

THIS REPORT IS PROVIDED AS AN EXAMPLE ONLY. ALL PROJECT INFORMATION, NAMES, AND DATES ARE FICTITIOUS. THIS IS NOT INTENDED TO BE A FINAL REPRESENTATION OF THE WORK DONE OR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY CALTRANS FOR AN ACTUAL PROJECT.

Long Form - Storm Water Data Report



Dist-County-Route: 01-MEN-222
 Post Mile Limits: R0.01 - R1.30
 Project Type: Bridge Replacement
 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX
 Program Identification: SHOPP-MAJ 20.10.201.111
 Phase: PID
 PA/ED
 PS&E

Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): North Coast (Region 1)

Is the Project required to consider Treatment BMPs? Yes No
 If yes, can Treatment BMPs be incorporated into the project? Yes No
 If No, a Technical Data Report must be submitted to the RWQCB at least 30 days prior to the projects RTL date. List RTL Date: _____

Total Disturbed Soil Area: 3 acres Risk Level: 2
 Estimated: Construction Start Date: June 2011 Construction Completion Date: June 2013
 Notification of Construction (NOC) Date to be submitted: 30 days prior to construction

Erosivity Waiver Yes Date: _____ No
 Notification of ADL reuse (if Yes, provide date) Yes Date: _____ No
 Separate Dewatering Permit (if yes, permit number) Yes Permit # _____ No

This Report has been prepared under the direction of the following Licensed Person. The Licensed Person attests to the technical information contained herein and the date upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based. Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect stamp required at PS&E.

Betsy Ross 10-8-10
 Betsy Ross, Registered Project Engineer Date

I have reviewed the stormwater quality design issues and find this report to be complete, current and accurate:



[Stamp Required for PS&E only]

George Washington 10-8-10
 George Washington, Project Manager Date
Paul Revere 10-8-10
 Paul Revere, Designated Maintenance Representative Date
Horatio Gates 10-8-10
 Horatio Gates, Designated Landscape Architect Representative Date
Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben 10-8-10
 Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, District/Regional Design SW Coordinator or Designee Date

STORM WATER DATA INFORMATION

1. Project Description

This project proposes to replace and widen the two-lane Russian River Bridge (Br. No. 10-80) in Mendocino County on Talmage Road (Route 222). The bridge is located east of the Ukiah city limits and just west of Talmage. It is approximately one mile east of the intersection of Route 222 and Route 101. The bridge was constructed in 1954, and over the last 30 years it has experienced significant channel bed degradation. It was identified as scour critical in the 1997 Structure Replacement and Improvement Needs (STRAIN) Report. The project is funded in the 2011 SHOPP as a Bridge Scour Mitigation Project and is programmed for construction in 2011.

The existing structure is approximately 500 feet in length and 36 feet wide. The bridge has two 12-foot lanes, two 1-foot shoulders, and two 4-foot sidewalks. The proposed structure will be widened by 10 feet to include two 12-foot lanes, one 11-foot shoulder, and one 8-foot shoulder. Type 80 “see through” aesthetic concrete barrier railing and tubular bicycle railings will be used on the bridge. Vertical and horizontal alignments will remain the same.

Seasonal construction limitations must be considered for this project. Construction activities occurring below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), 583.60 ft, are allowable from June 15 to October 15. Work below the OHWM will begin as soon as allowed by the permitting agencies. Construction activities above the OHWM may take place year-round. If necessary, the Russian River channel may be diverted to prevent flows from entering the work area. The diversion would consist of a barrier between the waterway and the work area (including the access road).

No permanent right-of-way (ROW) acquisition is required; however, temporary construction easements will be required on the south side of the bridge for construction and staging. These easements involve two land parcels.

The total disturbed soil area for the project is approximately 3 acres. The area was calculated using the project survey and Microstation (a CADD software package) and includes areas for construction, access, and staging. The existing impervious surface for the bridge is 0.42 acres, and at completion of the project the total impervious surface area will be 0.53 acres. Thus, a total of 0.11 acres of impervious area will be added as a result of the project. This project is not located within an area of a local MS4 permittee.

2. Site Data and Storm Water Quality Design Issues (refer to Checklists SW-1, SW-2, and SW-3)

The project is located in the Ukiah hydraulic sub-area (HSA 114.31) and the receiving waterbody is the Russian River, which flows directly under the bridge. The Russian River is a 303(d) listed waterbody for sedimentation/siltation and temperature. No TMDLs have been established for this waterbody.

The replacement of the bridge will impact water quality due to work within the river and the removal of riparian vegetation. The following permits will be required: Section 404 Permit from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act), 1602 Streambed Alteration

Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game, and Water Quality Certification, Section 401 from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The North Coast RWQCB has jurisdiction over these project limits. There are no municipal or domestic water supply reservoirs or groundwater percolation facilities within the project limits. The project is not located within an area of biological significance (ASBS).

The project is located in the Inner North Coast Ranges of the California Floristic province within the Russian River watershed in Yokayo Valley. The climate is mild with average temperatures ranging from 46 to 74 °F. The average annual rainfall in the area is 37 inches, and the elevation is 610 feet above sea level. River flows are greatest during the rainy season, which varies annually but is generally estimated as October 1 through May 1.

The soil type in the project area is classified as Type B soils per the project geotechnical report. The river channel is an open waterway composed primarily of gravel. The riverbanks are moderately sloped and eroded in some sections. The river bar is largely silt, fine-grained material.

As required by the new Construction General permit, the project risk level was calculated and has been determined to be Level 2. Initially, the GIS Map Method was used per the Project Risk Level Determination Guidance July 2010 and a risk level of 3 was calculated. The Individual Method was then used in an attempt to lower the risk level. Because the project sediment risk was reduced using the Individual Method, the overall risk level was reduced to a Level 2.

The May 2000 Asbestos and Lead Survey Report states there are no hazardous waste issues related to the soil under the bridge. The report says the soil materials generated from shallow excavations at the site should be suitable for reuse and/or offsite disposal with no restrictions based on lead content. Thus, soil reuse and Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) issues are not a concern for this project.

There are no existing treatment BMPs within the project area, and there will be no additional right-of-way costs associated with the proposed BMPs.

To reduce potential storm water impacts erosion control and BMPs will be incorporated as part of this project and soil disturbing work will be minimized during the rainy season. In addition, all runoff from the bridge will be directed to appropriately sized biofiltration systems.

3. Regional Water Quality Control Board Agreements

The North Coast RWQCB considers all projects that increase impervious surface area to be a risk to water quality. The feasibility of post construction Treatment BMPs must be evaluated as a condition of the 401 Water Quality Certification process. It has been determined that bioswales are feasible and will be incorporated into the project to meet the Board requirement.

A meeting was held by District NPDES Stormwater Coordinator, Nathanael Greene on 8/31/10 with the North Coast RWQCB. The project requires the following permits: Section 404 Permit from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act), 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game, and Water Quality

Certification, Section 401 from the RWQCB. The required permit applications have been submitted.

4. Proposed Design Pollution Prevention BMPs to be used on the Project.

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs will be incorporated into the project where appropriate to minimize impacts to water quality by preventing downstream erosion and stabilizing disturbed soil areas. These BMPs can provide water quality benefits including settling of solids and other pollutants and increasing detention time by incorporating and preserving vegetated surfaces.

Downstream Effects Related to Potentially Increased Flow, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 2

The proposed improvements will increase the impervious area by 0.11 acres, which will increase velocity and volume of flow within the project limits. This increase has been accounted for in the project design and mitigated through the use of BMPs. Per the project Drainage Report, the design matches the pre-project runoff curve number and time of concentration and controls erosive velocities in accordance with the HDM. Because the design has accounted for the increased velocity and volume of flow, the project should have a negligible impact on downstream flow.

Currently, drainage from the road is allowed to discharge directly to the main river channel below. The new bridge drainage system will collect runoff from the bridge deck and approaches and route it through appropriately sized bioswales, providing treatment and reducing volume prior to discharge. The bioswales are designed with rock check dams to increase the residence time of runoff in the swales. The project will continue to discharge to the Russian River, which is an unlined channel. The potential for increased sediment loading post construction will be very small because the runoff will be treated with a bioswale prior to discharge.

Slope/Surface Protection Systems, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 3

The cut and fill requirements are minimal for this project as the existing and proposed slope conditions will be similar. All slopes will be 4:1 or flatter. Slopes will require temporary and permanent measures to provide protection from erosion. Both onsite riparian replacement planting and offsite riparian mitigation will be implemented to offset the removal of trees and other riparian vegetation that is required for bridge construction. Permanent erosion control and vegetation will be implemented on slopes that are substantially complete.

The Erosion Prediction Procedure was used to validate final stabilization of project surfaces. The RUSLE 2 program was used and it was determined that the post-construction site conditions are better than or equal to pre-construction conditions. Hard surfaces are not required for this project.

Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 4

The proposed bridge drainage system provides four deck drain outfalls (two at each end) that will drain roadway runoff into the rock slope protection (RSP) and around the

abutments. The runoff will dissipate through the RSP down the slope and into the river. Runoff from the impervious area approaching the bridge is transferred via dikes to vegetated swales. The swales will treat the runoff prior to discharge.

Preservation of Existing Vegetation, Checklist DPP-1, Parts 1 and 5

This project will limit clearing, grubbing, and excavation to specific locations as delineated on the plans to maximize the preservation of existing vegetation. Areas that are off limits to the contractor are also delineated on the plans.

5. Proposed Permanent Treatment BMPs to be used on the Project

Treatment BMPs are not required as part of this project per the Evaluation Documentation Form (EDF); however, bioswales are feasible and will be incorporated to meet sustainability goals and the requirements of the North Coast RWQCB. As stated previously, the North Coast RWQCB requires all projects that increase impervious surface area to evaluate the feasibility of post construction permanent Treatment BMPs as a condition of the 401 Water Quality Certification process. The bioswales are Low Impact Development (LID) and they meet sustainability goals. Bioswales are an effective treatment for removing debris, solid particles, and other pollutants through infiltration and by sorption to the soil. Bioswales are designed with rock check dams that will be installed early during construction to aid in sediment removal by increasing residence time.

Four bioswales will be incorporated into the project, two along the eastbound bridge approach and two along the westbound approach. The bioswales will treat 100% of the WQF. The swale details are listed below.

Eastbound Approach

- South side of the approach from station "A" 16+28 to 17+00 Rt, bioswale No. 1 is approximately 300 feet long with a tributary area of 0.87 ac, a flowline slope of 1.5%, normal depth of 0.12 ft, and a hydraulic residence time (HRT) of 23 minutes.
- North side of the approach from station "A" 16+28 to 17+00 Lt, bioswale No. 2 is approximately 236 feet long with a tributary area of 1.24 ac, a flowline slope of 0.25%, normal depth of 0.26 ft, and a HRT of 28 minutes.

