

## CERTIFICATION



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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Warren D. Williams*  
Warren D. Williams  
General Manager / Chief Engineer  
Riverside County Flood Control  
and Water Conservation District

**RCFC&WCD**

**SANTA MARGARITA WATERSHED  
NPDES MUNICIPAL STORMWATER PERMIT  
(NPDES No. CAS0108766)**

**INDIVIDUAL ANNUAL REPORT**

**FOR**

**DISTRICT  
FISCAL YEAR 2007 - 2008**

- I. Executive Summary
1. Development Planning
2. Construction
3. Municipal
4. Industrial/Commercial
5. Residential
6. Education
7. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
8. Public Participation
9. Fiscal Analysis Component
10. Non-Storm Water Discharges
11. Receiving Water Limitations
12. Additional Urban Runoff Data
13. Proposed Revisions

Attachment A – WQMP Tracking Report

Attachment B – WQMP Example conditions

Attachment C – Training Logs

Attachment D – Encroachment / Construction Requirements and Logs

Attachment E – Reports of Collected Debris in MS4

Attachment F – IC/ID Reports

Attachment G – Changes to the Environmental Review Process

Attachment H – Newly accepted Flood Control Facilities

**BOARD ORDER NO. R9-2004-001  
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
SAN DIEGO REGION**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Individual SWMP Annual Report (Annual Report) documents specific urban runoff management programs and activities implemented by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) to comply with the requirements of the third-term Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit issued to the District by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) on July 14, 2004 (Board Order R9-2004-001).

This Permit regulates all storm water discharges from MS4's within the Santa Margarita Watershed Region of Riverside County (SMR), thus all of the Municipal governments that own or operate MS4 within the SMR are Co-Permittees on this permit, including:

- The District (serving as principal permittee)
- The City of Murrieta
- The City of Temecula
- The County of Riverside

The goals of this permit are to protect and enhance the quality of surface waters within the watershed to protect their beneficial uses as described in the Basin Plan. As stated above, this report documents the specific activities of the District to reach or maintain water quality objectives within the SMR. It should be noted though that the individual activities of one permittee are not sufficient to have a lasting effect on the regional waters within the watershed, but the joint efforts of all the stakeholders that have authority over the use of the land within the watershed.

To this end, the Third-Term MS4 Permit required each Permittee to develop an Individual Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and for all the Permittees to jointly develop a Watershed Storm Water Management Plan. As Principal Permittee, the District was to coordinate the development of the compliance programs. Annual Reports for each of these compliance programs are required and are to be submitted to the Regional Board on October 31<sup>st</sup> of each calendar year. The reporting period is specified as the preceeding fiscal year. The District specifically prepares this Individual Annual Report and the Watershed Annual Report. In addition, as Principal Permittee, the District is tasked with coordinating the submittal of the Individual SWMP Annual Reports for the other Co-Permittees.

This Annual Report covers the period extending from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. This report specifically responds to reporting requirements specified in Provision III.A.1 of the Monitoring and Reporting Program of the Permit. This includes identifying program progress and effectiveness evaluations.

The District was created through a special act of the state legislature and is charged with providing flood protection for the county. Through this goal, the District Constructs, owns and maintains an expansive network of MS4 throughout the County of Riverside including those in the Santa Margarita Watershed, but its enabling act does not provide land-use powers. As such, the District's activities during continue to be limited to MS4 Maintenance Activities, Public Outreach, Training, Water Quality Monitoring and IC/ID activities. The District relies on Combined Legal Authority with the Co-Permittees for all enforcement activities outside of District Right-of-Way. The District however, continues to evaluate and optimize its programs based on the observations of District staff, RWQCB audits and other sources of input. These enhancements include:

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Program Enhancements

- Continued Improvement of the Development Planning Program
  - Commitment to initiate development of a GIS system to track post-construction BMPs associated with new developments.
  - Continued work towards the development of a public maintenance and tracking mechanism for post-construction BMPs, including coordination of the District's proposed Low Impact Development (LID) Manual with the efforts currently underway by the California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies (CASQA) and the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition (SMC).
  - Initiation of an LID BMP testing and demonstration facility to increase municipal, developer and public awareness of low impact development techniques and also collect data necessary to characterize the hydrologic and water quality benefits of those techniques.
  - The District agreed to review Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs) prepared by the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency and the County Facilities Management Department in an effort to ensure consistency between public works projects and private development projects in the unincorporated County.
  - Continued cooperation with the Southern California Coastal Waters Research Project (SCCWRP) and the SMC to develop appropriate hydromodification guidance for southern California.
  - Development of new guidance to District Design Staff regarding necessary water quality documentation required to support CEQA documents.
- Continued improvement of municipal maintenance programs
  - Initiated development of a new procedure for reporting and addressing hazardous materials spills
  - New procedure to improve BMP implementation associated with major maintenance activities
  - Proposal to incorporate IPM guidance into District contracts for pest management at the District's Corporate Yard in Riverside.
- Continued improvement of the IC/ID programs
  - Continued work on a method to track third-party discharges

These and other compliance activities are addressed in the main body of this report. In addition, the data presented in this report, which aggregates data from the last four years of program implementation, will serve as the basis for the Report of Waste Discharge to be submitted in January 2009.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Program Effectiveness Assessments (PEAs)

The Permit requires the Permittees to develop a long-term strategy to evaluate the effectiveness of the SWMPs. It should be noted that a PEA requires the establishment of a set of baseline conditions using measurable metrics. These baseline conditions can then be used to establish measurable goals based on the selected metrics. Thereafter, effectiveness can be evaluated by comparisons of successive years of measurable metrics against the baseline data and measurable goals.

Where the period of evaluation is characterized by the implementation of new or revised program elements, determinations of program effectiveness will initially be limited to confirmation of program implementation and collection of measurable metrics until baseline conditions can be established. Further, it must be recognized that direct measures of long-term program effectiveness may not be available within the timeframe of the Third-Term Permit. This lack of direct measure confirmation arises because:

- Baseline water quality conditions are not readily established due to the inherent variability of natural systems and stormwater quality;
- Water quality changes in response to program implementation are likely to be very slow;
- Establishing a link between receiving water conditions and program activities is difficult at the watershed scale when programs are being implemented incrementally with the development/redevelopment cycle; and
- .

While program effectiveness assessment is a key step in the iterative process of program implementation, it should be realized that effectiveness assessment itself is a part of the management process that is also evolving. Assessing program effectiveness is recognized as a challenge for program managers across California, and the District continues to support the effort of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) to develop guidance in this area at a statewide level.

The long-term strategy for assessing program effectiveness will be conducted at two levels.

- Level 1 – Annual Assessments
- Level 2 – Long Term Assessments

At the Annual Assessment Level, the PEA will focus on an annual assessment of program implementation and Permit compliance. These assessments will be addressed by completing the Annual Reporting Forms, which will confirm program implementation, Permit compliance and collection of measurable metrics. Assessments will be included at the end of each Annual Report section as required by the reporting requirements of the Third-Term MS4 Permit. Inferences about the compliance of each program [development, construction, Illicit Connection/Illicit Discharge (IC/ID), etc.] will be drawn from both direct and indirect measures of progress for each program.

