Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans

Prepared by:
CDM Smith Inc.

Prepared for and Submitted by:
The County of San Bernardino Areawide Stormwater Program
NPDES No. CAS618036, ORDER No. R8-2010-0036

Submitted To:
California Water Quality Control Board – Santa Ana Region

June 7, 2013

Approval Date: June 21, 2013
Effective Date: September 19, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Technical Guidance Document

Section 1 - Introduction 1
1.1 Purpose of Guidance 1
1.2 Regulatory Background 1
1.3 Stormwater Management 3
1.3.1 Low Impact Development 3
1.3.2 Goals of LID 4
1.3.3 Benefits of LID 4
1.4 WQMP Guidance Revision 5
1.5 Guidance Applicability 6
1.5.1 Priority Projects 6
1.5.2 Transportation Projects 6
1.6 How to Use this Guidance 8
Section 2 – WQMP Development Process 9
2.1 Introduction 9
2.2 Process Overview 9
2.3 Working with Your Local Jurisdiction 11
2.3.1 Getting Started 11
2.3.2 Resource Information 11
2.4 Preliminary WQMP Submittal 13
2.5 Final WQMP Submittal 13
Section 3 – Project Evaluation 14
3.1 Introduction 14
3.2 Site Assessment 15
3.2.1 Project Location 15
3.2.2 Site Topography and Hydrography 16
3.2.3 Soils and Geologic Conditions 17
3.2.4 Groundwater Considerations 18
3.2.5 Environmental Concerns 18
3.2.6 Existing Development and Utilities 18
3.3 Pollutants of Concern 19
3.3.1 Land Use and Potential Pollutants of Concern 20
3.3.2 Expected Pollutants of Concern 22
3.3.3 Receiving Water Impairments and TMDLs 22
3.4 Hydrologic Conditions of Concern 22
3.4.1 Susceptibility of Receiving Waters to Hydromodification Impacts 24

3.4.2 Expected Hydrologic Conditions of Concern 24
3.5 Regional Stormwater Management 25
Section 4 – Project-Specific Performance Criteria 27
4.1 LID Performance Criteria 28
4.2 HCOC Performance Criteria 29
4.2.1 Runoff Volume 30
4.2.2 Time of Concentration 31
4.2.3 Peak Runoff 33
4.3 Case Studies 34
4.3.1 Case Studies - LID Performance Criteria 36
4.3.2 Case Studies - HCOC Performance Criteria 37
Section 5 – Low Impact Development BMP Evaluation and Selection 42
5.1 Introduction 42
5.2 Selection of LID Preventive Measures 43
5.2.1 Site Planning and Design Practices 44
5.2.2 Construction Practices 47
5.2.3 Post-Construction 48
5.3 Selection of LID Mitigative Measures and BMPs 48
5.3.1 Hierarchy of BMP Types 48
5.3.2 General Feasibility Criteria for Use of Required LID BMPs 50
5.4 Evaluation of LID BMPs 55
5.4.1 Hydrologic Source Control 55
5.4.2 Infiltration BMPs 60
5.4.3 Harvest and Use BMPs 64
5.4.4 Biotreatment BMPs 65
5.5 WQMP Conformance Analysis 73
5.5.1 Criteria for MEP Determination 74
5.5.2 Hydrologic Source Controls 77
5.5.3 LID Infiltration BMPs 77
5.5.4 Harvest and Use BMPs 78
5.5.5 Biotreatment BMPs 78
5.5.6 Case Study Conformance Analysis 79
5.6 Hydromodification Control 81
5.6.1 Incorporating Hydromodification into Project WQMPs 81
5.6.2 Hydromodification Control BMPs 82
Section 6 – Alternative Compliance Plan 84
6.1 Introduction 84
6.2 Water Quality Credits 86

6.2.1 Qualifying Projects 86
6.2.2 Applying Water Quality Credits 87
6.3 Treatment Control BMPs 88
6.4 Waivers 90
6.5 In-Lieu Fund 90
Section 7 – Source Control BMPs 92
7.1 Introduction 92
7.2 Non-Structural Source Control BMPs 92
7.3 Structural Source Control BMPs 96
7.4 Selecting Source Control BMPs 104
Section 8 – Post-Construction BMP Requirements 106
8.1 BMP Maintenance Mechanisms 106
8.2 BMP Maintenance Requirements 107
8.2.1 Operation and Maintenance Plan 107
8.2.2 O&M Commitments 107
8.2.3 Maintenance Agreements 108
8.3 Permit Closeout Requirements 109
Section 9 -References 110
Appendix A - Transportation Project BMP Guidance ..... A
Appendix B – WQMP Template ..... B
Appendix C – San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual (Selected Figures) C
Appendix C-1 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure D-1, Time of Concentration Nomograph C-1
Appendix C - 2 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure C-3, Curve Numbers of Hydrologic Soil C-2
Appendix C - 3 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure C-6, Infiltration Rate for Pervious Areas versus SCS Curve Numbers C-3
Appendix C - 4 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure D-3, Intensity – Duration Curves Calculation Sheet C-4
Appendix D – Section VII – Infiltration Rate Evaluation Protocol and Factor of Safety Recommendations, Orange County TGD Appendices, May 19, 2011 ..... D
Appendix E – Section XII – Conceptual Biotreatment Selection, Design, and Maintenance Criteria Orange County TGD Appendices, May 19, 2011 ..... E
Appendix F – HCOC Exemption Criteria and Map ..... F

Section 1 - Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Guidance

The 2010 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4 Permit), adopted by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and issued to San Bernardino County, requires all new development and significant redevelopment projects covered by this Order to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). In addition, the Order also requires development of a standard design and post-development best management practice (BMP) guidance for incorporation, where feasible and applicable, of site design/LID, source control, and treatment control BMP (where feasible and applicable) and Hydrologic Conditions of Concern (HCOC) mitigation measures to the MEP on public street, road, highway, and freeway improvement projects ("transportation projects") to reduce the discharge of pollutants to receiving waters. The purpose of this Technical Guidance Document (TGD) for Water Quality Management Plan(s) (WQMP) is to provide direction to project proponents on the regulatory requirements applicable to a private or public development activity, including public works transportation projects, from project conception to completion. This TGD is intended to serve as a living document, which will be updated as needed to remain applicable beyond the current Permit term. Any non-substantive updates to the TGD and Transportation Project BMP Guidance and applicable Template will be provided in the annual report. Future substantive updates shall be submitted to the RWQCB for review and approval, prior to implementation.

1.2 Regulatory Background

The 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its amendments comprise what is commonly known as the Clean Water Act (CWA). The CWA provides the basis for the protection of all inland surface waters, estuaries, and coastal waters. The federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for ensuring the implementation of the CWA and its governing regulations (primarily Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations) at the state level.

California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970 and its implementing regulations established the RWQCB as the agency responsible for implementing CWA and Porter-Cologne requirements in the Santa Ana River Watershed. These requirements include adoption of a Water Quality Control Plan ("Basin Plan") to protect inland freshwaters and estuaries. The Basin Plan identifies the beneficial uses for waterbodies in the Santa Ana River watershed, establishes the water quality objectives required to protect those uses, and provides an implementation plan to protect water quality in the region (RWQCB 1995 and subsequent amendments).

As part of its responsibility to protect beneficial uses of waters in the Santa Ana River Watershed in San Bernardino County, the RWQCB issued permits to regulate discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) facilities within the County.

The jurisdictions covered by this permit include:

San Bernardino County Flood Control District
County of San Bernardino
City of Big Bear Lake
City of Chino
City of Chino Hills
City of Colton
City of Fontana
City of Grand Terrace
City of Highland
City of Loma Linda
City of Montclair
City of Ontario
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Redlands
City of Rialto
City of San Bernardino
City of Upland
City of Yucaipa

The first MS4 Permit for these Permittees was issued by the RWQCB in 1990. This permit focused primarily on program development, which included establishment of the Drainage Area Management Plan (now the Municipal Stormwater Management Plan) and implementation of public education and staff training on stormwater quality concerns.

Revised permits were issued in 1996 and 2002. Under these permits the stormwater management requirements applicable to new development and significant redevelopment projects evolved. Accordingly, during these permits the Model WQMP Guidance was revised twice (2000 and 2005) to incorporate increasingly stringent requirements applicable to development activities.

The RWQCB issued the current MS4 Permit on January 29, 2010 (Order No. 2010-0036, NPDES No. CAS618036). This permit contains many new requirements that further increase the complexity and costs associated with the management of stormwater in the permitted area,

especially for new development and significant redevelopment projects and public works transportation projects. To address these new regulatory mandates, the MS4 Permit program has again revised the Model WQMP Guidance. This updated TGD replaces all previous guidance applicable to development projects within the Santa Ana River Watershed.

1.3 Stormwater Management

Development activities typically change pre-development hydrologic conditions by altering drainage patterns and increasing impervious area. Impervious areas include streets, walkways, driveways, rooftops, and parking lots which traditionally not only do not infiltrate stormwater runoff, but instead increase the rate and volume of runoff of precipitation during storm events. The traditional approach to storm drain design associated with a development activity focused on capturing and transporting stormwater runoff off-site in the most efficient manner to protect people and property from potential flood damage. Urban constructed drainage systems, comprised of street gutters, catch basins, belowground storm drain piping, detention basins, and open or closed channels (i.e., the MS4) have functioned to convey runoff from completed developments to the nearest receiving water.

Stormwater runoff mobilizes pollutants on land surfaces and carries them downstream via the MS4 to storm drain systems where impacts to receiving water quality may occur. In addition, increased runoff volume from development activities can cause erosion in downstream waters further impacting water quality. Accordingly, over a number of years stormwater management has evolved from simply managing the quantity of runoff from a development site to managing both the quantity and quality of the runoff to reduce impacts to downstream receiving waters.

The recently adopted MS4 Permit for San Bernardino County includes significant changes to the requirements for managing the quantity and quality of runoff from urban developments. These requirements include the incorporation of LID practices to maintain the pre-development hydrology of a development site to the maximum extent practicable.

1.3.1 Low Impact Development

LID principles are increasingly being applied in urban environments as a strategy to reduce receiving water impacts from stormwater runoff. A typical LID definition is:

> "*…a stormwater management strategy that emphasizes conservation and the use of existing natural site features integrated with distributed, small-scale stormwater controls to more closely mimic natural hydrologic patterns in residential, commercial and industrial setting*."[Washington State University Puget Sound Action Team as reported in Green Infrastructure for Los Angeles: Addressing Urban Runoff and Water Supply through LID, 2009]

Accordingly, the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program defines LID as "*a stormwater management and land development strategy that combines a hydrologically functional site design with pollution prevention measures to compensate for land development impacts on hydrology and water quality. LID techniques mimic the site pre-development site hydrology by using site design techniques that store, infiltrate, evapotranspire, bio-filter or detain runoff close to its source*".

1.3.2 Goals of LID

The primary goal of LID is to preserve the pre-development hydrology of a project site. Changes in runoff characteristics that result in increased post-development runoff can be reduced through the use of structural and nonstructural BMPs that store, infiltrate, evaporate, and detain runoff. The desired outcome of the use of these BMPs is to mimic the local watershed's natural hydrologic functions to the maximum extent practicable. There are many site design techniques that may be deployed on a project site to allow the site to function in a manner similar to how it functioned prior to development. With the incorporation of LID practices, downstream waters that ultimately receive stormwater runoff from developed sites will experience fewer negative impacts and have in-stream flows that more closely approximate pre-development runoff conditions.

1.3.3 Benefits of LID

The benefits of implementing LID practices can be significant. Examples include:

- *Maintain pre-development hydrology* – Maintaining the pre-development hydrology reduces the volume of water that must be conveyed offsite, which not only reduces erosion and sedimentation impacts, but ultimately reduces downstream flood control requirements.
- *Water quality benefits* – Pollutant loads carried by stormwater runoff can be greatly reduced through retention of stormwater and pollutants onsite and use of BMPs that biofilter pollutants onsite, thus reducing pollutants that would normally be discharged directly to the storm drain system.
- *Groundwater recharge* – LID emphasizes infiltration of runoff onsite which has the potential to increase local water supply availability from groundwater sources.
- *Aesthetic appeal* - LID involves the use of site design practices that minimize the footprint of proposed developments which increases preservation of open space.

1.4 WQMP Guidance Revision

The 2010 MS4 Permit significantly changed the requirements applicable to development activities by substantially changing how LID practices are incorporated into developments. Specifically, as stated in the Permit:

> *"This Order requires project proponents to first consider preventative and conservation techniques (e.g., preserve and protect natural features to the maximum extent practicable) prior to considering mitigative techniques (structural treatment, such as infiltration systems). The mitigative measures should be prioritized with the highest priority for BMPs that remove storm water pollutants and reduce runoff volume, such as infiltration, then other BMPs, such as harvesting and use, evapotranspiration and biotreatment should be considered. To the maximum extent practicable, these LID BMPs must be implemented at the project site. The Regional Board recognizes that site conditions, including site soils, contaminant plumes, high groundwater levels, etc., could limit the applicability of infiltration and other LID BMPs at certain project sites. Where LID BMPs are not feasible at the project site, more traditional, but equally effective control measures should be implemented. This Order provides for alternatives and in-lieu programs where the preferred LID BMPs are infeasible* (RWQCB Order No. 2010-0036, NPDES No. CAS618036, Section II.G.6)*."*

To address these requirements, this document replaces the existing 2005 Model WQMP Guidance for the Santa Ana River Watershed (revised in May 2012) in its entirety. Key changes to the WQMP Guidance include:

- Revised HCOC performance criteria based on MS4 Permit requirements to conduct hydrologic analysis for only the 2-year storm event (2005 Guidance also required analysis of 1-year and 5-year storm events)
- More detailed description of LID site design considerations including preventative principles (e.g. minimizing impervious area) and mitigative lot level hydrologic source controls (e.g. residential rooftop downspout disconnection)
- New approach to BMP selection and evaluation, whereby LID BMPs are evaluated according to the hierarchy specified in the 2010 MS4 Permit
- Updated tables of pollutant removal effectiveness for BMPs that treat and release runoff to the MS4
- New required calculations to demonstrate that planned LID BMPs are capable of capturing runoff from the water quality design storm event (Design Capture Volume or "DCV")

- New approach to determine if implementation of a BMP type is not feasible, including initial site screening factors (e.g. high groundwater conditions) and detailed assessment of project specific feasibility (e.g. infiltration basin in poorly draining soils)
- Inclusion of a Transportation Guidance specific to certain types of public works transportation projects. Application of this Guidance to transportation projects results in documentation that is functionally equivalent to the WQMP prepared for new development or significant re-development projects.

1.5 Guidance Applicability

All proponents of development projects are required to use this TGD and associated Template to obtain the necessary approvals for implementation of proposed new development and significant re-development activities and proposed transportation projects. Project submittal requirements vary depending on the type of project as well as whether the project proponent is a private entity or public agency. The following sections provide additional information regarding the applicability of this TGD.

1.5.1 Priority Projects

Table 1-1 defines development activities classified as Priority Projects. This TGD establishes requirements for project proponents (both private and public agency project proponents) to meet the minimum County-wide stormwater management requirements applicable to Priority Projects. In general terms, the project proponent shall incorporate infiltration LID BMP to the MEP; and use biotreatment and harvest and use BMP for the remainder of the DCV.

The project proponent should consult the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) established for the jurisdiction within which the project is proposed, as requirements may be applicable for non-priority /non-category projects. The LIP provides information regarding how the WQMP development process is implemented within the local jurisdiction and identifies any additional WQMP development requirements, i.e., in addition to the requirements identified in this document.

No building or grading permits will be issued to Priority Projects by any local jurisdiction without an approved final project-specific WQMP.

1.5.2 Transportation Projects

Transportation projects that are part of a new development or significant re-development project implemented by a private developer are subject to the requirements applicable to Priority Projects (e.g., see Section 1.5 and Table 1-1 Priority Project Category No. 2), regardless of whether the roads remain private or are dedicated to public right-of-way after the development is complete.

Table 1-1. Priority Projects[(1)]

Category No.	Project Type
1	All significant re-development[1] projects - defined as the addition or replacement of 5,000 or more square feet (sq. ft) of impervious surface on an already developed site subject to discretionary approval of the permitting jurisdiction. In addition: Re-development does not include: Routine maintenance activities that are conducted to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, original purpose of the facility, or emergency redevelopment activity required to protect public health and safety. Where re-development results in an increase of less than 50% of the impervious surfaces of a previously existing developed site, and the existing development was not subject to WQMP requirements, the numeric sizing criteria discussed in Section 4 applies only to the addition or replacement, and not to the entire developed site. Where re-development results in an increase of 50% or more of the impervious surfaces of a previously existing developed site, the numeric sizing criteria discussed in Section 4 applies to the entire development.
2	New development projects that create 10,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface (collectively over the entire project site) including commercial, industrial, residential housing subdivisions (i.e., detached single family home subdivisions, multi-family attached subdivisions or townhomes, condominiums, apartments, etc.), mixed-use, and public projects. This category includes development projects on public and private land, which fall under the planning and building authority of the permitting jurisdiction.
3	New development or significant re-development[1] of automotive repair shops (with SIC[2] Codes 5013, 5014, 5541, 7532-7534, 7536-7539) where the project creates, adds and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface.
4	New development or significant re-development[1] of restaurants (with SIC[2] Code 5812) where the land area of development is 5,000 sq. ft. or more.
5	All hillside developments of 5,000 sq. ft. or more which are located on areas with known erosive soil conditions or where the natural slope is 25% or more.
6	Developments of 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface or more adjacent to (within 200 feet) or discharging directly into environmentally sensitive areas or waterbodies listed on the CWA Section 303(d) list of impaired waters[(3)].
7	Parking lots of 5,000 sq. ft. or more exposed to stormwater. A parking lot is defined as land area or facility for the temporary parking or storage of motor vehicles.
8	New development or significant re-development[1] of Retail Gasoline Outlets that are either 5,000 sq. ft. or more, or have a projected average daily traffic of 100 or more vehicles per day.
	Non-Priority / Non-Category Projects may be required by the local jurisdiction to implement applicable site design LID and LIP requirements.

[(1)] – As defined by RWQCB Order R8-2010-0036
[(2)] - For SIC codes, see: www.osha.gov/oshstats/sicser.html
[(3)] – See Section 3 for additional information regarding impaired waters

Public works transportation projects not part of a Priority Project may be subject to the requirements of the Transportation Project BMP Guidance, which describes the stormwater management requirements applicable to selected categories of transportation projects. The Transportation Project BMP Guidance is incorporated into this document as Appendix A. Similar to a Priority Project; it is recommended that a project proponent also consult the LIP for the

local jurisdiction in which the public works transportation project is planned to determine if any additional local requirements apply to the proposed project.

1.6 How to Use this Guidance

This TGD provides project planning, site design, BMP selection and evaluation, and project implementation guidance for Priority Projects and transportation projects. Given varying site conditions throughout the County, it is not practical for this document to address every potential site design issue that may arise during project conception and design. Furthermore, this TGD does not supersede any local regulations that affect local development requirements. While not an all-encompassing document, the TGD does provide detailed discussion of LID BMP selection, evaluation, and feasibility analysis so that project proponents will understand what must be incorporated into Priority Projects and road projects to meet County-wide stormwater management requirements.