Westbound Approach

- South side of the approach from station "A" 18+84 to 19+30 Rt, bioswale No. 3 is approximately 150 feet long with a tributary area of 0.37 ac, a flowline slope of 0.50%, normal depth of 0.10 ft, and a HRT of 22 minutes.
- North side of the approach from station "A" 18+80 to 19+55 Lt, bioswale No. 4 is approximately 246 feet long with a tributary area of 0.57 ac, a flowline slope of 0.70%, normal depth of 0.06 ft, and a HRT of 43 minutes.

The bioswales have been designed to match existing slopes, to maintain existing vegetation, and to prevent purchasing additional right of way. Bioswale mowing is not

anticipated and has been accounted for in the design. The non-standard design of these bioswales has been reviewed and approved by the District Construction, Maintenance, and Design Stormwater Coordinators.

6. Proposed Temporary Construction Site BMPs to be used on Project

This project has a total disturbed soil area of 3 acres and, therefore, requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

The overall site risk level has been determined to be Level 2. Two monitoring locations will be needed for this project and are identified on the project plans. The project working days are specified in the order of work specification for this project. The R factor in the risk level determination calculation is dependent on project duration. If the project duration is changed at any time prior to project completion, the R factor will change and the project risk level must be recalculated. Monitoring quantities and costs may have to be adjusted if the project risk level changes.

The Construction Site BMP strategy for this project requires the implementation of the Construction Site BMPs identified in this section. Soil stabilization and sediment shall consist of placing fiber rolls and temporary fence around the excavation to provide run-on and run-off control and to prevent concentrated flow from eroding areas of soil disturbance. Storm drain inlet protection will be deployed throughout the project. Since there are two rainy seasons, multiple temporary erosion control mobilizations are required. Compliance of the CGP can be met through the use of traditional BMPs, therefore an active treatment system is not required.

For tracking controls stabilized construction entrances and street sweeping are required as the work will be adjacent to a roadway.

Various non-storm water management, waste management, and housekeeping BMPs will be used throughout the duration of the project and are included in the Construction Site Management cost item. Concrete wastes shall be managed through the use of portable concrete washout facilities.

Miscellaneous items include storm water monitoring that is required because this project is a RL 2. Monitoring consists of storm water sampling and analysis. In addition to monitoring, this project is required to implement a rain event action plan (REAP). Quantities for sampling and testing are included in the table below and costs are included in the cost summary attached to this report.

The following BMPs will be included as separate bid line items: move-in/move-out temporary erosion control, scheduling, temporary fence type ESA, temporary erosion control blanket, temporary silt fence, temporary fiber rolls, temporary drainage inlet protection, temporary hydraulic mulch, stabilized construction entrance/exit, street sweeping, temporary portable concrete washout facility, preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, implementation of a REAP, and storm water sampling and analysis day.

The following BMPs will be included as a lump sum under the Construction Site Management item: stockpile management, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, dewatering operations, paving and grinding operations, concrete curing, material and equipment usage over water and structure demolition/removal over or

adjacent to water. Dewatering will be required during the construction of this project; however, a separate dewatering permit is not anticipated.

The Actual Unit Cost Method (Option 4) was used to estimate costs for Construction Site BMPs. The quantities shown in the following table are related to the selected Construction Site BMPs and were estimated from take-off measurements using the layout sheets.

BEES	Temporary BMPs - PPDG Appendix C	Quantity	Unit
074037	Move-In/Move-out (Temporary Erosion Control)	12	EA
	Scheduling	1	LS
071325	Temp. Fence (Type ESA)	1,020	ft
074027	Temp. Erosion Control Blanket	1,800	yd ²
074029	Temp. Silt Fence	2,365	ft
074028	Temp. Fiber Roll	3,500	ft ²
074038	Temp. Drainage Inlet Protection	8	EA
074039	Temp. Hydraulic Mulch	13,700	yd ²
074033	Stabilized Constr. Entrance/Exit	2	EA
074041	Street Sweeping	1	LS
074042	Temp. Concrete Washout (Portable)	4	LS
074019	Water Pollution Control (SWPPP)	1	LS
	Rain Event Action Plan (REAP)	114	EA
074058	Storm Water Sampling and Analysis Day	30	EA
CSM*	*Construction Site Management	1	LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Stockpile Management</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Spill Prevention and Control</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Concrete Waste Management</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Dewatering Operations</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Paving & Grinding Operations</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Concrete Curing</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Material & Equipmt use over water</i>		LS
<i>CSM*</i>	<i>Structure Demolition/Removal Over or Adjacent to Water</i>		LS

A meeting was held on 9/1/10 to coordinate the temporary construction site BMP implementation strategy with the District Construction Stormwater Coordinator (CSWC) William Alexander. Other attendees included Betsy Ross - Project Engineer, Horatio Gates - District Landscape Architect, and Nathanael Greene- District NPDES Stormwater Coordinator. Topics discussed at the meeting included: construction site BMP selection, construction site BMP quantity estimating strategy, temporary soil stabilization BMP selection, monitoring requirements, the construction site management item, permanent erosion control strategy, mitigation planting and plant establishment period, and stream crossing concerns. Additional email communication between all parties was maintained until concurrence was reached. Concurrence on the implementation strategy was obtained from William Alexander via email to Betsy Ross on 9/30/10.

7. Maintenance BMPs (Drain Inlet Stenciling)

A meeting was held on 9/1/10 to coordinate the maintenance BMPs and concerns for this project with the District Maintenance Stormwater Coordinator (MSWC) Paul Revere. Topics discussed included drain inlet stenciling and the permanent erosion control strategy for the site. Drain inlet stenciling is not required as determined by the District MSWC. Final concurrence on the implementation strategy was obtained from Paul Revere via email to Betsy Ross on 9/30/10.

Required Attachments

- Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form
- Construction Site BMP Consideration Form
- RUSLE2 Summary Sheet
- Risk Level Determination Documentation
 - GIS Map Method
 - Individual Method

Supplemental Attachments


- Layout Sheets (4)
- SWDR Tracking Form
 - Biofiltration Design Calculations
- Storm Water BMP Cost Summary
- Checklist SW-1, Site Data Sources
- Checklist SW-2, Storm Water Quality Issues Summary
- Checklist SW-3, Measures for Avoiding or Reducing Potential Storm Water BMPs
- Checklists DPP-1, Parts 1-5
- Checklists CS-1, Parts 1-6

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROJECT PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION ON
STATE HIGHWAY
IN MENDOCINO COUNTY
NEAR UKIAH
AT RUSSIAN RIVER BRIDGE

TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY STANDARD PLANS DATED JULY 2004

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	KILOMETER POST TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	Men	222	1.6	1	1

LOCATION MAP



NO SCALE

10-8-10
 Project Engineer Date
 Registered Civil Engineer

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BETSY ROSS

No. CXXXXX
 Exp. 9-30-11
 CIVIL

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS THE CLASS (OR CLASSES) OF LICENSE AS SPECIFIED IN THE "NOTICE TO BIDDERS".

EXAMPLE ONLY

Evaluation Documentation Form

DATE: 10-8-10

Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX

NO.	CRITERIA	YES ✓	NO ✓	SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION
1.	Begin Project Evaluation regarding requirement for consideration of Treatment BMPs	✓		See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs. Go to 2
2.	Is this an emergency project?		✓	If Yes , go to 10. If No , continue to 3.
3.	Have TMDLs or other Pollution Control Requirements been established for surface waters within the project limits? Information provided in the water quality assessment or equivalent document. Sedimentation/sitation and temperature	✓		If Yes , contact the District/Regional NPDES Coordinator to discuss the Department's obligations under the TMDL (if Applicable) or Pollution Control Requirements, go to 9 or 4. <i>JWS</i> (Dist./Reg. SW Coordinator initials) If No , continue to 4.
4.	Is the project located within an area of a local MS4 Permittee?		✓	If Yes . (write the MS4 Area here), go to 5. If No , document in SWDR go to 5.
5.	Is the project directly or indirectly discharging to surface waters?	✓		If Yes , continue to 6. If No , go to 10.
6.	Is it a new facility or major reconstruction?	✓		If Yes , continue to 8. If No , go to 7.
7.	Will there be a change in line/grade or hydraulic capacity?			If Yes , continue to 8. If No , go to 10.
8.	Does the project result in a <u>net increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface</u> ?		✓	If Yes , continue to 9. If No , go to 10. <u>0.11 ac</u> (Net Increase New Impervious Surface)
9.	Project is required to consider approved Treatment BMPs.			See Sections 2.4 and either Section 5.5 or 6.5 for BMP Evaluation and Selection Process. Complete Checklist T-1 in this Appendix E.
10.	Project is not required to consider Treatment BMPs. <i>JWS</i> (Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. Initials) <i>PK</i> (Project Engineer Initials) <u>10-8-10</u> (Date)	✓		Document for Project Files by completing this form, and attaching it to the SWDR.

See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs

Construction Site BMP Consideration Form

DATE: 10-8-10

Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX

Project Evaluation Process for the Consideration of Construction Site BMPs

NO.	CRITERIA	YES ✓	NO ✓	SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
1.	Will construction of the project result in areas of disturbed soil as defined by the Project Planning and Design Guide (PPDG)?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Soil Stabilization (SS) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 1. Continue to 2. If No, Continue to 3.
2.	Is there a potential for disturbed soil areas within the project to discharge to storm drain inlets, drainage ditches, areas outside the right-of-way, etc?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Sediment Control (SC) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 2. Continue to 3.
3.	Is there a potential for sediment or construction related materials and wastes to be tracked offsite and deposited on private or public paved roads by construction vehicles and equipment?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Tracking Control (TC) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 3. Continue to 4.
4.	Is there a potential for wind to transport soil and dust offsite during the period of construction?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Wind Erosion Control (WE) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 4. Continue to 5.
5.	Is dewatering anticipated or will construction activities occur within or adjacent to a live channel or stream?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Non-Storm Water Management (NS) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 5. Continue to 6.
6.	Will construction include saw-cutting, grinding, drilling, concrete or mortar mixing, hydro-demolition, blasting, sandblasting, painting, paving, or other activities that produce residues?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Non-Storm Water Management (NS) will be required. Complete CS-1, Parts 5 & 6. Continue to 7.
7.	Are stockpiles of soil, construction related materials, and/or wastes anticipated?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Waste Management and Materials Pollution Control (WM) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 6. Continue to 8.
8.	Is there a potential for construction related materials and wastes to have direct contact with precipitation; stormwater run-on, or stormwater runoff; be dispersed by wind; be dumped and/or spilled into storm drain systems?	✓		If Yes, Construction Site BMPs for Waste Management and Materials Pollution Control (WM) will be required. Complete CS-1, Part 6. Continue to 9.
9.	End of checklist.	✓		Document for Project Files by completing this form, and attaching it to the SWDR.

