



State Water Resources Control Board

To Interested Parties:

2012 - 2013 RISK LEVEL 2 ANNUAL REPORT FOR STORM WATER DISCHARGES ASSOCIATED WITH CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Annual Reports will be submitted electronically via SMARTS. To register to use SMARTS please visit <u>smarts.waterboards.ca.gov</u>.

For all questions please contact the Storm Water Section at (866) 563-3107 or by email at <u>stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Storm Water Section

FELICIA MARCUS, CHAIR | THOMAS HOWARD, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

State of California STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

2012-;2013 RISK LEVEL 2 ANNUAL REPORT

FOR

STORM WATER DISCHARGES ASSOCIATED WITH CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (RISK LEVEL 2)

Reporting Period July 1,2012 through June 30, 2013

In compliance with the Construction General Permit (CGP) an annual report is required to be submitted electronically via SMARTS by September 1 of each year. This document must be certified and signed, under penalty of perjury, by the appropriate official of your company.

If you have any questions, please contact your Regional Board Storm Water Permit Contact. The names, telephone numbers and e-mail addresses of the Regional Board contacts, as well as the Regional Board office addresses can be found at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/contact.shtml. To find your Regional Board information, match the first digit of your WDID number with the corresponding number that appears in parenthesis on the first line of each Regional Board office.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

A. Property Owner Information:

Site WDID No: 4 19C361045

Owner's Name: Defense Energy Support Center Physical Address: <u>8725 John J Kingman Road</u> City: Fort Belvoir Contact Person: <u>Matthew Young</u> e-mail: <u>Matthew.Young@dla.mil</u> <u>VA</u> Zip: 22060 Phone: 703-767-8309

B. Site Information:

Site Name: Defense Fuel Support Point	Contact Person: Mary Lucas		
Mailing Address: 15306 Norwalk	e-mail: Mary.Lucas@parsons.com		
City: Norwalk	State: CA Zip: 90650 Phone: 626-440-6032		

FORM 1 SPECIFIC INFORMATION

C. STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) [CGP Section XIV]								
	1. Has a SWPPP been prepared by a Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD) for the construction project?						t?	
		\mathbf{X}	YES			NO		
	2.	Does th	e SWPPP include a Construction Site Monitor	ring Prog	ram (CSI	MP) section/elen	nent?	
		\mathbf{X}	YES			NO		
	3.	Are the	se documents kept onsite?					
		X	YES			NO		
D.	<u>GC</u>	DOD SIT	E MANAGEMENT "HOUSEKEEPING"	[CGP At	tachme	ent D, Section	B]	
	1.	Were re	quired good site management "housekeeping	" measur	es for <u>co</u>	nstruction mater	<u>rials</u> fully im	plemented on-site?
		\mathbf{X}	YES		NO			NA
		a. Wa	s an inventory of the products used and/or ex	pected to	be used	l conducted?		
		X	YES		NO			
	2.	Were re	quired good site management "housekeeping	" measur	es for <u>wa</u>	aste managemer	<u>nt</u> fully imple	emented on-site?
		X	YES		NO			
		a. Is t	here a spill response and implementation eler	nent of th	ne SWPP	P?		
		X	YES		NO			
	3.	Were re impleme	quired good site management "housekeeping ented on-site?	" measur	es for <u>ve</u>	<u>hicle storage an</u>	d maintena	<u>nce</u> fully
		\times	YES		NO			
	4.	Were re	quired good site management "housekeeping	" measur	es for <u>la</u>	ndscape materia	<u>ls </u> fully impl	emented on-site?
		\mathbf{X}	YES		NO			ΝΑ
	5.	Was a l	ist of potential pollutant sources developed?	_				
		$ \mathbf{X} $	YES		NO			