At the Long-Term Level, the Permittees will collectively evaluate the measurable metrics, Receiving Water monitoring Data, and IC/ID monitoring data to assess changes in knowledge and behavior, load reductions and improvements in Receiving Water Quality. This analysis will be conducted as

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

part of the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). The results of this assessment will evaluate the need to make significant programmatic revisions to the Permit compliance programs to protect Beneficial Uses of Receiving Waters. This analysis will place more emphasis on using direct measures of progress (monitoring data, long term trend analysis) and will support the review and any revisions to the Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) and Individual SWMPs using information from the Water Quality Monitoring Program, IC/ID Monitoring Program and measurable metrics that have been collected.

The PEAs included in this report are Level 1 assessments.

For purposes of this Annual Report, the terms "Watershed Stormwater Management Plan (Watershed SWMP)" and "Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP)" referenced in the cPermit are referred to as the "DAMP" and "Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP)" respectively, to be consistent with terminology previously established and in use by the Permittees. Additional terms and acronyms used in this Annual Report are defined in the glossary included in the DAMP.

# 1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (SECTION F of ORDER R9-2004-001)

## 1) Description of any Amendments to the General Plan or the Development Project Approval Process:

The District's enabling act does not provide land-use powers. . It, therefore, does not maintain a General Plan or have direct control over the overall development project approval process. However, at the County of Riverside's request, the District has agreed to review proposed developments in the unincorporated County area for water quality and flood control related impacts and recommend appropriate conditions of approval to the County.

In this role, the District spent the last fiscal year working on the following tasks:

- a. Subsequent to the Audits of the County's implementation of Provision F – Development Planning of the Permit, the District has agreed to review WQMPs for Capital Improvement Projects (CIP's) proposed by County Economic Development Agency (EDA) and the Facilities Management Department (FM). This will help to ensure the County's compliance with WQMP requirements and ensure that BMPs for Development Projects sponsored by these departments are appropriately and address and meet MEP for pollutants of concern.
- b. District and County staff are working on the development of expanded treatment control BMP design guidance with focus placed on low impact development concepts such as landscape based BMPs. In addition, staff are working on the development of a public funding mechanism to ensure that maintenance of the post-construction BMPs would be fully funded and to identify the County departments or other entity that will be responsible for tracking and maintaining post-construction BMPs.
- c. In support of the District's proposed LID BMP Design Manual, the District has initiated a LID BMP Testing and Evaluation Facility. The proposed facility will be constructed via a retrofit of the District's compound in Riverside. The project proposes to construct, test and evaluate a variety of integrated management practices (IMPs) that serve as hydraulic and hydrologic controls consistent with the low impact development (LID) planning and design approach. The project proposes the following Integrated Management Practices (IMPs):
  - The replacement of 55,800 sf of existing asphalt pavement & base with new porous asphalt pavement and new porous concrete pavement and sub drain systems.
  - The construction of 3 flow-through planter systems.
  - The replacement of 165' of storm drain pipe with a vegetated infiltration swale.
  - The replacement of 2,800 sf landscaped area with a vegetated infiltration swale.
  - The deepening of an existing infiltration basin to facilitate monitoring data collection.

**1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**  
**(SECTION F of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

In addition, the project proposes the following monitoring and testing components:

- The construction of 7 monitoring vaults with flow metering, discharge pumps and electronic control and recording equipment.
- The evaluation of a standard suite of pollutants for selected runoff events including specific pollutants of concern in the Santa Ana Watershed such as nutrients and pathogens.
- The assessment of each IMP's ability to mitigate increased runoff volumes associated with development.
- The assessment of life-cycle costs of the IMPs
- The assessment of necessary modifications to design standards to improve IMP effectiveness or ease of maintenance

The proposed project will implement a variety of LID Integrated Management Practices (IMPs) that will be used to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of these practices in contributing to storm water capture and management, treating pollutants of concern associated with urban runoff, mitigating the impacts of hydromodification from urban development, and identifying optimum IMP design criteria and standards for LID IMPs in Riverside County. Data collected by this project will be provided to the regional SMC LID Project and will be available to benefit all SMC members.

- d. In conformance with Permit requirement F.2.b)9. of the Permit, the District continues to participate in the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition's efforts to develop numeric guidance for addressing Hydrologic Conditions of Concern, including their Hydromodification study and their LID Projects, in conformance with Permit requirement F.2.b)9. of Board Order R9-2004-001. These efforts are further described in the Watershed Annual Report in Appendix G, Section G.7

**2) Number of Grading Permits Issued:**

Not applicable. The District does not issue grading permits.

**1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**  
**(SECTION F of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**3) Number of Developments Conditioned to meet WQMP Requirements:**

The District utilizes a case tracking program (District Land Management Tracking) that tracks project status and produces reports identifying the number of developments conditioned with WQMPs. The following numbers reflect projects reviewed that are recorded as being in the Santa Margarita Watershed.

282 Land Use/Development proposals were reviewed by the District for water quality and flood control related impacts.

146 Land Use/Development proposals meet the minimum requirements and were required to prepare a preliminary project specific WQMP,

48 of the Land Use/Development proposals that were required to prepare a preliminary project-specific WQMP were issued 'recommended' Conditions of Approval. The District does not have land use authority, thus these 'recommended' conditions are forwarded to the County who subsequently establishes the conditions of approval for the project.

A summary log of Projects that the District reviewed is contained in Attachment A. Entries marked "approved" are those for which Conditions of Approval were recommended to the County.

**4) Attach One Example of a Development Project that was Conditioned to Meet WQMP Requirements and a Description of the required BMPs:**

See Attachment B.

**5) Description of any Updates to the Environmental Review Process:**

In the beginning of the fiscal year, the District reviewed its internal CEQA process and developed a new internal memorandum describing a series of questions that the Design Engineers must answer to assist with preparing CEQA documentation for District projects. The memo incorporated questions relative to NPDES requirements to ensure that District projects were considering appropriate WQMP and Development Planning requirements early in the design process.

A copy of this memo is included in Attachment G.

**1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**  
**(SECTION F of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**6) Description and Number of Training Efforts Conducted during the Reporting Period (for staff, developers, contractors, etc.), including the Number of Staff Trained.**

**a. Training:** See Attachment C

| <b>Training</b> | <b>Training Description</b>   | <b>Training Dates</b> | <b>Number of District Attendees</b> |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| WQMP            | New Development   | 11/28/07              | 14                                  |
| WQMP            | New Development   | 11/29/07              | 15                                  |
| WQMP            | New Development   | 12/5/07               | 1                                   |
| WQMP            | New Development   | 4/16/08               | 9                                   |
| APWA - Hydromod | Hydromodification Management and Continuous Simulation Hydrologic Modeling for Plan Reviewers | 4/9/08                | 5                                   |
|                 |   | <b>Total</b>          | <b>44</b>                           |

**b. Summarize the Educational and Outreach Activities the Development Planning Component has conducted over the Past Year.**

Priority development projects conditioned by the County are required to obtain copies of appropriate public education and outreach materials from the District's NPDES Public Information Officer or from our website. They are also required to submit an affidavit stating that they will distribute the public education materials to new property owners. This affidavit is recorded in the development's individual file. Additionally, the District has implemented a tracking mechanism to facilitate the accurate reporting of the number of affidavits received each fiscal year.

23 Public Education Affidavits were received during the reporting period.

Additional public education and outreach activities undertaken by the District are considered part of the Regional Public Education Program described in the Watershed Annual Report.

**7) An Assessment of Program Effectiveness Based on the Measurable Goals Established in the Permittee's Individual SWMP:**

As mentioned above, because the District has no land use authority and provides services on the County's behalf, the District has no direct measurable goals for the Development Planning Component. As indicated in the District's Individual SWMP, we collect the metrics described in this report and forward them to the County for analysis as part of the County's Individual SWMP Annual Report.

