


CITY OF TEMECULA ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

**Reporting Period
July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007**

Santa Margarita River Watershed



**FOR
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
(ORDER NO. R9-2004-001)**

**PREPARED
OCTOBER 22, 2007**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION


CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

1.0	Executive Summary
2.0	Introduction
3.0	Development Planning Program
4.0	Construction Program
5.0	Municipal Program
6.0	Industrial/Commercial Program
7.0	Residential Program
8.0	Education Program
9.0	Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program
10.0	Public Participation
11.0	Assessment of Overall SWMP Effectiveness
12.0	Fiscal Analysis
13.0	Non-Storm Water Discharges
14.0	Receiving Water Limitations
15.0	Additional Urban Runoff Data
16.0	Proposed Revisions

ATTACHMENTS

A	Development Planning Program.
B	Construction Program.
C	Municipal Program.
D	Industrial/Commercial Program.
E	Residential Program.
F	Illicit Discharge Detection Program.

WATERSHED ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION STATEMENT



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

Signature

Daniel A. York, City Engineer

Name and Title, Printed or Typed

October 30, 2007

Date

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This annual report represents the current status of the stormwater management program for the City of Temecula (City). This report covers the reporting period between July 1, 2006, and June 30, 2007. Each section addresses individual programs that were implemented in order to comply with the requirements of the municipal separate storm-sewer system permit (MS4 permit) issued to the Santa Margarita River (SMR) watershed permittees of Riverside County. The SMR MS4 permit was issued on July 14, 2004 by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Board) and is a third-term MS4 permit.

The following represents the major improvements to the City's NPDES program during this reporting period.

- WQMPs were conditioned on more projects during this reporting period than during the previous reporting period;
- The City completed the required High-priority business inspections. In addition, a significant number of Medium and Low-priority business inspections were also completed. These efforts increased compliance and decreased the number of citations;
- The City increased the number of Construction inspections. These efforts increased compliance and decreased the number of citations;
- The City increased its Education and Outreach efforts throughout the Construction, Industrial/Commercial, and new Residential sectors;
- The City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff ordinance was fully implemented and enforced.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The information contained herein is presented in the same format as that outlined in Section III of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) of the MS4 permit (Permit). Each section addresses individual components of the Permit and summarizes the progress accomplished during the reporting period. These sections include the City's Development Planning process, Construction program, Municipal program, Industrial and Commercial program, Residential program, Education program, and Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program (IC/ID), respectively.

This Annual Report specifically responds to the Permit's reporting requirements and includes identifying program progress and effectiveness evaluations. This report will be the second year that the new Permit programs are fully implemented and effectiveness data is collected to establish baseline conditions. The Permit also requires the Permittees to develop a long term strategy for addressing the effectiveness of each jurisdiction's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP). The SWMP is the set of written policies and procedures for each component outlined in the MS4 permit. To that end, the Permittees have developed a long term strategy to evaluate the effectiveness of the SWMPs.

The long term strategy for the program effectiveness assessment (PEA) will be conducted at two levels described below. It should be noted that a PEA requires the initial establishment of a set of baseline conditions using measurable metrics. These baseline conditions can then be used to establish measurable goals based on the measured metrics. Thereafter, effectiveness can be evaluated by comparisons of successive years of measurable metrics against the baseline data and measurable goals.

At the first level, or 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. These assessments are included at the end of each Annual Report section. Inferences about the compliance of each program (new development, construction, IC/ID, etc.) will predominantly be drawn from both direct and indirect measures of progress for each program.

At the second level, or 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 long-term analysis will be conducted as part of the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). The results of this long-term assessment will be evaluations of the need to make significant programmatic revisions to the Permit compliance programs, as necessary, to protect Beneficial Uses of Receiving Waters. This level 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 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.

Where the period of evaluation is characterized by the implementation of new program requirements, determinations of program effectiveness will initially be limited to confirmation of program implementation and collection of measurable metrics until baseline conditions can be properly 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 Permits. This lack of direct measure confirmation arises because:

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

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 City of Temecula is supporting the effort of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) to develop guidance in this area at a statewide level.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROGRAM

1) Description of any amendments to the General Plan or the development project approval process:

General Plan – On April 12, 2005, the City adopted updates to its General Plan and included, per the MS4 permit and comments from the Regional Board, water quality and watershed protection elements. The Planning Department administers any changes to the City’s General Plan. According to the Planning Department, there have been no modifications to the General Plan during this reporting period. The City’s goals and policies that address the MS4 are listed in Table 6-1 of Section 6.2 (under General Plan) of the City’s SWMP.

