Chapter 2

Partnership Activities

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter describes activities conducted and financed jointly by the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

This Chapter is formatted to follow the organization and presentation of activities/tasks in the 2008-2013 Work Plans submitted as part of the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan dated November 2009 and adopted by the Regional Water Board on January 29, 2010 (SQIP).

Structure

This Chapter is divided into the following Sections:

- Section 2.1 – Introduction
- Section 2.2 – Program Management
- Section 2.3 – Program Effectiveness
- Section 2.4 – Monitoring Program
- Section 2.5 – Target Pollutants Program
- Section 2.6 – Regional Public Outreach Program
- Section 2.7 – Regional Commercial/Industrial Program

Within each Section, the information is presented as follows:

- Element Introduction
- Element Activities
- Element Effectiveness Assessment
- Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes
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County of Sacramento

SACRAMENTO STORMWATER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP

2015/2016 REGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS082597

CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Title 40, Section 122.22, Paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(1) and (d) of the Code of Federal Regulations

“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 a fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.”

[Signature]
Date: 9/28/16

MICHAEL L. PETERSON, Director
Department of Water Resources
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SACRAMENTO STORMWATER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP

2015/2016 REGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT

NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS082597

CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Title 40, Section 122.22, Paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(1) and (d) of the Code of Federal Regulations

"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 a fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Date: 9/28/16

Dan Sherry, Engineering Manager
Department of Utilities
City of Sacramento
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2015/2016 REGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS082597

CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Title 40, Section 122.22, Paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(1) and (d) of the Code of Federal Regulations

"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 a fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Date: 9/29/16

Brian Fragiao, Engineering Services Manager
SACRAMENTO STORMWATER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP

2015/2016 REGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS082597

CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Title 40, Section 122.22, Paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(1) and (d) of the Code of Federal Regulations

"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 a fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Executed on the 28th day of September, 2016,

At Folsom, California.

[Signature]

David E. Miller, AICP
Public Works/Community Development Director
City of Folsom
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SACRAMENTO STORMWATER QUALITY PARTNERSHIP

2015/2016 REGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
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CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Title 40, Section 122.22, Paragraphs (a)(3), (b)(1) and (d) of the Code of Federal Regulations

“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 a fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.”

Albert Stricker, Public Works Director

Date: 9.29.16
2.2  Regional Program Management

Element Introduction

The Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) was established to coordinate the Sacramento Areawide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (Stormwater Permit) compliance activities throughout the Permittees’ jurisdictional areas with the objective of improving water quality in receiving waters identified in the Stormwater Permit, including urban creeks, the Sacramento River and the American River.

The permittees entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that formalizes the manner in which the permittees address common issues, promote consistency among each Permittees’ stormwater programs, coordinate resources related to regional activities, and plan and coordinate activities required to comply with the Stormwater Permit. The MOU includes a cost-share percentage (based on population) for each Permittee for regional activities (also referred to as Partnership or joint activities). A Steering Committee, consisting of representatives designated by each Permittee, was established to provide a forum for making decisions and providing guidance to the Permittees relative to the implementation of regional activities.

Regional activities include the Monitoring Program, the Target Pollutant Program, Regional Public Outreach, the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program and Overall Program Effectiveness Assessments. Permittee-specific activities conducted in addition to regional activities are described in each agency’s Annual Report.

Element Activities

As required by the Permit, SQIP and Annual Work Plan, the following activities were performed under this element.

PM.1 Program Management

PM.1.1 Conduct Steering Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.3.e</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Steering Committee oversees Partnership permit compliance activities and provides leadership for implementation of the regional activities. The Permittees coordinate and make decisions through regular meetings of this Steering Committee and via electronic mail and telephone. The Steering Committee meets every other month. Some typical agenda items for the 2015/2016 fiscal year included joint budget updates, Region-wide MS4 Permit coordination and comments, regional monitoring activities, Delta Regional Monitoring Program updates, Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (EMD) coordination, Proposition 1 Stormwater Resource Plan update and grant coordination, regional outreach, annual report and work plan development, target pollutant reduction strategies (e.g., methylmercury and pesticides), 2016 Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) development, new development/redevelopment standards coordination and Federal and Statewide policies or programs (e.g., Trash Amendments, Waters of the United States (WOTUS), CA Water Fix, etc.).
Program Management Partnership Activities

PM.1.2 Submit Permittees’ Partnership (Regional) Activities Work Plan including the Monitoring Plan

PERMIT REFERENCE  PERFORMANCE STANDARD
D.3.a, MRP I.A  N/A

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

The Permittees’ 2016/2017 Regional Work Plan was submitted to the Regional Water Board on April 29, 2016. The Regional Work Plan included the activities for Program Management, the Monitoring Program, Target Pollutant Program, Regional Public Outreach and the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program. The effectiveness assessment approach for those regional activities was based on the 2007 CASQA Program Effectiveness Guidance Document. On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities) is required.

PM.1.3 Submit Permittees’ Partnership (Regional) Annual Report

PERMIT REFERENCE  PERFORMANCE STANDARD
D.3.b, D.29.a, MRP I.B  N/A

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership’s 2014/2015 Annual Report was submitted to the Regional Water Board on October 1, 2015.

PM.1.4 Conduct Partnership Work Plan assessment activities and report in the Partnership (Regional) Annual Report

PERMIT REFERENCE  PERFORMANCE STANDARD
D.2.b, D.3.b  N/A

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

This section describes the activities conducted during the fiscal year demonstrating assessment at Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities). The Program Management section does not have any assessments of key indicators and other activities that will be evaluated at Effectiveness Level 2 (raising awareness) and above during the permit term.
PM.1.5 Conduct the Regional Activities’ Annual Fiscal Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

Table 2.2-1 below presents an estimated summary of the expenditures incurred in the 2015/2016 fiscal year and the proposed 2016/2017 budget related to the regional activities of the Partnership. The Fiscal Summary does not include permittee staff costs. See the permittee-specific annual reports for the fiscal summaries for each individual agency and their funding source.

Table 2.2-1. Fiscal Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Programs</th>
<th>2015/2016 Expenditures ($)</th>
<th>2016/2017 Budget ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Program/Special Studies/Target Pollutant Program</td>
<td>$465,581</td>
<td>$772,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Public Outreach Program</td>
<td>$244,140</td>
<td>$333,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial/Industrial Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development Element</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$709,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,190,040</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2-2 below presents a summary of the joint authorizations that were executed during the 2015/2016 fiscal year for regional activities conducted during the 2015/2016 fiscal year per the MOU.

Table 2.2-2. Joint Authorization Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Authorization Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Budget Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY16-MP-01</td>
<td>Storm Water Monitoring – FY15/16 (LWA)</td>
<td>548,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-MP-02</td>
<td>Storm Water Monitoring – FY 15/16 CMP River Monitoring Data Management (SRCSD)</td>
<td>23,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-MP-03</td>
<td>Delta Regional Monitoring Program FY 15/16 Contribution</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-TP-01</td>
<td>CASQA Pesticide Reduction Program</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-TP-02</td>
<td>Pesticides Regulatory Assistance (ARC)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-PO-01</td>
<td>Media Placement (ProProse)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-PO-02</td>
<td>IPM Consultants and supplies (OWOW)</td>
<td>40,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-PO-03</td>
<td>Splash in the Class – Classroom Presentations</td>
<td>39,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-PO-04</td>
<td>Promotional Items</td>
<td>10,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-PO-05</td>
<td>SSQP “Sammy the Salmon” Brochures</td>
<td>4,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14-PO-04</td>
<td>Public Opinion Survey (FY14, FY15, FY16)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$898,443</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PM.1.6 Participate in the Region-wide MS4 Permit Stakeholder and work group meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

County and City of Sacramento staff actively participated on the Region-wide MS4 Permit Stakeholder Work Group throughout the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Regional Water Board Work Group Meetings were held on August 4, September 16, November 3, 2015 and January 11, 2016. The Regional Board held a public workshop on April 6, 2016 and an adoption hearing on June 23, 2016. This permit, General Permit for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (Order No. R5-2016-0040, NPDES No. CAS0085324) was adopted on June 23, 2016 and will be effective on October 1, 2016.

Element Effectiveness Assessment

The previous section described activities conducted during the fiscal year demonstrating assessment at Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities). On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required. The overall effectiveness of the SQIP and the individual Elements in reducing stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable, achieving compliance with water quality standards in receiving waters, and meeting performance standards was provided in the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013.

Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes

Work Plan Task Completion Summary

All tasks in the Regional Program Management section were completed per the Annual Work Plan.

Work Plan and/or SQIP Revisions and Changes

The Report of Waste Discharge and LTEA submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013 included SQIP amendments in the form of proposed 5-year Work Plans for each Program and Element for the next permit term. The Partnership plans to consider the key recommendations from the LTEA and the proposed 5-year work plans when developing the prioritized pollutant list, reasonable assurance analysis and updated SQIP (i.e., Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)) as a part of the new Region-wide MS4 Permit. There are no changes recommended to the 2016/2017 Regional Activities Annual Work Plan.
2.3 Program Effectiveness

Introduction

The Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) assesses the effectiveness of its program as required by the Sacramento Areawide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (Stormwater Permit), Provision 29, in order to:

- Demonstrate compliance with the Sacramento Areawide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (Stormwater Permit) in reducing pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) and ensuring that these discharges do not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards established for local rivers and creeks
- Track the long-term progress of the SQIP toward achieving improvements in receiving water quality
- Provide the data and feedback needed to improve the SQIP and identify new activities or modify existing activities in order to continuously improve upon meeting the above MEP and water quality standard goals of the Stormwater Permit

The Partnership’s Stormwater Permit expired on September 11, 2013, was administratively extended through the submittal of the 2013 ROWD and subsequently renewed for a limited term (Limited Term Permit). Reissuance of a full-term Stormwater Permit was delayed to allow for the Regional Water Board to develop a Region-wide Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) Permit (effective October 1, 2016). The Partnership plans to consider the key recommendations from the LTEA and the proposed 5-year work plans when developing the prioritized pollutant list, reasonable assurance analysis and updated SQIP (i.e., Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)) as a part of the new Region-wide MS4 Permit.

Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required.
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2.4 Monitoring Program

Element Introduction

The Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) Monitoring Program member agencies work jointly to comply with the requirements of the Sacramento Area-wide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit, Order No. R5-2015-0023, NPDES No. CAS082597, (Stormwater Permit) Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) and to demonstrate the effectiveness of the overall Partnership Program. Section 2.4 of the Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP) describes the monitoring activities to satisfy the MRP requirements and to evaluate effectiveness of the overall Partnership Program. Specifically, the Partnership uses monitoring data to achieve the following objectives:

- Assess water quality in urban runoff and receiving waters (rivers and creeks) and identify potential problems
- Identify pollutants and help identify key pollutant sources
- Investigate observed and reported problems in local waterways and help identify sources of the problems
- Evaluate the effectiveness of selected Best Management Practices (BMPs) and control measures
- Assess the effectiveness of the overall Partnership Program by tracking water quality changes and evaluating trends over time
- Adjust future monitoring efforts to provide the most useful data in the most cost-effective manner.