**1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**  
**(SECTION F of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

The District has identified the following program areas where, in conjunction with the County, we are evaluating potential ways to improve the effectiveness of post-construction BMP selection and maintenance for the County's Development Planning Program:

- a. A long-term public maintenance mechanism for post-construction BMPs within the unincorporated County.
- b. Additional post-construction BMP guidance to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of post-construction BMPs.

This evaluation is on-going. Currently, the District has proposed to spend approximately \$1.3 million on BMP testing for the purposes of optimizing the design and verifying the effectiveness of various BMPs. Further details are provided in the Monitoring Annual Report (Appendix G, Section G-7.1 of the Watershed Annual Report)

The District's Development Review operation was also audited by PG Environmental as part of a broader audit of the County's Development Planning Program. Although the District development review process was found adequate, the issue of post-construction BMP tracking and inspection was raised by Regional Board and PG Environmental staff. To support the development of such a program, District staff has committed to working with County staff to develop a GIS-based tracking mechanism for post-construction BMPs. Work on this mechanism will begin in Fiscal Year 2008-2009.

**8) Additional Comments/Information:**

**Describe the Major Accomplishments of the Development Planning Component over the Past Year. (General Plan or ordinance revisions, procedure/approval process changes, SUSMP guidance material):**

Major accomplishments of the program are described in responses to questions 1, 3 and 6 of this reporting form.

**9) Summarize New Activities or Improvements to be implemented Next Year as a result of your Self Assessment of the Development Planning Component:**

The District plans to continue the ongoing development and implementation of the activities described in the responses to question 1 and 7 in this section.

## 2. CONSTRUCTION (SECTION G)

**NOTE: THIS SECTION IS APPLICABLE TO DISTRICT ADMINISTERED AND ENCROACHMENT PROJECTS ONLY.**

### 1) Number of Inspections Conducted:

#### District Administered Construction Projects

There were **zero (0)** District administered construction projects within the Permit area within the reporting period.

#### Encroachment Permits Issued:

There were **ten (10)** encroachment permits issued by the District within the Permit area. Of the 10 encroachment permits issued, **seven (7)** had construction related activities within the District right-of-way.

During the active construction period of these encroachment projects, the District inspects the site as required based on the scope of the work being done. In general, most District encroachment projects last for a month or less and do not involve significant construction activity. Occasionally, more extensive projects, may encroach on the District property for a longer period. A copy of the encroachment permit log, with projects located in the Permit area highlighted in green, is included in Attachment D.

For both construction and encroachment projects, site inspections include verifying that adequate minimum BMPs are in place to comply with Order R9-2004-001 and the General Construction Permit. Inspection reports are not produced during a site visit unless there is a problem which needs to be addressed, at which time a notification is given. There were no significant construction related problems during the reporting period.

### 2) Number and Type of Enforcement Actions Related to Construction Sites:

| Enforcement and Compliance Responses   | Private Projects | Public Projects |
|--|------------------|-----------------|
| Non-monetary Penalties                 | 0                | 0               |
| Stop Work Authority                    | 0                | 0               |
| Fines                                  | 0                | 0               |
| Financial Security                     | 0                | 0               |
| Permit/Certificate of Occupancy Denial | 0                | 0               |
| Referral to SDRWQCB                    | 0                | 0               |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>        |

### 3) Description of Modifications made to the Construction and Grading Approval Process:

No revisions were needed nor made.

**2. CONSTRUCTION  
(SECTION G)  
CONTINUED**

**NOTE: THIS SECTION IS APPLICABLE TO DISTRICT ADMINISTERED AND ENCROACHMENT PROJECTS ONLY.**

**4) Description and Number of Training Efforts Conducted during the Reporting Period.**

**a. Training:** (See Attachment C.)

| Training     | Training Description                       | Training Dates | Number of District Attendees |
|--------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|
| Construction | NPDES Training for Construction Inspectors | 9/24/07        | 5                            |
| Construction | NPDES Training for Construction Inspectors | 9/25/07        | 5                            |
| <b>Total</b> |  |                | <b>10</b>                    |

**b. Summarize any Additional Education and Outreach Activities Conducted for Project Applicants, Contractors, Developers, Property Owners, and/or other Responsible Parties in Support of the Construction Component:**

The District is only directly responsible for administering District Public Works projects; it does not have authority over private development activities. For all District construction projects, the District reviews and approves contractor submitted SWPPP's prior to construction. As stated in the General Construction Permit (Order No. 99-08 DWQ), individuals responsible for SWPPP preparation, implementation, and permit compliance shall be appropriately trained both formally and informally. During the SWPPP review process, the District requires that contractors meet the requirements of the General Construction Permit and requires that training certifications are provided. Additionally, as part of the preconstruction meeting for all District projects, the contractor must attend a NPDES Contractor's Training Presentation given by District staff. In addition, the District's specifications require compliance with the Permit and the General Construction Permit, including appropriate minimum erosion and sediment control BMPs on District Capital Improvement Projects.

Additional contractor education and outreach is implemented through the Regional Public Education Program described in the Watershed SWMP.

**10) An Assessment of Program Effectiveness based on the Measurable Goals Established in the Permittee's Individual SWMP:**

As indicated in the District's Individual SWMP, the District does not have land-use or police powers, and as such cannot issue grading permits or regulate private construction activities. Therefore, the District's construction program is limited to District projects or those portions of Third-Party Construction Projects that encroach upon District rights-of-way. The District's Individual SWMP, therefore, did not establish specific measurable goals because of the District's limited role in construction activities and limited number of District projects in the Permit area.

## **2. CONSTRUCTION (SECTION G) CONTINUED**

**NOTE: THIS SECTION IS APPLICABLE TO DISTRICT ADMINISTERED AND ENCROACHMENT PROJECTS ONLY.**

Additionally, through a review of our NPDES Training Materials, District NPDES Staff are recommending that District Construction Inspectors attend additional training specific to the Construction General Permit in the future. This is because our inspectors only work on District public works projects that must be in compliance with the Construction General Permit. The District will evaluate potential providers of this training in Fiscal Year 2008-2009 and propose implementation in 2009-2010 (or in conjunction with the roll-out of the new Construction General Permit).

The District's construction program has been found to be effective because our inspectors received training and our construction projects were inspected consistent with permit requirements.

### **11) Additional Comments/Information:**

Attachment D includes the following items:

- Standard specifications related to water quality that are used for District-administered construction projects.
- Standard encroachment permit application and requirements,
- Copies of the District's encroachment permit log.

**3. MUNICIPAL**  
**(SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**

**1) Number of Inspections Conducted at Existing Municipal Facilities:**

Not Applicable – there are no District municipal facilities within the Permit area. However, the District does annually inspect its MS4 consistent with the requirements of the current Permit.

**2) Number and Type of Enforcement Actions Related to Municipal Sites:**

| Enforcement and Compliance Responses | Number     |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Education and Information            | N/A        |
| Verbal Warning                       | N/A        |
| Written Warning                      | N/A        |
| Other                                |            |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>N/A</b> |

**3) Number of Catch Basins and Inlets that were Inspected and the Number that were Cleaned:**

|                         | Number Inspected | Number Cleaned |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Catch Basins and Inlets | N/A              | N/A            |

NOTE: The District does not operate nor maintain catch basins and inlets within the permit area aside from those that are within District Rights-of-Way. Usually any inlets that are within District R/W are immediately adjacent to a channel, and are maintained as part of routine maintenance of the channels; as such they are not tracked separately. A significant majority of catch basins and inlets are maintained by the municipalities or in rare instances, may be maintained by property owners associations (POAS) or homeowners associations (HOAs).