The TGD is applicable to new development and re-development projects and includes a WQMP Template (Appendix B) that is to be used by all project proponents of Priority Projects. Careful adherence to the methods, calculations, and requirements incorporated into this Template will increase the likelihood that a complete application for project approval is submitted.

The Transportation Project BMP Guidance (Appendix A) also includes a Template that is to be used by all project proponents of public works road projects. For road projects, compliance with the Transportation Project BMP Guidance establishes the documentation that is functionally equivalent to the WQMP documentation prepared for Priority Projects. In addition, usage of the Transportation Project BMP Guidance and Template will increase the likelihood that the project file for a planned road project is complete.

Finally, this document and its accompanying appendices should be used to identify the minimum requirements applicable to private or public development activities or public works transportation projects. The information contained herein should be used to facilitate discussions between the project proponent and responsible agencies for issuing approvals and permits for the proposed development activities.

In addition, each jurisdiction under the MS4 Permit has adopted a LIP that provides information specific to the local area where the development activity is planned. The LIP should be consulted and used along with this TGD to prepare documentation applicable to the proposed project.

Section 2 – WQMP Development Process

2.1 Introduction

Use of this Guidance should begin in the earliest possible stages of project conception when a development site or transportation project is first evaluated to determine how to best utilize the site to optimize both its development potential and ability to incorporate LID concepts given the location and characteristics of the property and the area. Ideally, preparation of the documentation to support the planned project should be a multi-disciplinary effort involving planning, architecture, engineering, geotechnical expertise, and landscape architecture. Teams comprised of diverse disciplines can best evaluate how to apply LID practices from project conception through design and construction.

The process for developing a WQMP for a Priority Project, or the functionally equivalent documentation for a transportation project requires the systematic completion of a number of steps before a project can receive the necessary approvals and permits for construction. The following sections provide an overview of the key steps applicable to proposed projects. Subsequent sections of this TGD for WQMP and its appendices describe each step in more detail.

2.2 Process Overview

Figure 2-1 shows the overall process applicable to Priority Projects and public works transportation projects, including where additional information may be obtained in this document. The project proponent should consult the LIP for the jurisdiction in which the project is located. The LIP provides jurisdiction-specific requirements applicable to WQMP development and transportation projects. At a minimum, all local jurisdictions within the County of San Bernardino shall implement the following process for a proposed project:

- *Select Appropriate Guidance* - If this is a public works transportation project, Appendix A provides Guidance applicable to the proposed project. The remaining sections of this document (Sections 3 through 9) do not apply.
- *Establish Priority Project Type*: Table 1-1 identifies Priority Projects subject to WQMP development requirements.
- *Complete Project Evaluation Requirements*: Perform California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, Watershed Action Plan (WAP) analysis and assess local site conditions and jurisdictional requirements for project (see Section 3).
- *Develop Site Design:* This step involves planning the project using preventative LID site design principles to minimize the impact of development (see Section 5).

- *Establish Project-Specific Performance Criteria:* Based on information developed during project evaluation and site design, the project proponent establishes LID and HCOC performance criteria.



Figure 2-1. WQMP Development Process Flowchart

Section 4 provides guidelines for computing the project design capture volume (DCV) for LID and pre- and post-development hydrologic factors (runoff volume, time of concentration, and peak runoff velocity) for HCOC performance criteria.

2.3 Working with Your Local Jurisdiction

This TGD for WQMP identifies requirements for completion of a WQMP for Priority Projects or functionally equivalent document for transportation projects that satisfies County-wide MS4 Permit requirements. However, nothing in this TGD supersedes any local development requirements.

2.3.1 Getting Started

The first step in the approval process for a proposed project is to determine the applicability of WQMP requirements. If the proposed project is a public works transportation project, then the requirements established in Appendix A – Transportation Project BMP Guidance may apply. The Transportation Guidance provides all necessary information regarding its applicability, use and required documentation. If the project falls within one of the categories listed in Table 1-1, then it is classified as a Priority Project, and all requirements described in subsequent sections of this TGD must then be addressed.

Ultimately, the project proponent should consult the local LIP and, if needed, local stormwater management personnel to verify project approval requirements. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to determine stormwater management requirements applicable to the proposed project. Project proponents must also consult the WAP for the project location, to ensure that WQMP development is aligned with any watershed based plans.

Once it is determined that a project requires a WQMP, the project proponent should work through each step described in this TGD. The WQMP Template provided in Appendix B will guide the process and dictate the types of information and analyses required to complete the WQMP application.

2.3.2 Resource Information

The primary focus of this document is to provide sufficient baseline information for Priority Projects to guide project proponents through the development of the WQMP application. A secondary focus is to provide guidance for application of site design/LID-based BMPs, source control and treatment control BMPs (where applicable to project) to public works transportation projects (i.e., Appendix A). Regardless of the focus, this document is not intended to be an exhaustive source of information about LID BMPs, especially with regards to LID design practices or criteria. Where appropriate in various sections, links to additional specific reference materials are provided. However, prior to starting preparation of the WQMP, it is recommended that the project proponent become familiar with the LID literature,

especially as it relates to commonly accepted engineering practices. Recommended source material for transportation projects is provided in the Transportation Project BMP Guidance (Appendix A). Key source materials for new development and re-development projects include:

- Final Draft Model Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), Orange County (CA) Stormwater Program, March 22, 2011.
- Final Draft Technical Guidance Document for the Preparation of Conceptual/Preliminary and/or Project WQMPs, Orange County (CA) Stormwater Program, March 22, 2011.
- Final Draft Technical Guidance Document Appendices, Orange County (CA) Stormwater Program, March 22, 2011.
- San Bernardino County Watershed Action Plan, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program, January 29, 2011.
- California State Water Resources Control Board and Low Impact Development Center. Low Impact Development Manual for Southern California: Technical Guidance and Site Planning Strategies. 2009.
- Center for Watershed Protection. Better Site Design: A Handbook for Changing Development Rules in Your Community. 1998.
- Gregory, J.H.; Dukes, M.D.; Jones, P.H.; and G.L. Miller. Effect of Urban Soil Compaction on Infiltration Rate, Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 2006, 1(3):117-124.
- Maryland Department of Environmental Resource Programs and Planning Division. Low-Impact Development Design Strategies -An Integrated Design Approach (June 1999) Prince George's County, 1999; http://www.co.pg.md.us/Government/DER/PPD/pgcounty/lidmain.htm.
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). National Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database, Version 1.0.
- Urban Water Resources Research Council of ASCE Wright Water Engineers. National Stormwater Best Management Practices Database, 2001.
- Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA). Start at the Source (Detailed discussion of permeable pavements and alternative driveway designs presented), 1999.
- Schueler, Thomas R. and Holland, Heather K. Center for Watershed Protection. The Practice of Watershed Protection, 2000.
- Urban Runoff Quality Management, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Manual and Report on Engineering Practice No. 87/Water Environment Federation (WEF) Manual of Practice No.23, 1998.

2.4 Preliminary WQMP Submittal

Local jurisdictions shall require the submittal of a preliminary project-specific WQMP application for review early in the project development process to ensure compliance with all jurisdictional requirements applicable to development projects (Permit Section XI.D.3). A Preliminary WQMP may be used by the local jurisdiction during the land use entitlement process or as part of a project application for discretionary project approval. The level of detail and content of the preliminary WQMP submittal depends to a large degree on the nature of the project and local jurisdictional requirements.

The LIP applicable to the project area provides specific information regarding preliminary WQMP submittal process. This document should be consulted prior to initiating development of the WQMP.

2.5 Final WQMP Submittal

A completed Final WQMP shall fully address site design measures, LID BMPs, hydromodification controls, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs (where applicable to the project) to address pollutants or hydrologic conditions of concern. If the project proponent has demonstrated the infeasibility of use of the aforementioned BMPs, and is participating in an alternative compliance plan such as a contribution to an in-lieu fund (if available) or mitigation program, the WQMP must describe and document the Project’s participation. The Final WQMP, when prepared for submittal for approval, must be certified by the owner, and must include elements agreed upon at Preliminary WQMP acceptance and any revisions proposed.

The Final WQMP must be consistent with the Preliminary WQMP. If there are any substantial differences, the local jurisdiction must make a determination that the differences do not diminish the effectiveness of the BMPs to mitigate or address the project's potential impacts to water quality. Furthermore, any changes must not result in any new environmental impacts not previously disclosed in the local jurisdiction's circulated environmental document(s). If the changes diminish the project's ability to mitigate or address its water quality impacts, or result in previously undisclosed environmental impacts, the local jurisdiction should require that the project be subject to further environmental review.

The completed WQMP is to be submitted to the local jurisdiction for review and approval. Any changes to WQMP elements agreed upon at the Preliminary WQMP phase shall be noted within the WQMP submitted for final approval. Local jurisdiction staff will review the submittal for acceptance and approval. Reviews will be documented by the local jurisdiction. Additional information and submittals may be necessary for final approval. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to provide the additional information for consideration by the local jurisdiction.

Section 3 – Project Evaluation

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to describe the site and project information requirements needed to determine applicable LID and HCOC performance criteria and select and evaluate runoff capture in proposed BMPs. This information includes site-specific data as well as regional watershed or jurisdictional plans or requirements. Project evaluation involves several key steps, including:

- Assess site conditions
- Determine pollutants of concern (POC)
- Determine HCOC
- Identify requirements associated with a regional watershed or local jurisdiction that may affect project planning

Table 3-1. Key Sources of Information for use in Completing a WQMP Project Evaluation

Source	Key Information and Intended Use(s)
Watershed Geodatabase *(http://permitrack.sbcounty.gov/wap/)*	Downstream receiving waterbodies, downstream HCOC, NRCS soil properties, ecologically sensitive areas
RWQCB TMDL Webpage (*http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/tmdl/index.shtml*)	Downstream adopted TMDLs, planned TMDLs, and 303(d) listed impairments for Santa Ana River Watershed receiving waterbodies
NRCS Web Soil Survey (*http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm*)	General soil and geologic properties
NPDES Permit No. CAS618036 (Order No. R8-2010-0036) for San Bernardino County Permittees within the Santa Ana Watershed Region (*http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2010/10_036_SBC_MS4_Permit_01_29_10.pdf*)	Basis for project evaluation guidance, regulatory background for WQMP requirements
County of San Bernardino Hydrology Manual (*http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/floodcontrol/pdf/HydrologyManual.pdf*) and Addendum (*http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/floodcontrol/pdf/20100412_addendum.pdf*)	Storm event characterization, runoff and HCOC analyses

Several key references are necessary to develop the information required for project evaluation, as summarized in Table 3-1. In addition, information will need to be obtained from project planning documents, information searches and field surveys as necessary for assessing topography, soil characteristics, drainage patterns, and potential environmental concerns. Section 3 of the WQMP Template includes forms to insert information that describes the site location and drainage features, hydrologic characteristics, and regional watershed.

3.2 Site Assessment

Information gathered through site assessment facilitates computations of selected LID and HCOC BMPs performance relative to the criteria including runoff volume, time of concentration, peak runoff as well as computations of runoff capture of various proposed BMPs.

The review of existing information and the collection of site-specific measurements also identifies conditions that could prohibit the use of specific types of LID BMPs. Site assessments must include available information regarding site slope, soil type, geotechnical conditions, and local groundwater conditions, and how potential site layout and site design concepts can be adapted to these conditions as discussed below. In addition, soil and infiltration testing may be necessary to determine if stormwater infiltration is feasible and to determine the appropriate design infiltration rates for infiltration-based BMPs.

The County of San Bernardino Stormwater Management Program (Program) has completed an on-line watershed Geodatabase (*http://permitrack.sbcounty.gov/wap/*), including HCOC map, that will be a valuable tool in the project evaluation process. This web-based tool includes site assessment related data information as well as helpful links to background regulatory and technical documents. These components include information such as:

- GIS layers that include land use, topography, drainage subwatersheds, soils, and other groundwater data, etc.
- Delineation of existing channels that are engineered, hardened, and maintained as well as soft-armored or unarmored waterbodies that may be vulnerable to hydromodification
- GIS layers that include known sensitive species, protected habitat areas, and potential stormwater recharge areas

3.2.1 Project Location

The location of a project is important to establish what local jurisdictional conditions and requirements apply to the project and to understand where the project is located in relation to downstream receiving waters.

The project location is also used to obtain information needed for several important calculations necessary for completion of a WQMP. Site coordinates are used to identify the design storm depth to be used in determining LID and HCOC performance criteria from NOAA Atlas isohyet maps (*http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/sa/sca_pfds.html*).

The project location includes the climatic region of the site; valley, mountain, or desert. The climatic region for the project site characterizes distinct rainfall patterns that occur in these regions, which influences several WQMP calculations, as described below:

- Calculation of the DCV to meet LID performance criteria relies on a coefficient that is a function of the climatic region. The coefficients for each climatic region are shown in Table 3-2.
- Extrapolation of the 2-year return period, 1-hour rainfall hourly rainfall for sites with sub-hourly time of concentration for use in estimating peak runoff rate for HCOC performance criteria uses a slope that is a function of climatic region. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual provides intensity duration curves on a log-log scale to extrapolate sub-hourly rainfall intensity. The log-log slope of the extrapolated curve is different for different climatic regions (Table 3-2).
- Estimation of the necessary flow-through capacity to treat the portion of the DCV that is not retained on-site for sizing of flow-based BMPs (LID biotreatment BMPs with discharge or non-LID treatment BMPs). This process is described in Section 5.4.4.2.
- The project location is also the starting point in compiling other information such as topographic, soils, hydrology, and groundwater data, which vary spatially across San Bernardino County. These information types are discussed in the following sections.

Table 3-2. Coefficients for WQMP Development Influenced by Climatic Region

Variables	Valley	Mountain	Desert
Coefficient used in P_6 Method	1.4807	1.909	1.2371
Log-Log slope for extrapolating sub-hourly rainfall intensity	0.6	0.7	0.7

3.2.2 Site Topography and Hydrography

Site topography needs to be assessed to evaluate surface drainage patterns, high and low points, and identify slopes. Hydrographic calculations necessary for estimating pre- and post-

development time of concentration rely upon two key variables that require understanding of the existing and proposed site topography and drainage patterns including the length of the flowpath from the furthest upstream point of a site to its outlet (use longest flowpath if more than one exists) and the difference in elevation along the longest flowpath (see Section 4.2.2). The use of the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual time of concentration nomograph (Appendix C-1) requires these data inputs.

Selection of site design LID BMPs require an understanding of how stormwater runoff flows at a project site to be able to evaluate potential areas for siting LID BMPs, including impervious area dispersion, runoff capture, retention, or treatment and release. Selection of BMPs must also consider the location and elevation of existing drainage structures to ensure appropriate connections to the local MS4 system.

Preliminary assessment data can be collected through visual observations, but a topographic survey is required to provide sufficient detail for 1-foot contours.

The pre- and post-development topography and post-developed conveyance features may require delineation of multiple drainage management areas (DMAs), which may be routed to a single or multiple discharge points from the project site to the MS4. DMAs are portions of a site that drain to the same BMPs and/or conveyance facility. Projects that require phasing of construction activities should delineate separate DMAs for each phase of the development project. The networking of DMAs, on-site conveyance, and discharge points must be shown in the site plan and in a simple schematic format as shown in Form 3-1 of the WQMP Template.

The pre- and post- development project site will be, as necessary, divided into distinct Drainage Areas (DA). A Drainage Area is the area of the Project site that drains to a specific outlet. If the Project site has two outlets then the site will, by definition, have two DAs. Each DA will be further subdivided into Drainage Management Areas (DMAs) based on land cover type and HSG. If a DA has three distinct land cover types, then the DA will have three DMAs that must be accounted for in the calculations. By definition, the sum of the areas of the DMAs will total the area of the DA, and the sum of the areas of the DA will total the Project site area listed in Item 2 of Form 2.1-1 of the WQMP Template. Projects that require phasing of construction activities should delineate separate DMAs for each phase of the development project. The networking of DAs and DMAs, on-site conveyance, and discharge points must be shown in the site plan and in a simple schematic format as shown in Form 3-1 of the WQMP Template.

3.2.3 Soils and Geologic Conditions

Characterization of soil conditions is required to determine a project site's suitability to infiltrate stormwater runoff. If it is determined that infiltration is feasible, then soils data is necessary to estimate the percolation rate for determining the retention volume that can be

achieved with proposed BMPs. Initial review of general soils data such as from the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as well as site-specific soil information assessments conducted onsite are required to understand the characteristics and ability of soils to infiltrate runoff. Section 5.3.2 describes criteria for determining conditions under which infiltration BMPs are not considered feasible as a result of soils and geologic condition and therefore not required to be considered in WQMP as a result of soil characteristics and other factors.

The NRCS categorizes soil types as hydrologic soil group (HSG) A, B, C, or D, with the capacity to percolate water greatest in type A soils and lowest in type D soils. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual incorporates the HSG in estimating of both runoff volume and peak runoff from a drainage area, which are HCOC performance criteria (see Section 5.4.2).

Geologic assessments are required to evaluate and consider the project site's depth to water table, depth to bedrock, and susceptibility to landslides. Understanding the soils and geologic conditions is critical for design considerations such as placement of buildings and impervious surfaces.

3.2.4 Groundwater Considerations

Site assessment relative to groundwater characteristics includes an evaluation of groundwater levels. Several types of LID BMPs are prohibited from consideration for sites overlying a seasonal high groundwater table. Similarly, project sites overlying areas groundwater or soil contamination limit or prohibit the consideration of LID BMPs that rely on infiltration for inclusion in WQMP. Section 5.3.2 describes criteria for determining if infiltration BMPs are prohibited as a result of groundwater characteristics.

3.2.5 Environmental Concerns

Identification of sensitive areas on a project site is required since these areas potentially fall under the regulatory purview of other agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers or California State Department of Fish and Game (DFG). For instance, a proposed project may lie within a conservation or mitigation easement area identified in a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) that has identified key species and associated habitats. Sensitive or restricted areas may also include wetlands and floodplains. A site assessment also requires review of existing or historical vegetative plant communities and invasive species. Other concerns that may impact the placement of LID BMPs may include contaminated soil and groundwater or buried storage tanks.

3.2.6 Existing Development and Utilities

A clear understanding of site conditions requires knowledge of existing development conditions and utilities since they may limit the placement of LID BMPs and affect site design. For

redevelopment projects, existing as-built plans are valuable documents to review to compare against actual site conditions when identifying site features such as buildings and structures, parking lots, roads, landscaped areas, and underground utilities.

In addition, the quality of existing land cover is an important factor in developing a WQMP. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual incorporates a 'quality of cover' rating system in estimating of both runoff volume and peak runoff from a DMA, which are HCOC performance criteria (see Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.3).

Setting a pre-developed quality of cover rating requires field investigation and use of best professional judgment. Vegetation at a site can change dramatically between the wet and dry seasons, therefore assessments of quality of cover that take place toward the end of the dry and beginning of the wet season require observation of plants in a dormant state. These plants still provide similar soil stabilization benefits as during the growing season.