6. Were good site management "housekeeping" measures to control air deposition of site materia operations implemented on-site?					te materials	s and from site	
		X	YES		NO		
E.	<u>NC</u>	<u>ON-STO</u>	RM WATER MANAGEMENT [CGP Atta	chment	D, Section C]		
	1.	Were n	neasures to control all non-storm water discha	arges duri	ng construction implem	ented?	
		\mathbf{X}	YES		NO		
	2.	Were v drainag	ehicles washed in such a manner as to preve ge systems?	nt non-sto	orm water discharges to	o surface w	aters or to MS4
			YES		NO	X	NA
	3.	Were s waters	treets cleaned in such a manner as to preven or MS4 drainage systems?	t unautho	rized non-storm water	discharges	from reaching surface
		X	YES		NO		
F.	<u>ER</u> 1.	ROSION Were re	CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on	t ion D] your site	?		
F.	<u>ER</u> 1.	XOSION Were re	<u>CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES	tion D] your site	? NO		
F. G.	<u>ER</u> 1.	COSION Were re X	<u>CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES <u>T CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sec	tion D] your site	? NO		
F. G.	<u>ER</u> 1. <u>SE</u> 1.	COSION Were re C COIMEN Were re	<u>CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES <u>T CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sec	tion D] your site	? NO e?		
F.	<u>ER</u> 1. <u>SE</u> 1.	COSION Were re C C C DIMEN Were re	<u>CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES <u>T CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Sec equired sediment controls fully implemented of YES	tion D] your site ction E] on your sit	? NO e? NO		
F.	ER 1. 1. 1.	COSION Were re C C C C C C Were re Were in	CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES T CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sec equired sediment controls fully implemented of YES	tion D] your site ction E] on your sit	? NO e? NO		
F.	ER 1. 1. 1. 2.	COSION Were re COMMENT Were re Were in Were in	CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES TCONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sec equired sediment controls fully implemented of YES mmediate access roads inspected on a daily b YES	tion D] your site ction E] on your sit asis?	? NO NO		
F.	ER 1. 1. 2.	COSION Were re C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sect equired erosion controls fully implemented on YES T CONTROLS [CGP Attachment D, Sec equired sediment controls fully implemented of YES mmediate access roads inspected on a daily b YES	tion D] your site ction E] on your sit asis?	? NO NO		

H. <u>RUN-ON AND RUN-OFF CONTROLS</u> [CGP Attachment D, Section F]

1. Was all site run-on and run-off effectively managed?

X	YES		NO
	-		-

2. If run-on from the surrounding area is believed to contribute to an exceedance of the NALs, was this documented and was the run-on monitored?

YES	NO	X	NA

I. RAIN EVENT ACTION PLAN (REAP) [CGP Attachment D, Section H]

1. Were REAPs developed 48 hours prior to all likely precipitation events (50% or greater probability of producing precipitation)?

	YES		NO
--	-----	--	----

2. Did the REAPs developed meet the minimum criteria listed in CGP Attachment D, Section H?

X	YES			NO	

3. Was a phase specific REAP (ex: grading and land development, streets and utilities, vertical construction, final landscaping & site stabilization) prepared for each likely precipitation event?

\times	YES				NO
----------	-----	--	--	--	----

J. INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR [CGP Attachment D, Section G]

Were all site inspections, maintenance, and repairs performed or supervised by a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP)?

NO

NO

\mathbf{X}	YES			

2. Were site inspections conducted weekly and at least once each 24-hour period during extended storm events?

X	YES		

3. Were post rain event inspections conducted?

NO

4. Do your inspection forms/ checklists meet the minimum criteria listed in CGP Attachment D, Section G.5?

\times	YES			NO

5. During any site inspection, were BMP inadequacies noticed?

YES (Provide description in Form 3)		NO
-------------------------------------	--	----

-4-

6. If BMP inadequacies were observed, did BMP repairs/replacement occur within 72 hours?

X YES	NO	
-------	----	--

K. VISUAL MONITORING [CGP Attachment D, Section I.3]

1. Were all storm water discharges that occurred at all discharge locations observed within 2 business days (48 hours) after each qualifying rain event (producing precipitation of ½ inch or more at the time of discharge?

	\mathbf{X}	YES		ΝΟ
2. disc	Were all harge?	storm water discharges that occurred from st	orage or	containment systems visually observed prior to
	X	YES		NO
3.	Were the	e time, date, and rain gauge reading recorded	for each	qualifying rain event?
	\mathbf{X}	YES		ΝΟ
4.	Within 2 compliar	business days (48 hours) prior to each predic ace with CGP Attachment D, Section I.3.e&f	ted qualit?	ying rain event, were visual inspections conducted
	X	YES		ΝΟ

in

5. Are all visual inspection records retained on-site?

\times	YES					NO
----------	-----	--	--	--	--	----

L. WATER QUALITY SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS [CGP Attachment D, Section I.4]

- 1. How many qualifying storm events (producing precipitation of ½ inch or more at the time of discharge) occurred this past reporting year? 2_____
- How many qualifying storm events (producing precipitation of ½ inch or more at the time of discharge) were sampled?