The Monitoring Program activities are completed and the data are analyzed according to the Work Plan schedule to answer the 2009 SQIP Section 2.4-2 management questions and to assess program effectiveness at outcome levels 4 through 6. The data analysis also assists in selection of program, permittee-specific and Target Pollutant Program, Section 2.5, activities. The Monitoring Program objectives are achieved through the following activities: Receiving Water Monitoring (river, urban tributary, water column toxicity, sediment), Urban Runoff (Discharge) Monitoring, Special Studies, Dry Weather Monitoring Analysis, and Reporting and Effectiveness Evaluation.

For the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the receiving water river monitoring was not required in lieu of participating in the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) per the August 3, 2015 letter from the Regional Water Board.

As part of the 2015/2016 Regional Monitoring Program Work Plan, the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP) submitted an alternative monitoring program, which was approved by the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board. The alternative monitoring plan included participation in the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (Delta RMP) and a pilot study to be conducted during the 2015/2016 fiscal year utilizing continuous sensors at a long-term urban tributary (Arcade Creek at Watt Avenue) monitoring location and a long-term urban runoff discharge (North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4) monitoring location.

Table 2.4-1 summarizes all monitoring activities for the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Figure 2.4-1 is a map of the current monitoring stations.

---


Table 2.4-1. 2015/2016 Monitoring Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/26/2016</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

■ = sampling event completed

[1] River sampling was not required because of participation in the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP)
[2] Not required in stormwater permit
[3] Sampling was not performed due to limited precipitation and runoff
[4] Sampling was not performed, since this was a make-up event for the missed 10/17/2015 event at the North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4.
[5] As part of the Alternative Monitoring Program the Urban Tributary site was limited to Arcade Creek at Watt and the Urban Runoff Discharge monitoring was limited to North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4. Monitoring was supplemented at these sites beyond Limited-Term permit requirements to include continuous sensors and pilot evaluation of composite sample collection event mean concentration measurements.
Figure 2.4-1. 2015/2016 Monitoring Sites
Element Activities

As required by the Permit, SQIP and Annual Work Plan, the following activities were performed under this element.

MP.1 Receiving Water Monitoring

MP.1.1 Participate and fund Delta Regional Monitoring Plan (RMP) receiving water monitoring activities for FY 15/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP II.B.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

For the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the receiving water river monitoring was not required in lieu of participating in the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) per the August 3, 2015 letter from the Regional Water Board (Appendix 2.4-I).

MP.1.2 Pilot continuous sensors at Arcade creek or other historical urban tributary site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP II.B.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership collected urban tributary water column grab samples for the constituents listed in Table B of the Stormwater Permit at Arcade Creek (see Figure 2.4-1 and Table 2.4-2). Samples were collected for three wet weather events and one dry weather event in the 2015/2016 fiscal year. See Table 2.4-1 for a summary of the 2015/2016 fiscal year monitoring events. The rising limb or peak of the hydrograph is targeted for sample collection. The Partnership installed continuous data sensors for stage, temperature, electrical conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and fDOM. An automated sampler was also installed to collect “microsamples” as a pilot study evaluation of compositing techniques. The Partnership collected water column samples for the input parameters to the Biotic Ligand Model (BLM), a site specific water quality objective model for copper and potentially other metals. The Partnership was not required to collect sediment samples in 2015/2016. A complete report of all events and activities, including analytical results, is included as Appendix 2.4-B: 2015/2016 Sacramento Stormwater Permit Characterization Monitoring Report and Alternative Monitoring Pilot Study Report (Part 2. Appendix F includes all lab reports).
Table 2.4-2. Urban Tributary Monitoring Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creek</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Downstream Water Body</th>
<th>Description of Site Location and Upstream Land Use</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcade Creek</td>
<td>Watt Ave., Sacramento (AC03)</td>
<td>Natomas East Main Drain</td>
<td>The tributary watershed is highly urbanized with predominantly older development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MP.2 Urban Runoff (Discharge) Monitoring

MP.2.1 Pilot continuous sensors at Natomas Basin #4 or other historical urban discharge site

PERMIT REFERENCE
MRP II.C.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD
N/A

The Partnership collected urban discharge monitoring water column grab samples for the constituents listed in Table B of the Stormwater Permit at the North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (see Figure 2.4-1 and Table 2.4-3). Samples were collected for three wet weather events and one dry weather event in the 2015/2016 fiscal year. See Table 2.4-1 for a summary of the 2015/2016 fiscal year monitoring events. The Partnership installed continuous data sensors for stage, temperature, electrical conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and fDOM). An automated sampler was also installed to collect “microsamples” as a pilot study evaluation of compositing techniques. A complete report of all events and activities, including analytical results, is included as Appendix 2.4-B: 2015/2016 Sacramento Stormwater Permit Characterization Monitoring Report and Alternative Monitoring Pilot Study Report (Part 2. Appendix F includes all lab reports).

Table 2.4-3. Urban Discharge Monitoring Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Downstream Water Body</th>
<th>Description of Site Location and Upstream Land Use</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 Outlet</td>
<td>East Drainage Canal</td>
<td>The drainage area is a 470 acre residential development in North-West Sacramento.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MP.3 Water Column Toxicity

No tasks required for the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

MP.4 Sediment Monitoring

No tasks required for the 2015/2016 fiscal year.
**MP.5 Bioassessment Monitoring**

No tasks required for the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

**MP.6 Water Quality-Based Programs**

**MP.6.1 Additional pesticides monitoring to be determined after TMDL adoption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP.G.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

No new pesticide monitoring was required in the 2015/2016 Work Plan.

**MP.7 Additional Mercury and Methylmercury Analyses**

**MP.7.1 Complete the Delta Methylmercury TMDL Phase 1 evaluation Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP.G.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

As part of the Delta Methylmercury Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Phase 1 assessment, the Regional Water Board required the Partnership to develop a control study work plan to evaluate potential methylmercury control measures and feasibility of compliance with the TMDL wasteload allocation. The Partnership submitted the final work plan in April 2013 to satisfy this requirement and began sample collection for the Citrus Heights City Hall Green Parking Lot Grant Project funded by a Proposition 84 grant. A Phase I control study progress report based on this project was submitted to the Regional Water Board’s TMDL staff on October 20, 2015 (Appendix 2.4-K). The final Proposition 84 project report and the TMDL control study progress report proposed activities will be the basis for the TMDL final report due by October 20, 2018.

---

MP.8 Dry Weather Monitoring Analysis

**MP.8.1 Examine available dry weather monitoring results collected by the Permittees as grab or composite samples to identify water quality problems. Perform follow-up investigations if the examination indicates a need to investigate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.5.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership evaluates dry weather receiving water data as part of the event-based Notice of Water Quality Exceedance (NWQE) (Task MP.12.2) and in the year-end Report of Water Quality Exceedance (RWQE) (Task MP. 12.3). The 2015/2016 fiscal year dry weather monitoring event data for the urban tributaries did not identify any out-of-range results that led to new water quality objective exceedances and, as a result, follow-up activities were not necessary.

**MP.9 Annual Work Plan**

**MP.9.1 Submit Annual Work Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.3.a.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The 2016/2017 monitoring work plan was completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board on May 1, 2016. The submitted work plan included the previously approved participation in the Delta RMP in lieu of conducting local receiving water river monitoring.
MP.10 Annual Report

MP.10.1 Submit Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.3.b.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY INDICATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The 2014/2015 Annual Report was completed and submitted to the Regional Board on October 1, 2015.

MP.11 Standard Monitoring Provision Compliance


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP 1.B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY INDICATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership is committed to maintaining a Monitoring Program that provides reliable, accurate data that can be used as a measure of the current condition of the water resources in the Sacramento area and to determine the effectiveness of pollution control efforts. Standard Monitoring Program procedures ensure that data obtained are widely accepted as conforming to the best available methods: sample collection, sample transfer to laboratories for testing, laboratory testing, and review of the results including quality control. Quality control, in addition to quality assurance practices, has been incorporated to test the methodologies, laboratories, and quality assurance plans. This provides internal confidence of the results and a data set that is acceptable for use by outside parties. The Partnership generally prepares data to conform to the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPrP) standards through the historically used Data Quality Evaluation Plan (DQEP).

Sample Collection

All monitoring activities conform to sampling and analysis standards and protocols that are described in annually updated Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAPs). Sampling for the 2015/2016 Monitoring Program was conducted as prescribed in the sampling plans for each of the activities and are included in appendices to this report:

- 2015/2016 Sacramento Stormwater Permit Characterization Monitoring and Pilot Study Sampling and Analysis Plan, October 2015 (see Appendix 2.4-C)

The SAPs are updated prior to each monitoring year. crews are annually trained and required to attend refresher training on sample collection and handling protocols. The protocols are consistent with other regional monitoring programs and conform to state and national recommendations and requirements.

Sample Transfer

The SAPs outline chain of custody methods and requirements. In addition, transfer requirements for different samples are predetermined to ensure that the monitoring event is designed to allow adequate time for transportation and receipt of the samples at the laboratories.
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Laboratory Testing

The Partnership annually reviews laboratories to create a list of those certified for the various analysis methods and their respective ranking based on technical qualification and past experience. The Partnership uses the list developed to create the basis for laboratory selection and a list of substitute laboratories if needed. A summary of the laboratory evaluation process completed for the upcoming 2016/2017 monitoring year is included as Appendix 2.4-D. It is recommended to continue the rigorous review of analysis and reporting for organic carbon, metals, mercury, pyrethroid pesticides, orthophosphate (OP) pesticides, and low level polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH).

Quality Control

To ensure that the data obtained are valid and defensible, the Partnership has committed to a comprehensive quality control program. Each SAP describes specific quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) measures. The Partnership records the results from its quality control activities along with the environmental data. The Partnership maintains a more detailed list of qualifier data than included by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) guidance, yet is consistent with USEPA methods. The quality control procedures are detailed in a data quality evaluation plan (DQEP, see Appendix 2.4-E) and updated annually.

Permit Specified Requirements

The Monitoring Program activities comply with Standard Monitoring Provisions in Section IV of the Stormwater Permit’s MRP and are summarized below:

IV.A Samples and Measurements to be Representative

The Partnership collects samples in the following representative manner:

- Flow-weighted composite samples are collected when feasible and appropriate with automatic sampling equipment (USEPA protocols require the use of grab samples for certain constituents).
- Grab samples are taken at the rising limb of the hydrograph.
- Continuous monitoring with field parameter probes and telemetrically connected data loggers is performed at two of the urban tributary sites to characterize trends over time and better time grab sample collection.
- During river monitoring, a depth-integrated cross sectional composite is collected when feasible, except at American River at Nimbus where boat access is limited. Mid-stream depth integrated composites are collected sometimes given time constraints.
- Event data such as flow rate are recorded and linked to environmental data.
- The Partnership DQEP includes procedures to assess data accuracy, precision and overall representativeness.

IV.B Monitoring Records

The Partnership keeps records such as hard copy or electronically signed laboratory reports for the required retention period. The Partnership maintains a database of all laboratory analytical data, event data, and quality control results, including historical results, for internal and external use.