BR 10-8-10

PE to initialize after concurrence with Construction (PS&E only) Date

RUSLE2 Summary Sheet

Rev: 0 (9/09)

Location - Ukiah, CA.

Proposed Project Summary - Bridge Replacement

Latitude - 39° 8 min, 5 sec N
Longitude - 123° 11 min, 12 sec W

Project Phase	RUSLE 2 RUN #	INPUT						OUTPUT		Notes		
		CLIMATE - R	SOIL - R		TOPOGRAPHY - LS		COVER - C		SOIL LOSS EROD PORTION (tacyr)		SEDIMENT DELIVERY (tacyr)	
			SOIL TYPE	SOIL K VALUE	SLOPE %	SLOPE LENGTH	DISTURBED?	Veg Type				% Cover
Pre-Construction/Reference Site	1	USA/California/DIST-01/Mendocino County/CA_Mendocino_R36-40	Mendocino County, Eastern Part and Southwestern Part of Trinity County, Cal 188 RUSSIAN LOAM, 0 TO 2 PERCENT SLOPES/RUSSIAN loam 85%	0.43	10	50	No	Existing Undisturbed Vegetative Cover/Mixed Grass and shrubs existing, 35 to 70 pct Canopy Cover	30-70	7.3	7.3	
Construction Max Erosion	2	County/CA_Mendocino_R36-40	# 188 - Russian Loam	0.43	10	50	Yes	none	0	32.1	32.1	Construction MAER goal (80% reduction) = 6.4 tacyr
Construction BMPs - MAER	3	USA/California/DIST-01/Mendocino County/CA_Mendocino_R36-40	# 188 - Russian Loam	0.43	10	50	Yes	none	>70	3.8	1.8	includes 12" fiber rolls 20" OC and at toe of slope
Post-Construction	4	USA/California/DIST-01/Mendocino County/CA_Mendocino_R36-40	# 188 - Russian Loam	0.43	10	50	Yes	seed mix (contains annual rye)	50-70	2.8	1.3	includes 12" fiber rolls 20" OC and at toe of slope

Notes: 1) For purposes of "final stabilization," the site will not pose any additional sediment discharge risk than it did prior to the commencement of construction activity (Sediment Delivery at Post-Construction < Sediment Delivery Pre-Construction).

2) Soil 188 - Russian loam (K = 0.43) was used because this was the most erodable soil; other soils (#217, 218, K=0.24) may be in the same vicinity but were not modeled because they will have lower rates of erosion.

Background: Legally Responsible Parties must file a Notice of Termination (NOT) with the Regional Water Board when construction is complete and final stabilization has been transferred. The discharger must certify that all State and local requirements have been met in accordance with this General Permit. In order for construction to be found complete, the discharger must install post-construction storm water management measures and establish a long-term maintenance plan. This requirement is intended to ensure that the post-construction conditions at the project site do not cause or contribute to direct or indirect water quality impacts (i.e., pollution and/or hydromodification) upstream and downstream. Specifically, the discharger must demonstrate compliance with the post-construction standards set forth in this General Permit (Section XIII). The discharger is responsible for all compliance issues including all annual fees until the NOT has been filed and approved by the local Regional Water Board.

Risk Level - GIS Method
EA 01-XXXXXX, PS&E 10/8/10

	A	B	C
1	Sediment Risk Factor Worksheet		Entry
2	A) R Factor		
3	Analyses of data indicated that when factors other than rainfall are held constant, soil loss is directly proportional to a rainfall factor composed of total storm kinetic energy (E) times the maximum 30-min intensity (I30) (Wischmeier and Smith, 1958). The numerical value of R is the average annual sum of EI30 for storm events during a rainfall record of at least 22 years. "Isoerodent" maps were developed based on R values calculated for more than 1000 locations in the Western U.S. Refer to the link below to determine the R factor for the project site.		
4	http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/LEW/lewCalculator.cfm		
5	R Factor Value		118
6	B) K Factor (weighted average, by area, for all site soils)		
7	The soil-erodibility factor K represents: (1) susceptibility of soil or surface material to erosion, (2) transportability of the sediment, and (3) the amount and rate of runoff given a particular rainfall input, as measured under a standard condition. Fine-textured soils that are high in clay have low K values (about 0.05 to 0.15) because the particles are resistant to detachment. Coarse-textured soils, such as sandy soils, also have low K values (about 0.05 to 0.2) because of high infiltration resulting in low runoff even though these particles are easily detached. Medium-textured soils, such as a silt loam, have moderate K values (about 0.25 to 0.45) because they are moderately susceptible to particle detachment and they produce runoff at moderate rates. Soils having a high silt content are especially susceptible to erosion and have high K values, which can exceed 0.45 and can be as large as 0.65. Silt-size particles are easily detached and tend to crust, producing high rates and large volumes of runoff. Use Site-specific data must be submitted.		
8	Site-specific K factor guidance		
9	K Factor Value		1.6
10	C) LS Factor (weighted average, by area, for all slopes)		
11	The effect of topography on erosion is accounted for by the LS factor, which combines the effects of a hillslope-length factor, L, and a hillslope-gradient factor, S. Generally speaking, as hillslope length and/or hillslope gradient increase, soil loss increases. As hillslope length increases, total soil loss and soil loss per unit area increase due to the progressive accumulation of runoff in the downslope direction. As the hillslope gradient increases, the velocity and erosivity of runoff increases. Use the LS table located in separate tab of this spreadsheet to determine LS factors. Estimate the weighted LS for the site prior to construction.		
12	LS Table		
13	LS Factor Value		1
14			
15	Watershed Erosion Estimate (=R_xK_xLS) in tons/acre		188.8
16	Site Sediment Risk Factor		High
17	Low Sediment Risk: < 15 tons/acre		
18	Medium Sediment Risk: >=15 and <75 tons/acre		
19	High Sediment Risk: >= 75 tons/acre		
20			

Risk Level - GIS Method
EA 01-XXXXXX, PS&E 10/8/10

Receiving Water (RW) Risk Factor Worksheet	Entry	Score
A. Watershed Characteristics	yes/no	
<p>A.1. Does the disturbed area discharge (either directly or indirectly) to a 303(d)-listed waterbody impaired by sediment? For help with impaired waterbodies please check the attached worksheet or visit the link below:</p> <p style="background-color: yellow;">2006 Approved Sediment-impaired WBs Worksheet</p> <p style="background-color: yellow;">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/303d_lists2006_epa.shtml</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>A.2. Does the disturbed area discharge to a waterbody with designated beneficial uses of SPAWN & COLD & MIGRATORY?</p> <p style="background-color: yellow;">http://www.ice.ucdavis.edu/geowbs/asp/wbquse.asp</p>	yes	High

EXAMPLE ONLY

		Combined Risk Level Matrix		
		<u>Sediment Risk</u>		
<u>Receiving Water Risk</u>		Low	Medium	High
		Low	Level 1	Level 2
High	Level 2		Level 3	

Project Sediment Risk: **High**
Project RW Risk: **High**
Project Combined Risk: **Level 3**

EXAMPLE ONLY

Risk Level - Individual Method
EA 01-XXXXXX, PS&E 10/8/10

	A	B	C
1	Sediment Risk Factor Worksheet		Entry
2	A) R Factor		
3	Analyses of data indicated that when factors other than rainfall are held constant, soil loss is directly proportional to a rainfall factor composed of total storm kinetic energy (E) times the maximum 30-min intensity (I30) (Wischmeier and Smith, 1958). The numerical value of R is the average annual sum of EI30 for storm events during a rainfall record of at least 22 years. "Isoerodent" maps were developed based on R values calculated for more than 1000 locations in the Western U.S. Refer to the link below to determine the R factor for the project site.		
4	http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/LEW/lewCalculator.cfm		
5	R Factor Value	118	
6	B) K Factor (weighted average, by area, for all site soils)		
7	The soil-erodibility factor K represents: (1) susceptibility of soil or surface material to erosion, (2) transportability of the sediment, and (3) the amount and rate of runoff given a particular rainfall input, as measured under a standard condition. Fine-textured soils that are high in clay have low K values (about 0.05 to 0.15) because the particles are resistant to detachment. Coarse-textured soils, such as sandy soils, also have low K values (about 0.05 to 0.2) because of high infiltration resulting in low runoff even though these particles are easily detached. Medium-textured soils, such as a silt loam, have moderate K values (about 0.25 to 0.45) because they are moderately susceptible to particle detachment and they produce runoff at moderate rates. Soils having a high silt content are especially susceptible to erosion and have high K values, which can exceed 0.45 and can be as large as 0.65. Silt-size particles are easily detached and tend to crust, producing high rates and large volumes of runoff. Use Site-specific data must be submitted.		
8	Site-specific K factor guidance		
9	K Factor Value	0.33	
10	C) LS Factor (weighted average, by area, for all slopes)		
11	The effect of topography on erosion is accounted for by the LS factor, which combines the effects of a hillslope-length factor, L, and a hillslope-gradient factor, S. Generally speaking, as hillslope length and/or hillslope gradient increase, soil loss increases. As hillslope length increases, total soil loss and soil loss per unit area increase due to the progressive accumulation of runoff in the downslope direction. As the hillslope gradient increases, the velocity and erosivity of runoff increases. Use the LS table located in separate tab of this spreadsheet to determine LS factors. Estimate the weighted LS for the site prior to construction.		
12	LS Table		
13	LS Factor Value	1.33	
14			
15	Watershed Erosion Estimate (=R_xK_xLS) in tons/acre	51.7902	
16	Site Sediment Risk Factor		Medium
17	Low Sediment Risk: < 15 tons/acre		
18	Medium Sediment Risk: >=15 and <75 tons/acre		
19	High Sediment Risk: >= 75 tons/acre		
20			

Risk Level - Individual Method
EA 01-XXXXXX, PS&E 10/8/10

Receiving Water (RW) Risk Factor Worksheet	Entry	Score		
A. Watershed Characteristics	yes/no			
A.1. Does the disturbed area discharge (either directly or indirectly) to a 303(d)-listed waterbody impaired by sediment ? For help with impaired waterbodies please check the attached worksheet or visit the link below:				
2006 Approved Sediment-impaired WBs Worksheet				
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/303d_lists2006_epa.shtml	Yes	High		
OR				
A.2. Does the disturbed area discharge to a waterbody with designated beneficial uses of SPAWN & COLD & MIGRATORY?				
http://www.ice.ucdavis.edu/geowbs/asp/wbquse.asp				

EXAMPLE ONLY

		Combined Risk Level Matrix		
		<u>Sediment Risk</u>		
<u>Receiving Water Risk</u>		Low	Medium	High
		Low	Level 1	Level 2
High	Level 2		Level 3	

Project Sediment Risk: **Medium**

Project RW Risk: **High**

Project Combined Risk: **Level 2**

EXAMPLE ONLY

01-MEN-222
 R0.01 - R1.30
 Bridge Replacement
 01-XXXXXX
 10-8-10 PS-E
 P. ROSS


Risk Level Determination:

From PID, using the GIS Map Method, RL=3


Try Individual Method to Reduce Risk Level:

R Factor Value: 118 (From EPA website, printout attached)
 K Factor Value: 0.33 (From Soil Survey Website, printout attached.)
 LS Factor Value:

Cross sections drawn through disturbed soil areas



LS from table: 1.62



LS From table: 1.04

$LS_{avg} = \frac{1.62 + 1.04}{2} = \underline{\underline{1.33}}$

The Individual Method reduced the Sediment Risk to Medium, reducing the overall Risk Level

RL=2



National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

[Recent Additions](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Print Version](#) Search NPDES: [GO](#)

[EPA Home](#) > [OW Home](#) > [OWM Home](#) > [NPDES Home](#) >

[Basic Information](#)

[NPDES Topics](#)

[Alphabetical Index](#)

[Glossary](#)

[About NPDES](#)

[Municipal MS4s](#)

[Construction Activities](#)

[Industrial Activities](#)

[Road-Related MS4s](#)

[Menu of BMPs](#)

[Green Infrastructure](#)

[Urban BMP Tool](#)

[Stormwater Home](#)



Rainfall Erosivity Factor Calculator for Small Construction Sites

Facility Information

Facility Name: Route 222 Bridge Replacement
Start Date: 06/01/2011
End Date: 06/01/2013
Latitude: 39.1344
Longitude: -123.1863

Erosivity Index Calculator Results

AN EROSIIVITY INDEX VALUE OF **118.05** HAS BEEN DETERMINED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD OF **06/01/2011 - 06/01/2013**.

A rainfall erosivity factor of 5.0 or greater has been calculated for your site and period of construction. **You do not qualify for a waiver from NPDES permitting requirements.**

[Start Over](#)

Stormwater Information
Recent Additions
FAQs
Publications
Regulations
Training & Meetings
Links
Contacts



The documents on this site are best viewed with Acrobat 8.0

[Office of Water](#) | [Office of Wastewater Management](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Search EPA](#)

[EPA Home](#) | [Privacy and Security Notice](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Last updated on August 07, 2009 3:37 PM

URL: http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/LEW/erosivity_index_result.cfm

EXAMPLE ONLY

View Soil Information By Use: All Uses

[Printable Version](#) [Add to Shopping Cart](#)

Search

Properties and Qualities Ratings
[Open All](#) [Close All](#)

Soil Chemical Properties

Soil Erosion Factors

K Factor, Rock Free
[View Description](#) [View Rating](#)

View Options

Map
Table
Description of Rating
Rating Options Detailed Description

Advanced Options

Aggregation Method Dominant Condition
Component Percent Cutoff
Tie-break Rule Lower Higher
Layer Options Surface Layer Depth Range
Top Depth
Bottom Depth
 Inches Centimeters
 All Layers

[View Description](#) [View Rating](#)

K Factor, Whole Soil

T Factor

Wind Erodibility Group

Wind Erodibility Index

Soil Physical Properties

Soil Qualities and Features

Water Features

Map — K Factor, Rock Free



Warning: Soil Ratings Map may not be valid at this scale.

⚠ I have zoomed in beyond the scale at which the soil map for this area is intended to be used. Mapping of soils is done at a particular scale. The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000. The design of map units and the level of detail shown in the resulting soil map are dependent on that map scale. Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Tables — K Factor, Rock Free — Summary By Map Unit

Summary by Map Unit — Mendocino County, Eastern Part and Southwestern Part of Trinity County, California

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
188	RUSSIAN LOAM, 0 TO 2 PERCENT SLOPES	.43	1.9	30.3%
217	XEROFLUVENTS, 0 TO 2 PERCENT SLOPES	.24	2.4	38.1%
218	XEROFLUVENTS-RIVERWASH COMPLEX, 0 TO 2 PERCENT SLOPES	.24	1.2	19.3%
236	WATER		0.8	12.2%
Totals for Area of Interest			6.4	100.0%

Description — K Factor, Rock Free

Erosion factor K indicates the susceptibility of a soil to sheet and rill erosion by water. Factor K is one of six factors used in the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) and the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) to predict the average annual rate of soil loss by sheet and rill erosion in tons per acre per year. The estimates are based primarily on percentage of silt, sand, and organic matter and on soil structure and saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ksat). Values of K range from 0.02 to 0.69. Other factors being equal, the higher the value, the more susceptible the soil is to sheet and rill erosion by water.

"Erosion factor Kf (rock free)" indicates the erodibility of the fine-earth fraction, or the material less than 2 millimeters in size.

Rating Options — K Factor, Rock Free

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition
Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified
Tie-break Rule: Higher
Layer Options: Surface Layer

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	KILOMETER POST TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	Men	222	1.58	1	4

10-8-10
 REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
 Betsy Ross
 No. CXXXXX
 Exp. 09-30-11
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

The State of California or its officers or agents shall not be responsible for the accuracy or completeness of electronic copies of this plan sheet.

- NOTES:
- FOR COMPLETE RIGHT OF WAY AND ACCURATE ACCESS DATA, SEE RIGHT OF WAY RECORD MAPS AT DISTRICT OFFICE.
 - FOR PRIVATE ROAD/DRIVEWAY DETAIL, SEE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS.
 - FOR HMA CONFORM, SEE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS.
 - FOR RSP AROUND ABUTMENTS, SEE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS.

LEGEND

-  REMOVE AND CONSTRUCT BASE AND SURFACING
-  TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
-  1 in HMA OVERLAY
-  RSP AROUND ABUTMENTS
-  CONCRETE BARRIER (TYPE 80)
-  -TFESA TEMPORARY FENSE (TYPE ESA)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 NORTH REGION
 OFFICE OF DESIGN, WEST
 DESIGN BRANCH 88

Caltrans

FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR


BETSY ROSS
 GEORGE WASHINGTON

REVISOR BY DATE REVISOR

CALCULATED BY DESIGNED BY

CHECKED BY

...\\138050ea001.dgn



ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET
 UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN

LAYOUT

SCALE 1:500


EXAMPLE ONLY

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	KILOMETER POST TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	Men	222	1.58	2	4

10-8-10
 REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
 Betsy Ross
 No. CXXXXX
 Exp. 09-30-11
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PLANS APPROVAL DATE
 The State of California or its officers or agents shall not be responsible for the accuracy or completeness of electronic copies of this plan sheet.

NOTE: FOR COMPLETE RIGHT OF WAY AND ACCURATE ACCESS DATA, SEE RIGHT OF WAY RECORD MAPS AT DISTRICT OFFICE.



STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 NORTH REGION
 OFFICE OF DESIGN, WEST
 DESIGN BRANCH 58

Caltrans

FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
 L. STOCKTON

DESIGNED BY
 Betsy Ross

CHECKED BY
 GEORGE WASHINGTON

REVISOR BY
 DATE REVISOR

...\\138050ea002.dgn



ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET
 UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN
LAYOUT
 SCALE 1:500

L-2




EXAMPLE ONLY

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	KILOMETER POST TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET NO.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	Men	222	1.58	3	4


10-8-10
 REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
 Betsy Ross
 No. CXXXXX
 Exp. 09-30-11
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 PLANS APPROVAL DATE
The State of California or its officers or agents shall not be responsible for the accuracy or completeness of electronic copies of this plan sheet.



BIOFILTRATION SWALE NO.1
REGRADE EXISTING DITCH



BIOFILTRATION SWALE NO.2
REGRADE EXISTING DITCH



ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET
UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

NO SCALE

C-3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 NORTH REGION
 OFFICE OF DESIGN, WEST
 DESIGN BRANCH 88
 ...\\138050ga003.dgn
 SUPERVISOR
 Betsy Ross
 GEORGE WASHINGTON
 CALCULATED-DESIGNED BY
 CHECKED BY
 REVISED BY
 DATE REVISED
 BORDER LAST REVISED 10-8-10



EXAMPLE ONLY

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	KILOMETER POST TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET NO.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	Men	222	1.58	4	4



10-8-10
 REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER
 Betsy Ross
 No. CXXXXX
 Exp. 09-30-11
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

The State of California or its officers or agents shall not be responsible for the accuracy or completeness of electronic copies of this plan sheet.



BIOFILTRATION SWALE NO.3
 REGRADE EXISTING DITCH



BIOFILTRATION SWALE NO.4
 REGRADE EXISTING DITCH

ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET
 UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

NO SCALE

C-4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 NORTH REGION
 OFFICE OF DESIGN, WEST
 DESIGN BRANCH 58

FUNCTIONAL SUPERVISOR
 L. STOCKTON

DESIGNED BY
 BETSY ROSS

CHECKED BY
 GEORGE WASHINGTON

REVISOR
 DATE

REVISIONS

...\\138050ga004.dgn

BORDER LAST REVISED 10-8-10

EXAMPLE ONLY

Ref_to_hq	Dist_EA	District	EA	County	Route	Beg_PM	End_PM	Descrip	Phase	LongSWDR	PhaseRotDate	Exempt	TBMP	Pollution Program	Disturbance Act	AddImpArea	PercentTreated	MS4Area	MS4DCo	Her Bodies Affect	Criteria	BioStrip	BioSwale	Detention	Infiltration	InfilTrench	GSRD	TST	DryWeath	MedFilter	MCTT	WeiBasin	Const_Start	Const_Comp	SWComment
08-Oct-10 01.XXXXXX		1.XXXXXX	MEN		222.R0.01	R1.30		Bridge Replacement	PSE	TRUE	08-Oct-10	TRUE	TRUE	SWPPP	3	0.11	100	FALSE		Russian River	303	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01-Jun-11	01-Jun-13	

EXAMPLE ONLY

EXAMPLE ONLY

SWDR Tracking Form

IDNO	STBMPCode	PE	District	County	Route	LocBPM	LocEPM	Location	Direction	Facility	Cubic Yards	Const_Comp	Comments
1	BIOSWL	B. Ross	1	MEN	222	R0.01	R1.30	RW-STBMP	R			01-Jun-13	"A" 16+28 to 17+00
2	BIOSWL	B. Ross	1	MEN	222	R0.01	R1.30	RW-STBMP	L			01-Jun-13	"A" 16+28 to 17+00
3	BIOSWL	B. Ross	1	MEN	222	R0.01	R1.30	RW-STBMP	R			01-Jun-13	"A" 18+84 to 19+30
4	BIOSWL	B. Ross	1	MEN	222	R0.01	R1.30	RW-STBMP	L			01-Jun-13	"A" 18+80 to 19+55