Exp	lain Un-sampled events:					
-						
3.	For the sampled events, did you collect three sampled event?	es (repres	entative	of the flow and chara	acteristics) each	day of
	YES	X	NO		NA	

4. Were grab samples analyzed for pH and turbidity? (Analytical data must be entered in the **RAW DATA** tab in SMARTS)

X	YES		NO		NA
---	-----	--	----	--	----

	5.	Were A	ctive Treatment System (AT	rs) effluent samples take	en? (Applies to	projects that dep	loyed ATS)	
			YES		NO	X	NA	
М.	<u>NO</u>	N-STO	RM WATER DISCHARG	<u>E MONITORING</u> [CG	P Attachme	nt D, Section I.1	10]	
	1.	Were a Form 2	II drainage areas monitored)	for authorized/ unauthor	rized non-storr	n water discharges	s quarterly?	(Complete
		\mathbf{X}	YES		NO			
	2.	Did visu	ual observations indicate an	y authorized/ unauthoriz	ed non-storm	water discharges?		
			YES	X	NO Skip t	o next Section		
	3.	Were e entered	ffluent samples taken of the I in the RAW DATA tab in S	authorized/ unauthorize MARTS)	ed non-storm w	vater discharge? (A	Analytical da	ta must be
			YES		NO Skip t	o next Section	\mathbf{X}	NA
	4.	Were th Service	ne effluent samples sent to a s?	a laboratory certified for	such analyses	by the State Depa	artment of H	ealth
			YES		NO		\mathbf{X}	NA
	5.	Were u	nauthorized non-storm wate	er discharges eliminated?	?			
		YE	S		NO		\mathbf{X}	NA
N.	NO	N-VISIE	BLE POLLUTANT MONI	TORING [CGP Attac	hment D, Se	ction I.11]		
	1.	Were a	ny breaches, malfunctions,	leakages, or spills obser	ved during a v	isual inspection?		
			YES	\boxtimes	NO Skip t	o next Section		
	2.	How ma	any potential discharges of r	non-visible pollutants we	re identified?	0		
	3.	For each Sectior	h discharge event (of non-v n I.11.d? (Analytical data m	isible pollutants), were s ust be entered in the RA	amples collec W DATA tab	ted in compliance in SMARTS)	with CGP At	ttachment D,
			YES		NO	X	NA	
	4.	For eac with the	th discharge event was a co pollutant)? (Analytical data	mparison sample collect a must be entered in the	ted (uncontam RAW DATA ta	inated sample that ab in SMARTS)	t did not con	ne into contact
			YES		NO	X	NA	

О.	D. WATERSHED MONITORING [CGP Attachment D, Section I.12]										
	1.	Are you	ı part of a qualifie	d regional watershe	d-based	monitorin	ig program a	approved by	/ the Regio	nal Water Boa	rd?
			YES			X	NO				
Ρ.	<u>RE</u>	CORDS	6 [CGP Attachr	nent D, Section I	.14]						
	1.	Are all r	records of all stor	m water monitoring	informat	ion retain	ed on-site?				
		X	YES				NO				
Q.	NA		EDANCES (CO	GP Attachment D). Secti	on I.151					
	1.	Were a	ny Numeric Actio	on Levels (NALs) e	xceedeo	1?					
			VES			NO Ski	n to nevt Se	ction			
			120								
	2.	Were co	orrective actions	taken to address the	e NAL ex	ceedance	es?				
		X	YES			NO			NA		
		If YES,	please provide in	formation about the	correcti	ve actions	s taken on F	orm 3			
	3.	Were a 10 days	nalytical results fr	om any/all NAL exc sion of the storm eve	eedance ent?	es submitt	ed electroni	cally to the	State Wate	er Board no late	er than
		X	YES			NO			NA		
	4.	Were a	ny NAL Exceeda	nce Reports submitt	ed to the	e Regiona	I Water Boa	ırd?			
			YES		X	NO					
	*Sect	tion R - I	Not applicable to	o Risk Level 2							
,	Sect	ion S - N	 Iot annlicable to	Risk I evel 2							
	0000										
_											
Ι.	<u>TR</u>	AINING	- 								
	1.	Was a (Qualified SWPPP	Practitioner (QSP)	in reaso	nable cha	arge of SWP	PP implem	entation?		
			YES			NO Waltors					
	If Y	es , Provi 2675	ide Name and Ce	ertificate Number: J	osepn	vvaileis					
	23	5013									

2. Were all individuals conducting BMP installation, inspection, maintenance and repairs trained appropriately?

X	YES		NO
---	-----	--	----

3. Are complete training records kept on-site and available upon request?

X	YES	
---	-----	--

ANNUAL REPORT 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, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information submitted is, 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.

Printed Name: Matthew Young

Signature: _____ Date: 09/04/2013

Title:

DESCRIPTION OF ANALYTICAL PARAMETERS

The Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit (General Permit) requires you to analyze storm water samples for at least two parameters. These are pH and turbidity. In addition, you must monitor for any other pollutants which you believe to be present in your storm water discharge (i.e. non-visible pollutants) as a result of construction site materials.

pH (required) - is a numeric measure of the hydrogen-ion concentration. The neutral, or acceptable, range is within 6.5 to 8.5 (Numeric Action Level-NAL range). At values less than 6.5, the water is considered acidic; above 8.5 it is considered alkaline or basic. The Numeric Effluent Limitation (NEL) for pH is 6.0-9.0. An example of an acidic substance is vinegar, and an alkaline or basic substance is liquid antacid. Pure rainfall tends to have a pH of a little less than 7. There may be sources of materials or construction activities which could increase or decrease the pH of your storm water discharge.