3.3 Pollutants of Concern

Site assessments involve identification of specific pollutants of concern that could be expected from implementation of the Priority Project. Urban runoff mobilizes pollutants that have accumulated on surfaces of developed sites and has the potential to impact the receiving waters downstream of the development site. Typical urban runoff pollutants of concern include microbial pathogens (bacteria and viruses), metals, nutrients, toxic organic compounds, suspended solids/sediment, trash and debris, and oil and grease. Specifically pollutants include:

- ***Pathogens (Bacteria Indicators/ Virus)*** – Bacteria and viruses are ubiquitous microorganisms that thrive under certain environmental conditions. Their proliferation is typically caused by the transport of animal or human fecal wastes from the watershed. Water, containing excessive bacteria and viruses, can alter the aquatic habitat and create a harmful environment for humans and aquatic life. Also, the decomposition of excess organic waste causes increased growth of undesirable organisms in the water.
- ***Metals*** – The primary source of metal pollution in stormwater is typically commercially available metals and metal products, as well as emissions from brake pad and tire tread wear associated with driving. Primary metals of concern include cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc. Lead and chromium have been used as corrosion inhibitors in primer coatings and cooling tower systems. Metals are also raw material components in non-metal products such as fuels, adhesives, paints, and other coatings. At low concentrations naturally occurring in soil, metals may not be toxic. However, at higher concentrations, certain metals can be toxic to aquatic life. Humans can be impacted from contaminated groundwater resources, and bioaccumulation of metals in fish and shellfish.

Environmental concerns, regarding the potential for release of metals to the environment, have already led to restricted metal usage in certain applications.

- ***Nutrients*** – Nutrients are inorganic substances, such as nitrogen and phosphorus. Excessive discharge of nutrients to water bodies and streams causes eutrophication, where aquatic plants and algae growth can lead to excessive decay of organic matter in the water body, loss of oxygen in the water, release of toxins in sediment, and the eventual death of aquatic organisms. Primary sources of nutrients in urban runoff are fertilizers and eroded soils.
- ***Organic Compounds*** – Organic compounds are carbon-based. Commercially available or naturally occurring organic compounds are found in solvents and hydrocarbons. Organic compounds can, at certain concentrations, indirectly or directly constitute a hazard to life or health. When rinsing off objects, toxic levels of solvents and cleaning compounds can be discharged to storm drains. Dirt, grease, and grime retained in the cleaning fluid or rinse water may also adsorb levels of organic compounds that are harmful or hazardous to aquatic life. Sources of organic compounds may include waste handling areas and vehicle or landscape maintenance areas.
- ***Pesticides / Herbicides*** – Pesticides and herbicides are organic compounds used to destroy and/or prevent insects, rodents, fungi, weeds, and other undesirable pests. Pesticides and herbicides can be washed off urban landscapes during storm events.
- ***Sediments / Suspended Solids*** – Sediments are solid materials that are eroded from the land surface. Sediments can increase turbidity, clog fish gills, reduce spawning habitat, lower survival rates of young aquatic organisms, smother bottom dwelling organisms, and suppress aquatic vegetation growth.
- ***Trash and Debris*** – Trash (such as paper, plastic, polystyrene packing foam, and aluminum materials) and biodegradable organic matter (such as leaves, grass cuttings, and food waste) are general waste products on the landscape. The presence of trash and debris may have a significant impact on the recreational value of a water body and aquatic habitat. Trash also impacts water quality by increasing biochemical oxygen demand.
- ***Oil and Grease*** – Oil and grease in water bodies decreases the aesthetic value of the water body, as well as the water quality. Primary sources of oil and grease are petroleum hydrocarbon products, motor products from leaking vehicles, esters, oils, fats, waxes, and high molecular-weight fatty acids.

3.3.1 Land Use and Potential Pollutants of Concern

The WQMP must identify all pollutants that are expected to be generated from the proposed project. Site-specific conditions must also be considered as potential pollutant sources, such as

legacy pesticides or nutrients in site soils as a result of past agricultural practices or hazardous materials in site soils from industrial uses. Hazardous material sites that have been remediated and do not pose a current threat, and will not pose a future threat to stormwater quality, are not considered a pollutant of concern. Table 3-3 provides guidance for determining expected pollutants of concern and lists those pollutants that are typically associated with the project categories and land use types. The selection of BMPs that involve treatment and release of runoff from the site to downstream waters must effectively mitigate associated pollutants of concern for a proposed project.

Table 3-3. Pollutants of Concern for Project Categories and Land Uses

Priority Project Categories and/or Project Features	General Pollutant Categories								
	Pathogens (Bacterial / Virus)	Metals	Nutrients / Noxious Aquatic Plants	Organic Compounds	Pesticides / Herbicides	Sediments / Total Suspended Solids / pH	Trash & Debris	Oxygen Demanding Compounds	Oil & Grease
Detached Residential Development	E	N	E	E(1)	E	E	E	E(1)	E
Attached Residential Development	E	N	E	E(1)	E	E	E	E	E(2)
Commercial / Industrial Development	E(3)	E	E(1)	E(1,4)	E	E(1)	E	E(1)	E
Automotive Repair Shops	N	E	N	E(1,3,4)	E	N	E	E(1)	E
Restaurants (>5,000 ft^2)	E	E(2)	E(1)	E(1)	E	E(1)(2)	E	N	E
Hillside Development (>5,000 ft^2)	E	N	E	E(1)	E	E	E	E	E
Parking Lots (>5,000 ft^2)	E(5)	E	E(1)	E(3)	E	E(1)	E	E(1)	E
Retail Gasoline Outlets	N	E	N	E(3)	E	N	E	E(1)	E

E = Expected to be a concern in stormwater runoff
N = Not expected to be a concern in stormwater runoff
(1) Expected pollutant if landscaping exists on-site; otherwise not expected.
(2) Expected pollutant if the project includes uncovered parking areas; otherwise not expected
(3) Including petroleum hydrocarbons
(4) Including solvents
(5) Bacterial indicators are routinely detected in pavement runoff

3.3.2 Expected Pollutants of Concern

The WQMP must list all identified pollutants of concern that are expected to be generated by the project and compare this with the list of pollutants for which the receiving waters are impaired. To identify pollutants of concern in receiving waters, each project proponent shall reference Table 3-3 and Table 3-4 to determine if any pollutants expected to be generated by the project are also listed as causing impairments of downstream receiving waters for the project.

3.3.3 Receiving Water Impairments and TMDLs

For each of the proposed project discharge points, the Priority Project proponent shall identify the proximate receiving water for each point of discharge and all downstream receiving waters, using the HCOC Map and Watershed Geodatabase developed for the WAP. For all downstream receiving waters identified, determine if they are listed on the most recent list of CWA Section 303(d) impaired water bodies or have an effective, adopted or planned TMDL. Table 3-4 lists the current impaired receiving water bodies. Project proponent shall check with the RWQCB and State Water Resources Control Board for updates to the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies with adopted TMDLs within the Santa Ana River Watershed Region (*http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/*). For identified pollutants of concern that are causing an impairment in receiving waters, the Project WQMP shall incorporate LID BMPs that fully retain stormwater, or provide medium or high effectiveness in reducing pollutants prior to release, if on-site retention is infeasible.

Table 3-4. Summary of Impairments to Receiving Waterbodies (2010) in San Bernardino County

Water Body	Pollutant								
	Pathogens (Bacterial Indicators / Virus)	Metals	Nutrients	Sedimentation / Siltation	Noxious Aquatic Plants	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Chemical Oxygen Deman	pH	Polychlorinated biphenyls
Big Bear Lake		X	X		X				X
Chino Creek Reach 1A	X		X						
Chino Creek Reach 1B	X		X				X		
Chino Creek Reach 2	X							X	
Cucamonga Creek, Reach 1	X	X							
Cucamonga Creek, Reach 2								X	
Grout Creek			X						
Knickerbocker Creek	X								

Lytle Creek	X								
Mill Creek (Prado Area)	X		X			X			
Mill Creek Reach 1	X								
Mill Creek Reach 2	X								
Mountain Home Creek	X								
Mountain Home Creek, East Fork	X								
Prado Park Lake	X		X						
Rathbone (Rathbun Creek)		X	X	X					
Santa Ana River, Reach 3	X	X							
Santa Ana River, Reach 4	X								
Summit Creek			X						

For identified pollutants of concern that are causing an impairment in receiving waters, the Project WQMP shall incorporate LID BMPs that fully retain stormwater, or provide medium or high effectiveness in reducing pollutants prior to release, if on-site retention is infeasible.

3.4 Hydrologic Conditions of Concern

A WQMP is required to address the potential for causing or contributing to HCOC from project development. Conditions that demonstrate a project does not have the potential to cause or contribute to a downstream HCOC are found in Permit Section XI.E.5.d.ii. In addition, if your project meets one of the following criteria indicated below, you do not need to address Hydromodification at this time.

Additional HCOC Exemption Criteria:

1. Sump Condition: All downstream conveyance channels to an adequate sump (for example, Prado Dam, Santa Ana River, or other Lake, Reservoir or naturally erosion resistant feature) that will receive runoff from the project are engineered and regularly maintained to ensure design flow capacity; no sensitive stream habitat areas will be adversely affected; or are not identified on the Co-Permittees Hydromodification Sensitivity Maps.
2. Pre = Post: The runoff flow rate, volume and velocity for the post-development condition of the Priority Development Project do not exceed the pre-development (i.e, naturally occurring condition) for the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall event utilizing latest San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual.
    a. Submit a substantiated hydrologic analysis to justify your request.
3. Diversion to Storage Area / Controlled Release Point: The DMAs drain to water storage areas which are considered as controlled release points and utilized for water conservation.

a. See Appendix F for the HCOC Exemption Area Map and the on-line Watershed Geodatabase (*http://permitrack.sbcounty.gov/wap/*) for reference.

4. Less than One Acre: The Priority Development Project disturbs less than one acre. The Co-permittee has the discretion to require a Project Specific WQMP to address HCOCs on projects less than one acre on a case by case basis. The project disturbs less than one acre and is not part of a common plan of development.

5. Built Out Area: The contributing watershed area to which the project discharges has an impervious area percentage greater than 90 percent.

   a. See Appendix F for the HCOC Exemption Map and the on-line Watershed Geodatabase (*http://permitrack.sbcounty.gov/wap/*) for reference.

3.4.1 Susceptibility of Receiving Waters to Hydromodification Impacts

New development typically results in an increased proportion of impervious surfaces on the project site, or conversely reduction in the proportion of porous or pervious surface at the project site, and changes to the drainage network. Common changes to the hydrologic regime resulting from development include increased runoff volume and velocity, reduced infiltration, increased flow frequency, flow duration, peak flow, and faster time to reach peak flow. If the project covers pre-developed natural sediment source areas with impervious surfaces, or otherwise modifies these sediment source areas, the amount of sediment available for transport in downstream flows may be reduced. Storm runoff could fill this sediment-carrying capacity by eroding a downstream channel, resulting in excessive erosion, excessive sedimentation, or both, in downstream reaches. These changes have the potential to adversely impact downstream channels and habitat integrity. A change to the hydrologic regime would be considered an HCOC if the change would have a significant adverse impact on downstream natural channels and habitat integrity, alone or in conjunction with impacts of other projects.

3.4.2 Expected Hydrologic Conditions of Concern

As part of the development of a WAP for the County of San Bernardino (an MS4 Permit requirement), an HCOC Map and Watershed Geodatabase has been developed that delineates existing unarmored or soft-armored drainages in the permitted area that are vulnerable to geomorphology changes due to hydromodification. Initial mapping of HCOC in the Santa Ana River watershed was included in the WAP Phase 1 document, submitted to the RWQCB on January 29, 2011. Once the WAP is approved, the HCOC identified in the Watershed Geodatabase will provide the basis for determining if a proposed project is located upstream of a waterbody that requires protection from hydromodification.

If the proposed project is determined to have the potential to cause or contribute to a downstream HCOC, then the WQMP must address both LID and HCOC performance criteria

(see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2). Section 5.5 provides guidance on selection and evaluation of BMPs for addressing HCOC performance criteria. Conversely, if the project is not within a region upstream of a HCOC, then only LID performance criteria (see Section 4.3.1) and associated BMP selection and evaluation steps apply.

3.5 Regional Stormwater Management

Regional efforts to manage watersheds in an integrated manner are underway in San Bernardino County through the development of a WAP. Section XI.B.1 of the MS4 Permit states that:

> *The Permittees shall develop an integrated watershed management approach to improve integration of planning and approval processes with water quality and quantity control measures. Management of the water quality and hydrologic impacts of urbanization will be more effective whether managed on a per site, sub-regional, or regional basis, if coordinated within the WAP.*

Therefore, in some project locations, the WAP may designate sub-regional and/or regional LID BMPs that provide effective water quality and quantity management when on-site LID BMPs are ineffective at achieving LID DCV and HCOC requirements. Under such circumstances, the Project proponent will need to demonstrate, through their infeasibility analysis, that the use of regional BMPs is more effective based on all of the following criteria:

- The sub-regional/regional LID BMPs is sited and designed such that it will provide greater overall benefit than would be achieved by on-site LID BMPs, including combined considerations of pollutant loading, hydrologic loading, groundwater recharge, potable water demand, and Smart Growth goals.
- The sub-regional/regional LID BMPs are located such that runoff from the project would be conveyed to the BMPs prior to discharge to any Waters of the US. However, stormwater runoff from an individual project may be conveyed to a regional treatment system via receiving waters if the pollutants in the runoff have been controlled on-site using LID techniques to the MEP and beneficial uses of the receiving water have not been impacted.
- The sub-regional/regional LID BMPs are sufficiently sized to retain or biotreat runoff from the project in addition to runoff from other upstream drainage areas.
- The sub-regional/regional LID BMPs will be adequately maintained for the life of the project and the sub-regional/regional BMPs will be constructed and operational to serve the project once the project is complete.

To participate in an approved regional LID BMP, the project WQMP must also include an analysis to verify that the criteria used to demonstrate greater effectiveness in a regional LID BMP are maintained throughout the watershed at the time of project completion. For example, if more development occurs within the watershed than estimated, then the capacity of the regional LID BMPs may not be sufficient to mitigate the DCV of a development project.

The use of regional or sub-regional BMPs could require multiple jurisdictions and project proponents within a watershed to develop a watershed-based management strategy to be implemented on a jurisdictional basis. The WAP will identify regional opportunities and a framework for implementation. There may be multiple implementation scenarios among various jurisdictions that will need to be worked out on a case by case basis. As an example of implementing LID on a regional basis, several individual developments potentially in conjunction with other agencies could propose a project that incorporates LID BMPs to address stormwater runoff from all the developments collectively. Examples of regional BMPs would be the use of a regional infiltration basin, regional wetland, or groundwater injection and/or recharge facility as a total project or in conjunction with distributed swales and bioretention areas within the developments or at the regional site.

Section 4 – Project-Specific Performance Criteria

Performance criteria must be established for each Priority Project requiring a WQMP. MS4 Permit Section XI.D.6 prescribes performance criteria for managing the LID water quality control volume and Section X1.E.5 prescribes criteria for projects that have potential to cause a HCOC. The computed performance criteria are the basis for determining the extent of LID and hydromodification BMPs needed for a proposed project. Although the requirements for LID and HCOC are stated independently in the MS4 Permit, and the Project WQMP must also demonstrate compliance with each requirement (LID and HCOC) separately, these provisions overlap significantly and some best management practices may fulfill a portion of one or more of each of the requirements.

The following instructions address LID performance criteria (Section 4.1) separately from HCOC mitigation requirements (Section 4.2). Section 4.3 provides example case studies for implementing these concepts.

For non-Priority / non-Category projects, the Project proponent is not required to address HCOC mitigation requirements. However, they may be required to implement source and site control BMPs and other LIP requirements, as determined by the local jurisdiction. The proponent will complete the applicable sections and forms in the WQMP template (typically, Sections 1, 2 and 3 and Forms 4.1-1, 4.1-2 and 4.1-3) as directed by the local jurisdiction.

The Project site will be, as necessary, divided into distinct Drainage Areas (DA). A Drainage Area is the area of the Project site that drains to a specific outlet. For example, if the Project site has two outlets then the site will, by definition, have two DAs. Each DA will be further subdivided into Drainage Management Areas (DMAs) based on land cover type and HSG. For example, if the DA has three distinct land cover types, then the DA will have three DMAs that must be accounted for in the calculations. By definition, the sum of the areas of the DMAs will total the area of the DA, and the sum of the areas of the DA will total the Project site area listed in Item 2 of Form 2.1-1 of the WQMP Template.

If the Project site has two or more runoff outlets, the Project proponent will complete the HCOC and DCV analysis for each corresponding DA (using the applicable forms).

4.1 LID Performance Criteria

The combined runoff capture from the Project's proposed BMPs must equal or exceed volume-based BMP performance criteria (MS4 Permit Section XI.D.6). Volume-based performance criteria are used as the measure of the overall effectiveness of the LID BMPs. The MS4 Permit requires that volume-based LID BMPs be evaluated first. Flow-based BMPs may only be used after on-site retention and infiltration and volume-based biotreatment BMPs have been implemented to the MEP.

Implementation of BMPs shall follow the LID BMP hierarchy of use (Figure 5-1). The Project Proponent shall evaluate and incorporate LID site design components, hydrologic source controls (HSC), harvest and use BMPs, retention and infiltration BMPs, and, finally, biotreatment BMPs to mitigate the DCV associated with each individual DA on the project site. Section 5.5 provides guidance on the determination of the feasibility and optimization of BMP implementation. If the combination of hydrologic source controls (HSC), retention and infiltration, and harvest and use BMPs are unable to mitigate the entire DCV, then biotreatment BMPs may be implemented by the project proponent for the balance of the DCV. If flow-based biotreatment BMPs are used, then they must be sized to provide sufficient capacity for effective treatment of the remainder of the volume-based performance criteria that cannot be achieved with retention BMPs (TGD for WQMP Section 5.4.4.2). Under no circumstances shall any portion of the DCV be released from the site without effective mitigation and/or treatment.

Section XI.D.6.a of the MS4 Permit includes four alternatives for computing the design capture volume for development of sizing for proposed LID features and other BMPs, if necessary. Of the four, the Program has selected the following criterion for use:

> *The volume of annual runoff produced from a 24-hour, 85th percentile storm event determined as the maximum capture storm water volume for the area, from the formula recommended in Urban Runoff Quality Management, WEF Manual of Practice No. 23/ASCE Manual of Practice No. 87 (1998).*

This alternative was selected for use because of its ease of application, effective management of spatial variability in rainfall by using NOAA isohyetal maps, and status as the prescribed method used for WQMPs prepared since 2005. For the purposes of preparing this WQMP, the 24-hour, 85th percentile storm event shall be equivalent to the calculated DCV, as follows.