EXAMPLE ONLY

EXAMPLE ONLY

Normal Depth Calculations for Channels using Manning's Equation

BMP 1: Biofiltration Swale at Station 16+28 to 17+00 Rt


WQF Calculation, i= 0.16 in/hr #1

Input Values

Height	1.00	ft
Width	5	ft
LT Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Rt Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Mannings	0.2	
Slope	0.015	ft/ft
Design Flow	0.14	cfs

Normal Depth for Channel

Depth	0.440	ft
Area	2.97	ft ²
Perimeter	8.63	ft
Rh	0.34	ft
V	0.45	ft/s
Q	1.33	cfs
Goal Seek	-1.19	



WQF(cfs)= 0.14
Length of Swale= 300.00
HRT (L/(60xV))= 11.18 minutes

HRTx60/(DEPTHxVELOCITY) = 3406.458 GOOD

FB = 0.56 ft >? 0.2He = 0.089 ft GOOD

Tributary area for paved areas

37675 sf
 0.865 ac
 1 C for paved areas

Top width 13

Drawdown time	48	hrs
Unit Basin Storage Volume	1.11	in
WQV	3485	cf

Normal Depth Calculations for Channels using Manning's Equation

BMP 2 Biofiltration Swale at Station 16+28 to 17+00 Lt


WQF Calculation, i= 0.16 in/hr #2

Input Values

Height	1.00	ft
Width	5	ft
LT Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Rt Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Mannings	0.2	
Slope	0.0025	ft/ft
Design Flow	0.20	cfs

Normal Depth for Channel

Depth	0.500	ft
Area	3.50	ft ²
Perimeter	9.12	ft
Rh	0.38	ft
V	0.20	ft/s
Q	0.69	cfs
Goal Seek	-0.49	



WQF(cfs)= 0.20
Length of Swale= 236.00
HRT (L/(60xV))= 20.05 minutes

HRTx60/(DEPTHxVELOCITY) = 12268.47 GOOD
FB = 0.50 ft >? 0.2He = 0.1 ft GOOD

Tributary area for paved areas

53820 sf
 1.236 ac
 1 C for paved areas

Top width 13

Drawdown time	48	hrs
Unit Basin Storage Volume	1.11	in
WQV	4978	cf

Normal Depth Calculations for Channels using Manning's Equation

BMP 3: Biofiltration Swale at Station 18+84 to 19+30 Rt

WQF Calculation, i= 0.16 in/hr


#3

Input Values

Height	1.00	ft
Width	5	ft
LT Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Rt Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Mannings	0.2	
Slope	0.005	ft/ft
Design Flow	0.06	cfs

Normal Depth for Channel

Depth	0.500	ft
Area	3.50	ft ²
Perimeter	9.12	ft
Rh	0.38	ft
V	0.28	ft/s
Q	0.97	cfs
Goal Seek	-0.91	



WQF(cfs)= 0.06
Length of Swale= 150.00
HRT (L/(60xV))= 9.01 minutes

HRTx60/(DEPTHxVELOCITY) = 3898.88 GOOD

FB = 0.50 ft >? 0.2He = 0.1 ft GOOD

Tributary area for paved areas

16150 sf
 0.371 ac
 1 C for paved areas

Top width 13

Drawdown time	48	hrs
Unit Basin Storage Volume	1.11	in
WQV	1494	cf

Normal Depth Calculations for Channels using Manning's Equation

BMP 4: Biofiltration Swale at Station 18+80 to 19+55 Lt


WQF Calculation, i= 0.16 in/hr #4

Input Values

Height	1.00	ft
Width	10	ft
LT Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Rt Side Slope	4	:1 (h:v)
Mannings	0.2	
Slope	0.007	ft/ft
Design Flow	0.06	cfs

Normal Depth for Channel

Depth	0.050	ft
Area	0.51	ft ²
Perimeter	10.41	ft
Rh	0.05	ft
V	0.08	ft/s
Q	0.04	cfs
Goal Seek	0.02	



WQF(cfs)= 0.06
Length of Swale= 246.00
HRT (L/(60xV))= 49.27 minutes

HRTx60/(DEPTHxVELOCITY) = 710436.6 GOOD

FB = 0.95 ft >? 0.2He = 0.01 ft GOOD

Tributary area for paved areas

16150 sf
 0.371 ac
 1 C for paved areas

Top width 18

Drawdown time	48	hrs
Unit Basin Storage Volume	1.11	in
WQV	1494	cf

Storm Water BMP Cost Summary PS&E
 THIS INFORMATION IS FOR **CALTRANS INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Project Name:	Bridge Replacement
District:	1
County:	MEN
Route:	222
Postmile Limits:	R0.01 - R1.30
Project ID (or EA):	01-XXXXXX

Total Treatment BMP Costs \$ 8,000

Total Design Pollution Prevention BMP Costs \$ 46,100

Total Permanent Storm Water BMP Costs	\$ 54,100
--	------------------

Subtotal Soil Stabilization BMPs \$ 17,470

Subtotal Sediment Control BMPs \$ 21,728

Subtotal Wind Erosion Control BMPs \$ 13,700

Subtotal Tracking Control BMPs \$ 11,500

Subtotal Waste Management & Materials Handling BMPs \$ 6,000

Subtotal Non-Storm Water Management \$ 60,000

Subtotal Miscellaneous Items \$ 98,000

Total Construction Site BMP Costs	\$ 228,398
--	-------------------

TOTAL COST FOR STORM WATER BMPs	\$ 282,498
--	-------------------

Note: Please enter data in the fields shaded on this and the following pages. The totals will be reflected on this sheet automatically.

Storm Water BMP Cost Summary PS&E
THIS INFORMATION IS FOR **CALTRANS INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Treatment BMPs

BEES	Pollution Prevention BMPs Appendix A	PPDG	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost (\$)
	Biofiltration Swale				4	EA	2,000	\$ 8,000
Total Treatment BMP Costs								\$ 8,000

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

BEES	Pollution Prevention BMPs Appendix A	PPDG	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost (\$)
	Downstream Effects/Increased Flow Mitigation							
705307	- 12" Alternative Flared End Section		No	Yes	4	EA	250	\$ 1,000
	Slope/Surface Protection Systems- Hard Surfaces							
729010	- Rock Slope Protection Fabric		72-150	No	600	SQYD	2	\$ 1,200
	- Rock Slope Protection				570	CY	70	\$ 39,900
	Slope/Surface Protection Systems- Vegetated Surfaces							
203021	Fiber Rolls (<i>included in CS BMP estimate</i>)				1,665	LF		\$ -
204099	Plant Establishment Work		20-550		1	LS	4,000	\$ 4,000
Total Design Pollution Prevention BMP Costs								\$ 46,100

Total Permanent Storm Water BMP Costs	\$ 54,100
--	------------------

Storm Water BMP Cost Summary PS&E
THIS INFORMATION IS FOR **CALTRANS INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Temporary Construction Site BMPs

BEES	Temporary BMPs - PPDG Appendix C	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost (\$)
	Temporary Soil Stabilization						
074037	Move-In/Move-out (Temporary Erosion Control)	07-485	No	12	EA	500	\$ 6,000
	Scheduling		No	1	LS	2,500	\$ 2,500
071325	Temporary Fence (Type ESA)	07-446	Yes	1,020	ft	4	\$ 3,570
074027	Temp. Erosion Control Blanket	07-390	Yes	1,800	yd ²	3	\$ 5,400
Subtotal Soil Stabilization BMPs							\$ 17,470

BEES	Temporary Sediment Control	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
074029	Temp. Silt Fence	07-430	Yes	2,365	ft	4	\$ 8,278
074028	Temporary Fiber Roll	07-420	Yes	3,500	ft ²	4	\$ 12,250
074038	Temp. Drainage Inlet Protection	07-490	Yes	8	EA	150	\$ 1,200
Subtotal Sediment Control BMPs							\$ 21,728

BEES	Temporary Wind Erosion Control	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
074039	Temp. Hydraulic Mulch (Polymer Stabilized Fiber Matrix)	07-382	No	13,700	yd ²	1	\$ 13,700
Subtotal Wind Erosion Control BMPs							\$ 13,700

BEES	Temporary Tracking Control	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
074033	Stabilized Constr. Entrance/Exit	07-480	Yes	2	EA	2,800	\$ 5,600
074041	Street Sweeping	07-360	No	1	LS	5,900	\$ 5,900
Subtotal Tracking Control BMPs							\$ 11,500

BEES	Temporary Waste Management Control	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
CSM*	Stockpile Management	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	Spill Prevention and Control	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	Concrete Waste Management	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
074042	Temp. Concrete Washout (Portable)	07-406	No	4	LS	1,500	\$ 6,000
Subtotal Waste Management & Materials Handling BMPs							\$ 6,000

BEES	Temporary Non-Storm Water Management	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
CSM*	Dewatering Operations	07-341	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	Paving & Grinding Operations				LS		\$ -
CSM*	Concrete Curing	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	Material & Equipmt use over water	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	Structure Demolition/Removal Over or Adjacent to Water	07-346	No		LS		\$ -
CSM*	*Construction Site Management	07-346	No	1	LS	60,000	\$ 60,000
Subtotal Non-Storm Water Management							\$ 60,000

BEES	Miscellaneous Items	SSP/nSSP (#, Y or N)	STD. Det. (Y or N)	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost (\$/Unit)	Cost
074019	Water Pollution Control (SWPPP)	07-345	No	1	LS	8,600	\$ 8,600
	Rain Event Action Plan (REAP)		No	114	EA	500	\$ 57,000
074058	Storm Water Sampling and Analysis Day		No	30	EA	1,080	\$ 32,400
Subtotal Miscellaneous Items							\$ 98,000

Total Construction Site BMP Costs							\$ 228,398
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------

Construction site BMPs - Miscellaneous Items

- Prepare a SWPPP \$1,500,000 to \$12,000,000 = \$3,200 + RAM
(table F6, PPDG 2013 F-11)
(Eqn 1, PPDG 2010, pg F-11)

$$RAM = (\text{Mths}/3 + 1) \times (N+4) \times \text{Labor}$$

where:

Mths (project duration): 24

N: 2

Labor: \$100

$$RAM = \$5,400$$

$$\text{Cost to prepare SWPPP} = \$3,200 + \$5,400 = \$8,600$$

- Rain Event Action Plan (REAP)

Project Risk Level: 2

$$REAP = \$500 \times \text{Days}_{0.1} \quad (\text{pg F-12 PPDG 2010})$$

Annual Mean Number of Daily Precipitation $\approx 0.1 = 57$

↳ Project Risk Fall: Ukiah (see print out attached.)

$$REAP = \$500 \times 57 \times 2 \text{ rainy seasons} = \$57,000$$

- Storm Water Sampling + Analysis Day:

$$\text{SW Sampling + Analysis Day} = \text{SWM cost} / \text{Days}_{0.5} \quad (\text{Eqn 3, PPDG 2012, F-13})$$

$$\text{SWM Costs} = M \times \{ [\text{Days}_{0.5} \times \$1,000] + \$2000 [1 + 0.1(\text{Mths}/2)] \} \quad (\text{Eqn 2, PPDG 2010 F-12})$$

where:

M: 1

Mths: 24

Days_{0.5} = 30

$$\text{Annual Mean \# of Daily Precip} \approx 0.1 : 57 \approx 0.5 : 27.1$$

01-XXXXXX
Storm Water Costs
P&E
B. ROSS 10-8-10
2/2

Storm Water Sampling + Analysis Day (cont)

$$\text{Days}_{0.5}'' = 57 - 27.1 = \underline{29.9}$$

(definition PPDG 2010, pg F-13)

$$\text{SWM COSTS} = \$32,400$$

$$\boxed{\text{SW Sampling + Analysis Day} = \$32,400 / 30 = \$1,080}$$

EXAMPLE ONLY

Climatology of the United States No. 20 1971-2000

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
National Environmental Satellite, Data,
and Information Service

National Climatic Data Center
Federal Building
151 Patton Avenue
Asheville, North Carolina 28801
www.ncdc.noaa.gov

Station: UKIAH, CA

COOP ID: 049122

Climate Division: CA 1

Elevation: 633 Feet

Lat: 39° 09N

Lon: 123° 13W

		Precipitation (inches)										Precipitation Probabilities (1)												
		Mean Number of Days (3)										Probability that the monthly/annual precipitation will be equal to or less than the indicated amount												
		Extremes										Monthly/Annual Precipitation vs Probability Levels												
		Daily Precipitation										These values were determined from the incomplete gamma distribution												
		Means/Medians(t)																						
Month	Mean	Med-ian	Highest Daily(2)	Year	Day	Highest Monthly(1)	Year	Lowest Monthly(1)	Year	>= 0.01	>= 0.10	>= 0.50	>= 1.00	.05	.10	.20	.30	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	.90	.95
Jan	7.96	7.45	5.66	1974	16	24.76	1995	.50	1976	12.8	9.6	5.3	2.5	.82	1.41	2.50	3.61	4.81	6.15	7.74	9.71	12.41	16.88	21.25
Feb	7.05	5.33	4.65	1958	24	22.33	1998	.34	1988	12.3	9.3	5.2	2.5	.64	1.13	2.08	3.06	4.13	5.35	6.79	8.59	11.08	15.23	19.29
Mar	5.92	4.40	5.74	1995	9	18.64	1995	.16	1988	12.1	8.6	4.4	1.8	.57	.99	1.80	2.62	3.52	4.53	5.72	7.22	9.27	12.68	16.01
Apr	2.19	1.88	2.30	1983	23	6.99	1983	.14	1977	7.2	4.9	1.6	0.4	.22	.38	.68	.98	1.31	1.69	2.12	2.67	3.42	4.67	5.89
May	1.20	.54	2.11	1990	27	6.42	1998	.00+	1985	4.7	2.6	.7	.2	.00	.00	.11	.26	.46	.70	1.01	1.42	2.01	3.05	4.11
Jun	.28	.04	1.30	1967	2	1.39	1992	.00+	1999	1.4	.7	.1	.1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.05	.13	.25	.46	.86	1.29
Jul	.05	.00	.73	1974	8	.84	1974	.00+	2000	.3	.1	@	.0	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	.15	.36
Aug	.14	.00	.79	1997	20	1.16	1976	.00+	2000	.8	.4	.1	.0	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.06	.19	.48	.81
Sep	.67	.16	2.25	1957	27	3.02	1977	.00+	1998	2.2	1.2	.4	.2	.00	.00	.00	.00	.06	.22	.43	.73	1.18	1.96	2.77
Oct	2.07	1.75	3.19	1962	12	5.75	1981	.00+	1995	5.3	3.6	1.4	.5	.00	.25	.64	.97	1.31	1.67	2.09	2.58	3.26	4.37	5.43
Nov	5.40	4.30	3.85	1920	18	16.33	1973	.31	1995	11.1	7.6	3.9	1.6	.37	.70	1.38	2.12	2.95	3.91	5.07	6.54	8.59	12.06	15.49
Dec	5.97	4.99	6.18	1964	22	16.92	1996	.00	1989	11.9	8.4	4.0	1.7	.35	.92	1.84	2.72	3.65	4.68	5.88	7.36	9.37	12.68	15.89
Ann	38.90	36.84	6.18	Dec 1964	22	24.76	Jan 1995	.00+	Aug 2000	82.1	57.0	27.1	11.5	18.81	22.15	26.71	30.38	33.78	37.17	40.79	44.91	50.07	57.85	64.82

+ Also occurred on an earlier date(s)

Denotes amounts of a trace

@ Denotes mean number of days greater than 0 but less than .05

57.0 - 27.1 = 29.9

use 30

(1) From the 1971-2000 Monthly Normals

(2) Derived from station's available digital record: 1906-2001

(3) Derived from 1971-2000 serially complete daily data

** Statistics not computed because less than six years out of thirty had measurable precipitation

Complete documentation available from:

www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/normal/usnormals.html

Checklist SW-1, Site Data Sources

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Information for the following data categories should be obtained, reviewed and referenced as necessary throughout the project planning phase. Collect any available documents pertaining to the category and list them and reference your data source. For specific examples of documents within these categories, refer to Section 5.5 of this document. Example categories have been listed below; add additional categories, as needed. Summarize pertinent information in Section 2 of the SWDR.

DATA CATEGORY/SOURCES	Date
Topographic	
• Aerial Topography/Maps	August 2010
•	
•	
Hydraulic	
• http://www.water-programs.com/wqpt.htm	August 2010
• http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/tmdls/303d/pdf/100106/RussianRiver__MAP.pdf	August 2010
•	
Soils	
• Geotechnical Design Report	May 2010
•	
•	
Climatic	
• Average Temperatures (http://www.weather.com/)	August 2010
•	
•	
Water Quality	
• Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks, Project Planning and Design Guide (PPDG)	July 2010
• Caltrans SWPPP/WPCP Preparation Manual	March 2007
• North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Basin Plan	June 2007
Other Data Categories	
•	
•	

Checklist SW-2, Storm Water Quality Issues Summary

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

The following questions provide a guide to collecting critical information relevant to project stormwater quality issues. Complete responses to applicable questions, consulting other Caltrans functional units (Environmental, Landscape Architecture, Maintenance, etc.) and the District/Regional Storm Water Coordinator as necessary. Summarize pertinent responses in Section 2 of the SWDR.

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Determine the receiving waters that may be affected by the project throughout the project life cycle (i.e., construction, maintenance and operation). RUSSIAN RIVER (HSA 114.31) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 2. For the project limits, list the 303(d) impaired receiving water bodies and their constituents of concern. RUSSIAN RIVER IS LISTED FOR SEDIMENTATION/SILTATION AND TEMPERATURE. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 3. Determine if there are any municipal or domestic water supply reservoirs or groundwater percolation facilities within the project limits. Consider appropriate spill contamination and spill prevention control measures for these new areas. NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 4. Determine the RWQCB special requirements, including TMDLs, effluent limits, etc. NONE AND NO TMDLS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 5. Determine regulatory agencies seasonal construction and construction exclusion dates or restrictions required by federal, state, or local agencies. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 6. Determine if a 401 certification will be required. YES, AND BOARD HAS REQUIREMENTS FOR TREATMENT BMPS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 7. List rainy season dates. OCT 1 TO MAY 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 8. Determine the general climate of the project area. Identify annual rainfall and rainfall intensity curves. MILD 46-74°F, 37 IN RAIN | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 9. If considering Treatment BMPs, determine the soil classification, permeability, erodibility, and depth to groundwater. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 10. Determine contaminated soils within the project area. NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 11. Determine the total disturbed soil area of the project. 3 AC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 12. Describe the topography of the project site. FLAT BUT SURROUNDED BY MOUNTAINS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 13. List any areas outside of the Caltrans right-of-way that will be included in the project (e.g. contractor's staging yard, work from barges, easements for staging, etc.). NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 14. Determine if additional right-of-way acquisition or easements and right-of-entry will be required for design, construction and maintenance of BMPs. If so, how much? NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 15. Determine if a right-of-way certification is required. NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 16. Determine the estimated unit costs for right-of-way should it be needed for Treatment BMPs, stabilized conveyance systems, lay-back slopes, or interception ditches. NONE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| 17. Determine if project area has any slope stabilization concerns. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |

18. Describe the local land use within the project area and adjacent areas.
AGRICULTURAL, RESIDENTIAL

Complete

NA

19. Evaluate the presence of dry weather flow. **NONE**

Complete

NA

EXAMPLE ONLY

Checklist SW-3, Measures for Avoiding or Reducing Potential Storm Water Impacts

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

The PE must confer with other functional units, such as Landscape Architecture, Hydraulics, Environmental, Materials, Construction and Maintenance, as needed to assess these issues. Summarize pertinent responses in Section 2 of the SWDR.

Options for avoiding or reducing potential impacts during project planning include the following:

1. Can the project be relocated or realigned to avoid/reduce impacts to receiving waters or to increase the preservation of critical (or problematic) areas such as floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands, and areas with erosive or unstable soil conditions? Yes No NA
2. Can structures and bridges be designed or located to reduce work in live streams and minimize construction impacts? Yes No NA
3. Can any of the following methods be utilized to minimize erosion from slopes:
 - a. Disturbing existing slopes only when necessary? Yes No NA
 - b. Minimizing cut and fill areas to reduce slope lengths? Yes No NA
 - c. Incorporating retaining walls to reduce steepness of slopes or to shorten slopes? Yes No NA
 - d. Acquiring right-of-way easements (such as grading easements) to reduce steepness of slopes? Yes No NA
 - e. Avoiding soils or formations that will be particularly difficult to re-stabilize? Yes No NA
 - f. Providing cut and fill slopes flat enough to allow re-vegetation and limit erosion to pre-construction rates? Yes No NA
 - g. Providing benches or terraces on high cut and fill slopes to reduce concentration of flows? Yes No NA
 - h. Rounding and shaping slopes to reduce concentrated flow? Yes No NA
 - i. Collecting concentrated flows in stabilized drains and channels? Yes No NA
4. Does the project design allow for the ease of maintaining all BMPs? Yes No
5. Can the project be scheduled or phased to minimize soil-disturbing work during the rainy season? Yes No
6. Can permanent storm water pollution controls such as paved slopes, vegetated slopes, basins, and conveyance systems be installed early in the construction process to provide additional protection and to possibly utilize them in addressing construction storm water impacts? Yes No NA

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

Checklist DPP-1, Part 1

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Consideration of Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

Consideration of Downstream Effects Related to Potentially Increased Flow [to streams or channels]

- Will project increase velocity or volume of downstream flow? Yes No NA
- Will the project discharge to unlined channels? Yes No NA
- Will project increase potential sediment load of downstream flow? Yes No NA
- Will project encroach, cross, realign, or cause other hydraulic changes to a stream that may affect downstream channel stability? Yes No NA

If Yes was answered to any of the above questions, consider **Downstream Effects Related to Potentially Increased Flow**, complete the DPP-1, Part 2 checklist.