Development Projects - On July 1, 2005, the City incorporated the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) requirements into all new-development applications and on applications for modifications to existing developments. The revised applications are listed in Section 6.3 (under CEQA Environmental Review Process) of the SWMP under Project Application Forms. All applicable projects that did not receive legal approval, in the form of an approved status by the Planning Commission, prior to July 1st 2005 were required to include a WQMP with the planning application materials. The City also required all proposed projects with prior legal approval to incorporate WQMP-related treatment BMPs into their final designs and to show the locations and details on the grading drawings themselves. Although post-construction BMPs were included on these plans, fully-developed WQMPs were not required due to their prior-legal-approval status. In addition, WQMP requirements were included in the Conditions of Approval (COAs) associated with each applicable development project.

2) Number of grading permits issued:

The City issued 38 grading permits during this reporting period, compared to 62 from the 2005-2006 reporting period, and compared to 76 from the 2004-2005 reporting period. As in the previous reporting periods, many of these projects had legal approval prior to the July 1st WQMP start date and have been in the processing phase until now. Most projects required complete WQMPs. However, those with prior legal approval were not conditioned for this requirement but were still obligated to include post-construction treatment BMPs on the grading plans at a minimum. In both cases, the City has ensured that post-construction BMPs have been designed into the site plan. The list of grading permits issued during this reporting period is included in Attachment A.

3) Number of developments conditioned to meet WQMP requirements:

The City conditioned 25 development projects for the WQMP document submittal requirement during this reporting period, compared to 30 from the 2005-2006 reporting period. It should also be noted that 29 projects were conditioned for the installation of post-construction BMPs during the 2004-2005 reporting period prior to the WQMP requirement. A WQMP tracking log is included in Attachment A.

4) Attach one example of a development project that was conditioned to meet WQMP requirements and a description of the required BMPs:

Attachment A includes an approved COA for a new development that was conditioned with the WQMP requirement. The WQMP requirement is located in item number 17, under the ‘General Requirements’ section.

5) Description of any updates to the environmental review process:

There have been no updates to the City’s CEQA process during this reporting period. The City revised its CEQA Initial Study Checklist in June 2005 to include the submittal of a WQMP for priority projects. The revised Environmental Checklist is presented in Section 6.3 (under CEQA Environmental Review Process) of the SWMP under Initial Study Checklist. The WQMP requirement is listed as item ‘f’ under the ‘Hydrology and Water Quality’ section.

6) Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period:

a) Training:

Training (collectively with other Permittees)	Training Description	Training Dates	Number of Attendees
WQMP	Review and Approval process	Dec 10, 2004	3
WQMP	Review and Approval process	Dec 15, 2004	1
WQMP	Review and Approval process	May 4, 2005	19
WQMP	Review and Approval process	June 21, 2006	26
WQMP	Review and Approval process	Proposed for November and December 2007	TBD ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ TBD – To Be Determined.

A copy of the City’s tracking log for staff training is included in Attachment A.

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 Development Planning Component:

City staff also attended the annual CASQA conference on September 25, 26, and 27, 2006. This three-day conference included presentations on low impact development, and on the design, implementation, and maintenance of site-specific post-construction BMPs. Staff also attended the Low Impact Development Training seminar sponsored by the SWRCB on June 28 and 29, 2007, in Marina Del Rey. These courses also focused on low impact development and post-construction BMPs. The City’s WQMP requirement began on July 1, 2005. WQMP notification flyers were posted at the Public Works and Planning counters throughout the previous reporting period, as well as on the City’s web site

(www.cityoftemecula.org/Temecula/Government/PublicWorks/WQMPandNPDES/). The City's NPDES website also includes a WQMP design handbook, a downloadable project-specific WQMP template, checklists to ensure completeness, and links to CASQA's BMP handbooks.

7) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

	Projects Conditioned for the WQMP	WQMPs accepted by the City	Total Staff Trained (collectively with other Permittees)
FY 2004-2005	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	23
FY 2005-2006	30	4	26
FY 2006-2007	25	14	Proposed for November and December 2007

Overall, the City has been successful in requiring WQMPs on all development projects meeting the WQMP criteria. These projects were required to incorporate, as applicable, a combination of Site, Source, and Treatment BMPs into the design of their respective projects.

4.0 CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted:

The City conducted 2,965 NPDES construction inspections during this reporting period, compared to 2,154 inspections during the 2005-2006 reporting period, and compared to 1,647 from the 2004-2005 reporting period. Attachment B includes the record of inspections performed during this reporting period. This list is based on the monthly inspection frequency sheets, presented in Appendix C of the SWMP, and provides a month-to-month tally of all of the NPDES inspections, a break-down by project priority (high, medium, low), and monthly cumulative totals.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions related to construction sites:

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	Private Projects	Public Projects	Total
Verbal Warning	633	43	676
Written Warning	116	7	123
Fines	22	2	24
Stop Work Authority	*	*	*
Permit/Certificate of Occupancy Denial	*	*	*
Referral to SDRWQCB	*	*	*

* - Due to increased inspections, these measures were not required.

3) Description of modifications made to the construction and grading approval process:

The City is currently in the process of updating the existing Grading Ordinance, Grading Manual, Standard Grading Notes, and Standard Erosion and Sediment Control Notes. These updates will reflect successful practices observed since the previous round of revisions. A complete set of Standard Erosion and Sediment Control Notes are required on all Erosion and Sediment Control Plans. These plans must be approved by the City prior to any Grading Permit approvals. Each Erosion and Sediment Control Plan must also include exact locations and details of each proposed BMP, WDID number if applicable, BMP legend, quantities, topography, flow directions, etc. The Grading Ordinance and standard notes are posted on the City's website, as well as included in Appendix A of the SWMP.

4) Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period.

a) Training

Training (collectively with other Permittees)	Training Description	Training Dates	Number of Attendees
Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	Aug 18, 2004	30
Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	Mar 2, 2005	2

Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	May 3, 2005	7
Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	Aug 29, 2005	15
Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	Sep 28, 2005	3
Construction	Erosion and Sediment Control	Oct 18, 2006	29

A copy of the City’s tracking log for staff training is included in Attachment A.

- 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:

On September 8, 2006, the City began hand-delivering the City’s annual NPDES notification letter to each active construction site currently inspected for NPDES compliance. This letter is a formal notification to all active projects obligating each one to implement wet-weather BMPs by October 1st, in addition to complying with the State General Construction Permit, and maintaining pollution prevention measures year-round during the project duration. All of the active sites listed on the September 2006 NPDES Inspection Frequency Sheet List are included in Attachment B and were provided a notification letter. As such, approximately 107 annual letters were delivered to the field superintendents; 99 of these projects were in the private sector while 8 were City-owned projects. The annual letter was also provided to plan-reviewers in the Land Development division of the Public Works department of the City to ensure consistency between the development community and municipal staff. A copy of this letter is included in Attachment B. The City also participated with the Building Industry Association’s (BIA) annual all-day Construction Stormwater Compliance Workshop on September 19, 2006 as a guest speaker. The City’s presentation focused on SWPPP compliance and WQMP requirements. The City also distributed workshop flyers to all field superintendents for this workshop.

5) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

	Inspections	Monetary Penalties	Total Staff Trained (collectively with other Permittees)
FY 2004-2005	1,647	51	39
FY 2005-2006	2,154	67	18
FY 2006-2007	2,965	24	29

Overall, the City improved this component from the previous reporting period by increasing inspections by approximately 37%. This increase in the number of inspections allowed the city to closely monitor each active site, which in turn, increased compliance and decreased the number of citations. In addition, field observations indicate that the development community, in

general, has become more knowledgeable of the requirement. In addition, it has been noted that larger developments have hired in-house SWPPP specialists specifically to minimize non-compliance. It is also important to note that the permittees' staff training programs are category-specific for different in-house divisions. As such, all applicable staff members were directed to their respective training categories.