**3. MUNICIPAL**  
**(SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

4) **Assessment of the Amount and Type of Debris Removed from Catch Basins, Streets and Open Channels, including an Identification of Problem Areas that Generate the most Pollutants:** (See Attachment E.)

| Facility              | Type of Debris   | Approx. Weight           | Problem Areas that Generate Most Pollutants |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Catch basins</b>   | Vegetative Litter<br>Anthropogenic Litter<br>Sediment<br>Other man-made debris |                          | N/A   |
| <b>Total</b>          |  | <b>N/A</b>               | <b>tons (wet weight)</b>                    |
| <b>Streets</b>        | Vegetative Litter<br>Anthropogenic Litter<br>Sediment<br>Other man-made debris |                          | N/A   |
| <b>Total</b>          |  | <b>N/A</b>               | <b>tons (wet weight)</b>                    |
| <b>Open Channels</b>  | Vegetative Litter<br>Anthropogenic Litter<br>Sediment<br>Other man-made debris | 45.5<br>5.2<br>10,798.5* | N/A   |
| <b>Total</b>          |  | <b>10,849</b>            | <b>tons (wet weight)</b>                    |
| <b>Facility Total</b> |  | <b>10,849</b>            | <b>tons (wet weight)</b>                    |

\* 6,153 cy of sediment were removed, tonnage calculated based on an assumed density of 130 lbs/cf.

**3. MUNICIPAL**  
**(SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**5) Assessment of effectiveness of BMPs that have been implemented for municipal facilities and activities:**

| <b>BMP Code</b> | <b>Description</b>                     | <b>Used</b>                             |                             | <b>Notes</b> |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------------|--------------|
| SC-10           | Non-Stormwater Discharges              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-11           | Spill Prevention, Control and Clean-up | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-20           | Vehicle and Equipment Fueling          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-21           | Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-22           | Vehicle and Equipment Repair           | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-30           | Outdoor Loading/Unloading of Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-31           | Outdoor Liquid Container Storage       | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-32           | Outdoor Equipment Maintenance          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-33           | Outdoor Storage of Raw Materials       | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-34           | Waste Handling and Disposal            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-35           | Safe Alternative Products              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-40           | Contaminated or Erodible Areas         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-41           | Building and Grounds Maintenance       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-42           | Building Repair and Construction       | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-43           | Parking/Storage Area Maintenance       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-44           | Drainage System Maintenance            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-60           | Housekeeping Practices                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-61           | Safe Alternative Products              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-70           | Road and Street Maintenance            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-71           | Plaza and Sidewalk Cleaning            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-72           | Fountain and Pool Maintenance          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |
| SC-73           | Landscape Maintenance                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-74           | Drainage System Maintenance            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-75           | Waste Handling and Disposal            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |              |
| SC-76           | Water and Sewer Utility Maintenance    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A          |

**Assessment of the effectiveness of BMPs that have been implemented for municipal facilities and activities:**

THE DISTRICT DOES NOT OPERATE MUNICIPAL FACILITIES OTHER THAN MS4 IN THE SANTA MARGARITA REGION, THEREFORE THESE RESPONSES ARE LIMITED TO ADDRESSING THE DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION OF BMP's RELATING AND APPLICABLE TO MS4 MAINTENANCE.

**3. MUNICIPAL**  
**(SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**

**6) Description and Number of Training Efforts Conducted over the last year (for Municipal Facility Operators and/or Inspectors).**

**a. Training:**

Note – Because District staff do maintain MS4 in the Santa Margarita Region, District maintenance staff receive municipal NPDES training per the requirement of the NPDES permit. Attendance logs for these trainings are contained in Appendix E of the Watershed Annual Report.

| <b>Training</b>                                  | <b>Training Description</b>                                      | <b>Training Dates</b>  | <b>Number of District Attendees</b> |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Municipal Training                               | Municipal Site Inspection  | 11/27/07               | 6                                   |
| Municipal Training                               | Municipal Site Inspection  | 4/15/08                | 3                                   |
| Municipal Training                               | In-house training for PPE  | 6/10/08                | 56                                  |
| Worker Safety Training (Helena Chemical Company) | BMP implementation during herbicide applications                 | 5/22/08                | 11                                  |
| Municipal Training                               | Hazardous Material Spill Notification and Cleanup                | 1/8/08                 | 13                                  |
| Municipal Training                               | Hazardous Material Spill Notification and Cleanup                | 1/9/08                 | 9                                   |
| Pesticide Applicators Seminar, Monterey, CA      | SCWSS Annual Conference Southern California Weed Science Society | 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 2008 | 4                                   |
| Municipal Training                               | Hazardous Material Spill Notification and Cleanup                | 1/17/08                | 51                                  |
|  |  | <b>Total</b>           | <b>145</b>                          |

**b. Summarize the Internal and External Education and Outreach Activities the Municipal Component has Conducted over the past year:**

In compliance with Order No. R9-2004-001, the District maintains the District's corporate yard Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP), which also address field MS4 maintenance in the Santa Margarita Watershed. The PPP provides the pollution prevention strategy to address facilities and associated activities that may cause stormwater pollution without proper controls.

Staff also review the standard operating procedures for herbicide/pesticide management (product label instructions and Material Safety Data Sheets) that are part of the existing education requirements for applicators. Examples of standard procedures that constitute

**3. MUNICIPAL**  
**(SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

BMPs include schedules for applications considering weather and nesting seasons, and proper storage and disposal of unused product.

Site and activity assessments are performed annually prior to the storm season including the District's Corporate Yard (not subject to the SMR Permit) and the MS4 within the Permit area. The District does not own nor maintain any facilities in the SMR other than the MS4. The District's Corporate Yard is located in the Santa Ana watershed..

Additionally, District Maintenance staff have attended annual training events conducted by our contracted herbicide provider (Helena Chemical Company). These venues focus on BMP implementation for specific herbicides used by the District. The BMPs and related topics included:

- Anticipated Glyphosate concentration ranges in water samples given average AquaMaster application rates and following label instruction.
- Calculation for determining estimated surfactant concentrations.
- Application techniques for effective results when applying AquaMaster.
- California laboratories that can analyze for Glyphosate, should the need arise.

**7) An Assessment of Program Effectiveness Based on the Measurable Goals Established in the Permittee's Individual SWMP:**

The following metrics are required to be tracked and reported on by Section 5.6 of the District's Individual SWMP:

- Amount and Types of Debris Removed from Open Channels

Outside of the MS4, there are no District municipal facilities within the Santa Margarita Watershed. Therefore, the District's municipal program is limited to MS4 maintenance. The type and total amount of debris removed for each fiscal year is as follows:

| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | <b>Vegetative Litter</b> | <b>Anthropogenic Litter</b> | <b>Sediment</b> | <b>Total Amount of Debris Removed (tons)</b> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|
| FY 2004-2005       | 55.9                     | 0                           | 5,763.4         | 5,819.3                                      |
| FY 2005-2006       | 16.0                     | 8.1                         | 7,532.5         | 7,556.6                                      |
| FY 2006-2007       | 10.4                     | 4.7                         | 2,113.0         | 2,128.1                                      |
| FY 2007-2008       | 45.5                     | 5.2                         | 10,798.5        | 10,849                                       |

### 3. MUNICIPAL (SECTION H.1 of ORDER R9-2004-001) CONTINUED

The amount of sediment removed in FY 2006-2007 was lower than other years at 2,113 tons. This is likely due to the relatively dry wet season in FY 2006-2007, which results in a decrease in sediment transport, and thus sediment removal compared to other years.