Slope/Surface Protection Systems

- Will project create new slopes or modify existing slopes? Yes No NA

If Yes was answered to the above question, consider **Slope/Surface Protection Systems**, complete the DPP-1, Part 3 checklist.

Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems

- Will the project create or modify ditches, dikes, berms, or swales? Yes No NA
- Will project create new slopes or modify existing slopes? Yes No NA
- Will it be necessary to direct or intercept surface runoff? Yes No NA
- Will cross drains be modified? Yes No NA

If Yes was answered to any of the above questions, consider **Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems**; complete the DPP-1, Part 4 checklist.

Preservation of Existing Vegetation

It is the goal of the Storm Water Program to maximize the protection of desirable existing vegetation to provide erosion and sediment control benefits on all projects. Complete

Consider **Preservation of Existing Vegetation**, complete the DPP-1, Part 5 checklist.

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

Checklist DPP-1, Part 2

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Downstream Effects Related to Potentially Increased Flow

1. Review total paved area and reduce to the maximum extent practicable. Complete
2. Review channel lining materials and design for stream bank erosion control. Complete
 - (a) See Chapters 860 and 870 of the HDM. Complete
 - (b) Consider channel erosion control measures within the project limits as well as downstream. Consider scour velocity. Complete
3. Include, where appropriate, energy dissipation devices at culvert outlets. Complete
4. Ensure all transitions between culvert outlets/headwalls/wingwalls and channels are smooth to reduce turbulence and scour. Complete
5. Include, if appropriate, peak flow attenuation basins or devices to reduce peak discharges. Complete

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

Checklist DPP-1, Part 3

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Slope / Surface Protection Systems

1. What are the proposed areas of cut and fill? (attach plan or map) Complete
2. Were benches or terraces provided on high cut and fill slopes to reduce concentration of flows? Yes No
3. Were slopes rounded and/or shaped to reduce concentrated flow? Yes No
4. Were concentrated flows collected in stabilized drains or channels? Yes No
5. Are new or disturbed slopes > 4:1 horizontal:vertical (h:v)? Yes No
 If Yes, District Landscape Architect must prepare or approve an erosion control plan, at the District's discretion.
6. Are new or disturbed slopes > 2:1 (h:v)? Yes No
 If Yes, Geotechnical Services must prepare a Geotechnical Design Report, and the District Landscape Architect should prepare or approve an erosion control plan. Concurrence must be obtained from the District Maintenance Storm Water Coordinator for slopes steeper than 2:1 (h:v).
7. Estimate the net new impervious area that will result from this project. 0.11 acres Complete

VEGETATED SURFACES

1. Identify existing vegetation. Complete
2. Evaluate site to determine soil types, appropriate vegetation and planting strategies. Complete
3. How long will it take for permanent vegetation to establish? Complete
4. Minimize overland and concentrated flow depths and velocities. Complete

HARD SURFACES

1. Are hard surfaces required? Yes No
 If Yes, document purpose (safety, maintenance, soil stabilization, etc.), types, and general locations of the installations. Complete

Review appropriate SSPs for Vegetated Surface and Hard Surface Protection Systems. Complete

Design Pollution Prevention BMPs

Checklist DPP-1, Part 4

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems

Ditches, Berms, Dikes and Swales

- 1. Consider Ditches, Berms, Dikes, and Swales as per Topics 813, 834.3, and 835, and Chapter 860 of the HDM. Complete
- 2. Evaluate risks due to erosion, overtopping, flow backups or washout. Complete
- 3. Consider outlet protection where localized scour is anticipated. Complete
- 4. Examine the site for run-on from off-site sources. Complete
- 5. Consider channel lining when velocities exceed scour velocity for soil. Complete

Overside Drains

- 1. Consider downdrains, as per Index 834.4 of the HDM. Complete
- 2. Consider paved spillways for side slopes flatter than 4:1 h:v. Complete

Flared Culvert End Sections

- 1. Consider flared end sections on culvert inlets and outlets as per Chapter 827 of the HDM. Complete

Outlet Protection/Velocity Dissipation Devices

- 1. Consider outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at outlets, including cross drains, as per Chapters 827 and 870 of the HDM. Complete

Review appropriate SSPs for Concentrated Flow Conveyance Systems. Complete

**Design Pollution Prevention BMPs
Checklist DPP-1, Part 5**

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Preservation of Existing Vegetation

1. Review Preservation of Property, Standard Specifications 16.1.01 and 16-1.02 (Clearing and Grubbing) to reduce clearing and grubbing and maximize preservation of existing vegetation. Complete
2. Has all vegetation to be retained been coordinated with Environmental, and identified and defined in the contract plans? Yes No
3. Have steps been taken to minimize disturbed areas, such as locating temporary roadways to avoid stands of trees and shrubs and to follow existing contours to reduce cutting and filling? Complete
4. Have impacts to preserved vegetation been considered while work is occurring in disturbed areas? Yes No
5. Are all areas to be preserved delineated on the plans? Yes No

EXAMPLE ONLY

Construction Site BMPs			
Checklist CS-1, Part 1			
Prepared by: <u>B. Ross</u>	Date: <u>10-8-10</u>	District-Co-Route: <u>1-MEN-222</u>	
PM : <u>R0.01-R1.30</u>	Project ID (or EA): <u>01-XXXXXX</u>	RWQCB: <u>North Coast</u>	

Soil Stabilization

General Parameters

1. How many rainy seasons are anticipated between begin and end of construction? 2
2. What is the total disturbed soil area for the project? (ac) 3
 - (a) How much of the project DSA consists of slopes 4:1 (h:v) or flatter? (ac) 2.67
 - (b) How much of the project DSA consists of 4:1 (h:v) < slopes < 2:1 (h:v)? (ac) 0.24
 - (c) How much of the project DSA consists of slopes 2:1 (h:v) and steeper? (ac) 0.09
 - (d) How much of the project DSA consists of slopes with slope lengths longer than 20 ft? (ac) 0
3. What rainfall area does the project lie within? (Refer to Table 2-1 of the Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual) 1
4. Review the required combination of temporary soil stabilization and temporary sediment controls and barriers for area, slope inclinations, rainy and non-rainy season, and active and non-active disturbed soil areas. (Refer to Tables 2-2, and 2-3 of the Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual for Rainfall Area requirements.) Complete

Scheduling (SS-1)

5. Does the project have a duration of more than one rainy season and have disturbed soil area in excess of 25 acres? Yes No
 - (a) Include multiple mobilizations (Move-in/Move-out) as a separate contract bid line item to implement permanent erosion control or revegetation work on slopes that are substantially complete. (Estimate at least 6 mobilizations for each additional rainy season. Designated Construction Representative may suggest an alternate number of mobilizations.) Complete
 - (b) Edit Order of Work specifications for permanent erosion control or revegetation work to be implemented on slopes that are substantially complete. Complete

- (c) Edit permanent erosion control or revegetation specifications to require seeding and planting work to be performed when optimal. Complete

Preservation of Existing Vegetation (SS-2)

6. Do Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) exist within or adjacent to the project limits? (Verify the completion of DPP-1, Part 5) Yes No
- (a) Verify the protection of ESAs through delineation on all project plans. Complete
- (b) Protect from clearing and grubbing and other construction disturbance by enclosing the ESA perimeter with high visibility plastic fence or other BMP. Complete
7. Are there areas of existing vegetation (mature trees, native vegetation, landscape planting, etc.) that need not be disturbed by project construction? Will areas designated for proposed treatment BMPs need protection (infiltration characteristics, vegetative cover, etc.)? (Coordinate with District Environmental and Construction to determine limits of work necessary to preserve existing vegetation to the maximum extent practicable.) Yes No
- (a) Designate as outside of limits of work (or designate as ESAs) and show on all project plans. Complete
- (b) Protect with high visibility plastic fence or other BMP. Complete
8. If yes for 6, 7, or both, then designate ESA fencing as a separate contract bid line item, *if not already incorporated as part of design pollution prevention work (See DPP-1, Part 5).* Complete

Slope Protection

9. Provide a soil stabilization BMP(s) appropriate for the DSA, slope steepness, slope length, and soil erodibility. (Consult with District/Regional Landscape Architect.)
- (a) Select SS-3 (Hydraulic Mulch), SS-4 (Hydroseeding), SS-5 (Soil Binders), SS-6 (Straw Mulch), SS-7 (Geotextiles, Mats, Plastic Covers, and Erosion Control Blankets), SS-8 (Wood Mulching), other BMPs or a combination to cover the DSA throughout the project's rainy season. **Erosion control blankets will be used** Complete
- (b) Increase the quantities by 25% for each additional rainy season. (Designated Construction Representative may suggest an alternate increase.) Complete
- (c) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Slope Interrupter Devices

10. Provide slope interrupter devices for all slopes with slope lengths equal to or greater than of 20 ft in length. (Consult with District/Regional Landscape Architect and Designated Construction Representative.)
- (a) Select SC-5 (Fiber Rolls) or other BMPs to protect slopes throughout the project's rainy season. **Fiber rolls will be used** Complete
 - (b) For slope inclination of 4:1 (h:v) and flatter, SC-5 (Fiber Rolls) or other BMPs shall be placed along the contour and spaced 20 ft on center. Complete
 - (c) For slope inclination between 4:1 (h:v) and 2:1 (h:v), SC-5 (Fiber Rolls) or other BMPs shall be placed along the contour and spaced 15 ft on center. **NA** Complete
 - (d) For slope inclination of 2:1 (h:v) and greater, SC-5 (Fiber Rolls) or other BMPs shall be placed along the contour and spaced 10 ft on center. **NA** Complete
 - (e) Increase the quantities by 25% for each additional rainy season. (Designated Construction Representative may suggest alternate increase.) Complete
 - (f) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Channelized Flow

11. Identify locations within the project site where concentrated flow from stormwater runoff can erode areas of soil disturbance. Identify locations of concentrated flow that enters the site from outside of the right-of-way (off-site run-on).
- (a) Utilize SS-7 (Geotextiles, Mats, Plastic Covers, and Erosion Control Blankets), SS-9 (Earth Dikes/Swales, Ditches), SS-10 (Outlet Protection/Velocity Dissipation), SS-11 (Slope Drains), SC-4 (Check Dams), or other BMPs to convey concentrated flows in a non-erosive manner. **Erosion control blankets will be used** Complete
 - (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Construction Site BMPs