5.0 MUNICIPAL PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted at existing Municipal facilities:

Routinely performed but not formerly documented. The City is still in the process of developing inspection tracking procedures for areas and facilities owned and/or maintained by the City. A detailed listing of these areas and facilities is presented in Appendix B of the SWMP as the ‘City of Temecula Inventory of Municipal Facilities and Activities’. It is anticipated that the City will have a tracking system in place by the end of the third-term permit that will document inspection dates and any NPDES-related issues that were observed and addressed for each facility. This system will ensure that the City is actively maintaining compliance at each facility.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions related to municipal construction sites:

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	Number
Education and Information	Provided but not documented
Verbal Warning	Provided but not documented
Written Warning	8

3) Number of catch basins that were inspected and the number that were cleaned:

	Total on GIS Map (City, Caltrans, private)	City- Maintained Catchbasins	Minimum Number Inspected	Number Cleaned
Catch Basins	1,964	1,600	3,200 ⁽¹⁾	1,974 ⁽²⁾

- (1) There were 40 catch basins that were routinely inspected quarterly due to their proximity to heavier trafficked areas. However, the figure listed herein represents two inspections at each catch basin.
- (2) This figure represents the number of documented catch basins cleaned.

All of the 1,600 city-maintained catchbasins currently documented on the City’s GIS map were visited twice during the reporting period. Many of these required cleaning during both visits, while others did not. The City maintains a monthly catch basin maintenance log that lists dates, locations, and number of catch basins cleaned during any given month. In addition, the City also maintains a monthly NPDES stencil (legends) log that also lists the dates, locations, and number of legends installed during any given month. These legends are placed at the top of each catchbasin opening and state “Only Rain In The Drain”. An example of each of these monthly logs is included in Attachment C.

4) Assessment of the amount and type of debris removed from catch basins, streets, and open channels, including identification of areas that generate the most pollutants:

Facility	Type of Debris	Approx. %	Problem Areas that Generate Most Pollutants
Catch basins	Anthropogenic Litter	35 ⁽¹⁾	Residential/Commercial areas
	Green Waste	60 ⁽¹⁾	Residential areas
	Sediment	5 ⁽¹⁾	

		100	Total Removed: 160 CY⁽¹⁾
Street Sweeping⁽³⁾	Anthropogenic Litter Sediment	100	Total Removed: 1,798 Tons⁽²⁾ (approximately 1,798 CY)
Open Channels	Anthropogenic Litter Green Waste Sediment	7 ⁽¹⁾ 3 ⁽¹⁾ 90 ⁽¹⁾ 100	Natural channels Total Removed: 2,000 CY⁽¹⁾
Grand Total: 3,958 CY			
Notes: (1) – These figures are provided by the Maintenance Division of the PW Department. (2) – This figure is provided by Temecula Community Services District’s “City of Temecula Tonnage Report”. (3) – Street sweeping areas consist of all paved city-maintained streets. Currently, street sweeping is conducted on 283 miles of paved streets.			

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

BMP Code	Description	Used	Notes
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Fueling is conducted offsite
SC-21	Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	City vehicles are washed onsite. Stormceptor collects all discharges.
SC-22	Vehicle and Equipment Repair	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Repairs are conducted offsite
SC-30	Outdoor Loading/Unloading of Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
SC-31	Outdoor Liquid Container Storage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
SC-32	Outdoor Equipment Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	New facility has been constructed to cover all maintenance equipment
SC-33	Outdoor Storage of Raw Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
SC-41	Building and Grounds Maintenance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
SC-42	Building Repair and Construction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
SC-71	Plaza and Sidewalk Cleaning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Street sweeping has been extended into specific commercial areas
SC-72	Fountain and Pool Maintenance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Provided by RCWD and EMWD

6) **Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period.**

a) Training:

Training (collectively with other Permittees)	Training Description	Training Dates	Number of Attendees
Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspections	Oct 21, 2004	8
Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspections	May 3, 2005	16

Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspections	Sep 26, 2005	4
Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspections	Apr 27, 2006	20
Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspections	Oct 18, 2006	7
Municipal	Operations, Maintenance, Inspection	Proposed for November and December 2007	TBD

A copy of the City’s tracking log for staff training is included in Attachment A.