IV.C Monitoring Records Requirements

The Partnership keeps records of the following:

- Date, location, and time of sample
- Individual(s) collecting sample
- Date of analysis
- Laboratory or analyst
- Method of analysis
- Results of analysis
- Quality control records
IV.D Sampling Meets 40 CFR Part 136

The Partnership designs all sampling standard operating procedures to meet the 40 CFR 136 requirements. Additional analytical methods are used by the Partnership to meet the requirements of the MRP Table B for reporting limitation and method detection level.

IV.E False Results

The Partnership uses quality control methods and assessments to ensure conformance to data quality protocols and objectives and exclude false results, to the extent practicable.

IV.F Laboratory Certification

The Partnership reviewed laboratories to confirm their certification and previous reliability. The review concluded that laboratories used by the Partnership are reliable and state and/or USEPA certified.

IV.G ML and MDL analysis

The Partnership bases laboratory selection on ability to provide results consistent with necessary minimum levels (MLs) and method detection limits (MDLs) when feasible.

IV.H.1 Reporting of Concentrations above ML

The Partnership reports and maintains all sample results along with data qualifiers.

IV.H.2 Reporting of Concentrations at or Below ML and MDL

The Partnership reports laboratory analytical results in the following manner:

- The Partnership reports analytical results between the MDL and ML as “detected but not quantified” (DNQ).
- The Partnership reports analytical results less than the MDL as “not detected” at the MDL.
- Regardless of concentration all results are recorded and maintained.
- The Partnership employs statistical techniques that estimate the concentration at or below MDL for use in statistical analysis.
- The Partnership reviews laboratories to determine attainable ML values.
- The Partnership conducts a thorough review of laboratories each year to locate a lab that can meet the low reporting limits required. For some sample matrices, some pesticide and organic constituents cannot be reported at the Permit MLs.

IV.I Reporting Non-Permit Required Samples

The Partnership includes all data collected, enabling selection and design of effective measures that improve the water quality of the region. The Program maintains this data to help with future studies.

IV.J Arithmetic Mean unless otherwise noted

Partnership standard operating procedures report the statistical method used for analyzing sample result data. The Partnership uses arithmetic means where appropriate and possible, taking into account the occurrence of non-detect and unquantified values.

IV.L Changes to Monitoring Program

The Partnership works toward adapting the Monitoring Program to better reflect local conditions with the input of the Regional Board.
Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership's annual estimate of total discharged volume for the 2015/2016 fiscal year is 5.05 billion cubic feet, based on rainfall-runoff volume empirical relationships and previously reported estimates of dry weather runoff for the 2012 Sacramento County urban area, which was obtained from the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Table 2.4-4 summarizes the observed rainfall events and estimated discharge volumes based on the California State University Sacramento (CSUS) rainfall gage. The combined discharge for the rainfall events during the wet season was 2.87 billion cubic feet. The Partnership most recently updated the empirical models for estimating wet weather runoff volume discharge as part of the March 2013 Report of Waste Discharge. Dry weather discharge is based on per acre daily rates developed as part of the 1996 Discharge Characterization Report. Dry weather runoff in the wet season (October-April) is approximately 1.26 billion cubic feet and dry season runoff is 0.91 billion cubic feet.

Table 2.4-4. 2015/2016 Discharge Volume of Wet Weather Events as Determined by Rainfall Record (CSUS) and Estimated Discharge Volume for the Sacramento County Urban Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Event Start Time</th>
<th>Event End Time</th>
<th>Rainfall Event Duration (hr.)</th>
<th>Rainfall Amount (in.)</th>
<th>Estimated Discharge Volume (Million Cubic Feet MCF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/17/2015 2:00</td>
<td>10/17/2015 3:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>66.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/2/2015 2:00</td>
<td>11/2/2015 10:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>41.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/8/2015 10:00</td>
<td>11/8/2015 14:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>43.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11/9/2015 10:00</td>
<td>11/9/2015 17:00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11/15/2015 6:00</td>
<td>11/15/2015 11:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>54.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12/3/2015 13:00</td>
<td>12/3/2015 18:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>60.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12/13/2015 9:00</td>
<td>12/13/2015 12:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>82.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12/18/2015 20:00</td>
<td>12/19/2015 5:00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>103.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/4/2016 10:00</td>
<td>1/4/2016 12:00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1/5/2016 1:00</td>
<td>1/5/2016 13:00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>268.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1/6/2016 7:00</td>
<td>1/6/2016 15:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>58.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1/6/2016 20:00</td>
<td>1/7/2016 2:00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>58.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1/13/2016 3:00</td>
<td>1/13/2016 9:00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>35.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1/15/2016 23:00</td>
<td>1/16/2016 6:00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1/17/2016 15:00</td>
<td>1/18/2016 5:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>296.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1/19/2016 4:00</td>
<td>1/19/2016 12:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>188.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1/22/2016 6:00</td>
<td>1/22/2016 14:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1/22/2016 21:00</td>
<td>1/23/2016 2:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>24.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1/23/2016 11:00</td>
<td>1/23/2016 12:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1/29/2016 18:00</td>
<td>1/30/2016 3:00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>49.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2/17/2016 22:00</td>
<td>2/18/2016 7:00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>154.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MP.12.2 Notice of Water Quality Exceedance - Submit event-based notice of water quality exceedance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Event Start Time</th>
<th>Event End Time</th>
<th>Rainfall Event Duration (hr.)</th>
<th>Rainfall Amount (in.)</th>
<th>Estimated Discharge Volume (Million Cubic Feet MCF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3/4/2016 14:00</td>
<td>3/5/2016 4:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>96.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3/5/2016 9:00</td>
<td>3/6/2016 2:00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>248.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3/6/2016 20:00</td>
<td>3/7/2016 13:00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>132.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3/10/2016 15:00</td>
<td>3/10/2016 21:00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>80.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3/11/2016 5:00</td>
<td>3/11/2016 19:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>73.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3/12/2016 14:00</td>
<td>3/13/2016 1:00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>144.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3/13/2016 6:00</td>
<td>3/13/2016 20:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>54.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4/9/2016 9:00</td>
<td>4/9/2016 18:00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>22.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4/9/2016 23:00</td>
<td>4/10/2016 7:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>28.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4/22/2016 8:00</td>
<td>4/22/2016 13:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>71.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4/27/2016 17:00</td>
<td>4/28/2016 0:00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>129.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5/5/2016 17:00</td>
<td>5/5/2016 20:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>47.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5/20/2016 18:00</td>
<td>5/20/2016 21:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 299 14.88 2,868.09

Summary of Work Completed

NWQEs were prepared and submitted to the Regional Board following each event when comparisons to water quality objectives (WQOs) identified constituents that exceed WQOs as required by Section I.C. of the MRP section of the Permit. All NWQE reports for the 2015/2016 fiscal year are included as Appendix 2.4-F. Beginning in January 2003, water quality data from each monitoring event for receiving waters was compared with WQOs from the following sources as specified in the Permit:

- California Toxics Rule (CTR)
- Permit-specified WQOs (based on since-modified Department of Fish and Game objectives that were incorporated in Finding 65 of the Permit)
- Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River Watershed, and
- Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for chemical constituents (incorporated into the Basin Plan by reference for those waters that are used for drinking water supply)

Results for creek monitoring were compared against WQOs and considered in NWQEs. The Basin Plan does not specifically list beneficial uses for the tributaries; however, to be consistent with the Sacramento creek pesticide total maximum daily load (TMDL) and “tributary rule” policies, the downstream beneficial uses in the American and Sacramento Rivers are applied. The appropriateness of this policy for certain constituents and reaches should be carefully examined to determine if the beneficial use exists. Application of the “tributary rule” should also consider hydraulic dilution and in-stream water chemistry changes between the water body of interest and the downstream beneficial use. Downstream river receiving waters, where these beneficial uses are established, include vast volumes of watershed drainage that tend to “buffer” the relatively short duration and comparatively small (volumetrically) urban runoff event.
Exceedances reported in the original event-based NWQE were reviewed and updated where necessary. Table 2.4-5 summarize water quality objective exceedances at Arcade Creek.

Table 2.4-5. 2015/2016 Arcade Creek at Watt Avenue Exceedances of Water Quality Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>WQO</th>
<th>WQO Source</th>
<th>Included in NWQE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWCRK38 10/17/2015</td>
<td>Benzo(a)pyrene</td>
<td>0.0051 (^{GB})</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benzo(b)fluoranthene</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>0.0425</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Acute-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene</td>
<td>0.0234 (^{IL})</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escherichia coli</td>
<td>92000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Basin Plan</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>92000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>BP REC-1 Desig.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead - Dissolved</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinc - Dissolved</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Acute-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWCRK39 11/2/2015</td>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>0.0062 (^{IL})</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Acute-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>10 BP Table III-1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escherichia coli</td>
<td>160000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Basin Plan</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>540000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>BP REC-1 Desig.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron - Dissolved</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Title 22° MCL</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead - Dissolved</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWCRK40 1/18/2016</td>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.4 std units</td>
<td>6.5-8.5</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benzo(b)fluoranthene</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>CTR-HH water + org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Acute-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escherichia coli</td>
<td>110000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Basin Plan</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>110000</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>BP REC-1 Desig.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>7 BP (COLD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWCRK14 4/26/2016</td>
<td>Copper - Dissolved</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>CTR-FW AQ Chronic-Diss</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>7 BP (COLD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>BP REC-1 Desig.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron - Dissolved</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Title 22° MCL</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- WQO – water quality objective as specified in the NPDES permit
- NWQE – notice of water quality exceedance
- BP – Basin Plan
- REC – recreational use based objective
- CTR – California Toxics Rule
- FW AQ – freshwater aquatic life
- HH water + org only – human health based on consumption of water and organisms
- DNQ = Detected but not quantified
- GB = Matrix spike recovery outside of control limits
- IL = Laboratory replicate RPD exceeds control limit
### MP.12.3 Report of Water Quality Exceedances – Submit report of water quality exceedance as part of the Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.3.b.</td>
<td>Reduction in observed exceedances for RWQE constituents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership submits an annual RWQE that identifies constituents that exceed WQOs for the receiving water where urban runoff may cause or contribute to the exceedance. The MRP does not require the Partnership to repeat the RWQE process for recurring constituents unless directed to do so by the Regional Water Board.

The year-end RWQE considers the extent that urban runoff causes or contributes to the exceedances. The Partnership developed an assessment process as the Permit does not specify a method for this assessment. The Partnership updates and reports the process flow chart in this report as Appendix 2.4-G. Constituents that are addressed by a RWQE are included in the Target Pollutant analysis and prioritized accordingly as described in the November 2009 SQIP. Historical RWQE constituents are provided in Table 2.4-6.
Table 2.4-6. Historical Report of Water Quality Exceedance Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>RWQE Constituent</th>
<th>Control Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>Bacteriological indicators (Fecal Coliform and E. coli.)</td>
<td>Fecal Waste Reduction Strategy&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids and Specific Conductance (electrical conductivity/EC)</td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialzinon</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pesticide Plan&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)</td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Mercury Plan&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pentachlorophenol</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chlorpyrifos</td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>Gamma-hexachlorocyclohexane (gamma-BHC or Lindane) and Degradation By-Products</td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Lead Control Activities&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>General BMPs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sediment Strategy&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>No new constituents added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The proposed load reduction strategy is described in Section 2.9.7.1 of the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted as part of the March 2013 Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).