- Description of Training Efforts

See Section 3.6) above

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

- Although outside of the District's measurable goals, the District did discover the need to develop a procedure to better address hazardous material clean-up and reporting related to illegal dumping and/or District operational activities. Development of a revised procedure was initiated this reporting period and the procedure is expected to be approved in the upcoming fiscal year.
- District Maintenance Supervisors are now required to complete BMP plans for major maintenance activities. These BMP plans identify the BMPs that are to be deployed as part of the maintenance activity.

#### **8) Additional Comments/Information:**

The District's municipal program in the Permit area is limited to MS4 maintenance. The District reviewed its program to ensure it is continuing to meet or exceed the minimum requirements of Board Order R9-2004-001.

Within FY 2007-2008, the District did not construct any additional MS4 within the SMR. However, the District accepted maintenance responsibilities for several flood control facilities constructed by Developers. Maps showing the location of these new facilities are included in Attachment H of this report. An updated map of all District and City maintained facilities is included in Appendix F of the Watershed Annual Report.

#### **Summarize New Activities or Improvements to be implemented next year as a result of your Self Assessment of the Municipal Component:**

As mentioned above, the District reviews its corporate yard Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) at least annually to determine if any revision is necessary to reflect changes in the facility or changes in the activities conducted. No new activities or improvements are deemed necessary as a result of this assessment beyond changes discussed in Section 7 above.

The District is also going to review its pesticide application contracts (for the Municipal Facility in the Santa Ana Region) to ensure that the contracts require consideration and application (as appropriate) of IPM pest control methods. The contracting language will be based on guidance provided in the Eco-Wise IPM Contracting Toolkit available at:

<http://www.ecowisecertified.org/toolkit/>

## 4. INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL (SECTION H.2) CON'T

The District's enabling act does not provide land-use powers and therefore, individually it has no jurisdiction over industrial or commercial facilities. Through Combined Legal Authority established through an implementation agreement, the District relies on the Co-Permittees for regulation and enforcement related to Industrial and Commercial businesses and activities.

**1) Description and Number of Training Efforts conducted over the last year (for Industrial/Commercial Facility Operators and/or Inspectors).**

**a. Training:**

Although the District does not have authority to inspect or regulate industrial/commercial land-uses, District staff that respond to IC/ID complaints or notifications receive training to ensure that they are familiar with appropriate BMPs applicable to the various potential sources of discharges including Industrial/Commercial Operations and Facilities and Construction Sites. This training helps staff effectively respond to IC/ID events and, through discussions with offending parties, recommend BMPs to curtail illicit discharges to the MS4.

| Training                       | Training Description                      | Training Dates | Number of Attendees |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|
| Industrial/Commercial Training | Industrial/Commercial Facility Inspection | 11/27/07       | N/A*                |
| Industrial/Commercial Training | Industrial/Commercial Facility Inspection | 4/15/08        | N/A*                |
|                                |   | <b>Total</b>   | N/A                 |

\* District Staff that respond to IC/ID complaints or notifications attend inspection training annually, either for Commercial-Industrial sources or for Construction sources. This year, District IC/ID response staff attended the NPDES Construction Site Inspection training described in **Section 2. Construction** of this report.

**5. RESIDENTIAL**  
**(SECTION H.3 of ORDER R9-2004-001)**

The District's enabling act does not provide land-use powers or authority and therefore individually it has no jurisdiction over residential activities. Through Combined Legal Authority established through an implementation agreement, the District relies on the Co-Permittees for regulation and enforcement related to residential activities.

**6. EDUCATION**  
**(SECTION I of ORDER R9-2004-001)**

**1) Description of Education Efforts conducted by the Permittee (not collectively with other Permittees) during the previous year:**

The District and the Co-Permittees jointly fund a watershed-wide Public Education program administered by the District. Since the District does not have any land use authority, it generally does not conduct Educational activities outside of the collective educational efforts for the SMR permittees.

Sections 1 through 4 of this report include an accounting of training that District employees have received training within this reporting period. The training sessions listed in these sections includes Municipal staff training that was conducted by the District on behalf of the Co-Permittees as part of the watershed-wide education program, and training attended that was conducted by others, as available.

District employees responsible for the implementation of the NPDES compliance programs also attended the following Training:

| <u>Training</u>                  | <u>Training by</u> | <u>Date</u>  |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Program Effectiveness Assessment | CASQA              | May 27, 2008 |

The education and outreach programs described below were implemented as part of the Watershed SWMP requirements. Additional details regarding these programs are available in the Watershed Annual Report.

Education and Outreach efforts were conducted toward the following audiences:

| <b>Audience</b>                     | <b>Measures</b><br><b>Impressions are County-wide unless otherwise noted</b>   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Permittee Departments and Personnel | Number of District employees trained for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction Inspection: 10</li> <li>• Industrial/Commercial Inspection: N/A</li> <li>• Municipal Facilities and Activities: 9</li> <li>• Development Planning: 39</li> </ul> |
| Development Community               | Outreach was conducted at the following NPDES Construction Trainings:<br><br>Sep. 24 & 25, 2007, Nov. 19 & 20, 2007 and Jan. 17, 2008  |

**6. EDUCATION**  
**(SECTION I of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Industrial/Commercial Owners and Operators</p>                                | <p>Industrial/Commercial outreach conducted:</p> <p>SGA Home Improvement Stores 8 stores visited and training provided to 12 employees</p> <p>Riverside County Business License Program was instituted on July, 07. A storm water pollution prevention insert was developed and issued to all new license applicants and renewals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Date: 07/07    Inserts distributed: 7,503</p>  |
| <p>Residential Community, General Public, Other Public Agencies and Students</p> | <p>Number of Media Impressions in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newspaper/City/County publications 1,300,000</li> <li>• 800 Line Calls: 1,317</li> <li>• Website: 3,387 (Does not include County Page)</li> <li>• Radio/TV: 0</li> <li>• Billboards: 0</li> <li>• Other: 200</li> <li>• Materials: 240,000</li> </ul> <p>Number of students: 5,100</p> <p>Public Education events conducted: 2</p> <p># Attendees: 600 Temecula Museum/Flower Show</p> |

**6. EDUCATION**  
**(SECTION I of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**2) Assessment of Overall Program Effectiveness Based on the Measurable Goals Established in the Permittee's Individual SWMP:**

Measurable goals for the public education program are defined in Section 10 of the District's Individual SWMP.

As described in the DAMP, the Permittees have decided to pool their efforts into a single county-wide public education program implemented by the District. Since the District's individual jurisdiction covers the entire Santa Margarita Region, the District does not differentiate between education outreach efforts undertaken individually or as part of the county-wide efforts. Therefore, as stated in Section 10 of the District's Individual SWMP, a description and evaluation of the entire public education program implemented in the Permit area is contained in Sections G and J of the Watershed Annual Report.

**Additional Measures of Effectiveness**

Beyond the standard NPDES staff training that the District provides, District NPDES employees are constantly updating their knowledge on various topics relevant to their compliance programs. In this manner, this year District NPDES staff attended CASQA's Program Effectiveness Training. This training will help the District develop appropriate measurable goals in the assessment of their individual compliance programs and of the watershed based activities.