- b) Summarize any additional education and outreach activities conducted for municipal staff in support of the Municipal Component:

Due to the period between training workshops, only those who did not attend the April 27, 2006 session were required to attend the October 18, 2006 session. Although the fiscal year numbers only show 7 participants for the 2006-2007 fiscal year, a total of 27 participants were formally trained during the 2006 calendar year. The next round of training workshops are scheduled for November and December 2007. Although no additional formal classroom-type workshops were conducted this reporting period, numerous informal, one-on-one training has been ongoing with field crew members, the maintenance supervisor, and the maintenance superintendent on an as-needed basis.

7) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

	Inspections	Pollutants Removed (CY)	Total Staff Trained (collectively with other Permittees)
FY 2004-2005	Undocumented	1,794	24
FY 2005-2006	Undocumented	11,859	24
FY 2006-2007	Documented	3,958	7

Note: The FY 2006-2007 value listed under ‘Pollutants Removed’ reflects 3.75” of rain during the wet-weather season.

Overall, the City improved this component from the previous reporting period by increasing the awareness for documentation.

6.0 INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted:

Category	Number of Inspections	
	FY 2005-2006	FY 2006-2007
Industrial/Commercial Facilities		
High Priority Facilities	252	266
Medium Priority Facilities	52	61
Low Priority Facilities	1	96
Total	305	423

The City completed all of the annual high-priority inspections this reporting period and also addressed many medium and low priority facilities as well. The criteria used to prioritize each business is outlined in the MS4 permit and includes the facility’s Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code, materials used, wastes generated, exposure of activities to stormwater, size, proximity to receiving waters, etc. These inspections uncovered various facilities that were in different stages of compliance. However, each active facility, regardless of the stage of compliance, was provided educational materials, and verbal and written guidance and warnings through written inspection notices. These inspection notices served to document the current condition at each facility, including any deficiencies observed, and areas for improvement. Follow-up visits were also conducted at many of the more challenging sites to ensure that these were actively pursuing total compliance. The City’s current prioritized inventory of industrial and commercial facilities, including the City’s current inspection form, are located in Appendix D of the SWMP.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions taken:

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	FY 2005-2006	FY 2006-2007
Education and information	305	380 ⁽¹⁾
Verbal Warning	19	380 ⁽¹⁾
Written Warning	19	380 ⁽¹⁾
Citation	8	1
Business License Denial	*	*
Referral to SDRWQCB	*	*

(1) - Although 423 business locations were visited, many were no longer active or had become home-based.

* - Due to increased inspections, these measures were not required.

3) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

	Inspections	Monetary Penalties	Total staff trained
FY 2004-2005	161	3	1
FY 2005-2006	305	8	1
FY 2006-2007	423	1	*

* - The City contracted with AEI-CASC to conduct all business inspections. As such, municipal staff have not been required to participate in the business inspection training.

Overall, the City improved this component from the previous reporting period by inspecting more businesses, completing the high-priority inspections, and increasing the number of inspections at medium and low-priority facilities. This increase allowed the city to extend further into the business community, which in turn, increased compliance and decreased the number of citations. Field observations indicate that the business community, in general, has also become more knowledgeable of the requirements.

4) Additional Comments/Information:

Attachment D of this report includes two letters. The first letter is an outreach letter that was provided to all of the facilities that were inspected during this reporting period. The information contained in this letter describes the new NPDES regulations, the inspection criteria, and the previous outreach letter sent throughout the business community on June 7, 2005. This letter was provided to the facility representative at the time of each inspection. The second letter is provided to property management associations as an example of how to inform their respective tenants of the new discharge requirements and associated penalties for non-compliance.

7.0 RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM

1) A description of residential areas that were focused on during the past year:

Residential areas that had recently been released for occupancy continued to be the focus during this reporting period. Activities from these new residential neighborhoods generated more non-permitted discharges following occupancy than existing residential neighborhoods due to improvements incurred by the new homeowners, such as landscaping, pools, patios, etc. These areas generated limited discharges of dirt, sand, fertilizers, gravel, cement, and excess irrigation water from the newly installed lawns. The City’s existing residential efforts are presented in Section 9.0 of the SWMP under Residential Sources.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions taken:

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	
Education and information	Provided but not documented
Verbal Warning	Provided but not documented
Written Warning	0
Citation	5

3) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

	Residential SORs ⁽¹⁾ Received	Monetary Penalties	Trash/Recyclables/Green Waste (Tons)
FY 2004-2005	Not documented	Not documented	Not documented
FY 2005-2006	28 (42 ⁽²⁾)	0	54,429
FY 2006-2007	41	5	53,692

(1) – SOR – Service Order Request. SORs consist of written documentation of complaints that are called into City Hall by the general public.