This alternative employs two regression equations to convert watershed imperviousness to a runoff coefficient and convert average rainfall event depth (based on a 6-hour inter-event time to identify distinct storm events) to a maximized water quality capture volume (WEF/ASCE, 1998). The maximized water quality capture volume is referred to as the DCV and this term will be used throughout the San Bernardino County WQMP. Computation of the DCV for a potential project involves five steps as shown below:

- Step 1 – Compute the area, in square feet, for each Project Site DA
- Step 2 – Compute the DA runoff coefficient as a function of DA imperviousness (i), using the following regression equation (ASCE and WEF, 1998):

$$C = 0.858 * i^3 - 0.78 * i^2 + 0.774 * i + 0.04$$

- Step 3 – Identify the 2-year, 1-hour rainfall depth for the DA from the NOAA Atlas 14 isohyet map. The following webpage can be used to extract interpolated point rainfall from NOAA Atlas 14 isohyets:

http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/sa/sca_pfds.html

- Step 4 – Compute the P6 mean storm rainfall depth in inches for the DA by multiplying the 2 year, 1-hr rainfall depth by the appropriate coefficient (a_1) for the San Bernardino County climatic region (Valley = 1.4807, Mountain = 1.909, or Desert = 1.2371):

$$P_6 = P_{2yr,1hr} * a_1$$

- Step 5 – Calculate the design capture volume (DCV), in cubic feet, as a function of the total DA, in square feet; the runoff coefficient (C), the P6 rainfall depth, in inches; and the regression constant to account for drawdown time (a_2 = 1.582 for 24-hr drawdown, or 1.963 for 48-hr drawdown). Drawdown time is the maximum amount of time that runoff can be stored in a BMP to ensure sufficient capacity to treat subsequent storm events. The following equation computes the DCV:

$$DCV = DA * C * a_2 * P_6 / 12$$

Section 5.3.1 describes specific preventative site design principles that reduce the amount of runoff generated from a project site. Accordingly, computation of a DA's DCV using the P_6 method shown above requires input of post-developed imperviousness, which may be lower than traditional values as a result of the implementation of site design LID principles.

4.2 HCOC Performance Criteria

Not all potential projects will need to address HCOCs as discussed in Section 3.4. MS4 Permit Section XI.E.5d specifies conditions that would result in a project having the potential to cause an HCOC (see discussion in Section 3.4). If the project has potential to cause a HCOC, as determined in the project evaluation step, performance criteria to assess the effectiveness of a WQMP in mitigating HCOC impacts from the project involve comparing pre-development site hydrology with post-development site hydrology. MS4 Permit Section XI.E.5d provides specific metrics of compliance with the MS4 Permit requirements for HCOC, as follows:

- Post-development runoff volume, time of concentration, and peak flow velocity for the 2-year frequency storm does not exceed that of the pre-development condition by more than five percent.

To determine the proposed project's drainage characteristics, the project engineer must compute pre- and post-development hydrology for a 24-hour design storm event with a 2-yr return period. Each of the following hydrologic variables (runoff volume, time of concentration and peak flow velocity) must be demonstrated to not have changed by more than five percent as a result of the proposed development activity. The LID BMPs included in the WQMP will contribute to meeting HCOC requirements. The volume of runoff retained in LID BMPs serves to reduce the volume computed for the post-developed condition for a 2-year, 24-hour storm event. LID BMPs will also substantially affect the post-developed condition runoff hydrograph, including the time of concentration and peak runoff. HCOC performance criteria for time of concentration and peak runoff require matching of pre- and post- developed conditions within five percent. Longer time of concentration and lower peak runoff generally results in lower concern for hydromodification impacts. It may not be physically possible for a project to implement BMPs consistent with LID provisions of the MS4 Permit without increasing the time of concentration of a site and reducing peak runoff by more than five percent. Therefore, it is interpreted that the five percent post-developed hydrology matching criteria only applies to decreases in time of concentration and increases in peak runoff.

The governing document for discrete hydrologic analysis in San Bernardino County is the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual (SBCFCD, 1986). The following sections provide guidance for conducting calculations, using Forms 4.2-2 through 4.2-5 of the WQMP Template, for each of the HCOC performance criteria. Additional details are also available in the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual in the following sections:

- Runoff volume - Section J for drainage areas less than 10 acres or Section E for drainage areas greater than 10 acres;
- Time of concentration - Section D.3 for drainage areas less than 640 acres or Section E for drainage areas greater than 640 acres;
- Peak flowrate - Section D.1 for drainage areas less than 640 acres or Section E for drainage areas greater than 640 acres.

As an alternative for performing the manual calculations on each of these forms, a project proponent may, with the approval of the reviewing jurisdiction, replace Forms 4.2-3 through 4.2-5 by computer software analysis based on the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual.

4.2.1 Runoff Volume

The method prescribed in the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual for estimating runoff volume from a design storm event uses an empirical factor, the runoff curve number (CN), for estimating the portion of rainfall depth that is converted to runoff. High curve numbers indicate a high fraction of rainfall is expected to become runoff, as is the case for impervious surfaces such as pavement or rooftop areas, where a CN of 98 is assumed. Conversely, low CNs are

assigned to areas designated as a natural land cover type with well drained soils, where the capacity for rainfall to percolate to groundwater is greater.

In the first step for calculating runoff volume, the project site is divided into DAs, which are further subdivided into DMAs based on land cover type and HSG. For each defined land cover type and HSG within a delineated DMA, determine the appropriate CN using Figure C-3 of the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual (see Appendix C-2). Each column in Form 4.2-3 (WQMP Template) is used to represent the unique land cover type and HSG of each DMA (for projects with numerous DMAs, it may be necessary to incorporate additional columns into Form 4.2-3). Using the DMA areas and corresponding CNs, compute an area-weighted average CN for the entire project site (CN_{site}), using the following equation:

$$CN_{DA} = \sum_n [\ CN_{DMA} * Area_{DMA}\ ] / Area_{DA}$$

The area weighted CN for the site is then converted to a soil storage capacity (*S*) and initial abstraction (I_a) using the following equations;

$$S = (\ 1000 / CN_{DA}\ ) - 10$$

$$I_a = 0.2 * S$$

The initial abstraction is the depth of rainfall that is not available for surface runoff, by way of hydrologic processes such as infiltration, interception, or depression storage. In order to convert this estimate of initial abstraction to a runoff volume it is necessary to determine the design rainfall depth. The 2-year return period, 24-hour rainfall depth ($P_{2yr,24hr}$) for the project site is extracted using the NOAA Atlas 14 isohyetals found on their webpage (*http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/sa/sca_pfds.html*). Runoff volume (*V*) from the site is then computed for both pre- and post- developed conditions using the following equation:

$$V = 1/12 * Area_{site} * (\ P_{2yr,24hr} – I_a\ )^2 / (\ P_{2yr,24hr} – I_a + S\ )$$

The above process shall be completed for both pre-development site conditions and post-development site conditions. A comparison of the runoff volume estimates using pre- and post-developed weighted CNs determines the runoff volume reduction necessary to achieve the HCOC performance criteria. The following equation computes the volume reduction that must be achieved using a combination of LID and hydromodification mitigation BMPs:

$$V_{HCOC} = 0.95 * V_{Post\text{-}developed} – V_{Pre\text{-}developed}$$

4.2.2 Time of Concentration

The time of concentration is the time after the beginning of rainfall when all points in a drainage area are contributing to discharge point(s). It is a measure of the timing of a hydrologic response to a rainfall event. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual determines the time of concentration for a project site by using a nomograph (Appendix C-1). Information needed to use the nomograph includes:



- Length of the longest flowpath across the site (see example flowpath for an undeveloped site to the right)
- Change in elevation along the longest flowpath across the site (in example to the right: 1326'-1310' = 16')
- Land cover type and percent imperviousness (undeveloped land cover also requires an assessment of the quality of cover – see section 3.2.6)

The nomograph is limited to DA that are less than 10 acres and with a maximum flowpath length of 1,000 feet. If the site is greater than 10 acres and/or has multiple DA, an additional step (described below) is needed to determine the total time of concentration. For each DA (must be less than 10 acres) the initial DA time of concentration is determined using the nomograph in Appendix C-1. The travel time from each DA outlet to the site discharge point is estimated using the Manning's channel flow velocity equation, shown below:

$$V_{ft/sec} = 1.49 * R^{(2/3)} * S^{(1/2)} / n \; ; \; R = A / P$$

Where *n* is a coefficient determined by the roughness of the channel bottom, *R* is the hydraulic radius, which equals the cross sectional flow area in ft^2 *(A)* divided by the wetted perimeter in ft *(P),* and *S* is the slope of the channel bottom.

The additional travel time from a DA outlet to the project site outlet is then simply the length of the channel ($L_{channel}$) in ft divided by the velocity of flow (*V)* in feet per second, as show in the equation below:

$$T_{minutes} = L_{channel} / (V \; ft/sec * 60 \; sec/min)$$

The time of concentration (T_c) is the sum of the initial DA time of concentration and the travel time to the site discharge point. For sites with multiple DA, the total time of concentration is equal to the longest of the DA-specific times of concentration. Comparison of the time of concentration estimates for pre- and post-developed conditions determines the additional time of concentration ($T_{c\text{-}HCOC}$) that must be provided to achieve HCOC performance criteria:

$$T_{c,HCOC} = 0.95 * T_{c,Pre\text{-}developed} - T_{c,Post\text{-}developed}$$

4.2.3 Peak Runoff

Performance criteria for peak flow velocity are developed to be protective of the downstream waterbody. Velocity in the receiving water or MS4 conveyance facilities just downstream of the discharge point will change with the type, size, and slope of receiving MS4 conveyance facilities prior to reaching the HCOC segment. In addition, inputs of runoff from other drainage areas affect downstream velocity. Thus, peak runoff (cfs) serves as a better criterion for maintaining pre-developed peak flow velocity downstream than the peak velocity at the project's discharge point. New conveyance facilities associated with a development must still comply with local flood control sizing requirements, which include design criteria based on flow velocity.

The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual uses a form of the Rational Method to estimate peak flow (Q_p) from a DA. The equation is shown below:

$$Q_p = 0.9 * (I - F_m) * DA, ft^2 / 43{,}560\ ft^2/acre\ ;\ \ F_m = a_p * F_p$$

This form of the Rational Method estimates effective rainfall for runoff generation by subtracting the depth of rain expected to be infiltrated (F_m), referred to as the maximum loss rate. The sections below provide information regarding variables used in this equation.

Maximum Loss Rate

The variable F_m is equal to the infiltration capacity of soils on the project site (F_p) multiplied by the pervious fraction of the total site area (a_p). The site design determines the pervious fraction of the project site. The infiltration capacity of pervious areas is identified by using a nomograph in the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual (Appendix C-3). Data needed to use the nomograph include pervious area CN and antecedent moisture conditions (AMC). For estimating peak runoff for HCOC performance criteria, AMC II is assumed for all portions of the area under the MS4 Permit.

Rainfall Intensity

The rainfall intensity variable (I) in the Rational Method equation is intended to represent the 2 year return period peak intensity for duration equal to the time of concentration for the project site. Because most project sites will have a time of concentration that is less than one hour, it is necessary to extrapolate NOAA Atlas 14 information for sub-hourly durations. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual employs an intensity-duration curve plotted on a Log-Log scale to perform the extrapolation (Appendix C-4). Project sites within the valley use a Log-Log slope of 0.6, while project sites in the Mountain or Desert climatic regions use a Log-Log slope of 0.7. Alternatively, the following equation can be used to estimate the rainfall intensity (I) for duration equal to the time of concentration (T_c);

$$I = 10 \wedge [\mathrm{LOG}\ I_{2yr,\ 1hr} - S_{log\text{-}log} * \mathrm{LOG}\ (T_c / 60)]$$

Confluence Analysis

For project sites with more than one DA, estimation of peak runoff requires a Rational Method confluence analysis. If the time of concentration from all of the DA to the site discharge point were equal, then the peak runoff would simply be the sum of DA peak runoff estimates. When differences in time of concentration exist among DA, routed to same site discharge point, the peak runoff at the site discharge point (*Outlet* Q_p) is less than the sum of DA peak runoff rates due to different timing of runoff response from each upstream DA. The San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual provides a confluence analysis method for estimating peak runoff at the site discharge point (confluence of multiple DA) for two potential scenarios:

- DA with highest peak runoff has the longest time of concentration (sum of the initial DA time of concentration and the travel time to the site discharge point). Assuming DA-B has a higher peak runoff and longer time concentration than DA-A, peak runoff at the project site outlet is estimated using the following equation (subscripts indicate the DA reference ID):

$$\text{Outlet } Q_p = Q_2 + [\ Q1 * (\ I_2 - F_{m1}\ ) / (\ I_1 - F_{m1}\ )\ ]$$

- The DA with the highest peak runoff has the shortest time of concentration (sum of the initial DA time of concentration and the travel time to the site discharge point). Assuming DA-B has a higher peak runoff and shorter time concentration than DA-A, peak runoff at the project site outlet is estimated using the following equation (subscripts indicate the DA reference ID):

$$\text{Outlet } Q_p = Q_2 + [\ Q1 * (\ I_2 - F_{m1}\ ) / (\ I_1 - F_{m1}\ )\ ] * (\ T_{c2} / T_{c1}\ )$$

Comparison of the peak runoff estimates for pre- and post- developed conditions determines the peak runoff reduction necessary to achieve HCOC performance criteria ($Q_{p\text{-}HCOC}$). The following equation computes the peak runoff reduction needed with a combination of LID and hydromodification BMPs:

$$\text{Outlet } Q_{p\text{-}HCOC} = 0.95 * \text{Outlet } Q_{p,\text{Post-developed}} - \text{Outlet } Q_{p,\text{Pre-developed}}$$

4.3 Case Studies

Two case studies are presented to demonstrate the methodology for evaluating LID and HCOC performance criteria.

The first case study presents a 15-acre site with vacant land cover (Figure 4-1). Figure 4-1 also shows the site layout for Case Study 1 after construction. The proposed project will consist of a large commercial facility and parking lot. It was determined that there were no HCOCs associated with the proposed project.

The second Case Study presents a 6.7-acre site with vegetated land cover and canopy, as shown in Figure 4-2. Figure 4-2 also shows the site layout for Case Study 2 after construction. The site will consist of a low-density residential community with 15 dwelling units, a small pocket park, and an area reserved to preserve existing vegetation and drainage features. The project site is delineated into two hydrologically distinct DA, referred to as DA-A (2.8 acres) and DA-B (3.9 acres). Performance criteria are applied separately for each DA. This proposed project must address HCOC due to conditions in the downstream water body.

Figure 4-1. Case Study 1: Pre- (left) and Post- (right) Developed Site



Figure 4-2. Case Study 2: Pre- (left) and Post- (right) Developed Site Layout

4.3.1 Case Studies - LID Performance Criteria

The calculations for the LID Performance Criteria are shown below for Case Study 1 and for each of the two DAs of Case Study 2. Table 4-1 provides the parameters required to perform DCV calculations for each case study sites. Section 4.1 provides a step by step description of how these parameters are used to compute the DCV using the P_6 method. The NOAA Precipitation Frequency Data Server indicates the site has a 2-year, 24-hour storm precipitation of 2.88 inches and 2-year, 1-hour precipitation of 0.63 in/hr (*http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/pfds_map_cont.html?bkmrk=ca*).

Table 4-1. Key Parameters for Calculation of LID DCV for both Case Studies

Parameter	Case Study 1	Case Study 2, DA-A	Case Study 2, DA-B
Area (acres)	15	2.8	3.9
Pre-developed land classification	Undeveloped, unvegetated	Undeveloped, vegetated	Undeveloped, vegetated
Pre-developed imperviousness (%)	0%	0%	0%
Post-developed land classification	Commercial	Residential	Residential
Post-developed imperviousness (%)	70%	33%	29%
2-year, 1 hr precipitation (in)	0.63	0.63	0.63
Climatic Region	Valley	Valley	Valley
BMP Drawdown time (hrs)	48	48	48

Computation of LID DCV for Case Study 1

- **Step 1** – Project site – single drainage area (DA) of approximately 15 acres.

  DA = 15 acre *43,560 ft^2/acre = 653,400 ft^2

- **Step 2** – Post-developed runoff coefficient was calculated using the following equation:

  $C = 0.858 * (70\%)^3 – 0.78 * (70\%)^2 + 0.774 * (70\%) +0.04 = 0.49$

- **Step 3** – The 2-year, 1-hour rainfall depth for the project site was determined to be 0.63 in. using the NOAA Atlas 14 isohyet map.

- **Step 4** – The project site is located in the Valley climatic region and therefore, converting 2-year, 1-hour rain to the P_6 average storm depth is:

  $P_6 = 1.4807 * 0.63 = 0.93$ inches

- **Step 5** –Using the parameters obtained from the previous steps, the DCV for a 48-hour drawdown, was calculated as follows:

  DCV = 653,400 ft^2 * 0.49 * 0.93in / 12in/ft *1.963

  DCV = 48,708 ft^3

Computation of LID DCV for Case Study 2

- **Step 1** – Project site – two drainage areas: DA-A is approximately 2.8 acres, and DA-B is approximately 3.9 acres.

  DA-A = 2.8 acre *43,560 ft^2/acre = 121,968 ft^2

  DA-B = 3.9 acre *43,560 ft^2/acre = 169,884 ft^2

- **Step 2** – Post-developed runoff coefficient was calculated for DA-A using the following equation:

  $C = 0.858 * (33\%)^3 – 0.78 * (33\%)^2 + 0.774 * (33\%) +0.04 = 0.24$

  and for DA-B:

  $C = 0.858 * (29\%)^3 – 0.78 * (29\%)^2 + 0.774 * (29\%) +0.04 = 0.22$

- **Step 3** – The 2-year, 1-hour rainfall depth for the project site was determined to be 0.63 in. using the NOAA Atlas 14 isohyet map.

- **Step 4** – The project site is located in the Valley climatic region and therefore, converting 2-year, 1-hour rain to the P_6 average storm depth is:

  $P_6 = 1.4807 * 0.63 = 0.93$ inches

- **Step 5** –Using the parameters obtained from the previous steps, the DCV for a 48-hour drawdown for DA-A is calculated below:

  DCV-A = 121,968 ft^2 * 0.24 * 0.93in / 12in/ft *1.963

  DCV-A = 4,453ft^3

  and for DA-B:

  DCV-B = 169,884 ft^2 * 0.22 * 0.93in / 12in/ft *1.963

  DCV-B = 5,686ft^3

4.3.2 Case Studies - HCOC Performance Criteria

The hydrology analysis needed to demonstrate HCOC performance criteria was completed for Case Study 2, a low-density residential development with potential to cause or contribute to a downstream HCOC, using the methods described in Section 4.2. Case Study 2 consists of two hydrologically distinct DAs, and calculations were performed for each DA. Calculations of site-specific HCOC performance criteria for runoff volume, time of concentration, and peak runoff are shown below for this case study.

Runoff Volume

Runoff volume is calculated separately for each defined DA. Table 4-2 summarizes the parameters used in calculating the runoff volume. The entire site overlies the Merrill soil series, with a C HSG.

Table 4-2. Case Study 2 Calculation of Area-Weighted Curve Number

Land Cover	Units	DA-A		DA-B	
		Pre-developed	Post-developed	Pre-developed	Post-developed
Open Brush with Good Cover	CN	75	75	75	75
	Area (sq. ft)	92,129	9,917	126,848	39,518
Open Brush with Fair Cover	CN	77	77	77	77
	Area (sq. ft)	30,710	0	42,283	0
Residential Landscaping	CN	69	69	69	69
	Area (sq. ft)	0	72,540	0	80,984
Pavement	CN	98	98	98	98
	Area (sq. ft)	0	22,382	0	21,628
Rooftop	CN	98	98	98	98
	Area (sq. ft)	0	18,000	0	27,000
Area-weighted CN	CN	76	79	76	79

Case Study 2 - Runoff Volume Calculation

- **Step 1** - Calculate Site CN (see Table 4-2). Calculations of the CN for the pre-developed site assume 75 percent Open Brush with Good Cover (75) and 25 percent Open Brush with Fair Cover (77).