<sup>2</sup>General BMPs include: public and industrial outreach, erosion and sediment control, household hazardous waste programs, and new development BMPs


2015/2016 RWQE Constituents

Partnership monitoring in 2015/2016 resulted in the addition of no new constituents to the RWQE. Any constituents found at concentrations above relevant WQOs are already included in previous RWQEs or it cannot be demonstrated that urban runoff causes or contributes to the receiving water WQO exceedance. Appendix 2.4-G contains a flow chart of the RWQE identification process and Appendix 2.4-H includes a listing of the water quality objectives used for receiving water comparisons.

The Partnership annually reviews indicators of the frequency of exceedances to determine if there are noticeable changes. In the 2015/2016 fiscal year there was no significant change in trends for RWQE constituents.

A summary of constituents that exceeded WQOs in the 2015/2016 fiscal year and the rationale for not including the constituents in the 2015/2016 RWQE is presented in Table 2.4-7.

Table 2.4-7. Constituents Reported with Receiving Water Exceedances in 2015/2016 Fiscal Year and RWQE Listing Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents Above WQO in FY15/16</th>
<th>Creek Exceedance</th>
<th>River Exceedance</th>
<th>Previous RWQE</th>
<th>Reason for Not Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(a)pyrene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(b)fluoranthene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, dissolved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibenz(a,h)anthracene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Creek study and consideration of averaging periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.coli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal coliform</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, dissolved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not present in urban runoff concentrations exceeding water quality objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, dissolved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Creek study and consideration of averaging periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, dissolved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Previous RWQE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] River sampling was not required because of participation in the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP)

Receiving Water WQO Exceedances Not Requiring RWQE

Urban runoff could not be shown to cause or contribute to the receiving water dissolved iron WQO exceedances reported in the event-based NWQEs. Dissolved iron does not require a RWQE according to the Permit requirements, but is discussed below in light of current activities the Partnership performed or are planning.

**Dissolved Iron**

The Basin Plan (Table III-1) objective for dissolved iron (300 µg/L) in MUN designated waters of the State is based on incorporation of the Title 22, Table 64449-A (MCL). This WQO was exceeded during 2015/2016 fiscal year monitoring during two of the four events. Although the river sites were not assessed during this monitoring year, historically none of the river sites have had dissolved concentrations above the WQO for the duration of the monitoring program. This MCL is established to protect taste and odor of treated drinking water and is incorporated into the Basin Plan by reference. The historical downstream river concentrations were below the secondary MCL and are representative of what is observed at municipal drinking water intakes.
The November 2nd wet weather event and the April 26th dry weather event all had dissolved iron concentrations greater than the WQO. In the past 20 years only 5.0% of urban runoff samples exceeded this water quality objective. The Partnership implements BMPs that reduce total iron mass loading in urban runoff, and also benefit dissolved iron concentrations. The Wet Detention Basin Effectiveness Study demonstrated that dissolved iron is reduced in wet detention basins and concentrations were always less than the water quality objective.

Dissolved Oxygen and pH

Dissolved oxygen (DO) was measured below the Basin Plan limit of 7.0 mg/L during the 2015/2016 fiscal year in two of the four events. This WQO applies to waters of the State with "COLD" and "SPWN" beneficial use designations and more generally to areas within the legal boundary of the Delta including the Sacramento River downstream of the 'I' Street Bridge. For areas outside of the Delta, the Basin Plan requires that the monthly median of the daily average DO concentration be greater than 85% saturation and the 95th percentile of concentrations be greater than 75% saturation. The dissolved oxygen WQO is primarily based on protection of higher trophic level fish such as salmon, and it is not known if these fish are present in the urban tributaries. If year round data were considered, the urban tributaries would likely meet the DO requirements for water bodies outside of the Delta as wet season DO depression is often limited to short periods following wet weather events.

pH was measured outside of the Basin Plan acceptable range of 6.5-8.5 standard units for one of the four monitoring events during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.


The Phase I study was completed in the 2006/2007 fiscal year with continuous monitoring of several constituents (DO, pH, temperature, and turbidity) for much of the wet season at Laguna Creek, Willow Creek at Blue Ravine, and Morrison Creek at Brookfield.

The Phase II study targeted more specific conditions and included paired upstream-downstream monitoring on Morrison Creek. Removal of the concrete lining for long sections of Morrison Creek occurred during phases II and III.

The Phase III study confirmed that DO and pH depressions occurs sometimes following storm events, however, if longer term averaging periods are considered during the wet season, the urban tributaries meet downstream Basin Plan objectives. Results of this study were reported in the 2008/2009 fiscal year.

The Partnership continues to monitor DO and pH at the urban tributaries with grab sampling and continuous sensors during the wet season. Because no data indicate that urban runoff is directly causing DO or pH depression below applicable time averaged Basin Plan objectives, no RWQE is necessary at this time.

MP.12.4 Evaluate the alternate monitoring approach that replaces some urban discharge and urban tributary monitoring to better characterize water quality trends and the effectiveness of management programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRP II.B.2 and MRP II.C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

The Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board approved the alternate monitoring approach on August 3, 2015 (Appendix 2.4-J). The Partnership performed a pilot study and proof-of-concept evaluation of the use of...
sensors, grab sampling, and microsampling. High resolution (i.e., large number of observation) sensors for turbidity and a chromophoric dissolved organic matter (CDOM) sensor that measures fluorescent dissolved organic matter (fDOM) were used to evaluate the use of surrogate relationships for constituents of interest including methylmercury, fecal coliform, and total copper. The pilot study evaluated the use of “particle fractions” to account for variability due to solids and solids-attached concentrations. Finally, the pilot study evaluated the feasibility of using microsampling in place of flow-weighted composites as has been historically performed. Overall, the pilot study determined that all the methods were feasible tools for use in future water quality monitoring programs, but would need to be applied as appropriate to meet the requirements of any specific Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) or special study. The pilot study recommended continued collection of fDOM measurements and suspended sediment concentration to better understand surrogate relationships. The pilot study determined that there were insufficient data to determine that microsampling was a significantly better tool to enumerate event mean concentrations (EMCs); however, future requirements or changes in monitoring station configurations may justify implementation of this sample collection approach.

Element Effectiveness Assessment

On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required. The overall effectiveness of the SQIP and the individual Elements in reducing stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable, achieving compliance with water quality standards in receiving waters, and meeting performance standards was provided in the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013.

In general, effectiveness assessments using monitoring data to evaluate management actions requires longer periods of data (i.e., greater than five years), and complete updates to the assessments is not necessary annually. The Partnership updates data sets and evaluates the collected data for quality, exceedances of water quality objectives, and significant changes or out-of-range results.

Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes

Work Plan Task Completion Summary

All tasks in the Monitoring Program were completed per the 2015/2016 Annual Work Plan.

Work Plan and/or SQIP Revisions and Changes

The Report of Waste Discharge and LTEA submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013 included SQIP amendments in the form of proposed 5-year Work Plans for each Program and Element for the next permit term. The Partnership plans to consider the key recommendations from the LTEA and the proposed 5-year work plans when developing the prioritized pollutant list, reasonable assurance analysis and updated SQIP (i.e., Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)) as a part of the new Region-wide MS4 Permit.

The 2016/2017 Work Plan includes monitoring at three urban discharge sites, with a few additional elements from the pilot study. The Work Plan does not include monitoring at any urban tributary sites. There are no proposed changes to the 2016/2017 Work Plan.

Supplemental Data Analysis

The following table and plots summarize historical concentrations of “indicator” (i.e., target pollutant constituents of higher priority) constituents in and in the urban tributary and river receiving waters. Summary statistics for the indicator constituents are provided in Table 2.4-8 and Table 2.4-9. The time series plots (Figure 2.4-2 through Figure 2.4-17) are reprinted from the monitoring data reports included in Appendix 2.4- B (Permit...
Characterization). Time series plots are the first step in trend analysis and can be useful in identifying obvious data trends, variability, gaps and comparisons between sites.

### Table 2.4-8. Summary Statistics for Key Indicator Constituents at Monitoring Locations (Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Locations</th>
<th>Copper (filtered)</th>
<th>Mercury (unfiltered)</th>
<th>Total Suspended Solids</th>
<th>Escherichia coli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n median (µg/L)</td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
<td>n median (mg/L)</td>
<td>n median (MPN/100 mL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade Creek at Watt Ave.</td>
<td>56 5.26</td>
<td>35 17.8</td>
<td>51 111</td>
<td>50 11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4</td>
<td>20 2.95</td>
<td>23 3.07</td>
<td>20 6</td>
<td>20 1,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Data ranges consistent with time series plots below and are generally, 2003-2016 for urban tributaries and 2008-2016 for urban discharge.

### Table 2.4-9. Summary Statistics for Key Indicator Constituents at Monitoring Locations (Part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Locations</th>
<th>Chlorpyrifos</th>
<th>Diazinon</th>
<th>Chrysene</th>
<th>Bifenthrin</th>
<th>Permethrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
<td>n median (ng/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade Creek at Watt Ave.</td>
<td>60 &lt;1</td>
<td>59 &lt;0.2</td>
<td>35 15.3</td>
<td>28 15</td>
<td>26 &lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4</td>
<td>19 &lt;1</td>
<td>21 &lt;0.1</td>
<td>20 &lt;1</td>
<td>21 8</td>
<td>21 &lt;2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Data ranges consistent with time series plots below and are generally, 2003-2016 for urban tributaries and 2008-2016 for urban discharge.
Figure 2.4-2 Dissolved Copper at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-3 Dissolved Copper at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-4 Total Mercury at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-5 Total Mercury at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-6 Total Suspended Solids at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-7 Total Suspended Solids at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-8 Escherichia coli at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-9 Escherichia coli at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-10 Chlorpyrifos at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-11 Chlorpyrifos at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-12 Diazinon at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-13 Diazinon at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-14 Chrysene at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-15 Chrysene at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
Figure 2.4-16 Bifenthrin at Arcade Creek (AC03)

Figure 2.4-17 Bifenthrin at North Natomas Detention Basin No. 4 (UR5)
2.5 Target Pollutants

Program Introduction

The Target Pollutant Program identifies the highest priority pollutants for the Partnership and focuses resources on the reduction of these pollutants. The Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) uses an established process for prioritizing pollutants based on a review of discharge and receiving water data and an evaluation of water quality impacts and regulatory concerns. The Partnership develops reduction strategies for each target pollutant and then implements the associated control strategies and activities.

This chapter describes the Target Pollutant Program activities conducted in compliance with Provision D.27 of the 2008 Sacramento Areawide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (Stormwater Permit) and the 2015 Limited Term Stormwater Permit during the 2015/2016 fiscal year related to the following target pollutants: sediment and erosion surrogates, pesticides, mercury, metals and pathogen indicators. The Partnership generally implemented this work as a joint effort, although some tasks (e.g., related to integrated pest management implementation, infrastructure cleaning operations, erosion control efforts, etc.) were conducted by individual Permittees under other program elements. See the individual Permittee discussions in each agency’s 2015/2016 Annual Report (Chapters 3 through 9) for discussions of agency-specific work performed.