(2) – This value reflects the total number of same-day field inspections conducted in response to completed written SORs as well as to inspections conducted without formal written SORs.

Overall, the City continued improving this component from the previous reporting period by further educating staff responsible for collecting SOR information to identify incoming calls associated with NPDES issues. All calls associated with NPDES issues are now being documented as formal written Service Order Requests. As such, staff have increased their base knowledge with the NPDES requirements.

4) Additional Comments/Information:

Public outreach was implemented through information contained in the City’s “Inside Temecula” newsletters, “Guide to Leisure Living Activities” guide, “CityWide Clean-up” flyers, and Household Hazardous Waste Collection” flyers that are distributed biannually to

all City residents. Information pertaining to stormwater, recycling, hazardous waste disposal, community clean-up events, greenwaste management, landscape maintenance, street sweeping, etc. were presented in one or more issues of these newsletters and guides. In addition, biannual City-wide community clean-up events were conducted on November 11, 2006 and on May 19, 2007. Relevant sections from the various mailings and the community clean-up flyers are included in Attachment E.

8.0 EDUCATION PROGRAM

1) Description of education efforts conducted by the Permittee (not collectively with other Permittees) during the previous year:

Audience	Measures
Permittee Departments and Personnel	<p>Number of Permittee employees trained for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Inspection: * • Industrial/Commercial Inspection: * • Municipal Facilities and Activities: * • Development Planning: * <p>* - City staff are provided with continuous informal in-house training on an individual and as-needed basis. As such, these one-on-one opportunities are not formally documented. However, all formal classroom-type workshops are conducted and documented thru the regional education program administered by the Riverside County Flood Control District and paid with contributions from all permittees.</p>
Construction Site Owners and Developers	<p>Outreach: (1) Distributed BIA's annual workshop flyer to all field superintendents. (2) Distributed the City's annual NPDES notification letter to all active sites.</p>
Industrial/ Commercial Owners and Operators	<p>Outreach events conducted: Conducted inspections at 423 businesses and provided educational brochures and written inspection notices at each active facility.</p>
Residential Community, General Public, Other Public Agencies and Students	<p>Number of Media Impressions in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newspaper: Refer to watershed report • Mailings: All outreach activities took place through hand-deliveries. • Radio/TV: Refer to watershed report • Web Site: In place. The number of visitors is not documented. • Billboards: Refer to watershed report • Brochures: Distributed but not documented <p><u>Classroom Presentations Conducted:</u> The City contributes funds for NPDES-related presentations at elementary schools. These presentations are conducted by the Mission Resource Conservation District. 50 presentations were conducted at 6 elementary schools in Temecula during FY 2006-2007.</p>

	<u>Public Education Events Conducted:</u> Biannual Events - “City-Wide Cleanup” & “Household Hazardous Waste Collection”. Annual Events - Earth Day at the Promenade; Temecula Wine and Balloon Festival; SMR Watershed Cleanup.
--	--

2) Assessment of overall program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The following information represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing a series of baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the permit.

Total Staff Trained (collectively with other Permittees)				
	New Development	Construction	Municipal	Commercial/ Industrial
FY 2004-2005	23	39	24	1
FY 2005-2006	26	18	24	1
FY 2006-2007	⁽¹⁾	29	7 ⁽²⁾	⁽³⁾

(1) - 26 staff members attended training in the 2006 calendar year. The next set of workshops is scheduled for Nov and Dec 2007.

(2) - 27 staff members attended training in the 2006 calendar year. The next set of workshops is scheduled for Nov and Dec 2007.

(3) - The City contracted with AEI-CASC to conduct all business inspections. As such, municipal staff have not been required to participate in the business inspection workshops.

Although no formal in-house classroom-type workshops were conducted this reporting period, numerous informal training has been ongoing with staff on an individual and as-needed basis.