  Site CN_{pre} = [(75 * 218,977) + (77 * 72,993)] / 291,970 = 76

  DA-A CN_{post} = [(75 * 9,917) + (69 * 72,540) + { 98 * (22,382 + 18,000) }] / 122,839 = 79

  DA-B CN_{post} = [(75 * 39,518) + (69 * 80,984) + { 98 * (21,628 + 27,000) }] / 169,131 = 79

- **Step 2** - Calculate Soil Storage Capacity (*S*) and Initial Abstraction (I_a)

  DA-A & DA-B (Pre-developed) $S_{A/Bpre}$ = 1,000 / 76 – 10 = 3.2 ; I_{pre} = 0.2 * 3.2 = 0.64 in

  DA-A (Post-developed) S_{APost} = 1,000 / 79 – 10 = 2.7; I_{APost} = 0.2 * 2.7 = 0.53 in

  DA-B (Post-developed) S_{BPost} = 1,000 / 79 – 10 = 2.7; I_{BPost} = 0.2 * 2.7 = 0.53 in

- **Step 3.** Compute pre-development and post-development runoff volume and calculate required volume reduction to meet HCOC performance criteria.

  DA-A

  Pre-developed: V_{APre} = 1/12 * 122,839 * (2.88 – 0.64)^2 / (2.88 – 0.64 + 3.2) = 9,442 ft^3

  Post-developed: V_{APost} = 1/12 * 122,839 * (2.88 – 0.53)^2 / (2.88 – 0.53 + 2.7) = 11,194 ft^3

  Volume reduction: $\mathbf{V_{A\text{-}HCOC}}$ = 0.95 * 11,194 – 9,442 = **1,193 ft^3**

  DA-B

  Pre-developed: V_{BPre} = 1/12 * 169,131 * (2.88 – 0.64)^2 / (2.88 – 0.64 + 3.2) = 13,000 ft^3

  Post-developed: V_{BPost} = 1/12 * 169,131 * (2.88 – 0.53)^2 / (2.88 – 0.53 + 2.7) = 15,413 ft^3

  Volume reduction: $\mathbf{V_{B\text{-}HCOC}}$ = 0.95 * 15,413 – 13,000 = **1,642 ft^3**

Case Study 2 – Time of Concentration Calculation

Step 1 – Estimate longest flow length

Use GIS elevation data to estimate the maximum flow length and change in elevation for each of the DA for pre- and post- developed site conditions.



Step 2 – The total area of the case study is less than 10 acres. Therefore, the nomograph in Appendix C-1 provided the time of concentration for each DA. The nomograph requires the predominant land cover type for each DA. Parameters used in the nomograph and time of concentration results are shown below:

DMA	Landuse	Flow Length (ft)	Change in elevation (ft)	Time of Concentration (min)
Pre-developed	Undeveloped Good Cover	669	2	40
Post-developed DA A	Single-Family Residential	911	2	20
Post-developed DA B	Single-Family Residential	1000	2	21

Case Study 2 – Peak Runoff Calculation

- **Step 1** – Use nomograph in Appendix C-3 to calculate infiltration capacity of soils, F_p, for each DA assuming AMC II for both pre- and post- developed conditions. Multiply resulting F_p with pervious fraction (a_p) in project to calculate depth of rain to be infiltrated, F_m. Do this for all pervious areas and sum all F_m values to obtain total F_m value for each DA.

Compute DA infiltration depth, F_m	DA-A		DA-B	
	Pre-developed	Post-developed	Pre-developed	Post-developed
Surface Description:	Open Brush			
Pervious Area CN	76	75	76	75
Antecedent Moisture Condition	2	2	2	2
Infiltration Capacity F_p (in/hr)	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.46
Pervious Fraction a_p	1	0.08	1	0.23
Infiltration depth (in)	0.44	0.04	0.44	0.11
Surface Description:	Residential Landscaping (only in post-developed condition)			
Pervious Area CN		69		69
Antecedent Moisture Condition		2		2
Infiltration Capacity F_p (in/hr)		0.56		0.56
Pervious Fraction a_p		0.59		0.48
Infiltration depth (in)		0.33		0.27
Total Depth of Infiltration F_m (in/hr)	0.44	0.37	0.44	0.38

- **Step 2 –** Calculate rainfall intensity for each DA for duration equal to the time of concentration under pre- and post- developed conditions by extrapolating from the 2-year, 1-hr rainfall intensity for the site. For Case Study 2, the 2-year, 1-hr rainfall intensity is 0.63 in/hr. Due to the site being located in the Valley climatic region, extrapolation used a Slog-log of 0.6.

DA-A

Pre-developed: I_{APre} = 10^[LOG 0.63 – 0.6 * LOG (40 / 60)] =0.80

Post-developed: I_{APost} = 10^[LOG 0.63 – 0.6 * LOG (20 / 60)] = 1.22

DA-B

Pre-developed: I_{BPre} = 10^[LOG 0.63 – 0.6 * LOG (40 / 60)] =0.80

Post-developed: I_{BPost} = 10^[LOG 0.63 – 0.6 * LOG (21 / 60)] = 1.18

Case Study 2 – Peak Runoff Calculation (cont.)

- **Step 3** – Calculate peak runoff for each DA**.**

  DA-A

  Pre-developed: $Q_{p,APre}$ = 0.9 * (0.8 – 0.44) * 122,839 ft^2 / 43,560 ft^2/acre = 0.91 cfs

  Post-developed: $Q_{p,APost}$ = 0.9 * (1.22 – 0.37) * 122,839 ft^2 / 43,560 ft^2/acre = 2.16 cfs

  DA-B

  Pre-developed: $Q_{p,BPre}$ = 0.9 * (0.8 – 0.44) * 169,131 ft^2 / 43,560 ft^2/acre = 1.26 cfs

  Post-developed: $Q_{p,BPost}$ = 0.9 * (1.18 – 0.38) * 169,131ft^2 / 43,560 ft^2/acre = 2.81 cfs

- **Step 4** – A confluence analysis is needed to compute peak runoff because the site is divided into hydrologically independent DA. For pre-developed conditions, it is assumed both DA have the same time of concentration and therefore the values are added together:

  $Q_{p,pre}$ = 0.91 + 1.26 = 2.17 cfs

  For post-developed conditions, DA-B has a greater peak runoff and time of concentration then DA-A, therefore peak runoff at the project site discharge point is calculated as follows:

  $Q_{p,post}$ = 2.81 + 2.16 * (1.18 – 0.37) / (1.22 – 0.37) = 4.87 cfs

- **Step 5** –The pre-developed peak runoff is subtracted from the post-developed peak runoff to calculate the required peak runoff reduction to meet HCOC performance criteria:

  $Q_{p\text{-}HCOC}$ = 0.95 * 4.88 – 2.17 = 2.47 cfs

Section 5 – Low Impact Development BMP Evaluation and Selection

5.1 Introduction

The extent to which LID practices may be incorporated into a Priority Project can be determined once the project proponent has a clear understanding of project conditions based on the information developed under Section 3, and the applicable performance criteria determined as described in Section 4. Using this information, LID practices are selected and evaluated to meet the minimum performance criteria feasible. If it is not feasible to fully meet the performance criteria utilizing BMPs, as described in this Section, a Project Proponent must then evaluate and propose an Alternative Compliance approach as described in Section 6.

LID practices may be divided into two general categories:

- **Preventive measures** are site planning, design and construction practices that focus on minimizing the amount of land disturbed and retaining, to the maximum extent practicable, the natural drainage characteristics of the site. Consideration of preventive measures begins early in the project planning phase, when the layout of the project site is being contemplated. The extent to which such measures are incorporated into the project site dictate to a large degree the extent to which additional mitigative measures will be required to meet the performance criteria. Maximizing preventative measures will reduce additional mitigation requirements, resulting in a more cost effective project.
- **Mitigative measures**, if required, are structural BMPs that manage impacts from stormwater runoff and provide pollutant reduction. Categories of mitigative BMPs that must be considered in order of priority are: (1) infiltration BMPs; (2) BMPs that harvest and use runoff (e.g., rain barrels, cisterns, etc); and (3) vegetated BMPs that promote evapotranspiration (e.g., bioretention, biofiltration, and biotreatment).

Table 5-1 summarizes how preventive and mitigative measures interrelate and how WQMP development addresses each category. The following sections describe requirements for incorporation of both categories into the planning and design of a project.

The purpose of this section is to provide guidance for preparing site designs and drainage plans, selecting and sizing BMPs applicable to the project as prescribed in the MS4 Permit, and evaluating the conformance of the proposed BMPs with project-specific LID performance criteria. Final construction documents prepared during project design are the appropriate place to establish construction phase requirements that will then be enforced during construction. Furthermore, detailed requirements for stormwater quality protection during construction are covered under the Sections X.B and XIV of the MS4 Permit. Establishing appropriate post-

construction measures and mechanisms for ensuring that they will be implemented are discussed in Section 8.

Table 5-1. Application of LID Practices to Development Phases

Project Development Phase	LID Practice	
	Preventive Measures	Mitigative Measures
Site Planning and layout	Preserve natural infiltration capacity Preserve existing drainage patterns Protect existing vegetation and sensitive areas	Not applicable, but extensive application of preventive measures will reduce the mitigative measures required below
Site and Project Design	Minimize impervious area Disconnect impervious areas	Infiltration BMPs Capture/Use BMPs Vegetated BMPs
Construction	Minimize construction footprint Minimize unnecessary compaction Minimize removal of native vegetation	Re-vegetate disturbed areas
Post-Construction	Implement source control BMPs Restore original soils and use appropriate vegetation	Maintain BMPs appropriately

Source: Adapted from SoCal LID manual (original source: Low Impact Development Center, Inc.)

5.2 Selection of LID Preventive Measures

Consistent with the MS4 Permit, the LID practices incorporated into a project-specific WQMP should promote the following principles, where feasible:

- Incorporate landscape designs that promote water retention and evapotranspiration, such as through soil development and grading techniques, and incorporation of water conservation elements such as use of native plants;
- Include permeable surface designs in parking lots and areas with low traffic;
- Allow natural drainage systems for street construction and catchments (with no drainage pipes), and allow grassy swales and ditches;
- Require parking lots to drain to landscaped areas to provide treatment, retention, or infiltration;
- Reduce curb requirements where adequate drainage, conveyance, treatment and storage are available to allow stormwater to drain into landscaped areas;
- Incorporate rainwater harvesting and use;
- Allow building of narrow streets and provide alternatives to minimum parking requirements;
- Consider vegetated landscape as an integral element of streets, parking lots, playgrounds and buildings as a stormwater treatment and retention system; and

- Consider and facilitate application of landform grading techniques and revegetation as an alternative to traditional approaches, particularly in areas susceptible to erosion and sediment loss such as hillside development projects.

Extensive application of preventive measures throughout the development will reduce the number and size of mitigative BMPs required to meet WQMP requirements. The earlier in the project development phase that preventive measures are considered, the easier it will be to incorporate them.



Preventive measures are incorporated into all phases of a project. Initially, these measures are considered during the planning phase to identify ways to reduce the project footprint, minimize land disturbance and maintain the pre-development hydrological function of a new development site, or, at a minimum, to maintain the existing hydrologic function of a site being redeveloped.

Preventive measures must also be considered and included during both the construction and post-construction phases of the project. Unless carefully anticipated and prescribed in construction document requirements, construction activity can reduce the benefits incorporated during earlier phases, such as by disturbing or compacting naturally infiltrating soils in an area that was set aside for preservation. It is vital that the project incorporate revegetation requirements to cover exposed soils and allow for the site to maximize stormwater retention as quickly as possible following completion of construction activities.

The following sections provide additional information regarding the key elements associated with the incorporation of preventive measures into the various phases of a project – from conception to completion.

5.2.1 Site Planning and Design Practices

Preventive measures associated with site planning and design will be considered together as the practicability of a particular design may be determined by site plan characteristics. Table 5-2 summarizes the key elements that should be considered during the site planning and design phases.

Preventive measures apply to both new development and significant redevelopment projects. However, it is recognized that the ability to incorporate preventive measures into an existing

developed site undergoing redevelopment can be more difficult. Attention to specific types of preventive measures, such as minimizing new impervious area and disconnecting existing impervious areas can provide substantial stormwater management benefits.

Table 5-2. LID Preventive Measures for Consideration During Site Planning and Design Phases

LID - Preventive Measures	Project Phase	
	Planning	Design
Maximize natural infiltration capacity	▪ Avoid locating constructed elements on highly permeable areas ▪ Cluster constructed elements in the least permeable areas	▪ Use alternative permeable or porous building materials where allowed by code
Preserve existing drainage patterns and increase time of concentration	▪ Avoid channelization of natural drainages ▪ Where channel engineering is necessary, include sinuosity to increase time of concentration ▪ Establish setbacks and buffer areas from natural waterbodies ▪ Retain natural depressions in project area	▪ Avoid channelization of natural streams ▪ Where channel engineering is necessary: ▪ Include mild slopes, ▪ Increase channel roughness to increase time of concentration ▪ Use pervious channel linings to increase infiltration
Protect existing vegetation and sensitive areas	▪ At the outset, establish areas within project site that should remain undisturbed ▪ Establish setbacks and buffer zones around sensitive areas ▪ Incorporate rather than eliminate established vegetation throughout site layout	▪ Design site layout to protect sensitive areas
Minimize impervious area	▪ Reduce footprint by: ▪ Building vertically rather than horizontally ▪ Reducing road and sidewalk widths to MEP ▪ Clustering constructed elements to preserve open space ▪ Minimizing lot setbacks to reduce driveway lengths	▪ Install sidewalks only one side of private roadways ▪ Use alternative permeable or porous building materials where allowed by code ▪ Reduce overall parking lot size by creating smaller parking spaces for compact cars
Disconnect impervious areas	▪ Plan site layout and mass grading to allow runoff to be directed to permeable areas, e.g., natural retention areas, open spaces, medians, parking islands, planter boxes ▪ Avoid channelization of natural on-site streams	▪ Incorporate permeable areas throughout project site to accept runoff ▪ Design roof downspouts to drain to pervious areas ▪ Use alternative permeable or porous building materials where allowed by code
Integrated with planning	▪ Incorporate preventive measures that are consistent with the Watershed Action Plan ▪ Determine if any approved regional BMP projects are constructed downstream and included in WAP, prior to site design planning	▪ Use all design requirements included in the Watershed Action Plan for watershed based BMPs

Source: Adapted from SoCAL LID manual (original source: Low Impact Development Center, Inc)

The following sections provide a description of each preventive measure listed in Table 5-2. For additional information and links to additional technical resources, consult the *Low Impact Development Manual for Southern California: Technical Guidance and Site Planning Strategies* (*www.casqa.org/LID/SoCalLID/tabid/218/Default.aspx*), or Maryland Department of Resource Programs and Planning Division. Low-Impact Development Design Strategies -An Integrated

Design Approach (*http://www.co.pg.md.us/Government/DER/PPD/pgcounty/lidmain.htm*), or Orange County, CA stormwater program guidance documents (*http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/oc_permit.shtml*).

5.2.1.1 Maximize Natural Infiltration Capacity

Taking advantage of a site's natural infiltration and water storage capacity decreases the volume of stormwater runoff generated and the need for BMPs that mitigate project impacts. Accordingly, when developing the footprint for constructed elements of a proposed project, areas where infiltration could be maximized should be preserved. Typically, these areas include:

- Hydrologic Soil Groups A or B
- Mild slopes or depressions
- Undeveloped portions of an existing site undergoing redevelopment

Selecting areas to maximize infiltration must consider geotechnical hazards that could be created by infiltration in inappropriate locations, such as near structures, which may cause structural failure, or in and around steep slopes, which may cause slope destabilization.

5.2.1.2 Preserve Existing Drainage Patterns and Increase Time of Concentration

A project site should be evaluated to determine how rainfall naturally moves through or is stored on the site. To the extent practicable, the natural drainage flow-through and storage characteristics should be incorporated into the project layout. Preserving these features will help maintain the site's pre-development hydrologic characteristics, including the time of concentration, runoff velocity, and peak flow volume. In addition to preserving natural features, the project site should be evaluated to determine where site grading could add additional depressions that can provide on-site storage of stormwater runoff.

5.2.1.3 Protect Existing Vegetation and Sensitive Areas

Vegetative cover (extent, depth and density) provides additional storage volume during rainfall events. Soils with undisturbed vegetation have a much higher capacity to store and infiltrate runoff than disturbed soils or vegetation. Every effort should be made to minimize soil and vegetation disturbance (including existing trees) to retain on-site storage capacity.

Projects should avoid sensitive areas, including wetlands, streams, floodplains, and intact wooded areas. Not only do federal, state and local laws already limit development in these areas or require compliance with significantly more stringent regulatory requirements, impacts to these areas can greatly impact the pre-development hydrologic characteristics of a site.

5.2.1.4 Minimize Impervious Areas

Increased imperviousness is associated with increased environmental impacts to downstream receiving waters, including the creation of hydrologic conditions of concern. Accordingly, projects site plans should minimize impervious areas, which will greatly reduce the amount of BMPs needed to mitigate potential downstream impacts. Table 5-2 includes several example

techniques for reducing imperviousness. The extent to which some of these techniques may be employed in the local area (e.g., minimum road widths) is dependent on existing codes and ordinances, which should be carefully consulted in coordination with the local jurisdiction.

5.2.1.5 Disconnect Impervious Areas

Disconnection of impervious areas so that stormwater runoff is directed to on-site pervious surfaces rather than off-site streets and storm drains increases the time of concentration, reduces the peak discharge rate from the site, and maximizes opportunities for on-site infiltration. Careful application of this preventive measure can greatly reduce the need for other BMPs. Care must be taken to ensure that runoff to pervious areas for on-site infiltration does not create geotechnical hazards or cause impacts to adjacent properties. The extent to which disconnection practices may be employed on the project site may be dependent on existing codes and ordinances, which should be carefully consulted.

5.2.1.6 Integrate with Watershed Planning

Regional efforts to manage watersheds in an integrated manner are underway in San Bernardino County through the development of a Watershed Action Plan. This planning effort may influence requirements applicable to site planning and design.

5.2.2 Construction Practices

Project proponents should thoroughly evaluate how the planned construction activity will be staged and phased, and the construction activities allowed or specified throughout the planning and design phases of a project. Table 5-3 summarizes the construction practices that should be considered when incorporating preventive measures into the project during site planning and design. For example, if minimizing land disturbance is a key element of the project plan, then it is important to consider how construction activities, including siting of staging and laydown areas, can be performed without impacting areas where no disturbance is desired. In addition, during construction the following preventive measures should be considered:

- Minimize size of construction easements;
- Locate material storage areas and stockpiles within area being developed;
- Limit ground disturbance in areas not requiring grading;
- Delineate access routes for heavy equipment; and
- Delineate areas to remain undisturbed.