Element Activities

As required by the Permit, SQIP and Annual Work Plan, the following activities were performed under this element.

TP.1 Overall Target Pollutant Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

City/County Stormwater Program staff continued to update Permittees on progress in addressing target pollutants. Key items include the following:

- CASQA efforts to monitor and improve regulation of key pesticides by Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Statewide Trash Policy
- SWRCB Storm Water Strategic Initiative
- Delta Regional Monitoring Program
- SWRCB initiative to revise statewide bacteria objectives
- Continued CASQA participation in the development of regulations by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control to implement Senate Bill 346 (copper brake pad legislation)
TP.2 Sediment Erosion Control Strategies

TP.2.1 Implement Sediment Control Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Permittees continued to conduct the following activities to control sediment and erosion during the 2015/2016 fiscal year, as identified in the Sediment Strategy completed in September 2012:

- Implementation of storm water quality development standards for new and redevelopment projects to reduce the amount of sediment and other pollutants discharged to receiving waters under the New Development Element.
- Enforcement of ordinances and standards to reduce erosion at construction sites implemented under the Construction Element.
- Implementation of operational best management practices (BMPs) implemented under the Municipal Operations Element which remove sediment, such as street sweeping and maintenance of detention basins, storm drains and inlets, sumps and channels.
- Operation and maintenance of storm water quality treatment facilities required for new and redevelopment projects under the New Development Element and/or the Municipal Operations Element such as wet basins, dry basins, stormwater planters (i.e., bioretention), and underground vaults.
- Inspection, complaint response, and enforcement activities conducted under the Commercial/Industrial and Illicit Discharge elements to identify and eliminate sources of sediments and associated pollutants from industrial, commercial, and residential sources.

TP.3 Pesticide Control Strategies

TP.3.1 Implement Pesticide Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27.a.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Permittees continued activities to address pesticide use, consistent with the Pesticide Plan, during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

BMPs implemented by individual Permittees include the following:

- Documentation of municipal pesticide use
- Qualified Applicator Certificate holder oversight of municipal pesticide applications
- Training for public agency pesticide applicators
- Permittee-specific Integrated Pest Management (IPM) policies
- Coverage under Aquatic Pesticide Permit (requirement for this permit depends on the nature of Permittee pesticide applications
- Coordination with Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District on structural BMP design and maintenance
- Support of Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) programs
Partnership Activities Target Pollutants

- Enforcement of local prohibitions against illegal discharges

BMPs implemented jointly by the Permittees include the following:

- IPM outreach and education programs, such as the Water Wise Program and Our Water Our World
- Development of IPM message for a storm water media campaign
- Encouragement of IPM in landscaping through support of the River Friendly Landscaping program
- Promotion of IPM implementation by licensed structural pest control operators (PCO), through Permittee participation in GreenPro Certified and California Structural Pest Control Board
- Water quality monitoring
- Tracking of relevant monitoring programs by other agencies, such as the SWRCB’s Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program and DPR’s Environmental Monitoring Branch
- Participation in the development of Central Valley pyrethroid total maximum daily load (TMDL)
- Participation in the development of the urban pesticide reduction project of the SWRCB (Strategy To Optimize Resource Management of Stormwater (STORMS))
- Tracking and commenting on State and Federal regulatory activities that pertain to pesticides of significance to urban storm water discharges, primarily through CASQA
- Input on pesticide product risk assessments for surface water quality, primarily through CASQA
- Leading efforts to improve water quality protection through State and Federal pesticide regulations, primarily through CASQA

Continued regulation of pesticide use throughout Permittee jurisdictions is conducted by the County Agricultural Commissioner.

**TP.3.2 Identify and Promote Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27.a.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership promotes IPM through implementation of in-house IPM policies (described in the Municipal Operations sections of the individual Permittee Annual Reports), public outreach efforts (described in section TP.3.4 below), and participation in IPM certification programs. Permittee staff continues to serve on the Advisory Committee and Audit Committee for the National Pest Management Association’s (NPMA) GreenPro IPM Certification program. Permittee staff serving as president of the California Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB) led the Board to propose regulations to increase the number of continuing education hours in IPM required of licensees.

**TP.3.3 Support/participate in efforts to influence pesticide regulation by state and federal agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27.a.v.</td>
<td>Decrease residential use of pesticides known to impact water quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership, primarily through active leadership and participation in the CASQA pesticide subcommittee, as well as providing staff to represent CASQA with various State and Federal agencies, continued to
participate in the State and Federal regulatory processes that affect pesticide discharges including the following:

- A Permittee staff member continued to serve as president and appointed member of the California Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB), which regulates the structural pest control industry. The SPCB continues to maintain IPM licensing and continuing education requirements, as well as funding IPM research for bed bugs and Argentine ants. Based on recommendation from its IPM Continuing Education Committee, the SPCB voted to adopt a regulation to increase IPM continuing education requirements to better promote and support adoption of IPM by the structural pest control industry.

- Permittee staff serves by appointment on DPR’s Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC). Participation on the PMAC has promoted DPR’s focus on urban pest management and water quality issues. DPR’s priority areas in the solicitation for the 2015/2016 Pest Management Alliance Grant funding included improving surface water quality through urban IPM practices.

- Permittee staff participated in development of the Central Valley Pyrethroid TMDL. A key result is recognition in the draft TMDL of the importance of utilizing pesticide regulatory authority as the primary mechanism to mitigate urban water quality impacts of pesticides, as well as inclusion of BMPs appropriate for local agency implementation, such as public outreach and in-house IPM.

- Permittee staff serves as co-chair of the CASQA Pesticides Subcommittee. This subcommittee includes storm water program staff and consultants from throughout the state and facilitates proactive action by CASQA on pesticide issues, including communication with US EPA’s Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) and DPR staff, and submission of comment letters on relevant pesticide regulatory actions. Activities and achievements of the subcommittee during the 2015/2016 fiscal year are described in detail in the CASQA Pesticides Subcommittee Annual Report 2015/2016 (included as Appendix 2.5.A).

- Resulting from CASQA leadership, and continuing collaboration with Water Board staff, the SWRCB adopted “Urban Pesticide Reduction” as a top priority project in STORMS. The Urban Pesticide Reduction Project is aimed at establishing as an adopted SWRCB policy for addressing pesticide impairments that recognizes state and federal pesticide regulatory authority as the primary mechanism to mitigate urban water quality impacts of pesticides, and identifies appropriate BMPs for local agency implementation, such as public outreach and in-house IPM.

- Through CASQA, the Permittees submitted the following comments letters (copies included in Appendix 2.5.B-E) on EPA and DPR pesticide regulatory activities, as well as pesticide use by the California Department of Food and Agriculture:

  **EPA Office of Pesticide Programs**
  - Chlorfenapyr Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision
  - Diuron Registration Review
  - Malathion – Draft Biological Evaluation

  **DPR**
  - Registration Application – Oblitiroot Dichlobenil Storm Drain Product
TP.4 Mercury Control Strategies

TP.4.1 Implement Mercury Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27.b.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Permittees continued to implement the Mercury Plan during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Mercury control activities include the following as needed by the individual Permittees:

- Sediment and erosion control BMPs
- Commercial/industrial inspections
- Support of HHW mercury reduction programs (See Task TP.4.2)
- Posting of mercury reduction information on Partnership website
- Implementation of activities required under the Delta Mercury TMDL
- Participation on the Delta Tributary Mercury Council (DTMC) on mercury watershed programs

Sediment Erosion Control BMPs

As indicated in TP.2, sediment erosion control activities reduce the pollutants associated with sediments, such as mercury, metals and pesticides. The Permittees implement the strategies listed above that are associated with sediment erosion control through the following Program Elements:

- Erosion and sediment control BMPs implemented under the Construction Element
- Operational BMPs implemented under the Municipal Operations Element which remove sediment, such as street sweeping and maintenance of detention basins, storm drains and inlets, sumps and channels.
- Storm water quality treatment facilities required for new and redevelopment projects under the New Development Element such as wet basins, dry basins, stormwater planters (i.e., bioretention), and underground vaults.
- Inspection, complaint response, and enforcement activities conducted under the Commercial/Industrial and Illicit Discharge Elements to identify and eliminate sources of sediments and associated pollutants from industrial, commercial, and residential sources. See below for more information on a portion of the Industrial inspections conducted.

Commercial/Industrial Inspections

The County Department of Environmental Management (EMD), on behalf of the Partnership, continued inspections at industries such as metal recyclers, auto dismantlers, and auto body shops. These industry facilities are likely to have some or all of the following mercury sources: mercury switches (automobiles and major appliances), mercury-containing control devices (major appliances), and discarded mercury thermometers, thermostats, and fluorescent lamps from households and commercial buildings. See CI.3 in the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program for more information on the compliance program.

Guidance materials on mercury switch disposal for auto dismantlers and auto repair shops are available from the California Department of Toxic Substances control and are posted on the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP) website www.beriverfriendly.net.

Mercury Web Page

The Partnership’s web page (www.beriverfriendly.net/mercury/) contains information for residents and businesses about mercury impacts, and steps that they can take to reduce the discharge of mercury to the environment. It also includes links to Be Mercury Free (a regional partnership for mercury pollution reduction) and information on the household hazardous waste collection from various local agencies.
Methylmercury TMDL

The SSQP submitted, on October 20, 2015, its Progress Report for the Phase I control study required by the Delta Methylmercury TMDL for the project completed during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. The Partnership initiated its control study through the Citrus Heights City Hall Green Parking Lot Grant Project funded by a Proposition 84 grant. The completed grant report was approved by the SWRCB in September 2015. Project activities included water quality sample collection, sample analysis, and data evaluations for the purpose of testing whether LID features reduce the methylmercury discharges to the MS4.

Delta Tributary Mercury Council (DTMC)

The DTMC is a watershed-level program intended to provide a forum on science and management activities to understand mercury in the Delta watershed, and ultimately reduce mercury levels and mercury consumption. The Partnership continued to track DTMC activities.

Delta Stewardship Council Mercury Strategy Workshop.

Staff participated in the Delta Stewardship Council’s 3-day workshop entitled “Revisiting the 2003 Mercury Strategy for the Bay-Delta Ecosystem” which convened numerous scientists working on mercury in the Delta. The purpose of the workshop was to “To create a shared understanding of the current knowledge of mercury science among scientists and managers invested in the San Francisco Bay-Delta system. The workshop will assess the progress made toward achieving the recommendations outlined in the 2003 Mercury Strategy and provide an update of recent and ongoing scientific studies in the region.” The workshop included participation by outside reviewers. The findings of the workshop are intended to inform managers in “selecting management actions to address mercury pollution.”

TP.5 Metals Control Strategies

TP.5.1 Implement the Metals Reduction Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

Metals reduction is implemented primarily through sediment reduction, as outlined Section TP.2 above, and through implementation of SB 346, which was State legislation passed to reduce copper content of brake pads.

