. *Standard HM modeling:* On-site and regional HM controls designed using the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM<sup>153</sup>) and site-specific input data shall be considered to meet the HM Standard. Such use must be consistent with directions and options set forth in the

<sup>151</sup> Where referred to in this Order, the 2-year peak flow is determined using a flood flow frequency analysis procedure based on USGS Bulletin 17B to obtain the peak flow statistically expected to occur at a 2-year recurrence interval. In this analysis, the appropriate record of hourly rainfall data (e.g., 35–50 years of data) is run through a continuous simulation hydrologic model, the annual peak flows are identified, rank ordered, and the 2-year peak flow is estimated. Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>152</sup>  $Q_{ep}$  is the allowable low flow discharge from a flow control structure on a project site. It is a means of apportioning the critical flow in a stream to individual projects that discharge to that stream, such that cumulative discharges do not exceed the critical flow in the stream.

<sup>153</sup> See [www.bayareahydrologymodel.org](http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org), Resources.

most current BAHM User Manual.<sup>154</sup> Permittees shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer that any modifications of the BAHM made are consistent with this attachment and Provision C.3.g.

- e. *Alternate HM modeling and design:* The project proponent may use a continuous simulation hydrologic computer model<sup>155</sup> to simulate pre-project and post-project runoff and to design HM controls. To use this method, the project proponent shall compare the pre-project and post-project model output for a rainfall record of at least 30 years, and shall show that all applicable performance criteria in 1. a. – c. above are met.

## 2. Impracticability Provision

Where conditions (e.g., extreme space limitations) prevent a project from meeting the HM Standard for a reasonable cost, *and* where the project's runoff cannot be directed to a Regional HM control<sup>156</sup> within a reasonable time frame, *and* where an in-stream measure is not practicable, the project shall use (1) site design for hydrologic source control, *and* (2) stormwater treatment measures that collectively minimize, slow, and detain<sup>157</sup> runoff to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, if the cost of providing site design for hydrologic source control and treatment measures to the maximum extent practicable does not exceed 2% of the project cost (as defined in "2.a." below), the project shall contribute financially to an alternative HM project as set forth below:

- a. *Reasonable cost:* To show that the HM Standard cannot be met at a reasonable cost, the project proponent must demonstrate that the total cost to comply with both the HM Standard and the Provision C.3.d treatment requirement exceeds 2 percent of the project construction cost, excluding land costs. Costs of HM and treatment control measures shall not include land costs, soil disposal fees, hauling, contaminated soil testing, mitigation, disposal, or other normal site enhancement costs such as landscaping or grading that are required for other development purposes.
- b. *Regional HM control:* A regional HM control shall be considered available if there is a planned location for the regional HM control and if an appropriate funding mechanism for a regional control is in place by the time of project construction.
- c. *In-stream measures practicability:* In-stream measures shall be considered practicable when an in-stream measure for the project's watershed is planned and an appropriate funding mechanism for an in-stream measure is in place by the time of project construction.
- d. *Financial contribution to an alternative HM project:* The difference between 2 percent of the project construction costs and the cost of the treatment measures at the site (both costs as described in Section 2.a of this Attachment) shall be contributed to an alternative

<sup>154</sup> The Bay Area Hydrology Model User Manual is available at <http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org/downloads.html>.

<sup>155</sup> Such models include USEPA's Hydrologic Simulation Program—Fortran (HSPF), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), and USEPA's Storm Water Management Model (SWMM).

<sup>156</sup> *Regional HM controls* are flow duration control structures that collect stormwater runoff discharge from multiple projects (each of which should incorporate hydrologic source control measures as well) and are designed such that the HM Standard is met for all the projects at the point where the regional control measure discharges.

<sup>157</sup> Stormwater treatment measures that detain runoff are generally those that filter runoff through soil or other media, and include bioretention units, bioswales, basins, planter boxes, sand filters, and green roofs.

HM project, such as a stormwater treatment retrofit, HM retrofit, regional HM control, or in-stream measure. Preference shall be given to projects discharging, in this order, to the same tributary, mainstem, watershed, then in the same municipality or county.