Table 5-3. LID Preventive Measures for Consideration During Construction

LID - Preventive Measures	Example Practices to Minimize Construction Impacts
Maximize natural infiltration capacity	Minimize construction footprint Minimize unnecessary compaction of soils
Preserve existing drainage patterns and increase time of concentration	Minimize construction footprint
Protect existing vegetation and sensitive areas	Ensure sensitive areas are protected during construction phase
Minimize impervious areas	Minimize unnecessary soil compaction (may require geotechnical analysis to determine minimum level of compaction to provide structural stability)
Disconnect impervious areas	N/A

Source: Adapted from SoCal LID manual (original source: Low Impact Development Center, Inc.)

5.2.3 Post-Construction

Post-construction revegetation of disturbed areas is an important preventive measure. Revegetation of disturbed areas that will not be landscaped should occur immediately after completion of construction activity to protect exposed soils and maximize on-site stormwater retention. Considerations include:

- Incorporation of native vegetation, wherever possible;
- Restoration of disturbed areas using native soils which were stockpiled during the construction phase;
- Storage or maintenance of stockpiled soils in a manner that maintains the viability of the flora and fauna within the soil, to the maximum extent practicable;
- Firescaping the site, e.g., through selection of appropriate vegetation for planting and application of California requirements for establishment of required buffer zones around structures; and
- Application of xeriscape landscaping principles, as appropriate.

In addition to the implementation of appropriate re-vegetation techniques, proper implementation of source control BMPs and post-construction BMP management are also required elements of any project regardless of their relationship to LID practices. These requirements are discussed in Sections 7 and 8.

5.3 Selection of LID Mitigative Measures and BMPs

5.3.1 Hierarchy of BMP Types

A large suite of BMPs is effective at managing a wide spectrum of pollutants. The MS4 Permit requires that BMPs that use on-site retention be prioritized over BMPs that may result in some release of runoff to the MS4 system. Specifically, higher priority type BMPs (e.g., retention)

must be evaluated for feasibility (see Section 5.4), selected and sized to capture the maximum feasible portion of the DCV, before attempting to address the remaining volume with the next lower control (e.g., biotreatment). Section 5.3.2 describes site-specific conditions that would require or allow for a project WQMP to determine that it is not feasible to consider retention and infiltration BMPs, and proceed to evaluate biotreatment BMPs.

Figure 5-1 provides a flowchart showing the BMP selection and evaluation process that must be followed in developing a WQMP. The following sections provide guidance on the selection of specific BMPs and methods for evaluating conformance with project–specific performance criteria. General steps involved in BMP selection and evaluation are summarized below:

- Step 1 - Incorporate hydrologic source control into site design
  The first step in the process is to consider hydrologic source control (HSC). HSC is a class of BMPs integrated with site design that retain stormwater runoff and reduce the volume (and potentially the rate) of stormwater discharge to the downstream system (e.g. impervious area dispersion). If the volume of runoff retained by HSC in a DA is greater than or equal to the DCV for the DA, the DA is considered to be self-retaining and no additional BMPs are required to treat discharges from the drainage area to meet LID requirements. Otherwise, the volume retained by HSC is subtracted from the DCV to estimate the remaining volume for sizing LID infiltration BMPs. However, the excess volume retained by the HSC could be used to provide additional volume mitigation that may be required to meet HCOC performance criteria.
- Step 2 – Evaluate on-site retention and infiltration BMPs

  The next step is to determine the feasibility of retention and infiltration BMPs (Sections 5.3.2.1 and 5.5.1). If on-site retention and infiltration is infeasible the project proponent shall proceed to Step 3.
- Step 3 – Evaluate harvest and use BMPs

  The next step is to determine the feasibility of harvest and use BMPs (Sections 5.3.2.2 and 5.5.4). If implementation of harvest and use BMPs is infeasible the project proponent shall proceed to Step 4.
- Step 4 – Re-Evaluate and Optimize suite of BMPs to maximize on-site retention of DCV

  If individual retention and infiltration, and/or harvest and use BMP are feasible, but unable to treat the entire DCV, evaluate the use of combinations of BMPs, including HSC BMPs, to maximize on-site retention of the DCV. If no combination of BMP can mitigate the entire DCV, implement the single BMP type, or combination of BMP types, that maximizes on-site retention of the DCV, and proceed to Step 5.
- Step 5 – Evaluate BMPs for biotreatment of pollutants of concern

  If it is infeasible to fully infiltrate the DCV on the project site, then biotreatment BMPs must be selected and implemented to mitigate the entire remaining DCV (Sections 5.3.2.4

and 5.5.5). Biotreatment BMPs with medium to high pollutant removal effectiveness must be selected to address the project pollutants of concern (POC) that cause impairment of downstream receiving waters. If the combination of retention and infiltration, harvest and use, and biotreatment is insufficient to capture and treat the full DCV, proceed to Step 6.

- Step 6 – Determine alternative compliance strategies

  Lastly, if it is infeasible to fully infiltrate, retain or biotreat the DCV on the project site, then Section 6 provides guidance for identifying alternative compliance approaches.

5.3.2 General Feasibility Criteria for Use of Required LID BMPs

Prior to BMP selection, the WQMP must substantiate whether any or all BMPs are feasible to consider for use on a particular site, or whether use of one or more BMP types would result in violations of statutory requirements. The WQMP must include justification for any infeasibility determination. The following subsections describe specific conditions that would make the use of a specific BMP type infeasible for consideration when developing a project WQMP.



Figure 5-1 On-site LID BMP Selection and Evaluation Flowchart

5.3.2.1 Infiltration BMPs

All projects retaining and infiltrating runoff shall implement source control and pollutant prevention control BMPs, to the MEP, in order to protect groundwater quality. Conditions that would <u>prohibit</u> the use of infiltration BMPs for a specific project WQMP are listed below:

- Stormwater infiltration would result in significant risks to drinking water quality and groundwater quality that cannot be reasonably and technically mitigated. Factors that may pose a risk to groundwater quality that cannot be mitigated include:
  - Seasonally high groundwater is less than 10 feet below the designed bottom of the infiltration facility for aquifers managed for water quality or with significant connectivity to aquifers managed for groundwater quality.
  - Seasonally high groundwater is less than 5 feet below the designed bottom of the infiltration facility for aquifers not managed for groundwater quality and without significant connectivity to aquifers managed for groundwater quality.
  - Horizontal distance to a water supply well is less than 100 feet.
  - Infiltration of stormwater from project land uses would result in significant risks to drinking water quality and groundwater quality that cannot be reasonably and technically mitigated through methods such isolation of sources and/or pre-treatment of runoff prior to infiltration.
- For Brownfield sites or adjacent sites, stormwater infiltration would result in a significant risk of mobilizing or moving contamination that cannot be reasonably and technically avoided, as documented by a site-specific or available watershed study with sufficient resolution to positively identify areas where stormwater infiltration should not be conducted. The documenting study shall have sufficient resolution to positively identify areas where stormwater infiltration should be restricted.
- Where a groundwater pollutant plume (man-made or natural) is under the site or in close proximity, and stormwater infiltration would result in a significant risk of causing or contributing to plume movement that cannot be reasonably and technically avoided, as documented by a site-specific study or available watershed study. The documenting study shall have sufficient resolution to positively identify areas where stormwater infiltration should be restricted.
- Projects constructing fueling operations, large commercial parking lots, areas of industrial or light industrial activity, areas subject to high vehicular traffic (25,000 or more daily volume), car washes, fleet storage areas, nurseries, or any other land use or activity with a high threat to water quality, unless adequate pretreatment is provided.
- Infiltration of runoff into Class V injection wells or drywells, in projects occupied by vehicular repair or maintenance activities, such as auto body repair, automotive repair, new and used car dealerships, specialty repair shops (e.g. transmission and muffler repair) or any facility that performs vehicular repair work.
- Stormwater infiltration would result in significantly increased risks of geotechnical hazards such as liquefaction or landslides that cannot be reasonably and technically mitigated as documented by a geotechnical professional or available watershed study. The

documenting study shall have sufficient resolution to positively identify areas of expansive clays or other conditions, which would prohibit stormwater infiltration.

- Infiltration of site runoff would create a nuisance or pollution as defined in Water Code Section 13050 (*http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=13001-14000&file=13050-13051*).
- Infiltration of runoff would violate downstream water rights.

Certain factors may limit the potential benefit that infiltration BMPs can have or limit the extent to which infiltration is beneficial. While these factors eliminate the requirement to consider BMPs with a primary purpose of infiltration, these factors shall not prevent the ability of the project proponent to consider some level of *incidental* infiltration, if desired, as part of an integrated stormwater management design.

Infiltration is not required to be considered if any of the following conditions are met:

- Project is located in D soils per the watershed Geodatabase *and* the site geotechnical investigation confirms presence of soil characteristics, which support categorization as D soils. For small projects (residential projects under 10 acres in size and comprised of less than 30 dwelling units; commercial projects less than 5 acres in size, and industrial projects less than 2 acres in size), the geotechnical investigation shall not be required to include infiltration testing to confirm mapped categorization as D soils; other sources of data such as bore logs, soils reports and other related information from the site, or from other sites in the immediate vicinity obtained for other purposes may be used.
- The measured infiltration rate after accounting for soil amendments is less than 0.3 inches per hour in the vicinity of proposed BMPs. Infiltration measurement shall include protocols that account for the effect of soil amendments. Soil amendments would not be expected to increase the effective infiltration rate of a soil if the limiting horizon for infiltration lies below the amended zone (in this case, it would increase storage, but not infiltration rate). Soil amendments would be expected to effectively increase infiltration rates if the limiting horizon for infiltration occurs near the proposed bottom of the infiltration basin and the entire depth of this layer can be amended.
- Reduction of runoff to pre-developed conditions would be partially or fully inconsistent with watershed-scale management strategies and/or would impair the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The allowable level of runoff reduction must be documented in a site-specific study or watershed plan, and it must be demonstrated that infiltration BMPs would exceed the allowable level of runoff reduction.
- Increase in infiltration to pre-developed conditions would be partially or fully inconsistent with watershed-scale management strategies and/or would cause impairments to downstream beneficial uses, such as change of seasonality of ephemeral washes. The level of allowable increase in infiltration must be documented in a site-specific study or watershed plan, and it must be demonstrated that stand-alone infiltration BMPs would

exceed the allowable level of increase in infiltration or what level could be infiltrated as a partial consideration.

In the event that any of these conditions apply, infiltration BMPs are not required, but may be considered as an option. Biotreatment BMPs (where employed) should be designed to promote incidental infiltration where possible.

5.3.2.2 Harvest and Use BMPs

A single 'yes' answer to any of the following questions indicates that harvest and use shall not be considered because harvest and use would conflict with codes and/or ordinances or is impractical:

- Does use of harvested water for the type of demand on the project violate codes or ordinances in effect at the time of project application?
- Would harvest and use of runoff violate downstream water rights?
- Is recycled water planned for use to serve the project site non-potable demand?

5.3.2.3 Evapotranspiration BMPs

In general, evapotranspiration (ET) would not be expected to cause a risk that would exclude its use from any project.

Green roofs, brown roofs, and blue roofs may be considered wherever they are consistent with applicable codes and ordinances. However, the use of these BMPs is presently considered above and beyond the MEP; and, therefore, these BMPs are encouraged but not required to be considered in assessing feasibility. Green roofs, brown roofs, and blue roofs are considered to be beyond the MEP for the following technical, economical, and societal reasons:

- The increased use of irrigation water and plant life requiring water is inappropriate to the direction of state legislation (AB1881) mandating landscaping water efficiency.
- Long term data regarding maintenance of a green roof, in a Mediterranean climate prone to high winds and fire hazard is not readily available.
- The practical limitations of requiring individual homeowners and small business owners to irrigate and maintain a green roof are untested.
- The majority of current building codes and the fire code do not specifically address green roof construction, and it is unknown how this requirement may conflict with other building code provisions or upcoming mandatory solar requirements.
- Studies of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness of green roofs have often not considered costs of additional structural requirements, which may comprise a large portion of green roof costs.
- Although green roofs have been encouraged in several locations across the country, there are no known locations in the US where implementation of greenroofs has been required in an implemented permit in order to meet the MEP standard.

Where green roofs, brown roofs and blue roofs are selected as an option, consideration should be given for overall water demands which may increase as a result of an increase in the amount of area potentially requiring irrigation during the dry periods. However, for a project with very high density, green roofs could provide almost complete treatment for the water quality design storm (sidewalks and minor surface areas would also need treatment) and, for some projects, could provide a cost-saving when other benefits (heating and cooling reductions, etc.) are factored in.

5.3.2.4 Biotreatment BMPs

In general, biotreatment BMPs would not be expected to cause a risk that would exclude their use from any project. However, biotreatment BMPs shall be designed to prevent or limit incidental infiltration for projects where use of infiltration BMPs would be prohibited (see Section 5.3.2.1).

5.4 Evaluation of LID BMPs

When evaluating the effect of proposed BMPs on the post-development hydrologic condition, it is necessary to calculate the runoff capture provided by all volume mitigation BMPs proposed in the WQMP. This section provides methodologies for estimating runoff capture for specific BMPs designed to infiltrate, harvest and use, evapotranspire, and/or biotreat runoff. The BMPs include:

- Hydrologic Source Control (HSC) BMPs – Impervious area dispersion, localized on-lot infiltration, green/brown/blue roof, street trees, and residential rain barrels/cisterns
- Infiltration BMPs - Infiltration trench, infiltration basin, bioretention with no underdrain, drywell, permeable pavement, and underground infiltration
- Harvest and Use BMPs – Cisterns and underground detention
- Biotreatment BMPs – Bioretention with underdrain, vegetated swale, vegetated filter strip, dry extended detention basin, wet detention basin, constructed wetland, and proprietary biotreatment.

5.4.1 Hydrologic Source Control

HSC BMPs are differentiated from retention and biotreatment classes of BMPs by their higher level of integration within a site. They are not sized according to engineering design criteria, and they do not typically result in a distinct facility. Consequently, they are usually regarded as site design practices, as opposed to structural BMPs. On-site retention of runoff in HSC BMPs reduces the portion of the DCV that must be addressed in downstream BMPs. HSC BMPs that are considered to retain runoff include:

- Impervious area dispersion
- Localized on-lot infiltration
- Green / brown roof
- Blue roof

- Street trees
- Residential rain barrels/cisterns

5.4.1.1 Impervious Area Dispersion

Impervious area dispersion refers to the practice of routing runoff from impervious areas, such as rooftops, walkways, and patios onto the surface of adjacent pervious areas. Rooftop downspout disconnection is an example of commonly used impervious area dispersion BMPs. Runoff is dispersed uniformly via splash block or dispersion trench and soaks into the ground as it moves slowly across the surface of pervious areas. The retention volume provided by downspout dispersion is a function of the ratio of impervious to pervious area (Table 5-4).

5.4.1.2 Localized on-lot infiltration

Localized on-lot infiltration refers to the practice of collecting runoff from small distributed areas within a DA and diverting it to a dedicated on-site infiltration area where it can be infiltrated or evapotranspired. This technique can include disconnecting downspouts and draining sidewalks and patios into french drains, trenches, small rain gardens, or other surface depressions. Localized on-lot infiltration shall meet infiltration infeasibility screening criteria to be considered for use (see Section 5.3.2.1). The retention volume provided by localized on-lot infiltration is equal to the storage volume provided by surface ponding and the pore space within an amended soil layer or gravel trench (Table 5-4).

5.4.1.3 Evapotranspiration: Green, brown, or blue roofs

Green roofs are also known as ecoroofs, roof gardens, or vegetated roof covers. Green roofs are roofing systems that provide a layer of soil/vegetative cover over a waterproofing membrane. There are two types of green roofing systems; extensive (a light weight system); and intensive (a heavier system that allows for larger plants but requires additional maintenance). A green roof mimics pre-development conditions by limiting the impervious area created by development. Green roofs filter, absorb, and evapotranspire precipitation to help mitigate the delivery of excess runoff to the local storm water conveyance systems and the effects of urbanization on water quality.

Brown roofs are essentially a sub-type of green roof designed to maximize biodiversity. Brown roofs typically utilize natural soil and locally available substrates to create a protected biodiverse habitat for specific species of local flora and fauna. Rather than landscaping the roof during construction, plants are left to germinate and grow on their own in the native soils, thus the “brown” (i.e., initially unvegetated) designation. Hand-seeding may be implemented where self-colonization via airborne seeds is unlikely.

Table 5-4 - Estimation Methods for On-site Retention BMPs

BMP Type	Runoff Volume Calculation	Variables	Fact Sheet Reference for Design Details
Impervious area dispersion	$V_{ret} = DA_{imp} * R_{perv:imperv} * 0.5/12$	DA_{imp} = impervious drainage area (ft^2) $R_{perv:imperv}$ = ratio of pervious to impervious area	Orange County Technical Guidance Document (TGD) for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Localized on-lot infiltration	$V_{ret} = (SA_{pond} * d_{pond}) +$ $(SA_{matrix} * d_{matrix} * n_{matrix})$	SA_{pond} = surface area for ponding water (ft^2) d_{pond} = depth of ponding water (ft) SA_{matrix} = surface area of amended soil / gravel (ft^2) d_{matrix} = depth of amended soil / gravel (ft) n_{matrix} = porosity of amended soil / gravel	Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Green / Brown roofs	$V_{ret} = E_{daily,\ wet\ season} * A_{rooftop} * T_{drawdown}/24$ *or* *fully self-retaining if* $d_{matrix} = 3/R_{BMP,\ roof}$	dmatrix = depth of soil layer for roof BMP (ft) RBMP:roof = ratio of BMP area to total roof area Edaily,wetseason = wet season daily evaporation (in/day) Tdrawdown Arooftop – rooftop area for evapotranspiration BMPs	Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendices IX and XIV[1]
Blue roof	$V_{ret} = E_{daily,\ wet\ season} * A_{rooftop} * T_{drawdown}/24$	$E_{daily,wetseason}$ = wet season daily evaporation (in/day) $T_{drawdown}$ = drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 96 hours Arooftop – rooftop area for evapotranspiration BMPs	Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Street trees	$V_{ret} = n_{trees} * IA_{canopy} * d_{int} / 12$	n_{trees} = number of street trees IA_{canopy} = average impervious area under tree canopy after 4 years growth (ft^2) d_{int} = rain depth retained by canopy interception (in)	Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Residential rain barrels / cisterns	$V_{ret} = n_{barrels} * S_{barrel} / 2$	$n_{barrels}$ = number of residential rain barrels / cisterns S_{barrel} = volume of residential rain barrels / cisterns (ft^3)	Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Infiltration basin	$V_{ret} = P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * (T_{drawdown} + T_{fill})$	P_{design} = design percolation rate (in/hr), field measured infiltration divided by safety factor SA_{inf} = infiltrating surface area (ft^2) $T_{drawdown}$ = drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours[1] T_{fill} = duration of storm when infiltration is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours	Riverside County LID BMP Manual[2] Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]

[1] A 48-hour drawdown time is utilized for infiltration basin sizing, which is consistent with the current DCV calculation methodology in Form 4.2-1 of the WQMP Template

Table 5-4 (cont.) - Estimation Methods for On-site Retention BMPs

BMP Type	Runoff Volume Calculation	Variables	Fact Sheet Reference for Design Details
Infiltration trench	$V_{ret} = (P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{ponded} * d_{ponded}) + (SA_{gravel} * d_{gravel} * n_{gravel})$ *where* $d_{ponded} < T_{drawdown} * P_{design} / 12$	P_{design} = *design percolation rate (in/hr), field measured infiltration divided by safety factor* $SA_{inf,\ ponded,gravel}$ = *surface area (ft^2) of trench bottom, gravel layer, and surface ponding* $T_{drawdown}$ = *drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours* T_{fill} = *duration of storm when infiltration is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours* $d_{ponded,gravel}$ = *depth (ft) of ponding and gravel layers* n_{gravel} = *porosity of gravel layer*	Riverside County LID BMP Manual[2] Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Bioretention with no underdrain	$V_{ret} = (P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{ponded} * d_{ponded}) + (SA_{soil} * d_{soil} * n_{soil}) + (SA_{gravel} * d_{gravel} * n_{gravel})$ *where* $d_{ponded} < T_{drawdown} * P_{design} / 12$	P_{design} = *design percolation rate (in/hr), field measured infiltration divided by safety factor* $SA_{inf,ponded,soil,gravel}$ = *surface area (ft^2) of bioretention bottom, soil and gravel layers, and surface ponding* $T_{drawdown}$ = *drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours* T_{fill} = *duration of storm when infiltration is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours* $d_{ponded,gravel}$ = *depth (ft) of ponding and gravel layers* n_{gravel} = *porosity of gravel layer*	Riverside County LID BMP Manual[2] Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]
Drywell / Permeable pavement / Underground infiltration	$V_{ret} = (P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{resevoir} * d_{resevoir} * n_{aggregate})$ *where* $d_{resevoir} < T_{drawdown} * P_{design} / 12$	P_{design} = *design percolation rate (in/hr), field measured infiltration divided by safety factor* $SA_{inf,reservoir}$ = *surface area (ft^2) of reservoir for drywell or permeable pavement, include weep holes for drywell* SA_{inf} $T_{drawdown}$ = *drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours* T_{fill} = *duration of storm when infiltration is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours* $d_{reservoir}$ = *depth (ft) of drywell* $n_{aggregate}$ = *porosity of aggregate , if none then 1.0*	Riverside County LID BMP Manual[2] Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV[1]

1) http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/oc_permit.shtml
2) http://rcflood.org/NPDES/LIDBMP.aspx

A green or brown roof can be considered to be fully self-retaining if it meets criteria for soil depth as shown in Table 5-4. By fully retaining water from the roof, the LID DCV should be recomputed to account for the reduction in imperviousness equal to the area of the roof routed into the BMP.