TP.6 Pathogen Indicator Control Strategies

TP.6.1 Implement Fecal Waste Reduction Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership continued to implement the Fecal Waste Reduction Strategy during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. The fecal waste reduction strategies include the following:

- Inspection of kennels for appropriate waste handling procedures
- Support of practical alternatives to increase appropriate pet waste disposal and continue to prohibit discharges of pet waste into the MS4
• Control of illicit discharges, cross connections, and sanitary sewer overflows

Additional information regarding implementation of the strategy is provided below:

Kennel Inspections

Inspections of kennels throughout the Partnership area were conducted through the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program implemented by the Sacramento County EMD. Kennels are inspected on a triennial basis. See CI.3.3 through CI.3.10, and CI 5.2 for more information on the inspections.

Appropriate Pet Waste Disposal

Pups on the Parkway complements the Stormwater Program’s public outreach messages that promote proper pet waste disposal. Partnership support includes funding for stocking of pet waste disposal stations. The Partnership continued its Scoop the Poop program, which supports the use of pet waste disposal bag dispensers in local parks and along trails. The dispenser stations include outreach messages. See PO.1.2 for more information.

The Partnership continued to include pet waste messages in general storm water outreach materials and on its website (www.beriverfriendly.net). The Partnership’s regional mixed media campaign included a focus on proper pet waste disposal. See PO.3.3 for more information.

Individual Permittees continue local ordinances that prohibit discharges of pet waste into the MS4.

Illicit Discharge and Sanitary Sewer Overflows

The Partnership continued implementation of BMPs that help to eliminate or reduce fecal matter in the storm drain system, including prohibition, investigation, and elimination of sanitary sewer cross connections; mitigation of sanitary sewer overflows; street sweeping; and cleaning of the storm drainage system infrastructure including detention basins.

TP.7 Other Target Pollutant Control Strategies

No tasks scheduled for the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

TP.8 Effectiveness Evaluation

No tasks scheduled for the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Only Outcome Level 1 assessments being conducted.

Element Effectiveness Assessment

On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required. The overall effectiveness of the SQIP and the individual Elements in reducing stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable, achieving compliance with water quality standards in receiving waters, and meeting performance standards was provided in the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013. The previous section described activities conducted during the fiscal year demonstrating assessment at Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities).
Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes

Work Plan Task Completion Summary

All tasks were completed per the Annual Work Plan.

Work Plan and/or SQIP Revisions and Changes

The Report of Waste Discharge and LTEA submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013 included SQIP amendments in the form of proposed 5-year Work Plans for each Program and Element for the next permit term. The Partnership proposed a new approach for the Target Pollutant Program in the 2013 ROWD and LTEA (Section 2.9). These proposed SQIP amendments were not incorporated in the Limited Term Stormwater Permit due to the limited term of the order. The Partnership plans to incorporate the key recommendations from the LTEA into an updated SQIP when the new Region-wide MS4 Permit is issued.

2016/2017 Annual Work Plan revisions are not proposed at this time.
2.6 Regional Public Outreach

Element Introduction

The Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (Partnership) conducts regional public outreach programs to educate the public about the harmful effects of storm water pollution and to motivate people to prevent pollution. Furthermore, it creates and promotes opportunities for public participation in creek and river stewardship projects. The ultimate purpose is to improve the quality of urban runoff and protect local creeks and rivers.

The permit requires the permittees to ensure that the Regional Public Outreach Program uses appropriate media to measurably increase the knowledge of target communities regarding the impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters and to provide potential solutions for the target audience that lead to behavioral change and reduce pollutant releases to the municipal storm drain systems and the environment.

Public outreach activities are coordinated with activities related to other program elements to ensure consistent and integrated messages. The Partnership maintains relationships with other groups and agencies to share ideas and experiences, and jointly implement outreach where mutually beneficial opportunities exist. Many of the Partnership’s outreach activities are conducted regionally, as a collaborative effort among the permittees to prevent duplication, share resources and reach a broader segment of the population. In general, collaborative, county-wide efforts can be more cost-effective; however, in some cases, localized public outreach by individual permittees is more appropriate or cost-effective. This section describes the Partnership’s regional activities. Permittee-specific activities conducted in addition to regional activities are described in each agency’s Annual Report (Chapters 3-9).

Element Activities

As required by the Permit, SQIP and Annual Work Plan, the following activities were performed under this element.

PO.1 Public Participation

PO.1.1 Participate in clean up events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.ai.,bi.c.</td>
<td>Remove trash from waterways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

During Creek Week 2016, more than 1,600 volunteers helped clean 35 miles of creeks and removed nearly 16 tons of trash from creeks in Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Folsom, Rancho Cordova, Galt, Rio Linda, the Delta, and unincorporated Sacramento County. Volunteers also removed invasive plants along the creeks. See Appendix 2.6A for a copy of the 2016 Creek Week Brochure.
PO.1.2 Implement pet waste reduction programs such as “Scoop the Poop”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.ai., aiv., bi., biv., c.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

Since the Scoop the Poop program was initiated in the 2006/2007 fiscal year, a total of 167 stations have been installed in the Sacramento region. The program continues to support the mission of the Scoop the Poop program which aims to reduce the improper disposal of pet waste in parks and along trails. Each station includes a plastic bag dispenser and a sign to encourage proper waste disposal.

PO.1.3 Encourage the public to participate in watershed groups and their activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.ai., bi., c.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INDICATOR

ASSESSMENT LEVEL

Summary of Work Completed

During the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the Partnership continued to participate in activities that were sponsored or conducted by local watershed and environmental groups (see list in Table 2.6-1) as requested or warranted, depending on available staff and resources. This may have included providing technical resources, and/or sponsoring, attending and/or speaking at meetings and outreach events.

Table 2.6-1 Watershed Groups and Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watersheds/ Groups</th>
<th>Permittees/ Geographical Area</th>
<th>Other Regional Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alder Creek</td>
<td>City of Folsom County of Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council Sacramento Valley Conservancy Bureau of Reclamation State Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador/Dry Creek</td>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>Amador County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Watersheds/Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permittees/Geographical Area</th>
<th>Other Regional Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council</td>
<td>SAFCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>Dry Creek Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>California State Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade Creek</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Creek</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Creeks Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>Laguna Creek Watershed Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Elk Grove</td>
<td>Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>SRCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Elk Grove</td>
<td>California Waterfowl Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento River</td>
<td>Cosumnes River Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PO.2 Hotline

**PO.2.1 Maintain hotline number for illicit discharges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aii,bii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership and the County continued to maintain two hotline phone numbers (808-4H2O and 875-RAIN, respectively) in order to facilitate easy reporting of storm water-related problems by the public (e.g., clogged drains, illicit discharges/connections, and faded inlet markers). The Partnership hotline is a ‘phone tree’ system that asks callers to select the jurisdictions in which the problem is located, and then forwards calls to the appropriate Permittee’s direct contact number for follow–up action. The hotline numbers are publicized as follows:

- On the Partnership and individual Permittee websites
- In newspaper advertisements
- On brochures and other outreach materials
- Storm drain inlet markers
**PO.3 Public Outreach Implementation**

**PO.3.1 Update the public outreach strategy to account for changes in public awareness and behavior based on survey results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii, biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

As in past years, a major component of the Partnership’s public outreach strategy involves the development of a media campaign. Last year the Partnership developed an outreach plan that involved using the storm water survey results from 2013/2014 to design and create messages for the new outreach campaign. Out of all of the environmental topics addressed in the survey (e.g. pet waste, motor oil, paint, pesticides/fertilizer, and litter/trash) the survey showed that the greatest potential for impact is with convincing Sacramento residents to use less pesticides/fertilizer and to shop for less-toxic versions of these products. As a result, the Partnership worked with a media consultant to design an outreach campaign that focused on promoting integrated pest management (IPM) practices. For details about the campaign, see PO.3.3. During the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the Partnership continued to focus on repeating the "Some Jeepers are Keepers" message to further educate the public about IPM practices.

In addition, the Partnership continued to focus efforts on other key activities such as the Our Water Our World program, participating in community outreach events, and partnering with Capital Public Radio’s eco-friendly gardening radio advertisements.

**PO.3.2 Continue to distribute brochures and promotional materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aii., biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

Appendix 2.6B summarizes the educational and instructional materials produced and distributed by the Partnership during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. The distribution numbers shown represent all seven Permittees combined. Several storm water brochures in other languages, such as in Spanish and Russian, were distributed throughout Sacramento at public outreach events and workshops. These brochures are also available electronically on the Partnership website [wwwбереживfriendly.net](http://wwwбереживfriendly.net).

**PO.3.3 Conduct a mixed media campaign (e.g., radio, print ads, television, signage, etc.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii., biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

In January 2015, the Partnership launched a new mixed media IPM campaign (“Some Jeepers are Keepers”) that focused on informing the public about less toxic and natural ways of controlling pests around the home.
The Partnership continued this successful outreach campaign through fiscal year 2015/2016. The campaign included billboards, radio and bus advertising, and social media ads, delivering a combined total of 1,984,362 impressions. The campaign also has been extended to non-English speaking audiences.

The Partnership also utilized social media techniques to promote messages to Facebook users. The Be River Friendly Facebook page currently has 1,208 followers. Seasonal messages were featured on a consistent basis to motivate the public to engage in everyday activities that protect and conserve waterways. The Partnership also updated its website www.beriverfriendly.net by enhancing the design and functionality of the website. The Partnership continued to look for opportunities to promote its Facebook and social media presence and enhance its website as part of its 2015/2016 public outreach efforts.

**PO.3.4 Implement a program that addresses fundraiser carwash discharges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.ai.,aiv., bi., biv., c.</td>
<td>Increase awareness on the impact of fundraiser carwash discharges in waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![KEY INDICATOR]</td>
<td>![ASSESSMENT LEVEL]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership continued to expand efforts to increase awareness on the impact of fundraiser carwash discharges in waterways by maintaining the River-Friendly Fundraiser Carwash Program (RFFCP) website and distributing promotional materials at several public outreach events listed in Table 2.6-2. In addition, the Partnership contacted local school districts to inform youth programs about the program and how to find carwashes that help support river-friendly fundraising events.

The Partnership continued to support the Regional Water Authority’s “Water Smart Carwash” certification program. The program certifies commercial carwashes as “Water Smart” and encourages residents to utilize carwash facilities for personal and fundraising events while saving water and preventing storm water pollution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.ai.,aiv., bi., biv., c.</td>
<td>Increase number of River-Friendly Carwash host facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![KEY INDICATOR]</td>
<td>![ASSESSMENT LEVEL]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

During the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the Partnership collaborated with the Business Environmental Resource Center (BERC) to encourage commercial carwash facilities to register as a carwash site for fundraiser groups through the River-Friendly Fundraiser Carwash Program. BERC mailed out 124 letters to invite more carwashes to partner in the program. Commercial carwashes who participate help fundraiser groups prevent carwash wastewater from discharging into local waterways and conserve water.
PO.3.5 Implement home and garden care programs, including the distribution of educational materials (e.g., Our Water Our World, Waterwise, and River-Friendly Landscaping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii., biii.</td>
<td>Reduction in pesticide use and increase public's use of alternative home and garden care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership participated in several home and garden care programs to promote less toxic methods for controlling pests:

**Our Water Our World**

The Partnership supported the Our Water Our World (OWOW) IPM outreach program in the Sacramento-area. The Partnership partnered with retail stores to make less toxic products more available to consumers such as Orchard Supply Hardware (OSH), Home Depot, Emigh Ace Hardware and Green Acres nursery.