**3) Additional Comments/Information:**

As described above, the District reports all of its implemented education related activities, and an assessment of the public education program in the Watershed Annual Report.

**Describe the major accomplishments of the Education Component over the past year.**

See Watershed Annual Report.

**Summarize new activities or improvements to be implemented next year as a result of your self assessment of the Education Component:**

See Watershed Annual Report.

## 7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION (SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)

### 1) Number of Illicit Discharges, Connections and Spills Reported and/or Identified during the Reporting Period:

The District recorded 70 IC/ID/S reports during FY07-08.

- **Illicit Discharges (ID):** 8
- **Illicit Connections (IC):** 0
- **Spills (S):** 62

- a. **Illicit Discharges (ID):** The ID numbers above reflect the number of reports received that constitute the willfull and/or negligent but intentional release of prohibited discharges. ID reports received by the District are included in Attachment F. In addition, Appendix C of the Watershed Annual Report contains a Fire Department HazMat Response Team Report of other IC/ID/S responses acted upon directly by them.
- b. **Illicit Connections (IC):** In 1990, the District performed a detailed reconnaissance of its MS4 to identify potential illicit connections. A very small number of connections were identified. Since then, the District maintenance and construction inspectors have been trained to look for and report any illicit connections. In addition, the District requires entities wishing to drain non-stormwater discharges to its facilities to complete a Third-Party Non-Stormwater Discharge Application to ensure the discharge complies with the requirements of R9-2004-001.
- c. **Spills (S):** The Spill numbers above reflect the number of reports received that consisted of accidental release of hazardous and/or prohibited discharges. Typically the District is notified of spills through receipt of a copy of the State OES report, and in most cases the spill has already been appropriately responded to when the District receives the report. The District does however, review all spill reports and follow-up on those deemed a threat to water quality. Spill reports received by the District are included in Attachment F. In addition, Appendix C of the Watershed SWMP contains a report of spill responses by the Riverside County Fire Department HazMat Response Team. The District contributes significant funding to the Hazmat team to ensure that they are cognizant of stormwater issues and incorporate appropriate BMPs as part of their hazardous materials response activities.

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**2) Number of Illicit Discharges or Connections Investigated during the Reporting Period and the Outcome of the Investigations:**

All reports received are reviewed/investigated to ensure that they are responded to appropriately and to check for proximity and impact to District Facilities. In many cases such as spills, the District receives reports after the incident has already been appropriately responded to and no further action by the District is necessary. Results of investigations can be found in the IC/ID/S Reports included in Attachment F.

Number of IC/ID/S incidents reviewed/investigated by District: 70

Number of IC/ID/S incidents having potential to impact District facilities: 14\*\*

Number of IC/ID/S incidents directly impacting District facilities: 6\*

\*\* "Potential to impact District Facilities" was classified as spills/discharges that were not contained nor cleaned up and were near a District Facility, or were cleaned up but were immediately adjacent to a District Facility.

\* "Directly impacting District Facilities" is classified as spills/discharges that are known to have entered a District Facility.

**3) Number and Types of Enforcement Actions Taken for Illicit Discharges or Connections during the Reporting Period:**

See Summary Report in Attachment F.

Because the District's enabling act does not provide land-use powers, the District relies on combined legal authority with the Co-Permittees to control industrial, commercial or development activities within its jurisdiction. Any enforcement actions resulting from an IC/ID reported to the District would be taken by the respective Co-Permittee with jurisdiction. The District does maintain the ability to regulate third-party activities within its rights-of-way through encroachment permits, construction contracts and other legal agreements.

**4) Number of Times your Agency's Hotline was called during the Reporting Period, as Compared to Previous Reporting Periods.**

The table below identifies the number of calls that were tracked by our 1-800 hotline. Do to a technical error, the call counters were not used during the FY 2004-2005 reporting period. The calls identified below for FY 2004-2005 only reflect the calls that were diverted to the District's front counter. The District has restored this service with the County Information Technology Department who hosts the hotline. These calls may have been for IC/ID, education outreach or other purposes.

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

|                         | Number of Calls |         |         |         |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                         | 2004-05         | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 |
| Water Pollution Hotline | 100             | 2015    | 1648    | 1317    |

**5) Number and Location of Dry Weather Monitoring Sites that were Monitored during the Reporting Period:**

The District maintains four IC/ID dry weather monitoring stations. These stations are identified below:

Number of Site(s): 4

Location(s): Santa Gertrudis Channel, Warm Springs Creek, Long Canyon Creek, Redhawk Channel

The exact location of these stations can be found in Section G-3.0 of the Santa Margarita Region Monitoring Annual Report (Appendix G of the Watershed Annual Report).

**6) Summary of Illicit Discharge Monitoring Program results, including: 1) All inspection, field screening and analytical monitoring results 2) All follow-up and elimination activities and 3) Any proposed changes to station locations and/or sampling frequencies:**

The District conducts IC/ID dry weather monitoring at the four tributary stations. As a result, monitoring occurs more frequently than the minimum of two times required under the MRP.

**Inspection, Field Screening and Analytical Monitoring Results**

All field screening and analytical monitoring results can be found in the Watershed Annual Report, Appendix G (Monitoring Annual Report) Tables G-14 and G-36 for all four tributary stations: Long Canyon Creek, Santa Gertrudis Channel, Redhawk Channel and Warm Springs Creek.

The District has developed numeric field screening criteria to determine whether a follow-up laboratory sample should be collected as summarized below:

- Specific conductance more than 25% higher than BPO
- Total dissolved solids more than 25% higher than BPO
- Turbidity more than 25% higher than long-term average (Avg. = 71.3 NTU)
- pH below 6 or above 9.5
- Dissolved oxygen below 4 mg/L

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

- Unusually low or high water temperature
- Sensory observations in the area of the discharge that indicates the presence of pollutants (e.g., staining, water sheen, water color and/or odor, algae, foaming)

Below is a summary of the results of the IC/ID investigations conducted by the District.

**IC/ID Investigations Conducted by the District**

| <b>IC/ID Station Name</b>              | <b>Date</b> | <b>TDS<br/>(mg/L)</b>                                 | <b>Sp. Cond.<br/>(µmhos/cm)</b> | <b>Turbidity<br/>(NTU)</b> | <b>pH</b>   | <b>T (°C)</b> | <b>DO<br/>(mg/L)</b> |
|--|-------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Redhawk Channel                        | 8/28/07*    | <b>1100</b>   | 1700                            | 72.9                       | 9.2         | 33.1          | 14.51                |
|  | 5/29/08*    | 900   | 1300                            | -                          | <b>10.3</b> | 26.8          | 11.23                |
| Long Canyon Channel                    | 8/28/2007   | 900   | 1300                            | 57.4                       | 8.3         | 24.9          | 15.13                |
|  | 5/29/2008   | 700   | 1000                            | 9.8                        | 8.6         | 20.4          | 16.34                |
| Santa Gertrudis Chnl.<br>near Murrieta | 8/28/2007   | Too shallow to accurately measure field measurements. |                                 |                            |             |               |                      |
|  | 5/29/2008   | Too shallow to accurately measure field measurements. |                                 |                            |             |               |                      |
| Warm Springs Creek<br>near Murrieta    | 8/28/2007   | DRY. No field measurements.                           |                                 |                            |             |               |                      |
|  | 5/29/2008   | Too shallow to accurately measure field measurements. |                                 |                            |             |               |                      |

\* Samples taken for Analytical Testing

\*\* **Bold** values exceeded field screening criteria

**Follow-up and Elimination Activities**

Generally, during IC/ID field visits, visual observations and field screening did not indicate the presence of illicit connections or illegal discharges. The two exceptions within the reporting period are summarized on the following page:

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

Redhawk Channel, sampling date 8/28/07 –



Field TDS exceeded 1100 mg/l. There was adequate flow to collect samples for laboratory analysis and samples were collected. Flow was clear with a slight yellow tint and very little floatables or settleables (photo). Lab turbidity (4.8 NTU) was below BPO; however, lab TDS slightly exceeded 125% BPO. Lab pH was neutral. Redhawk is in a predominately-residential area and rules out discharges from industries that would most likely produce elevated TDS flows. Nutrient levels are normal for the watershed and MBAS results are below BPO. No obvious sources of the exceedance were determined based on the field visit or follow up chemical analysis.