9.0 ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION PROGRAM

1) Number of illicit discharges, connections and spills reported and/or identified during the reporting period:

- a) Illicit Discharges (ID): 22 (based on Service Order Requests)
- b) Illicit Connections (IC): 0
- c) Sewage Spills (S): 2

2) Number of illicit discharges or connections investigated during the reporting period and the outcome of the investigations:

All of the SORs were addressed. The City did not receive any calls related to illicit connections.

3) Number and types of enforcement actions taken for illicit discharges or connections during the reporting period:

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	Private Facilities	Public Facilities
Non-monetary penalties	16	
Fines (Residential & Business)	6	
Total	22	0

4) Number of times City Hall was notified (calls, e-mail, walk-ins, etc.) during the reporting period, as compared to previous reporting periods.

	Number of Notifications		
	2003-04	2004-05	2006-07
NPDES SORs	74	24	41

5) Number and location of dry weather monitoring sites that were monitored during the reporting period:

Number of Site(s): The City of Temecula selected 4 sites that were monitored during the fiscal year’s dry-weather fall and spring seasons. These sites consist of the following locations:

1. Empire Creek at the Del Rio Bridge.
2. Pechanga Parkway stormdrain channel near the confluence into Temecula Creek.
3. Pechanga Creek at the Rainbow Canyon bridge.
4. Temecula Creek at the confluence into the upper reach of the Santa Margarita River.

In addition, the Riverside County Flood Control District has four separate sites throughout the City that are also monitored in like manner. These sites consist of the following locations:

1. Long Canyon Wash at the Commerce Center Drive bridge
2. Murrieta Creek at the USGS station at the end of Pujol street
3. Redhawk Parkway stormdrain channel near the confluence with Temecula Creek
4. Santa Gertrudis Creek at the Jefferson Avenue bridge.

As such, eight locations are monitored throughout the City of Temecula. The latest version of the City's Dry-Weather Illicit Discharge Monitoring Log is presented in Appendix E of the SWMP. The results of the field activities conducted during this reporting period are presented in Attachment F herein.

- 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:**

Date	Location	Monitoring Results	Follow-up and Elimination Activities	Proposed Changes
August 31, 2006	Primary Locations	No indications of illicit discharges	None	No Changes Comment(s):
June 15, 2007	Primary Locations	No indications of illicit discharges	None	No Changes Comment(s):

- 7) **Assessment of overall program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:**

Overall, all of the primary dry-weather monitoring locations were monitored, and all SORs were investigated. The City did not encounter any illicit discharges or connections into or at any of the monitoring locations, and all of the SORs resulted in either verbal or written warnings and citations that enforced the mitigation of each specific incident.

10.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1) A description of efforts to include the public in urban runoff management programs during the reporting period.

The City conducted various outreach efforts to the public this reporting period. The more visible programs included larger events consisting of community clean-up activities on November 11, 2006 and on May 19, 2007, a Household Hazardous Waste Collection Event on January 27, 2007, and the annual creek clean-up. The less visible programs included personal contact with the public regarding pollution prevention thru business inspections, responses to Service Order Requests, in-house meetings with project applicants, and field meetings with developers.

11.0 ASSESSMENT OF OVERALL SWMP EFFECTIVENESS

The SWMP continued to be implemented in its entirety this reporting period. Other than minor edits, each section provides enough detail to successfully implement each of the components of the permit.

12.0 FISCAL ANALYSIS

1) A summary of the reporting period's expenditures and an estimated budget for the upcoming reporting period.