A total of 18 stores participated in the OWOW program at the end of the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Over 35,000 less toxic informational materials (including translated materials) were distributed via the store displays. In addition, participating stores placed small labels in front of products to help consumers identify products that were non-toxic or less toxic than their conventional counterparts. In addition, OWOW fact sheets were distributed at landscape/garden related events and several other outreach events.

On behalf of the Partnership, OWOW participated in events at store locations and helped encourage customers to pick less-toxic pesticide options. According to 18 participating locations, there was an average increase of up to 20% in sales of less-toxic pesticides (varied by location). In most cases, the stores feel that the less toxic products continued to grow in demand.

*OWOW staff tabling at the Home Depot in Sacramento*  
*Home Depot staff standing next to an OWOW Display Rack at Home Depot in Rancho Cordova*

**Water Wise Pest Control Materials**

During the 2015/2016 fiscal year, the Partnership continued to distribute Water Wise Pest Control cards that provide accurate, easy to understand information on effective and less toxic methods of dealing with common garden and household pests. These materials were distributed during landscape/garden related events and several other outreach events.
River-Friendly Landscaping

The Partnership continued to distribute River-Friendly Landscaping educational and outreach materials at various outreach events listed in Table 2.6-2.

PO.3.6 Continue to promote proper disposal of pet waste through the multicultural, mixed media outreach campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii., biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

The Partnership continued to spread messages about the importance of picking up pet waste through social media (e.g. Facebook). In addition, Scoop the Poop ads were placed in Arden Carmichael News, a local community newspaper (see Appendix 2.6C), totaling 15,000 circulations.

PO.3.7 Continue Public-Public and Public-Private Partnerships with other governmental agencies or special districts (i.e., River-Friendly Landscaping) and private businesses (e.g. pet stores, nurseries, zoo, educational institutions, River-Friendly Carwash Program, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii., biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

To ensure effective storm water outreach activities and promote coordination and consistent messages, the Partnership continued to cultivate and maintain relationships with other government agencies, special districts, local businesses, trade and professional associations, schools, environmental groups, involved individuals, and the media. The following are a few ways the Partnership coordinated with other groups during the fiscal year to present the storm water message.

Sacramento Area Creeks Council

During the 2015/2016 fiscal year, several of the Permittees worked with the Sacramento Area Creeks Council on the Creek Week event. See PO.1.1 for a summary of coordination efforts.

EcoLandscape California

EcoLandscape California is a committee that organizes a conference every two years to promote ecologically sustainable landscaping. EcoLandscape California is actively involved in the River-Friendly Landscape outreach effort which includes promoting landscaping practices that reduce storm water runoff and the application of pesticides. The Partnership works with the group to promote and expand the use of the River-Friendly Landscaping guidelines in the Sacramento region.

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) — Our Water Our World Program

SRCSD partnered with the Partnership on the OWOW program and IPM campaign (see PO 3.3), which educates the public on pesticide issues and promotes less toxic alternative methods for controlling specific pests.

Business Environmental Resource Center (BERC)
BERC continued to maintain, provide web support, and conduct outreach for the River-Friendly Fundraiser Carwash program, previously mentioned in this chapter (see PO.3.4). In addition, the Partnership coordinates with BERC to promote the Sacramento Area Sustainable Business Program (SASB) to the pressure washer industry.

**Regional Water Authority**

The Partnership combined efforts with the Regional Water Authority to support the “Water Smart Carwash” program to encourage residents to wash their vehicles at commercial carwashes to reduce storm water pollution and conserve water. Please see section PO.3.4 for more information.

**Capital Public Radio**

Capital Public Radio partnered with the Partnership to develop and run radio ads promoting eco-friendly gardening and IPM, specifically using the “Some Jeepers are Keepers” campaign messages. The Partnership also includes the development of interpretive signage, promoting key elements of IPM.

**PO.3.8 Support community outreach events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiii.,biii.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership participated in eight (8) community outreach events during the fiscal year to reach as many Sacramento area residents as possible. The Partnership also promoted community outreach events to the public. The Partnership provided a storm water booth at most events and distributed educational and promotional materials such as those described in the following table.

**Table 2.6-2 Community Outreach Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>No. of attendees</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2015</td>
<td>Harvest Day</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Landscape &amp; garden community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2015</td>
<td>The Sacramento Sustainable Business Awards</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2/2016</td>
<td>Earth Fest @ the Sacramento Zoo</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2016</td>
<td>Creek Week</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/2016</td>
<td>Sacramento State Earth Day</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>College students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24/2016</td>
<td>Earth Day @ Southside Park</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/2016</td>
<td>State of CA, Department of General Service (DGS) Earth Day</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>DGS Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/2016</td>
<td>Mayor’s Earth Day @ Cesar Chavez Park</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,700</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PO.4 Public School Education

PO.4.1 Conduct classroom presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.aiv., biv.</td>
<td>Document number of school presentations conducted and increased awareness of storm water issues among students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership provided the “Splash in the Class” program to students throughout the County of Sacramento. “Splash in the Class” is a 70-minute, highly interactive presentation covering storm water pollution found around the home and neighborhood, pollution prevention, the aquatic food chain, and the hydrological cycle- linking all three aspects together. A total of 4,884 students in grades 3-6 received the presentation. Last year Splash fully implemented an improved evaluation method for assessing student learning. This approach directly measured how much the Program improved students’ understanding of storm water pollution by testing their knowledge before and after the presentation as opposed to assessing program quality through teacher opinion polls, which was used in the past. 27 classes participated in the pre and post assessment. Of those who participated in the assessment, the results showed that the presentation improved students' understanding of basic storm water pollution concepts by an average of 47% with nearly 80% of the students answering the questions correctly after the presentation. In addition, the program received positive feedback from several teachers based on a teacher opinion survey. Results show that 83% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the presentations made the students more environmentally aware and 62% agreed or strongly agreed that students are likely to practice pollution prevention.

PO.5 Business Outreach

PO.5.1 Evaluate strategies to partner with sustainable business programs to encourage storm water pollution prevention in businesses, targeting mobile businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12av., bv.</td>
<td>Work with an existing green business program to establish storm water practices for businesses, specifically mobile businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership worked with BERC to promote the Sacramento Area Sustainable Business Program to the pressure washer industry in workshops and various events. In addition, BERC mailed letters to more than 100 pressure washing businesses explaining the benefits of participation in the Sustainable Business program and following established best management practices in their pressure washing activities. This program promotes businesses that take voluntary actions to prevent pollution and conserve resources.

A Sustainable Business checklist developed specifically for pressure washers can be found online at [http://www.sacberc.org/sasb/Pages/Checklist-and-Publications.aspx](http://www.sacberc.org/sasb/Pages/Checklist-and-Publications.aspx)
**Summary of Work Completed**

Several storm water brochures in other languages, such as in Spanish and Russian, were distributed throughout Sacramento at inspections, public outreach events and workshops. Appendix 2.6B summarizes the educational and instructional materials, including translated brochures, distributed by the Partnership during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

**Summary of Work Completed**

The Partnership distributed River-Friendly Landscaping (RFL) publications to professionals to encourage the use of River-Friendly landscaping practices (see www.riverfriendly.org for RFL publications). RFL materials were distributed at community outreach events and were promoted on the RFL website. In addition, the Partnership worked with Ecolandscape California to distribute materials at the Sacramento County UC Master Gardener’s Harvest Day event on August 1, 2015. These events were geared towards landscape professionals and residents. In addition, RFL tips and resources were promoted on the Be River Friendly Sacramento’s Facebook page throughout the year.

**Summary of Work Completed**

A total of 18 stores are currently participating in the OWOW program. Additional information is also discussed in PO.3.5. A total of 208 staff from 17 participating stores were trained during this fiscal year. For the fourth year in a row, the Partnership conducted surveys of store staff to gauge the effectiveness of the trainings. Similar to past results, the 2015/2016 results demonstrate improvement in the store staff’s post-training awareness of storm water issues and ability to accurately assist customers to find products that would address their needs while being less toxic to the environment.
Element Effectiveness Assessment

On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required. The overall effectiveness of the SQIP and the individual Elements in reducing storm water pollution to the maximum extent practicable, achieving compliance with water quality standards in receiving waters, and meeting performance standards was provided in the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013.

The previous section described activities conducted during the fiscal year demonstrating assessment at Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities).

Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes

Work Plan Task Completion Summary

All tasks were completed per the Annual Work Plan.

Work Plan and/or SQIP Revisions and Changes

The Report of Waste Discharge and LTEA submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013 included SQIP amendments in the form of proposed 5-year Work Plans for each Program and Element for the next permit term. These proposed SQIP amendments were not incorporated in the Limited Term Storm water Permit due to the limited term of the order.

The Permittees plan to obtain coverage under the new Region-wide MS4 Permit (Order No. R5-2016-0040, NPDES No. CAS0085324) during the 2016/2017 fiscal year. The SQIP will be updated in accordance with this Permit and the associated schedule of deliverables.

There are no changes recommended to the 2016/2017 Annual Work Plan.
This page left intentionally blank.
2.7 Regional Commercial/Industrial

Element Introduction

The primary goal of the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program is to reduce the discharge of stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable and effectively eliminate illegal non-stormwater discharges from Permittee-identified priority commercial and industrial facilities and businesses within the boundaries of the Sacramento Area-wide NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (Stormwater Permit) area. As required by the Stormwater Permit, the Regional Commercial/Industrial Program works to address these conditions by conducting regular compliance inspections and associated enforcement at priority commercial and industrial facilities, as well as through outreach targeted at business operators and their employees.

Through Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) executed with each of the Permittees, the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (EMD) is authorized to implement the Commercial and Industrial Storm Water Compliance Program (CISCP) in which triennial stormwater compliance inspections and associated enforcement are conducted at identified priority commercial and industrial facilities on behalf of all the Permittees. Implementation of the CISCP makes efficient use of Permittee resources, provides regional consistency, and minimizes impacts to businesses through consolidation of inspections with other EMD inspection programs. The categories of priority commercial and industrial facilities that are included in the CISCP are as follows:

- Facilities with coverage under the Industrial General Permit
- Auto body shops
- Auto repair shops
- Auto dealers
- Equipment rental facilities
- Kennels
- Nurseries
- Retail gasoline outlets (i.e., gas stations)
- Restaurants

Priority industrial pollutants are identified by taking into consideration stormwater monitoring-related benchmark data exceedances for facilities covered under the Industrial General Permit, as described in the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan dated November 2009 and adopted by the Regional Water Board on January 29, 2010 (SQIP). The data is evaluated to identify overlaps between benchmark exceedances and the pollutants identified in the Regional Target Pollutant Program. Overlapping constituents are considered priority industrial pollutants. Additional priority industrial pollutants may be identified by the Permittees using alternative criteria. Outreach material is distributed to targeted businesses having problems addressing the priority industrial pollutants.