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

Redhawk Channel, sampling data 5/29/08 –



Field Parameters indicated an elevated field pH, exceeding pH criteria (9.5). There was adequate flow to collect samples for laboratory analysis and samples were collected. Lab pH measurement did not exceed criteria therefore no follow-up action was necessary. Flow had a light green to yellow tint, clear in clarity with very little floatables and settleables (photo). No obvious illegal discharges were detected during the field visits.

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**Proposed changes to station locations and/or sampling frequencies**

No changes are proposed to the station locations and/or sampling frequencies at this time. However, the District has committed to reviewing the entire IC/ID program with the RWQCB staff prior to submittal of the ROWD.

**7) An Assessment of Overall Program Effectiveness Based on the Measurable Goals Established in the Permittee's Individual SWMP:**

The measurable goals are defined in Section 4.4 of the District's Individual SWMP and have been reported upon in response to questions 1 through 5 of this section. The Overall effectiveness of the IC/ID program has been found to be effective based on the responses to these questions,

Based on an analysis of the accumulation of four years of IC/ID data, specific measurable targets will be established in the ROWD as appropriate and possible.

In response to the Los Angeles RWQCB and the Ventura County MS4 Permit, CASQA prepared a letter identify proposed measures and goals to evaluate the effectiveness of the IC/ID Program. The measures are as follows:

- Percent (%) of IC/IDs responded to within 24 hours of receiving notice; and
- Percent (%) of Illegal Connections eliminated or permitted once detected.

The goal identified for each measure was 80%. Based on our FY 2007-2008 IC/ID information, 99% of IC/ID incidents were responded to within 24 hours of receiving notice and zero (0) Illicit Connections were detected. Only one (1) of the seventy (70) reports was not responded to within 24 hours (Complaint No. 1061) which was a report of a previously occurring, permitted non-stormwater discharge of de-chlorinated swimming pool water.

**8) Additional Comments/Information:**

**Describe the major accomplishments of the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Component over the past year:**

The District continues to improve its IC/ID program through refinements in its ability to track complaints, enhance its ability to gather important complaint related information through custom GIS graphic user interfaces (developed in late 2005) and efforts to enhance our coordination with other municipal agencies with authority to respond to complaints.

**Summarize the internal and external education and outreach activities the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Component has conducted over the past year:**

During field investigations of complaint calls, field staff disseminates public education and outreach information to violators and adjacent residents/businesses. Other IC/ID education addressed through the public education program is described in the Watershed SWMP.

**7. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION**  
**(SECTION J of ORDER R9-2004-001)**  
**CONTINUED**

**Summarize new activities or improvements to be implemented next year as a result of your self assessment of the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Component:**

The District will continue to implement the program based on the recent improvements. Additional recommendations may be proposed for next year.

The District is also proposing to establish an electronic third-party discharge electronic reporting form and GIS layer that would allow us to quickly research known third-party discharges to our system as part of complaint call responses. Work on the system was initiated and may take 1-2 years to complete.

**Other Comments:**

N/A

## 8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- 1) **A Description of Efforts to Include the Public Urban Runoff Management Programs during the Reporting Period (i.e., river clean-ups, volunteer monitoring, Permittee council meetings related to the SWMP, etc.):**

Public involvement programs for this reporting period included:

- a) Technical Advisory Committee meetings held on a monthly basis and are open to the public.
- b) Participation in SMR Executive Management Team and Water Quality Monitoring Committee meetings.

- 2) **Additional Comments/Information:**

N/A

## 9. FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT

**Fiscal Analysis Component - each Permittee shall include an annual fiscal analysis, for each fiscal year covered by Order No. R9-2004-001, in its Individual Annual Report. This analysis shall evaluate the expenditures (such as capital, operation and maintenance, education, and administrative expenditures) necessary to accomplish the activities of the Permittee's Individual SWMP. The analysis shall include the following:**

- 1) A Report of the Previous Reporting Period's Budget and a Budget for the Upcoming Reporting Period. To the Extent Possible, the Budgets should be Broken Down by the following Programs:**

Expenditures identified below reflect costs incurred by the District for implementing its own NPDES Program and for implementing the Regional Watershed Program. The District does not track its direct implementation costs separately nor does it track costs separately for many permit provisions.

| Program Element                                  | Fiscal Year 2007-2008 |                       | Fiscal Year 2008-2009 |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|  | Capital Expenditures  | O&M/Admin Expenditure | Capital Expenditures  | O&M/Admin Expenditure |
| Program Management                               | N/A                   | \$362,539             | N/A                   | \$534,020             |
| Annual Fee for MS4 NPDES Permit                  | N/A                   | 0                     | N/A                   | \$4,000               |
| Implementation Agreement Shared Cost             | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| Construction Inspections*                        | N/A                   | ~\$10,000             | N/A                   | ~\$10,000             |
| Development Planning*                            | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| Industrial and Commercial Inspections            | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| Illicit Connections & Illegal Discharges Program | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| Municipal Facilities and Activities              | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| Public Education & Outreach                      | N/A                   | \$51,204              | N/A                   | \$66,030              |
| Monitoring Program                               | N/A                   | \$146,722             | N/A                   | \$152,600             |
| Other  | N/A                   | \$0                   | N/A                   | \$0                   |
| Contributions to Other Programs                  | N/A                   | \$91,228              | N/A                   | \$96,330              |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>N/A</b>            | <b>\$661,693</b>      | <b>N/A</b>            | <b>\$862,890</b>      |

\* Costs are not directly tracked for these Program Elements, however a brief description follows that identifies manpower requirements for those specific Program Elements

**Construction Inspection** – The District's Construction Inspectors are trained to address construction related NPDES issues associated with District administered construction projects

**9. FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT  
CONTINUED**

(storm drains, channels, levees, basins, etc.). They perform these inspections as part of their normal duties. The District's NPDES Section staff also has an individual assigned to review SWPPPs associated with District administered construction projects. The NPDES staff person also provides a training presentation on NPDES related construction issues at construction project pre-construction meetings for the benefit of the contractor. Costs for Construction Inspection permit obligations for the Santa Margarita Watershed are recovered from the District's ad-valorem tax revenues collected within the Santa Margarita Region of the County.

**Development Planning** – The District's Development Review staff are responsible for reviewing proposed development projects in the unincorporated Riverside County area for compliance with the SWMP, recommending conditions of approval relative to water quality/NPDES and reviewing preliminary Project-Specific WQMPs and associated plans within the unincorporated County. Costs incurred by the District's Development Review and Plan Check staff for Development Planning permit obligations are recovered via development review and plan check fees charged to the development proponent.