Blue roofs, also known as rooftop detention systems, serve as a rooftop storage designed to reduce runoff peak flows and volumes. Captured stormwater, up to the design depth, is held on the rooftop until the water either evaporates or is slowly metered out via flow restriction valves. With sufficent waterproofing blue roofs can be implemented on existing structures, given that the roof and building are of sufficient structural integrity to support the weight for the ponded water. As blue roofs lack vegetation, they require significantly less maintenance than green or brown roofs. Blue roofs should not be designed to hold standing water longer than 96 hours in order to mitigate vector hazards, and therefore it is not possible for these BMPs to be fully self retaining. Instead, volume retention is equal to the wet season evaporation over a 96 hour period (Table 5-4).

5.4.1.4 Street Trees

By intercepting rainfall, trees located in street medians, shoulders, and parking lots, can provide several aesthetic and stormwater benefits including peak flow control, increased infiltration and evapotranspiration, and runoff temperature reduction. The volume of precipitation intercepted by the canopy reduces the treatment volume required for downstream BMPs. Shading reduces the heat island effect as well as the temperature of adjacent impervious surfaces, over which stormwater flows, and reducing the heat transferred to downstream receiving waters. Tree roots also strengthen the soil structure and provide infiltrative pathways, simultaneously reducing erosion potential and enhancing infiltration.

Case Study 1 Application of Street Trees HSC

- Project with 114 street trees
- IA_{canopy} = 1,000 ft^2
- $V_{ret} = n_{trees} * IA_{canopy} * 0.05 / 12 = 475\ ft^3$



The retention volume provided by street trees via canopy interception is dependent on the tree species, time of year, and maturity. To compute the retention depth, the expected impervious area covered by the full tree canopy (IA_{canopy}) after 4 years of growth must be computed. The maximum retention depth credit for canopy interception is 0.05 inches over the impervious area covered by the canopy at 4 years of growth (Table 5-4).

5.4.1.5 Residential Rain Barrels/Cisterns

Rain barrels / cisterns are above ground storage vessels that capture runoff from roof downspouts during rain events and detain that runoff for later uses such as irrigating landscaped areas. The temporary storage of roof runoff reduces the runoff volume from a property and may reduce the peak runoff velocity for small, frequently occurring storms. In addition, by reducing the amount of storm water runoff that flows overland into a storm water conveyance system (storm drain inlets and drain pipes), fewer pollutants are transported through the conveyance system into the offsite storm drain system and receiving waters. The use of the detained water for irrigation purposes leads to the conservation of potable water and the recharge of groundwater.

Retention volume from residential rain barrels/cisterns can be approximately estimated as half of the storage capacity provided, which assumes the storage is half-empty at the beginning of a storm event (Table 5-4).

5.4.2 Infiltration BMPs

Infiltration BMPs are BMPs that capture, store and infiltrate stormwater runoff. These BMPs are engineered to store a specified volume of water and have no design surface discharge (underdrain or outlet structure) until this volume is exceeded. These types of BMPs may also lose some water to evapotranspiration, but are characterized by having their most dominant volume losses due to infiltration.

As discussed in Section 5.3.2.1, certain conditions related to soils and groundwater make it infeasible to infiltrate runoff at a project site. Form 4.3-1 of the WQMP Template facilitates the determination of whether a project site meets one or more criteria that would prohibit, or make infeasible, any implementation of infiltration BMPs. Appendix D provides a more detailed set of guidelines to determine the feasibility of infiltrating runoff at a project site due to soil or groundwater conditions. Unless the project site meets one or more of these criteria that would deem infiltration infeasible, then infiltration BMPs must be evaluated for retention of the LID DCV.

The first step in evaluating infiltration BMP potential is to assess the infiltration rate of soils underlying the project site. For infeasibility analysis, small projects may rely only on regional soils data mapping (*http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm*) instead of on-site infiltration testing required, because on-site infiltration tests would constitute an unreasonable economic burden. The definitions for small projects are categorized based on land use as follows:

- Residential properties less than 10 acres and consisting of less than 30 dwelling units
- Commercial/institutional properties must be less than 5 acres and less than 50,000 SF building footprint,

- Industrial properties must be less than 2 acres and less than 20,000 SF building footprint. For larger projects, field measurements are required as specified in Appendix D.

Infiltration BMPs have the potential to fail over time when not adequately designed or maintained. Based on experience from numerous studies and published information, an appropriate factor of safety applied to infiltration testing results is mandatory. The infiltration rate will decline between maintenance cycles as the BMP surface becomes occluded and particulates accumulate in the infiltrative layer. Monitoring of actual facility performance has shown that the full-scale infiltration rate is typically far lower than the rate measured by small-scale testing. It is important that adequate conservatism is incorporated in the selection of design infiltration rates. The methodology for estimating an appropriate infiltration factor of safety is provided in Appendix D. The infiltration safety factor is estimated based on ratings of low, medium, or high concern for the following criteria:

- Infiltration assessment method
- Soil texture classification
- Variability of soil across site
- Depth to groundwater or impervious layer
- Tributary area size
- Level of pretreatment / Expected influent sediment load
- Redundancy of treatment
- Compaction during construction

The field measured infiltration rate is divided by the infiltration safety factor to obtain the design infiltration rate. The design safety factor must be 2.0 or greater (cannot be less than 2.0) and less than 9. A safety factor greater than 9 can be used at the discretion of the design engineer.

Some infiltration BMPs may be considered "Class V Injection Wells" under the federal Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program regulated in California by U.S. EPA Region 9. The project proponent must assess whether a UIC permit is required (*http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/uic-classv.html*).

The following sections describe BMPs that can be used to retain runoff on-site. The methods for estimating the runoff volume retained from each BMP type, including specific equations and references for design details, are provided in Table 5-4.

5.4.2.1 Infiltration basin

An infiltration basin consists of an earthen basin constructed in naturally pervious soils with a flat bottom. An energy dissipating inlet must be provided, along with an emergency spillway to control excess flows. A forebay settling basin or separate treatment control measure must be provided as pretreatment. An infiltration basin allows retained runoff to percolate into the underlying soils in 48 hours or less. The bottom of an infiltration basin is typically vegetated with dryland grasses or vegetative ground cover. Other types of vegetation are permissible if they can survive periodic inundation and long inter-event dry periods.

The retention volume provided by an infiltration basin is a function of the infiltrating surface area on the basin bottom and the depth of water that is percolated and stored in the basin over the course of the storm and infiltrated within 48 hours after the basin is filled (see Table 5-4).

5.4.2.2 Infiltration trench

An infiltration trench is a long, narrow, rock-filled trench with no outlet other than an overflow outlet. Runoff is stored in the void space between stones and infiltrates through the bottom and sides of the trench. Pretreatment is important for limiting amounts of coarse sediment entering the trench which can clog and render the trench ineffective.

Retention volume provided by an infiltration trench is a function of the infiltrating surface area on the trench bottom and the depth of water that is either percolated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for percolation into underlying soils following the storm (Table 5-4). The volume of water that is stored in the trench includes both pore water in the trench gravel layer as well as up to one foot of allowable ponding above the gravel layer. Allowable ponding is limited by the requirement to drawdown ponded water within 48 hours following a storm event.

5.4.2.3 Bioretention with no Underdrain

Bioretention stormwater treatment facilities are shallow landscaped depressions that capture and filter stormwater runoff. These facilities function as a soil and plant-based filtration device that removes pollutants through a variety of physical, biological, and chemical treatment processes. The facilities normally consist of a ponding area, mulch layer, planting soils, and plants. As stormwater passes down through the planting soil, pollutants are filtered, adsorbed, and biodegraded by the soil and plants.

Retention volume provided by a bioretention BMP with no underdrain is a function of the infiltrating surface area on the bioretention bottom and the depth of water that is either percolated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for percolation into underlying soils following the storm (Table 5-4). The volume of water that is stored in a bioretention area includes pore water in the amended soil and gravel layers as well as up to 1.5 ft of allowable ponding above the ammended soil layer. Allowable ponding is limited by the

requirement to draw down ponded water within 48 hours following a storm event. The pore water can be stored for extended periods of time, which is necessary to support plants.

5.4.2.4 Drywell

Drywells are similar to infiltration trenches in their design and function, but generally have a greater depth to footprint area ratio and can be installed at relatively large depths. A drywell is a subsurface storage facility designed to temporarily store and infiltrate runoff, primarily from rooftops or other impervious areas with low pollutant loading. A drywell may be either a small excavated pit filled with aggregate or a prefabricated storage chamber or pipe segment. Drywells can be used to reduce the volume of runoff from roofs. While roofs are generally not a significant source of stormwater pollutants, they can be a major contributor of runoff volumes. Therefore, drywells can indirectly enhance water quality by reducing the DCV that must be treated by other, downstream stormwater management facilities. Note: A drywell is considered a "Class V Injection Wells" under the federal Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program regulated in California by U.S. EPA Region 9.

Retention volume provided by a drywell is a function of the infiltrating surface area into soils underlying and surrounding the drywell and the depth of water that is either percolated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for percolation into soils following the storm (Table 5-4). Volume retention is estimated similarly to an infiltration trench; however, there is not surface ponding to account for when evaluating drywells. The same equation is used to estimate retention in permeable pavement and underground infiltration BMPs.

5.4.2.5 Permeable Pavement

Permeable pavement BMPs contain small voids that allow water to pass through to a gravel base. Permeable pavement comes in a variety of forms, including modular paving systems (concrete pavers, grass-pave, or gravel-pave) or poured in place pervious pavement (porous concrete, permeable asphalt). All permeable pavements treat stormwater and remove sediments and metals to some degree within the pavement pore space and gravel base.

Case Study 1 Application of Permeable Pavement Infiltration

- Field measured infiltration = 3 in/hr
- Infiltration safety factor = 3.0
- $V_{ret} = (P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{resevoir} * d_{resevoir} * n_{aggregate})$
- $V_{ret} = (1*28{,}300*3/12) + (28{,}300*0.5*0.33)$
  $= 11{,}745\ ft^3$



Porosity = 0.33

Cross-Section (not to scale)



While conventional pavement results in increased rates and volumes of stormwater and non-stormwater runoff, properly constructed and maintained porous pavement BMPs allow stormwater to percolate through the pavement and enter the soil below.

This facilitates groundwater recharge while providing the structural and functional features needed for the roadway, parking lot, or sidewalk. The paving surface, subgrade, and installation requirements of permeable pavements are more complex than those for conventional asphalt or concrete surfaces. For permeable pavement BMPs to function properly over an expected life span of 15 to 20 years, they must be properly sited, carefully designed and installed, and periodically maintained. Failure to protect paved areas from construction-related sediment loads can result in their premature clogging and failure.

Retention volume provided by permeable pavement is a function of the infiltrating surface area into underlying soils and the depth of water that is either percolated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for percolation into soils following the storm (Table 5-4). Volume retention is estimated using the same equation as used for drywells and undergound infiltration.

5.4.2.6 Underground Infiltration

Underground infiltration BMPs typically include a vault or chamber with an open bottom that is used to store runoff and infiltrate the runoff into the subsurface soils and aquifer. A number of vendors offer proprietary products that allow for similar or enhanced rates of infiltration and subsurface storage while offering durable prefabricated structures. There are many varieties of proprietary infiltration BMPs that can be used for roads and parking lots, parks and open spaces, single and multi-family residential, or mixed-use and commercial uses.

Retention volume provided by underground infiltration is a function of the surface area infiltrating into underlying soils and the depth of water that is either percolated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for percolation into soils following the storm (Table 5-4). Volume retention is estimated using the same equation as used for drywells and permeable pavement.

5.4.3 Harvest and Use BMPs

Harvest and use BMPs are BMPs that capture and store stormwater runoff for later on-site use. These BMPs are engineered to store a specified volume of water and have no design surface discharge until this volume is exceeded. The use of captured water used should comply with codes and regulations and should not result in runoff to storm drains or receiving waters (except indirectly via the sanitary sewer/municipal wastewater treatment system). Uses of captured water may potentially include irrigation demand, indoor non-potable demand, industrial process water demand, or other demands. This document provides guidance for irrigation use. Use of harvested stormwater for other non-potable demands shall be evaluated

on a case-by-case basis by local jurisdictions. Harvest and use BMPs involve either above ground (cisterns) or below ground storage of harvested water for subsequent on-site use as follows:

- Cisterns are large rain barrels. While rain barrels are less than 100 gallons (see Section 5.4.1.5 for information on small residential rain barrels as HSC), cisterns range from 100 to more than 10,000 gallons in capacity. Cisterns collect and temporarily store runoff from rooftops for later use as irrigation and/or other non-potable uses. The following components are generally required for installing and utilizing a cistern: (1) pipes that divert rooftop runoff to the cistern, (2) an overflow for when the cistern is full, (3) a pump (unless the site is designed such that the water can be distibuted to the use by gravity such as drip irrigation systems), and (4) a distribution system to supply the intended end uses.

- Underground detention facilities are subsurface tanks, vaults, or oversized pipes that store stormwater runoff. Similar to cisterns, underground detention facilities can store water for later use as irrigation and/or other non-potable uses.

Volume retention from implementation of harvest and use BMPs is a function of the wet season irrigation demand for landscaped areas on the project site. The Inland Empire Landscape Alliance Model Water Ordinance includes a formula for estimating a project's annual Estimated Applied Water Use (EAWU) based on the landscaped area in square feet (LA), daily reference evaporation ($ETo_{wet\text{-}day}$), landscape coefficient (K_L), and irrigation efficiency (IE), as follows:

$$EAWU_{wet\text{-}day} = [\ LA * ETo_{wet\text{-}day} / 12 * K_L\ ] / IE$$

To calculate harvested water irrigation demand, monthly reference ET data was averaged to obtain a daily wet season ET of approximately 0.1 in/day based on several CIMIS stations in the vicinity of the Permit area. For planning level assessments of harvest and use potential, a landscape coefficient of 0.7 shall be used for active turf areas, and 0.35 for conservation landscaping (Orange County TGD Appendix X.2.5.2, (*http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/oc_permit.shtml*). For the MS4 Permit area, an assumption of 0.9 shall be used. Potential to harvest and use is typically a small fraction of the DCV in most potential projects given the low irrigation demand during the wet season. Sections 5.3.2.2 and 5.5.5 describe infeasibility criteria for harvest and use BMPs.

5.4.4 Biotreatment BMPs

Mitigative BMPs must be selected based on a hierarchy of controls (infiltration first, then harvest and use) and sized to capture the maximum feasible portion of the DCV. The portion of the DCV that is not retained is referred to as unmet. The first three categories of mitigative

BMPs (HSC, infiltration, and harvest and use) consist of BMPs that, if used properly, retain runoff on-site and therefore all pollutants in captured runoff are removed from discharges to the MS4. After evaluating HSC, infiltration, and harvest and use, vegetative BMPs that promote evapotranspiration, including bio-retention, biofiltration and biotreatment (collectively termed biotreatment BMPs), should be considered. Biotreatment BMPs do not retain all runoff on-site. While biotreatment BMPs can be designed to maximize evapotranspiration and retention, a portion of the unmet volume would be treated and subsequently discharged to the MS4. Consequently, selection of biotreatment BMPs for evaluation must consider the pollutants of concern for the project.

Biotreatment BMPs are a broad class of structural BMPs that treat stormwater using a suite of treatment mechanisms characteristic of biologically active systems to remove both suspended and dissolved pollutants in urban storm water runoff. All biotreatment BMPs include treatment mechanisms that employ soil microbes and plants. Biotreatment BMPs may be either flow-based (limited storage) or volume-based (storage a key design component) and be designed to treat and discharge urban stormwater runoff to a downstream conveyance system. Biotreatment BMPs should be designed to maximize infiltration and evapotranspiration even though they will result in discharge of runoff.

Table 5-5 provides ratings of pollutant removal effectiveness (low, medium, and high) for different types of biotreatment BMPs that employ different unit operations and processes (UOPs) to remove pollutants. At a minimum, WQMPs that rely upon biotreatment BMPs must include at least one BMP type that is given a medium or high rating for the pollutant of concern for the entire unmet volume. The performance ratings in this table are based on observed effluent quality, observed differences between influent and effluent quality (magnitude and significance), and the assumed UOPs provided by each BMP. In order for a BMP to achieve the level of performance anticipated by this table, the BMP must:

- Be designed to industry-adopted standards based on the criteria contained in the BMP Fact Sheets referenced in the table and additional requirements for biotreatment provided in Appendix E.
- Include the assumed UOPs listed in this table. BMPs not found on this list may be acceptable if they incorporate similar UOPs.