The Permittees conduct industry and pollutant-specific outreach to the priority industries described in the SQIP. The outreach was conducted twice during the five-year term of the Stormwater Permit (2009/2010 and 2012/2013 fiscal years). The objectives of the outreach are to increase awareness of stormwater pollution prevention and stormwater regulations, to educate business owners and operators about best management practices (BMPs) for addressing pollutants, and to encourage environmental stewardship.

The Regional Commercial/Industrial Program is implemented in addition to Permittee-specific Commercial/Industrial Element activities described in Chapters 3 through 9 of this Annual Report.

For background information and additional details about any of the activities/tasks referenced above or listed in this Annual Report, see the SQIP.
Element Activities

As required by the Permit, SQIP and Annual Work Plan, the following activities were performed under this element.

CI.1 Legal Authority
No tasks scheduled for FY15/16.

CI.2 Priority Industry and Industrial Pollutant Identification
No tasks scheduled for FY15/16.

CI.3 Commercial and Industrial Storm Water Compliance Program (CISCP) – EMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI.3.1 Maintain fee ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY INDICATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT LEVEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed
There were no changes made to the fee ordinance during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI.3.2 Maintain enforcement policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY INDICATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT LEVEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed
There were no changes made to the enforcement policy during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

EMD continued to implement its Progressive Approach Enforcement Policy by conducting “Monitoring Status” re-inspections with associated fees at facilities with repeat violations to ensure continued compliance.

See tasks CI.3.4 and CI.3.7 of this chapter for a summary of enforcement actions conducted during the fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI.3.3 Inspect priority industries once every 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT REFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY INDICATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT LEVEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed
EMD continued to conduct triennial inspections of priority industry inspections during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Refer to Appendix 2.7A for a list of businesses included in the CISCP inventory, organized by jurisdiction.

Table 2.7-1 shows inspection-related data for the 2015/2016 fiscal year, which includes the total number of facilities included in the inspection inventory at the start and end of the fiscal year, the number of routine...
inspections that were conducted, the number of inspections that were conducted in response to complaints received, and the number of re-inspections (i.e., follow up inspections) that were conducted, by industry type. Re-inspections were conducted when the violation(s) noted during a previous inspection were serious, or when suitable return to compliance documentation was not submitted to EMD following issuance of an enforcement action.

Table 2.7-1 EMD Inspection Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. facilities as of 7/1/15</th>
<th>No. facilities as of 6/30/16</th>
<th>No. inspections conducted</th>
<th>No. Complaint Response conducted</th>
<th>No. re-inspections conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto body shops</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto dealers</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto repair shops</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental companies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants (^1,^2)</td>
<td>3,102(^1,^2)</td>
<td>3,157(^1,^2)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Gasoline Outlets(^2)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial General Permitted Industries</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Also includes Licensed Health Care Facilities
2 RGO/mini-mart facilities are two separate businesses with one joint inspection completed to consolidate inspection time. However, they are tracked as separate businesses and each one location is counted as two facilities/inspections. Currently, there are 98 facilities in this RGO/mini-mart category. This number is manually added to both the restaurant total and the RGO total. Therefore, the totals in these columns will not be consistent with the totals in Appendix 2.7A.

CI.3.4 Track violations during 3 year cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>Decrease in violations observed from one 3-yr cycle to the next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Work Completed

As shown in Table 2.7-2, a total of 552 violations were noted by EMD staff for the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Violations may be noted during routine inspections, complaint responses or during re-inspections. Multiple violations observed at a facility may be addressed with a single enforcement action. See task CI.3.7 for a summary of enforcement actions that were issued in response to these recorded violations.

Table 2.7-2 Observed Violations by EMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Violations Observed</th>
<th>Total Number Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Filer</td>
<td>NSD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NSD: Non-stormwater discharge to storm drain system or local waterway.
** Poor housekeeping includes waste management problems.
### Cl.3.5 Track follow-up inspections during 3 year cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>Decrease in follow-up inspections required from one 3-yr cycle to the next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

As shown in Table 2.7-1, 10 re-inspections (also called follow-up inspections) were conducted by EMD staff during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

### Cl.3.6 De-list facilities with no exposure of pollutants to stormwater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

As shown in Table 2.7-3, a total of 25 facilities were determined by EMD to have no exposure to stormwater, and were de-listed from their inspection program. All facilities de-listed from the EMD program sign an agreement with EMD stating that conditions (all activities and storage are conducted indoors) at the facility will not change and that the facility will be brought back into the stormwater inspections program if facility was found to be in violation of said agreement.

### Table 2.7-3 Delisted Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Industry Category</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Elk Grove</td>
<td>IGP</td>
<td>Matheson Fast Freight, Inc.</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Extreme Auto Dismantling</td>
<td>Regulated under different address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>IGP</td>
<td>Federal Express Corp</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>Gunther’s Collision Service</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
<td>Discovery Animal Hospital</td>
<td>Does not meet definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Vallet Indoor RV &amp; Boat Storage</td>
<td>Regulated under different address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Andrew’s Automotive Repair</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>IGP</td>
<td>Sunshine Pad and Foam Recycling</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>Advanced Restoration and Autobody</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>APK Auto Body</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Japan Transmissions</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Autobahn Performance</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Rally Muffler</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Interstate Batteries Sacramento</td>
<td>Does not meet definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Low Cost Auto Repair &amp; Body Shop</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Auto Dealer</td>
<td>Hertz Rent A Car</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Veterinary Hospital</td>
<td>Does not meet definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Moore’s Garage</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>Gen 1 Automotive</td>
<td>No outdoor exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Auto Dealer</td>
<td>Davis Tow Inc.</td>
<td>Does not meet definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
<td>Country Oaks Pet Hospital</td>
<td>Does not meet definition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CI.3.7 Conduct enforcement (incl. warnings, NOVs, Cease and Desist Orders, ACPs, and Cost Recoveries)

**PERMIT REFERENCE**
9.a.iii-viii

**PERFORMANCE STANDARD**
Decrease in enforcement actions from one 3-yr cycle to the next

**KEY INDICATOR**

| ASSESSMENT LEVEL |

#### Summary of Work Completed

As shown in Table 2.7-4, a total of 566 enforcement actions were conducted by EMD during the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Multiple violations may be addressed with a single enforcement action. See CI.3.4 for information related to the Stormwater Ordinance violations observed that resulted in these enforcement actions.

Monitoring status inspections are an enforcement tool that is implemented in lieu of issuing an Administrative Enforcement Order to a facility found to be in violation of the Stormwater Ordinance after follow-up inspections. Monitoring status inspections are used as an enforcement tool as well as a means of "monitoring" a facility to ensure it does not relapse into non-compliance. The inspections consist of one to three unannounced re-inspections (the number of inspections conducted is based upon the type and number of violations that are present, and are billed for at EMD’s current hourly rate).

#### Table 2.7-4 Enforcement Actions by EMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Notice of Violation</th>
<th>Cease and Desist Order</th>
<th>Admin. Enforcement Order</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Monitoring Status Inspections</th>
<th>Re-inspection Fee Assessed for failure to Comply</th>
<th>Non-filer referrals to the Regional Water Board</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total # of Enforcement Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CI.3.8 Conduct workshops, upon request and as needs are identified, for the regulated community

**PERMIT REFERENCE**
9.a.iii-viii

**PERFORMANCE STANDARD**
Document workshops conducted

**KEY INDICATOR**

| ASSESSMENT LEVEL |

#### Summary of Work Completed

A CISCP outreach presentation was provided to the Sacramento County Food Industry working group on January 19, 2016. Workshops are conducted when requested by the regulated community, or when a high number of facilities are found to have similar or reoccurring violations.
### CI.3.9 Provide annual training to CISCP inspectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>Document training events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

All EMD employees involved in the CISCP were provided annual training by Stormwater Staff in classes offered on June 9, 2016 and June 29, 2016. Refer to appendix 2.7B to view the EMD training documentation.

### CI.3.10 CISCP database - track facility inventory, inspections, enforcement and outreach materials distributed (facilities included to be based on list of priority industries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

The CISCP database is updated daily to document additions and deletions of facilities from the inventory, as well as to document inspections and enforcement conducted over the course of the fiscal year.

### CI.3.11 Refer significant violations to the Regional Water Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

A report of violations issued during inspections is emailed on a monthly basis by EMD to the Regional Water Board. No significant violators were encountered during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.  
Refer to Appendix 2.7C for an example of the monthly reports of significant violations submitted by EMD to the Regional Water Board.

### CI.3.12 Refer potential Industrial General Permit non-filers to the Regional Water Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a.iii-viii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

A total of 8 potential Industrial General Permit non-filers were referred to the Regional Water Board during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.
CI.3.13 Track NOIs filed for potential non-filers referred to the Regional Water Board

Summary of Work Completed
Table 2.7-5 shows the number of potential Industrial General Permit non-filers that were referred to the Regional Water Board, as well as the number that filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) following referral.

Table 2.7-5 Industrial General Permit Non-Filer Referrals and NOIs Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number Referred to Regional Water Board</th>
<th>Number of facilities that submitted NOI to Regional Water Board</th>
<th>Percentage of Referrals that submitted NOIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI.3.14 Investigate Regional Water Board referrals within 3 working days of receipt of referral

Summary of Work Completed
No Regional Water Board referrals were given to EMD for investigation during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

CI.3.15 Provide enforcement support to Regional Water Board related to facilities in the CISCP inventory, including providing facility and historical information, and staff for joint inspections when available

Summary of Work Completed
No requests of enforcement support were made by the Regional Water Board to EMD during the 2015/2016 fiscal year.

CI.4 Permittee Evaluations
No tasks scheduled for FY15/16.
CI.5 Outreach

**CI.5.1 Distribute industry and pollutant-specific educational materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REFERENCE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.b.iii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Work Completed**

No industry and/or pollutant-specific educational materials were developed during the 2015/2016 fiscal year because the current materials are sufficient.

**Element Effectiveness Assessment**

On April 17, 2015, the Regional Water Board renewed the Partnership’s 2008 Permit for a limited term (Limited Term Permit) to allow the option to participate in a Regional Monitoring Program (e.g., the Delta RMP). Under the Limited Term Permit, only Outcome Level 1 effectiveness assessment is required. The overall effectiveness of the SQIP and the individual Elements in reducing stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable, achieving compliance with water quality standards in receiving waters, and meeting performance standards was provided in the Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013.

The previous section described activities conducted during the fiscal year demonstrating assessment at Effectiveness Level 1 (documenting activities).

**Assessment Summary and Proposed Element Changes**

**Work Plan Task Completion Summary**

All tasks were completed per the Annual Work Plan.

**Work Plan and/or SQIP Revisions and Changes**

The Report of Waste Discharge and LTEA submitted to the Regional Water Board on March 15, 2013 included SQIP amendments in the form of proposed 5-year Work Plans for each Program and Element for the next permit term. These proposed SQIP amendments were not incorporated in the Limited Term Stormwater Permit due to the limited term of the order.

The Permittees plans to obtain coverage under the new Region-wide MS4 Permit (Order No. R5-2016-0040, NPDES No. CAS0085324) during the 2016/2017 fiscal year. The SQIP will be updated in accordance with this Permit and the associated schedule of deliverables.

There are no changes recommended to the 2016/2017 Annual Work Plan.