**2) A Description of the Source(s) of Funds that were Utilized during the Previous Fiscal Year and the Source(s) of Funds Proposed to Meet the Necessary Expenditures for the Subsequent Year, including Legal Restrictions on the use of such Funds.**

| Source of Funds  | Capital Expenditures | Percent of Total Program Funding | Restrictions on Use (if applicable)  |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Santa Margarita Watershed Benefit Assessment Fund            | \$410,267            | 51.5%                            | District NPDES compliance costs, excess funds used to fund regional NPDES activities.  |
| Santa Margarita Watershed Permittee Implementation Agreement | \$365,787.59         | 46%                              | Regional NPDES Compliance Programs.  |
| Zone 7 Ad-Valorem Tax Revenue                                | ~\$10,000            | 1.25%                            | Costs associated with District's compliance with Municipal Construction component of Board Order R9-2004-001.  |
| Developer Development Review/Plan Check Fees                 | Unknown              | Unknown                          | Costs associated with review of proposed developments in the unincorporated County for compliance with the Development Planning provisions of Board Order R9-2004-001. |
| Spending Against Reserves                                    | \$0                  | 0%                               | District NPDES Compliance Costs  |
| Miscellaneous Revenue  | ~\$10,000            | 1.25%                            | Interest, Other Misc.  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>\$796,094.59</b>  | <b>100%</b>                      |  |

## 9. FISCAL ANALYSIS COMPONENT CONTINUED

### 3) Additional Comments/Information:

The District is working with other stakeholder groups to leverage funds for regional planning objectives including:

**Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority** – Jointly fund a LID BMP testing and demonstration facility. This effort is described in Appendix G, Section G-7.1 of the Monitoring Annual Report.

**Joint Permittee Efforts** - Additional efforts to leverage funds are jointly being made with the SMR permittees. These efforts are described in Section H.11 of the Watershed Annual Report.

## 10. NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES

Permittees shall report on any discharge category listed in Requirement B.2 of Order No. R9-2004-001 that was identified as a source of pollutants during the reporting period. For each identified category, the Permittee shall report whether it elected to prohibit the discharge or to require BMPs to reduce pollutants in the discharge to the MEP. If the discharge is not prohibited, the BMPs that will be implemented, or required to be implemented, shall be described in each Permittee's Individual SWMP Annual Report.

| Category  | Prohibited  | BMP to be Implemented           |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Diverted stream flows   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Rising ground waters  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Uncontaminated ground water infiltration [as defined at 40CFR35.2005(20)] to MS4s                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Uncontaminated pumped ground water  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Foundation drains   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Springs   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Water from crawl space pumps  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Footing drains  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Air conditioning condensation   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Water line flushing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Landscape irrigation  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Discharges from potable water sources not subject to NPDES Permit No. CAG679001, other than water main breaks | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Irrigation water  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Lawn watering   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Individual residential car washing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Non-emergency fire fighting flows   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |
| Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable, no applications |

## 10. NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES CONTINUED

### **Additional Comments/Information:**

The District requires a Third-Party Non-Stormwater Discharge Application to be completed for any encroachment involving a non-stormwater discharge into District facilities. The application requires the applicant to characterize the discharge, including a chemical analysis of the flow when possible. Where the discharges would contain contaminants exceeding receiving water standards, BMPs are required or the specific discharge would be prohibited. No evidence has been identified to date that would indicate that a specific class, or classes, of allowable non-stormwater discharges are persistent sources of pollution per Requirement B.2.

## 11. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

This section includes the report required pursuant to Requirement C.2.a. of Order No. R9-2004-001, if applicable.

Requirement C.2.a. states:

**"Upon a determination by either a Permittee or the SDRWQCB that MS4 discharges are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable water quality standard, the Permittee shall promptly notify and thereafter submit a report to the SDRWQCB that describes BMPs that are currently being implemented and additional BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards. The report may be incorporated in the SWMP Annual Report unless the SDRWQCB directs an earlier submittal. The report shall include an implementation schedule. The SDRWQCB may require modifications to the report."**

Each reporting period, the District collects and reviews monitoring data as part of Appendix G of the Monitoring Annual Report. Based on the results of this monitoring data, pollutants of concern are identified and prioritized. Programs necessary to control these pollutants of concern are also identified in Appendix G and incorporated into the Permittees compliance programs.

## 12. ADDITIONAL URBAN RUNOFF DATA

**This Section is a Summary of all Urban Runoff Related Data not included in the Annual Monitoring Report (e.g., special investigations).**

The District did not collect any supplemental data that is not reported in the Annual Monitoring Report.

## **13. PROPOSED REVISIONS**

### **This Section Includes Proposed Revisions to the Individual SWMP, Including Areas in Need of Improvement Based on the Assessment of Effectiveness of Each Program Component.**

The District is currently reviewing the Individual SWMP for any needed updates to ensure that it remains a current and effective document.

Additional proposed revisions to the Individual SWMP are based on the effectiveness analyses for each of the components of this report and are summarized as follows:

#### **13.1 Development Planning**

Although the District does not individually have land use authority to regulate development, the District reviews New Development and Significant Redevelopment projects at the request of the County. The District continues to assist the County in the following efforts to improve the effectiveness of post-construction BMP selection and maintenance for its Development Planning Program:

- Create a long-term public maintenance mechanism for post-construction BMPs within the unincorporated County.
- Create a GIS-based tracking mechanism for post-construction BMPs within the unincorporated County. Work on this mechanism will begin in Fiscal Year 2008-2009.
- Develop additional post-construction BMP guidance to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of post-construction BMPs.

The results of these efforts may require revisions to Section 6 of the District's Individual SWMP to reflect its updated role in this process.

#### **13.2 Construction**

The District will evaluate potential providers for training District Construction Inspectors for compliance with the General Construction Permit. This evaluation will happen in Fiscal Year 2008-2009 with anticipated implementation in 2009-2010 (or in conjunction with the roll-out of the new Construction General Permit). Once this additional training is developed, Section 10.0 of the Individual SWMP will be updated accordingly.

#### **13.3 Municipal**

- The District is working to develop a procedure to better address hazardous material clean-up and reporting related to illegal dumping and District operational activities. Development of a revised procedure was initiated this reporting period and the procedure is expected to be approved in the upcoming fiscal year. Section 4.2 of the Individual SWMP will be updated to reflect this change once the procedure has been finalized.
- District Maintenance Supervisors are now required to incorporate BMPs into major maintenance activities. These BMP plans identify the BMPs that are to be deployed as part of the maintenance action. Section 5.3 of the Individual SWMP will be updated to reflect this change.

## **13. PROPOSED REVISIONS**

- The District is also going to review its pesticide application contracts (for its Municipal Facility in the Santa Ana Region) to ensure that the contracts require consideration and application (as appropriate) of IPM pest control methods. Once complete, Section 5.3 of the Individual SWMP will be updated as appropriate.

### **13.4 Education**

The District will be providing additional training on the Construction General Permit for District Construction Inspectors as described in the section 13.2 above.

### **13.5 Illicit Connections / Illicit Discharges**

The District is working to establish an electronic third-party discharge electronic reporting form and GIS layer that would allow staff to quickly research known third-party discharges to our system as part of complaint call responses. Work on the system was initiated and may take 1-2 years to complete. Once complete, this system will be documented in Section 4.1 of the Individual SWMP.