Checklist CS-1, Part 2

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Sediment Control

Perimeter Controls - Run-off Control

1. Is there a potential for sediment laden sheet and concentrated flows to discharge offsite from runoff cleared and grubbed areas, below cut slopes, embankment slopes, etc.? Yes No
 - (a) Select linear sediment barrier such as SC-1 (Silt Fence), SC-5 (Fiber Rolls), SC-6 (Gravel Bag Berm), SC-8 (Sand Bag Barrier), SC-9 (Straw Bale Barrier), or a combination to protect wetlands, water courses, roads (paved and unpaved), construction activities, and adjacent properties. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of linear sediment barrier BMPs.) **Fiber rolls will be used** Complete
 - (b) Increase the quantities by 25% for each additional rainy season. (Designated Construction Representative may suggest an alternate increase.) Complete
 - (c) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Perimeter Controls - Run-on Control

2. Do locations exist where sheet flow upslope of the project site and where concentrated flow upstream of the project site may contact DSA and construction activities? Yes No
 - (a) Utilize linear sediment barriers such as SS-9 (Earth Dike/Drainage Swales and Lined Ditches), SC-5 (Fiber Rolls), SC-6 (Gravel Bag Berm), SC-8 (Sand Bag Barrier), SC-9 (Straw Bale Barrier), or other BMPs to convey flows through and/or around the project site. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of perimeter control BMPs.) **Fiber rolls will be used** Complete
 - (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Storm Drain Inlets

3. Do existing or proposed drainage inlets exist within the project limits? Yes No
- (a) Select SC-10 (Storm Drain Inlet Protection) to protect municipal storm drain systems or receiving waters wetlands at each drainage inlet. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of inlet protection BMPs.) Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete
4. Can existing or proposed drainage inlets utilize an excavated sediment trap as described in SC-10 (Storm Drain Inlet Protection- Type 2)? Yes No
- (a) Include with other types of SC-10 (Storm Drain Inlet Protection). Complete

Sediment/Desilting Basin (SC-2)

5. Does the project lie within a Rainfall Area where the required combination of temporary soil stabilization and sediment control BMPs includes desilting basins? (Refer to Tables 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3 of the Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual for Rainfall Area requirements.) Yes No
- (a) Consider feasibility for desilting basin allowing for available right-of-way within the project limits, topography, soil type, disturbed soil area within the watershed, and climate conditions. Document if the inclusion of sediment/desilting basins is infeasible. Complete
- (b) If feasible, design desilting basin(s) per the guidance in SC-2 Sediment/ Desilting Basins of the Construction Site BMP Manual to maximize capture of sediment-laden runoff. Complete
- Designate as a separate contract bid item. Complete
6. Is ATS to be used for controlling sediment? Yes No
- (a) If "yes", then will desilting basin or other means of natural storage be used? Yes No
- (b) If "no", then plan for storage tanks sufficient to hold treatment volume. Complete
7. Will the project benefit from the early implementation of proposed permanent Treatment BMPs? (Coordinate with District Construction.) Yes No
- (a) Edit Order of Work specifications for permanent treatment BMP work to be implemented in a manner that will allow its use as a construction site BMP. Complete

Sediment Trap (SC-3)

8. Can sediment traps be located to collect channelized runoff from disturbed soil areas prior to discharge? Yes No
- (a) Design sediment traps in accordance with the Construction Site BMP Manual. Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Construction Site BMPs		
Checklist CS-1, Part 3		
Prepared by: <u>B. Ross</u>	Date: <u>10-8-10</u>	District-Co-Route: <u>1-MEN-222</u>
PM : <u>R0.01-R1.30</u>	Project ID (or EA): <u>01-XXXXXX</u>	RWQCB: <u>North Coast</u>

Tracking Controls

Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit (TC-1)

1. Are there points of entrance and exit from the project site to paved roads where mud and dirt could be transported offsite by construction equipment? (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of tracking control BMPs.) Yes No
- (a) Identify and designate these entrance/exit points as stabilized construction entrances (TC-1). Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Tire/Wheel Wash (TC-3)

1. Are site conditions anticipated that would require additional or modified tracking controls such as entrance/outlet tire wash? (Coordinate with District Construction.) Yes No
- Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Stabilized Construction Roadway (TC-2)

3. Are temporary access roads necessary to access remote construction activity locations or to transport materials and equipment? (In addition to controlling dust and sediment tracking, access roads limit impact to sensitive areas by limiting ingress, and provide enhanced bearing capacity.) (Coordinate with District Construction.) Yes No
- (a) Designate these temporary access roads as stabilized construction roadways (TC-2). Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Street Sweeping and Vacuuming (SC-7)

1. Is there a potential for tracked sediment or construction related residues to be transported offsite and deposited on public or private roads? (Coordinate with District Construction for preference of including street sweeping and vacuuming with tracking control BMPs.) Yes No
- Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

Construction Site BMPs		
Checklist CS-1, Part 4		
Prepared by: <u>B. Ross</u>	Date: <u>10-8-10</u>	District-Co-Route: <u>1-MEN-222</u>
PM : <u>R0.01-R1.30</u>	Project ID (or EA): <u>01-XXXXXX</u>	RWQCB: <u>North Coast</u>

Wind Erosion Controls

Wind Erosion Control (WE-1)

1. Is the project located in an area where standard dust control practices in accordance with Standard Specifications, Section 10: Dust Control, are anticipated to be inadequate during construction to prevent the transport of dust offsite by wind? *(Note: Dust control by water truck application is paid for through the various items of work. Dust palliative, if it is included, is paid for as a separate item.)*

Yes No

- (a) Select SS-3 (Hydraulic Mulch), SS-4 (Hydroseeding), SS-5 (Soil Binders), SS-7 (Geotextiles, Mats, Plastic Covers, and Erosion Control Blankets), SS-8 (Wood Mulching) or a combination to cover the DSA subject to wind erosion year-round, especially when significant wind and dry conditions are anticipated during project construction. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of wind erosion control BMPs.)

Complete

- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item.

Complete

Construction Site BMPs			
Checklist CS-1, Part 5			
Prepared by: <u>B. Ross</u>	Date: <u>10-8-10</u>	District-Co-Route: <u>1-MEN-222</u>	
PM : <u>R0.01-R1.30</u>	Project ID (or EA): <u>01-XXXXXX</u>	RWQCB: <u>North Coast</u>	

Non-Storm Water Management

Temporary Stream Crossing (NS-4) & Clear Water Diversion (NS-5)

1. Will construction activities occur within a waterbody or watercourse such as a lake, wetland, or stream? (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference for stream crossing and clear water diversion BMPs.) Yes No
- (a) Select from types offered in NS-4 (Temporary Stream Crossing) to provide access through watercourses consistent with permits and agreements.¹ NA Complete
- (b) Select from types offered in NS-5 (Clear Water Diversion) to divert watercourse consistent with permits and agreements.¹ Complete
- (c) Designate as a separate contract bid line item(s). Complete

Other Non-Storm Water Management BMPs

2. Are construction activities anticipated that will generate wastes or residues with the potential to discharge pollutants? Yes No
- (a) Identify potential pollutants associated with the anticipated construction activity and select the corresponding BMP such as NS-1 (Water Conservation Practices), NS-2 (Dewatering Operations), NS-3 (Paving and Grinding Operations), NS-7 (Potable Water/Irrigation), NS-8 (Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning), NS-9 (Vehicle and Equipment Fueling), NS-10 (Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance), NS-11 (Pile Driving Operations), NS-12 (Concrete Curing), NS-13 (Material and Equipment Use Over Water), NS-14 (Concrete Finishing), and NS-15 (Structure Demolition/Removal Over or Adjacent to Water).¹ Complete
- (b) Verify that costs for non-stormwater management BMPs are identified in the contract documents. Designate BMP as a separate contract bid line item if the requirements in Construction Site Management (SSP 07-346) are anticipated to be inadequate or if requested by Construction. Complete

¹ Coordinate with District Environmental for consistency with US Army Corps of Engineers 404 and 401 permits and Dept. of Fish and Game 1601 Streambed alteration Agreements.

**Construction Site BMPs
Checklist CS-1, Part 6**

Prepared by: B. Ross Date: 10-8-10 District-Co-Route: 1-MEN-222

PM : R0.01-R1.30 Project ID (or EA): 01-XXXXXX RWQCB: North Coast

Waste Management & Materials Pollution Control

Concrete Waste Management (WM-8)

1. Does the project include concrete placement or mortar mixing? Yes No
- (a) Select from types offered in WM-8 (Concrete Waste Management) to provide concrete washout facilities. In addition, consider portable concrete washouts and vendor supplied concrete waste management services. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of waste management and materials pollution control BMPs.) Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item if the quantity of concrete waste and washout are anticipated to exceed 5.2 yd³ or if requested by Construction. Complete

Other Waste Management and Materials Pollution Controls

2. Are construction activities anticipated that will generate wastes or residues with the potential to discharge pollutants? Yes No
- (a) Identify potential pollutants associated with the anticipated construction activity and select the corresponding BMP such as WM-1 (Material Delivery and Storage), WM-2 (Material Use), WM-4 (Spill Prevention and Control), WM-5 (Solid Waste Management), WM-6 (Hazardous Waste Management), WM-7 (Contaminated Soil Management), WM-9 (Sanitary/Septic Waste Management) and WM-10 (Liquid Waste Management) Complete
- (b) Verify that costs for waste management and materials pollution control BMPs are identified in the contract documents. Designate BMP as a separate contract bid line item if the requirements in Construction Site Management (SSP 07-346) are anticipated to be inadequate or if requested by Construction. Complete

Temporary Stockpiles (Soil, Materials, and Wastes)

3. Are stockpiles of soil, etc. anticipated during construction? Yes No
- (a) Select WM-3 (Stockpile Management), SS-3 (Hydraulic Mulch), SS-4 (Hydroseeding), SS-5 (Soil Binders), SS-7 (Geotextiles, Mats, Plastic Covers, and Erosion Control Blankets), or a combination as appropriate to cover temporary stockpiles of soil, etc. Complete

- (b) Select linear sediment barrier such as SC-1 (Silt Fence), SC-5 (Fiber Rolls), SC-6 (Gravel Bag Berm), SC-8 (Sand Bag Barrier), SC-9 (Straw Bale Barrier), or a combination to encircle temporary stockpiles of soil, etc. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of BMPs related to stockpiles.) Complete
- (c) Designate as a separate contract bid line item if the requirements in Construction Site Management (SSP 07-346) are anticipated to be inadequate or if requested by Construction. Complete
4. Is there a potential for dust and debris from construction material (fill material, etc.) and waste (concrete, contaminated soil, etc.) stockpiles to be transported offsite by wind? Yes No
- (a) Select SS-7, temporary cover, plastic sheeting or other BMP to cover stockpiles subject to wind erosion year-round, especially when significant wind and dry conditions are anticipated during project construction. (Coordinate with District Construction for selection and preference of wind erosion control BMPs.) Complete
- (b) Designate as a separate contract bid line item. Complete

EXAMPLE ONLY