### 3. Record Keeping

Permittees shall collect and retain the following information for all projects subject to HM requirements:

- a. Site plans identifying impervious areas, surface flow directions for the entire site, and location(s) of HM measures;
- b. For projects using standard sizing charts, a summary of sizing calculations used;
- c. For projects using the BAHM, a listing of model inputs;
- d. For projects using custom modeling, a summary of the modeling calculations with corresponding graph showing curve matching (existing, post-project, and post-project with HM controls curves);
- e. For projects using the Impracticability Provision, a listing of all applicable costs and a brief description of the alternative HM project (name, location, date of start up, entity responsible for maintenance); and
- f. A listing, summary, and date of modifications made to the BAHM, including technical rationale. Permittees shall submit this list and explanation annually with the Annual Report. This may be prepared at the Countywide Program level and submitted on behalf of participating Permittees.

### 4. HM Control Areas

Applicable projects shall be required to meet the HM Standard when such projects are located in areas of HM applicability as described below and shown in the Santa Clara Permittees' HM Map (available at [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mr/p/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/stormwater/muni/mr/p/Final%20TO%20HM%20Maps.pdf)).

- a. **Purple areas:** These areas represent catchments that drain to hardened channels that extend continuously to the Bay or to tidally influenced sections of creeks. The HM Standard and associated requirements do not apply to projects in the areas designated in purple on the map.

Plans to restore a creek reach may reintroduce the applicability of HM requirements, unless the creek restoration project is designed to accommodate the potential hydromodification impacts of future development; if this is not the case, in these instances, Permittees may add, but shall not delete, areas of applicability accordingly.

- b. **Red areas:** These areas represent catchments and subwatersheds that are greater than or equal to 65% impervious, based on existing imperviousness data sources. The HM Standard and associated requirements do not apply to projects in the areas designated in red on the map.
- c. **Pink areas:** These are areas that are under review by the Permittees for accuracy of the imperviousness data. The HM Standard and associated requirements apply to projects in areas designated as pink on the map until such time as a Permittee presents new data that indicate that the actual level of imperviousness of a particular area is greater than or equal

to 65% impervious. Any new data will be submitted to the Water Board in one coordinated submittal within one year of permit adoption.

- d. **Green area:** These areas represent catchments and subwatersheds that are less than 65% impervious and are not under review by the Permittees. The HM Standard and associated requirements apply to projects in areas designated as green on the map.

## 5. Potential Exceptions to Map Designations

The Program may choose to prepare a User Guide<sup>158</sup> to be used for evaluating individual receiving waterbodies using detailed methods to assess channel stability and watercourse critical flow. This User Guide would reiterate and collate established stream stability assessment methods that have been presented in the Program's HMP.<sup>159</sup> After the Program has collated its methods into User Guide format, received approval of the User Guide from the Executive Officer,<sup>160</sup> and informed the public through such process as an electronic mailing list, the Permittees may use the User Guide to guide preparation of technical reports for the following: implementing the HM Standard using in-stream or regional controls; determining whether certain projects are discharging to a watercourse that is less susceptible (from point of discharge to the Bay) to hydromodification (e.g., would have a lower potential for erosion than set forth in these requirements); and/or determining if a watercourse has a higher critical flow and project(s) discharging to it are eligible for an alternative Qcp for the purpose of designing on-site or regional measures to control flows draining to these channels (i.e., the actual threshold of erosion-causing critical flow is higher than 10 percent of the 2-year pre-project flow). In no case shall the design value of Qcp exceed 50 percent of the 2-year pre-project flow.

<sup>158</sup> The User Guide may be offered under a different title.

<sup>159</sup> The Program's HMP has undergone Water Board staff review and been subject to public notice and comment.

<sup>160</sup> The User Guide will not introduce a new concept, but rather reformat existing methods; therefore, Executive Officer approval is appropriate.