Program Element	Fiscal Year 2005-2006		Fiscal Year 2006-2007		Fiscal Year 2007-2008 (Estimated)	
	Capital Expenditures	O&M/Admin Expenditure	Capital Expenditures	O&M/Admin Expenditure	Capital Expenditures	O&M/Admin Expenditure
Program Management ⁽¹⁾	--	116,196	--	118,261	--	122,747
Annual Fee for NPDES Permit from SWRCB	--	9,609 (actual invoice)	--	11,109 (actual invoice)	--	14,813
Implementation Agreement (I.A.) Shared Cost	--	130,147	--	129,769	--	130,173
Construction Inspections ⁽²⁾	--	60,635	--	62,798	--	63,163
Development Planning (WQMP reviews) ⁽³⁾	--	11,054	--	12,224	--	10,000
Industrial and Commercial Inspections ⁽⁴⁾	--	24,650	--	51,791	--	70,000
IC/ID Program	--	1,000	--	1,000	--	1,000
Municipal Programs (PW Maint) ⁽⁵⁾	--	250,000	--	150,000 (Dryer than average Wet-Weather Season)	--	250,000
Municipal Programs (TCSD) ⁽⁶⁾	--	5,885,545	--	6,381,136	--	7,134,931
Public Outreach (i.e. classrooms, brochures, etc.)	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.
Monitoring Program	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.
Other ⁽⁷⁾	--	5,000	--	15,000	--	15,000
Total ⁽⁸⁾		\$608,291		\$551,952		\$676,896
Grand Total	\$ 0	\$6,493,836	\$ 0	\$6,933,088	\$ 0	\$7,811,827

- Notes:
- (1) This cost reflects program administrator time.
 - (2) This cost reflects NPDES inspector time plus 10K vehicle expenses
 - (3) This cost reflects out-sourced WQMP reviews
 - (4) This cost reflects out-sourced inspection services
 - (5) This cost reflects drainage channel clearing, catchbasin maintenance, and stenciling.
 - (6) This cost reflects the operating budgets for refuse/recycling, street sweeping, landscape/slope programs through Temecula Community Services District.
 - (7) This cost reflects staff's time for formal classroom training, conferences, inspection forms, citation books, mailings, etc.
 - (8) This total does not include the refuse/recycling, street sweeping, landscape/slope programs.

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	Percent of Program Funding	Restrictions on Use (if applicable)
General Fund	96	Allocations to other departments and divisions.
WQMP Review Fees	4	

13.0 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 SWMP Annual Report.

Category	Prohibited	BMP to be Implemented
Diverted stream flows	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Rising ground waters	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Uncontaminated ground water infiltration [as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)] to MS4s	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Uncontaminated pumped ground water	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Foundation drains	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Springs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Water from crawl space pumps (Identified as a source of pollutants when commingled with construction-related sediment).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Footing drains	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Air conditioning condensation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Water line flushing. (Identified as a source of pollution when commingled with construction-related sediment).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Landscape irrigation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Discharges from potable water sources not subject to NPDES Permit No. CAG679001, other than water main breaks. (Identified as a source of pollutants when commingled with construction-related sediment).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Irrigation water	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Lawn watering	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Individual residential car washing	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Non-emergency fire fighting flows	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable
Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not Applicable

14.0 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.”

Not Applicable. The City has not received any indications of exceedances to an applicable water quality standard in this area during the reporting period. Please refer to the watershed monitoring data report for a detailed review of the monitoring data.

15.0 SUMMARY OF 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 City of Temecula did not conduct any special investigations during this reporting period.

16.0 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SWMP

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.

There were no revisions to the City's SWMP during this reporting period. Attachment G includes the list of revisions that were provided previously for the FY 2005-2006 reporting period as an example. This list will eventually show a cumulative summary of all revisions to the SWMP since the full implementation of all components of the third-term permit.

ATTACHMENT A

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROGRAM

- List of Grading Permits
 - List of WQMPs
- Example of Final Conditions of Approval
 - NPDES Training Log

ATTACHMENT B

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

- Monthly Tally of NPDES Inspections
- Annual Letter to Development Community
- NPDES Inspection Frequency Sheet

ATTACHMENT C

MUNICIPAL PROGRAM

- Debris Tonnage Report
- Monthly Catch Basin Maintenance Log
- Monthly Stencil Log

ATTACHMENT D

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL PROGRAM

- Outreach Letter
- Letter from Property Management Company to Tenants

ATTACHMENT E

RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM

- Biannual “Inside Temecula” Newsletters
- Biannual “Guide to Leisure Activities”
- Biannual “City-Wide Clean-up” Flyers
- Biannual “Household Hazardous Waste Collection”
Flyers

ATTACHMENT F

ILLCIT DISCHARGE DETECTION PROGRAM

- Completed Dry-Weather Monitoring Log

ATTACHMENT G

REVISIONS TO THE SWMP

- SWMP Revisions List