Turbidity (required) - is the cloudiness of water quantified by the degree to which light traveling through a water column is scattered by the suspended organic and inorganic particles it contains. The turbidity test is reported in Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) or Jackson Turbidity Units (JTU). The NAL for turbidity in this General Permit is 250 NTU. The NEL is 500 NTU

Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC) - is the measure of the concentration of suspended solid material in a water sample by measuring the dry weight of all of the solid material from a known volume of a collected water sample. Results are reported in mg/L.

Benthic Macroinvertebrate Bioassessment – evaluation of animals without backbones, living in or on sediments or other substrates, of a size large enough to be seen by the unaided eye, and which can be retained by a U.S. Standard No. 30 sieve (28 openings per inch, 0.595-mm openings) to assess the biological conditions (health) of a waterbody.

See Storm Water Contacts at

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterboards_map.shtml

FORM 2- VISUAL OBSERVATIONS OF <u>AUTHORIZED</u> & <u>UNAUTHORIZED</u> NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES (NSWDs)

* Dry weather visual observations are required of each authorized NSWD.

• Make additional copies of this form as necessary.

• Observe each authorized NSWD source, impacted drainage area, and discharge location.

U. AUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED

WERE ANY <u>AUTHORIZED</u> NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM JULY-SEPTEMBER?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	NO
WERE ANY <u>AUTHORIZED</u> NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM OCTOBER-DECEMBER?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	NO
WERE ANY <u>AUTHORIZED</u> NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM JANUARY-MARCH?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	NO
WERE ANY <u>AUTHORIZED</u> NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM APRIL-JUNE?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	NO

V. UNAUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED

WERE ANY UNAUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM JULY-SEPTEMBER?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	⊠ NO
WERE ANY UNAUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM OCTOBER-DECEMBER?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	⊠ NO
WERE ANY UNAUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM JANUARY-MARCH?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	NO
WERE ANY UNAUTHORIZED NSWDs DISCHARGED OBSERVED FROM APRIL-JUNE?	YES (If Yes, fill out side 2)
	K NO

ANNUAL REPORT

FORM 2 - QUARTERLY VISUAL OBSERVATIONS OF <u>AUTHORIZED</u> NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES (NSWDs)

Quarter	Date/Time(HH:MM)	Source and Location of Authorized NSWD	Name of Authorized NSWD	Authorized NSWD Characteristics at Source	Authorized NSWD Characteristics at Drainage Area and Discharge Location	Revised or New BMPs Description and Implementation Date
July - Sept						
Oct - Dec						
Jan - Mar						
Apr - Jun						

ANNUAL REPORT

FORM 2 - QUARTERLY VISUAL OBSERVATIONS OF <u>UNAUTHORIZED</u> NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES (NSWDs)

Quarter	Date/Time(HH:MM)	Source and Location of Unauthorized NSWD	Name of Unauthorized NSWD	Unauthorized NSWD Characteristics at Source	Unauthorized NSWD Characteristics at Drainage Area and Discharge Location	Revised or New BMPs Description and Implementation Date
July - Sept						
Oct - Dec						
Jan - Mar						
Apr - Jun						

ANNUAL REPORT

FORM 3

July-Sept Quarter	Oct-Dec Quarter	Jan-March Quarter?	April-June Quarter
		Due primarily to an extended project schedule, the project changed from a Risk Level 1 to Risk Level 2 as of the 1/14/2013 SWPPP update. This change in Risk Level affected modifications in monitoring requirements. Loose soil observed close to roadway. Created sand bag berm and added gravel to transition points. Installed filter fabric on grate of storm drain drop inlet.	

ANNUAL REPORT

EXPLANATIONS SPECIFIED FOR VARIOUS YES/NO QUESTIONS IN THE REPORT

Explanation Question	Explanation Text
L3	Limited rainfall occurred during relatively short rainfall duration periods. In addition, the primary sample point only allows for a representative sample to be obtained within a catch basin drop inlet. Although a clean 5-gallon capacity bucket is used to capture a representative sample, the site experienced very limited runoff and sample volume accumulation for the two more significant rain events. Again, due to limited rainfall durations, attempts to obtain subsequent samples during the same rain event were unsuccessful.

Attachments:

Attachment Title	Description	Date Uploaded	Attachment Type	Doc Part No/Total Parts