# **ATTACHMENT G**

## **Provision C.3.h. Sample Reporting Table**

**Table C.3.h. – Operation and Maintenance of Stormwater Treatment Systems  
City of Eden Annual Report FY 2008-09**

Facility/Site Inspected and Responsible Party for Maintenance	Date of Inspection	Type of Inspection (annual, follow-up, etc.)	Type of Treatment System or HM Control Inspected	Inspection Findings or Results	Enforcement Action Taken (Warning, NOV, administrative citation, etc.)	Comments
ABC Company 123 Alphabet Road San Jose	12/06/08	annual	offsite bioretention unit	proper operation	none	Unit is operating properly and is well maintained.
DEF site 234 Blossom Drive Santa Clara	12/17/08	annual	onsite media filter	ineffective filter media	verbal warning	Media filter is clogged and needs to be replaced.
	12/19/08	follow-up	onsite media filter	proper operation	none	New media filter in place and unit is operating properly.
	1/19/09	follow-up	onsite media filter	proper operation	none	Unit is operating properly.
GHI Hotel 1001 Grand Blvd 227 Touring Parkway	12/21/08	annual	onsite swales	proper operation	notice of violation	Bioretention unit #2 is badly eroded because of flow channelization. Stormwater is flowing over the eroded areas, bypassing treatment and running off into parking area.
			onsite bioretention unit #1	proper operation		
			onsite bioretention unit #2	eroded areas due to flow channelization		
	12/27/08	follow-up	onsite bioretention unit #2	proper operation	none	Entire bioretention unit #2 has been replanted and re-graded. Raining heavily but no overflow observed.
Rolling Hills Estates Homeowners' Association 543 Rolling Hill Drive Pleasanton	01/17/09	annual	onsite pond	sediment and debris accumulation	notice of violation	Pond needs sediment removal and check dam needs debris removal.
	01/24/09	follow-up	onsite pond	sediment and debris accumulation	administrative citation \$1000	Pond still a mess. Administrative citation requires maintenance within a week.
	01/31/09	follow-up	onsite pond	proper maintenance	none	Pond maintenance completed.
	02/18/09	spot inspection	onsite pond	proper operation and maintenance	none	Proper operation and maintenance.



# **ATTACHMENT H**

## **Provision C.8. Status and Long-Term Monitoring Follow-up Analysis and Actions**

## Status and Long-Term Monitoring Follow-up Analysis and Actions for Biological Assessment, Bedded Sediment Toxicity, and Bedded Sediment Pollutants

When results from Biological Assessment, Bedded Sediment Toxicity, and/or Bedded Sediment Pollutants monitoring indicate impacts at a monitoring location, Permittees shall evaluate the extent and cause(s) of impacts to determine the potential role of urban runoff as indicated in Table H-1.

**Table H-1. Sediment Triad Approach to Determining Follow-Up Actions**

Chemistry Results <sup>161</sup>	Toxicity Results <sup>162</sup>	Bioassessment Results <sup>163</sup>	Action
No chemicals exceed Threshold Effect Concentrations (TEC), mean Probable Effects Concentrations (PEC) quotient < 0.5 and pyrethroids < 1.0 Toxicity Unit (TU) <sup>164</sup>	No Toxicity	No indications of alterations	No action necessary
No chemicals exceed TECs, mean PEC quotient < 0.5 and pyrethroids < 1.0 TU	Toxicity	No indications of alterations	(1) Take confirmatory sample for toxicity. (2) If toxicity repeated, attempt to identify cause and spatial extent. (3) Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to minimize upstream sources causing toxicity; initiate no later than the second fiscal year following the sampling event.

<sup>161</sup> TEC and PEC are found in MacDonald, D.D., G.G. Ingersoll, and T.A. Berger. 2000. Development and Evaluation of Consensus-based Sediment Quality Guidelines for Freshwater Ecosystems. *Archives of Environ. Contamination and Toxicology* 39(1):20-31.

<sup>162</sup> Toxicity is exhibited when *Hyallela* survival statistically different than and < 20 percent of control.

<sup>163</sup> Alterations are exhibited if metrics indicate substantially degraded community.

<sup>164</sup> Toxicity Units (TU) are calculated as follows: TU = Actual concentration (organic carbon normalized) ÷ Reported *H. azteca* LC<sub>50</sub> concentration (organic concentration normalized). Weston, D.P., R.W. Holmes, J. You, and M.J. Lydy, 2005. Aquatic Toxicity Due to Residential Use of Pyrethroid Insecticides. *Environ. Science and Technology* 39(24):9778-9784.

Chemistry Results <sup>161</sup>	Toxicity Results <sup>162</sup>	Bioassessment Results <sup>163</sup>	Action
No chemicals exceed TECs, mean PEC quotient < 0.5 and pyrethroids < 1.0 TU	No Toxicity	Indications of alterations	Identify the most probable cause(s) of the alterations in biological community. Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to minimize the impacts causing physical habitat disturbance; initiate no later than the second fiscal year following the sampling event.
No chemicals exceed TECs, mean PEC quotient < 0.5 and pyrethroids < 1.0 TU	Toxicity	Indications of alterations	(1) Identify cause(s) of impacts and spatial extent. (2) Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to minimize impacts; initiate no later than the second fiscal year following the sampling event.
3 or more chemicals exceed PECs, the mean PEC quotient is > 0.5, or pyrethroids > 1.0 TU	No Toxicity	Indications of alterations	(1) Identify cause of impacts. (2) Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to minimize the impacts caused by urban runoff; initiate no later than the second fiscal year following the sampling event.
3 or more chemicals exceed PECs, the mean PEC quotient is > 0.5, or pyrethroids > 1.0 TU	Toxicity	No indications of alterations	(1) Take confirmatory sample for toxicity. (2) If toxicity repeated, attempt to identify cause and spatial extent. (3) Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to minimize upstream sources; initiate no later than the second fiscal year following the sampling event.
3 or more chemicals exceed PECs, the mean PEC quotient is > 0.5, or pyrethroids > 1.0 TU	No Toxicity	No Indications of alterations	If PEC exceedance is Hg or PCBs, address under TMDLs
3 or more chemicals exceed PECs, the mean PEC quotient is > 0.5, or pyrethroids > 1.0 TU	Toxicity	Indications of alterations	(1) Identify cause(s) of impacts and spatial extent. (2) Where impacts are under Permittee's control, take management actions to address impacts.

# **ATTACHMENT I**

## **Provision C.8. Standard Monitoring Provisions**

**All monitoring activities shall meet the following requirements:**

1. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. [40 CFR 122.41(j)(1)]
2. Permittees shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance of monitoring instrumentation, and copies of all reports required by this Order for a period of at least five (5) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report, or application. This period may be extended by request of the Water Board or USEPA at any time and shall be extended during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding this discharge. [40 CFR 122.41(j)(2), CWC section 13383(a)]
3. Records of monitoring information shall include [40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)]:
  - a. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements;
  - b. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements;
  - c. The date(s) analyses were performed;
  - d. The individual(s) who performed the analyses;
  - e. The analytical techniques or methods used; and,
  - f. The results of such analyses.
4. The CWA provides that any person who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this Order shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both. If a conviction of a person is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment is a fine of not more than \$20,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment of not more than four years, or both. [40 CFR 122.41(j)(5)]
5. Calculations for all limitations which require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in the monitoring Provisions. [40 CFR 122.41(l)(4)(iii)]
6. All chemical, bacteriological, and toxicity analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the California Department of Health Services or a laboratory approved by the Executive Officer.
7. For priority toxic pollutants that are identified in the California Toxics Rule (CTR) (65 Fed. Reg. 31682), the Permittees shall instruct its laboratories to establish calibration standards that are equivalent to or lower than the Minimum Levels (MLs) published in Appendix 4 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP). If a Permittee can demonstrate that a particular ML is not attainable, in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR 136, the lowest quantifiable concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure (assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed) may be used instead of the ML listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP. The Permittee must submit documentation from the laboratory to the Water Board for approval prior to raising the ML for any priority toxic pollutant.
8. The Clean Water Act provides that any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this permit, including monitoring reports or reports of compliance or non-