Operations and maintenance of biotreatment BMPs should emphasize preservation of hydraulic function and the promotion of robust biological processes. Biotreatment BMPs typically utilize “soft” infrastructure (e.g., vegetative slope stabilization as opposed to rip rap slope stabilization) and therefore require an adaptive approach to maintenance and performance enhancement, more typical of landscape maintenance than maintenance of hard infrastructure.

Note that while biotreatment BMPs promote and depend upon vegetation for effective performance, plant growth may damage facility infrastructure elements such as fencing, curbs, etc. This hazard can be mitigated by incorporating root barriers and/or through regular maintenance.

Biotreatment BMPs can be divided into two sub-categories:

- Volume-based biotreatment incorporating a significant amount of storage, maximizing evapotranspiration and infiltration, and delaying outflow of the remaining retained volume; and
- Flow-based biotreatment in which temporary storage is minimal, evapotranspiration and/or infiltration is limited to incidental losses, and most of the runoff is discharged following treatment by the combination of physical and biological processes inherent in the BMP design.

5.4.4.1 Volume-based biotreatment

Biotreatment achieved from implementing volume-based biotreatment BMPs is a function of the depth of water that is either treated over the course of the storm or stored within the BMP for evapotranspiration, infiltration and release following the storm (Table 5-6). Runoff stored in pore spaces, if applicable, can be detained for extended periods of time, which may be necessary to support the vegetation and maximize any potential infiltration. The outflow from the bioretention underdrains is sized to allow for 48 hour drawdown in retained water following a storm event. Allowable retention is limited by the requirement to drawdown retained water within 48 hours following a storm event in order to restore retention volume for a subsequent storm event. Several types of volume-based biotreatment BMPs may be considered when developing a Project WQMP, including:

- Bioretention / Planter Box with underdrains - Bioretention stormwater treatment facilities are shallow landscaped depressions that capture and filter stormwater runoff. The incorporation of an underdrain system that releases treated stormwater runoff changes the BMP from an on-site retention category to a biotreatment category. Use of underdrains is necessary in areas with low permeability native soils or steep slopes. The underdrain system routes the treated runoff not otherwise infiltrated or evapotranspirated to the storm drain system rather than depending entirely on infiltration or ET. These facilities function as a soil and plant-based filtration device that removes pollutants through a variety of physical, biological, and chemical treatment processes. The facilities normally consist of a ponding area, mulch layer, planting soils, and plants. As stormwater passes down through the planting soil, pollutants are filtered, adsorbed, biodegraded, and sequestered by the soil and plants. The volume of water that is stored includes pore water in the ammended soil and gravel layers (for bioretention areas) as well as up to 1.5 ft of allowable ponding above the amended soil layer.

Table 5-5. Relative Treatment Performance Ratings of Biotreatment BMPs

Unit Operations and Process	Assumed Principal Unit Operations and Processes Provided	Pathogens (Bacteria/Virus)	Metals	Nutrients		Sediment / Total Suspended Solids	Organic Compounds	Pesticides / Herbicides	Trash and Debris	Oil and Grease
				Nitrogen	Phosphorus					
Bioretention system	Particulate Settling Size Exclusion Inert Media Filtration Sorption / Ion Exchange Microbial Competition / Predation Biological Uptake	M	H	L	L	H	M	M	H	H
Bioretention system with internal water storage zone and nutrient sensitive media design	Bioretention UOPs, plus: Microbially Mediated Transformations (if designed with internal water storage zone)	M	H	M	M	H	M	M	H	H
Dry extended detention basin	Particulate Settling Size Exclusion Floatable Capture Vegetative Filtration (with low-flow channel)	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	H	M
Dry extended detention basin with vegetated sand filter outlet structure	Dry extended detention basin UOPs, plus: Inert Media Filtration	M	M	L	M	H	L	L	H	M
Vegetated Swale	Vegetative Filtration Sorption/Ion Exchange	L	M	L	L	M	M	M	M	M
Vegetated Filter Strip	Vegetative Filtration Sorption/Ion Exchange	L	M	L	L	M	M	M	L	M
Wet detention basins and constructed stormwater wetlands	Particulate Settling Size Exclusion Floatable Capture Sorption/Ion Exchange Microbially Mediated Transformations Microbial Competition/ Predation Biological Uptake Solar Irradiation	M	H	M	H	H	M	M	H	H
Proprietary Biotreatment and Treatment Control	Varies by product.	Expected performance should be based on evaluation of unit processes provided by BMP and available testing data. Approval is based on the discretion of the reviewing agency.								

L = Low Effectiveness M = Medium Effectiveness H = High Effectiveness

Sources: Strecker, E.W ., W.C Huber, J.P. Heaney, D. Bodine, J.J. Sansalone, M.M. Quigley, D. Pankani, M. Leisenring, and P. Thayumanavan, "Critical assessment of Stormwater Treatment and Control Selection Issues." Water Environment Research Federation, Report No. 02-SW-1. ISBN 1-84339-741-2. 290pp

International Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database

Biotreatment volume calculation is similar to bioretention without underdrains, but applies a higher design percolation rate to account for infiltration into an amended soil layer and not underlying soils.

Case Study 2 Application of Bioretention with Underdrains

- Amended soil design percolation = 2.5 in/hr
- Surface area of each bioretention cell = 2,000 ft^2
- $V_{biotreated} = (P_{design}/12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{ponded} * d_{ponded}/2) + (SA_{soild} * d_{soil} * n_{soil}) + (SA_{gravel} * d_{gravel} * n_{gravel})$
- Vret = (2.5/12 * 2,000 * 3) + (2,000 * 1.5/2) + (2,000 * 3.0 * 0.25) + (2,000 * 2.0 * 0.33) = 5,570 ft^3 in each cell





- Constructed wetland - A constructed wetland is a system consisting of a sediment forebay and one or more permanent micro-pools with aquatic vegetation covering a significant portion of the basin. Constructed treatment wetlands typically include components such as an inlet with energy dissipation, a sediment forebay for settling out coarse solids and to facilitate maintenance, shallow sections (1 to 2 feet deep) planted with emergent vegetation, deeper areas or micro pools (3 to 5 feet deep), and a water quality outlet structure. The interactions between the incoming stormwater runoff, aquatic vegetation, wetland soils, and the associated physical, chemical, and biological unit processes are a fundamental part of constructed wetlands. Biotreated volume is a function of the HRT for the facility (default is 48 hours for capture of frequent storms in the wet season), which is used to determine sizing criteria for wetland and outflow facilities.

- Wet detention basin – Wet detention basins are constructed, naturalistic ponds with a permanent or seasonal pool of water (also called a “wet pool” or “dead storage”). Aquascape facilities, such as artificial lakes, are a special form of wet pool facility that can incorporate innovative design elements to allow them to function as a stormwater treatment facility in addition to an aesthetic water feature. Wet ponds require base flows to exceed or match losses through evaporation and/or infiltration, and they must be designed with the outlet positioned and/or operated in such a way as to maintain a permanent pool. Wet ponds can be designed to provide extended detention of incoming

flows using the volume above the permanent pool surface. Biotreated volume is a function of the HRT for the facility (default is 48 hours for capture of frequent storms in the wet season), which is used to determine sizing criteria for wetland and outflow facilities.

- Dry extended detention basin (DEDB) - DEDBs are basins whose outlets have been designed to detain stormwater runoff to allow particulates and associated pollutants to settle out. DEDBs do not have a permanent pool, but are designed to drain completely between storm events. They can also be used to provide hydromodification and/or flood control by modifying the outlet control structure and providing additional detention storage. The slopes, bottom, and forebay of DEDBs are typically vegetated. Considerable stormwater volume reduction can occur in DEDBs when they are located in permeable soils and are not lined with an impermeable barrier.

5.4.4.2 Flow-based biotreatment

Flow based biotreatment BMPs do not provide for significant storage of runoff, and therefore the treatment capacity must be sufficient to address the entire runoff hydrograph. Since the shape of the runoff hydrograph is not defined in the P_6 method for determining BMP performance criteria, an alternative approach was employed to evaluate the effectiveness of flow-based biotreatment BMPs. Section XI.D.6.a of the MS4 Permit allows for demonstration of 80 percent of long-term average annual runoff for sizing of BMPs included in a WQMP. This method was not selected for use in developing site-specific performance criteria for WQMPs in San Bernardino County. However, the basis for allowing for multiple methods to estimate site-specific performance criteria is so that application of either method will result in BMPs sized to capture and treat equivalent volumes of runoff. Accordingly, a BMP that is capable of capturing 80 percent of long-term average annual runoff capture is comparable to the capture of a single design storm as determined using the P_6 method.

The runoff treatment effectiveness of flow-based biotreatment BMPs was evaluated using a simplified continuous daily simulation analysis of long-term rainfall, runoff, and BMP performance. For each storm event in the period of record a mass balance of precipitation, runoff, treatment, and overflow was accounted using a hypothetical 1 acre impervious catchment. Precipitation is converted to runoff (BMP inflow) by subtracting estimated depth of depression storage (assumed to be 0.06 inches for the WQMP guidance development). Overflow of the flow-based treatment occurred when the runoff inflow exceeded the treatment capacity of the BMP. Flow-based BMPs can be designed to route higher flows, but with insufficient contact time with vegetation to provide biotreatment of pollutants. Aggregating results from each event provides an estimate of long term annual average capture. The long-term simulation was run for the same hypothetical 1 acre impervious catchment with varying treatment capacities to develop a relationship between on-site treatment capacity and long-term average annual runoff capture. To account for different rainfall patterns in each

Table 5-6. Estimation methods for biotreatment BMPs

BMP Type	Runoff Volume Calculation	Variables	Fact Sheet Reference for Design Details
Constructed wetland / Extended wet detention / Dry extended detention	$V_{biotreated} = (S_{forebay} + S_{basin}) + \{ T_{fill} * (V_{forebay} + V_{basin}) / T_{drawdown} \}$ *where* $Q_{out} = (V_{forebay} + V_{basin}) / (T_{drawdown} * 3600)$	$S_{forebay,basin}$ = storage volume in forebay and main basin (ft^3), approximated by equation for volume of a rectangular frustam (Template Form 4.3-7 Item 8) $T_{drawdown}$ = drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours T_{fill} = duration of storm when biotreatment is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours Q_{out} = capacity of outflow (cfs)	Riverside County LID BMP Manual Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV
Bioretention with underdrain / Planter Box	$V_{biotreated} = (P_{design} / 12 * SA_{inf} * T_{fill}) + (SA_{ponded} * d_{ponded}/2) + (SA_{soil} * d_{soil} * n_{soil}) + (SA_{gravel} * d_{gravel} * n_{gravel})$ *where* $d_{ponded} \leq T_{drawdown} * P_{design} / 12$	P_{design} = design percolation rate into amended soil layer (in/hr), default 2.5 in/hr $SA_{amended\ soil}$ = surface area (ft^2) of amended soil layer of bioretention area and surface ponding $T_{drawdown}$ = drawdown time for stored runoff (hrs), default is 48 hours T_{fill} = duration of storm when biotreatment is occurring as basin is filling (hrs), default is 3 hours $d_{ponded,soil,gravel}$ = depth (ft) of ponding and gravel layers, zero ponding for planter box $n_{amended\ soil,\ gravel}$ = porosity of amended soil and gravel layer	Riverside County LID BMP Manual Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV
Bioswale / Vegetated filter strip	$b = (Q_{design} * n / (1.49 * d^{1.67} * S^{0.5})$ *where* $b_{filter\ strip} \geq Q_{design} / 0.005$	b = bottom width (ft) of bioswale / vegetated filter strip Q_{design}= design flow capacity (cfs) as determined from Figure 5-2 n = Manning's roughness coefficient d = depth of flow (ft), vegetated filter strip not to exceed 1", bioswale not to exceed 2" if mowed or 4" if not mowed S = slope in direction of flow	Riverside County LID BMP Manual Orange County TGD for Project WQMPs Appendix XIV

climatic region in San Bernardino County, this analysis was conducted for two rainfall gauges that are representative of different climatic regions of the Valley (Carbon Canyon COOP 041520) and Mountain (Camp Angelus COOP 041369). The results of these continuous simulation models (Figure 5-2) were interpreted to estimate the treatment capacity needed to achieve the unmet volume after incorporating in the project, to the extent feasible, higher priority LID.

Once the necessary treatment capacity for sizing flow-based BMPs is determined from Figure 5-2, the Manning's equation shall be used to estimate bioswale sizing criteria to allow for a minimum of 10 minutes hydraulic residence time (HRT) and 100 feet length (Table 5-6). Table 5-6 shows the form of the Manning's equation to be used in evaluating flow-based BMPs as well as fact sheets to use in developing BMPs designs. Flow-based biotreatment BMPs include:

- Bioswale - Bioswales are open, shallow channels with low-lying vegetation covering the side slopes and bottom that collect and slowly convey runoff flow to downstream discharge points. Bioswales provide pollutant removal through settling and filtration in the vegetation (usually grasses) lining the channels. In addition to conveying storm water runoff, they provide the opportunity for volume reduction through infiltration and evapotranspiration, and reduce the flow velocity. Where soil conditions allow, volume reduction in bioswales can be enhanced by adding a gravel drainage layer underneath the swale allowing additional flows to be retained and infiltrated. Where slopes are shallow and soil conditions limit or prohibit infiltration, an underdrain system or low flow channel for dry weather flows may be required to minimize ponding and convey treated and/or dry weather flows to an acceptable discharge point. An effective bioswale achieves uniform sheet flow through a densely vegetated area for a period longer than 10 minutes. The vegetation in the swale can vary depending on its location within the project area, and is generally the choice of the designer, subject to the design criteria outlined in this section.

- Vegetated filter strip - Vegetated filter strips are designed to treat sheet flow runoff from adjacent impervious surfaces or intensive landscaped areas such as golf courses. Filter strips decrease runoff velocity, filter out total suspended solids and associated pollutants, and provide some infiltration into underlying soils. While some assimilation of dissolved constituents may occur, filter strips are generally more effective in trapping sediment and particulate-bound metals, nutrients, and pesticides. Filter strips are more effective when the runoff passes through the vegetation and thatch layer in the form of shallow, uniform flow. Biological and chemical processes may help break down pesticides, uptake metals, and utilize nutrients that are trapped in the filter.



Figure 5-2. Nomograph for Determining Flow-based BMP Capacity Requirement to meet Remaining Unmet DCV

- Proprietary biotreatment - Proprietary biotreatment devices are devices that are manufactured to mimic natural systems such as bioretention areas by incorporating plants, soil, and microbes engineered to provide treatment at higher flow rates or volumes and with smaller footprints than their natural counterparts. Incoming flows are typically filtered through a planting media (mulch, compost, soil, plants, microbes, etc.) and either infiltrated or collected by an underdrain and delivered to the storm water conveyance system. Tree box filters are an increasingly common type of proprietary biotreatment device that are installed at curb level and filled with a bioretention type soil. For low to moderate flows they operate similarly to bioretention systems and are bypassed during high flows. Tree box filters are highly adaptable solutions that can be used in all types of development and soils but are especially applicable to urban parking lots, street, and roadways.

5.5 WQMP Conformance Analysis

Section 5.3.2 presented general feasibility criteria for determining project conditions that would preclude or restrict the use of one or more types of BMPs. This section describes specific,

quantitative analyses to be conducted to determine the extent to which BMPs that are not excluded or limited from consideration can be used to meet the LID performance criteria.

The WQMP shall demonstrate how implementation of the combination of proposed preventive and mitigative measures are expected to achieve retention and/or treatment and release of the DCV. If it can be demonstrated that the DCV can be retained through a combination of infiltration BMPs, no additional analysis is required. Otherwise, the WQMPs must include an infeasibility analysis to objectively determine the amount of runoff that can be retained on-site by infiltration BMPs. The feasibility analysis must also evaluate how much of the DCV can be retained by harvest and use BMPs. If the analyses indicate that it is not feasible to retain the entire DCV through preventive, infiltration and/or harvest and use BMPs, then the Project Proponent must investigate the use of biotreatment BMPs. If the DCV can be retained and/or treated and released with BMPs designed in accordance with the methodologies described in Section 5.4, no additional BMPs are required to achieve the water quality requirement.

BMPs shall be designed to retain, infiltrate and/or biotreat the DCV to the MEP by applying the applicable feasibility criteria in the following subsections. The project proponent shall evaluate and implement BMPs to the MEP using the following hierarchy of priority:

1) Retention and infiltration BMPs
2) Harvest and Use BMPs
3) Volume-based Biotreatment BMPs
4) Flow-based Biotreatment BMPs
5) Alternative Compliance Plan, including off-site BMPs

The methods used to conduct an infeasibility analysis vary for the different types of BMPs under consideration. The following sections describe specific requirements to demonstrate that BMP implementation is infeasible, or that implementation of the BMP to the MEP does not mitigate the full DCV prior to considering other BMP types lower in the hierarchy for demonstrating conformance.

5.5.1 Criteria for MEP Determination

WQMP site designs shall incorporate BMPs to the MEP per the following criteria:

- At least the recommended portion of the site specified in Table 5-7 shall be provided in the site plans for surface plus subsurface BMPs. Local jurisdictions may develop a more stringent table (i.e., greater area required to be provided for BMPs) at their discretion; and

- The site shall be configured such that runoff can be routed to BMPs located in the available area(s) of the site; and
- The site shall be laid out such that BMPs are located over infiltrative soils with the highest percolation capacity as practicable given the constraints of the site, unless infiltration is infeasible for risk-based reasons identified in Section 5.3.2.1, and
- Satisfaction of these criteria shall be documented in exhibits or narrative descriptions.

OR

- A site specific study shall be prepared as part of the Project WQMP that documents that the site cannot be designed to allow at least the recommended percentage of area shown in Table 5-7 for BMPs. The study may consider:
  - Site conditions/constraints (e.g., depth to groundwater, topography, existing utilities)
  - Zoning/code requirements (e.g., target density, accessibility, traffic circulation, health and safety, setbacks, etc.)
  - Economic feasibility

Table 5-7 provides the minimum percentage of a project site that is necessary to demonstrate MEP implementation of on-site retention and infiltration and biotreatment of the DCV using LID BMPs. The project proponent may provide additional area for BMPs, if desired. Table 5-7 is intended to be used as follows:

- If a Project Proponent proposes to demonstrate that it is infeasible to retain and infiltrate the entire DCV on-site, it is necessary to demonstrate that the area within the applicable DA provided for retention and infiltration equals or exceeds the project-type specific minimum effective area criteria listed in Table 5-7
- If the minimum effective area in Table 5-7 is not provided for LID BMPs and the full DCV is not managed on-site, the reviewer shall request that additional area be made available for BMPs in the site design until either the percentage of the site in Table 5-7 is provided or the entire DCV is retained and infiltrated on-site, whichever percentage is less.
- If 1) the Project Proponent has provided the minimum effective area within a DA, and 2) site constraints limit the use of BMPs to a single type, and 3) the specific BMP type is unable to mitigate more than 40% of the DCV, then the Project Proponent may consider that specific BMP to be “infeasible” and shall evaluate a BMP listed lower in the hierarchy for feasibility.

- If the percentage of the site made available for retention and infiltration, harvest and use, and biotreatment BMPs equals or exceeds the project-type specific minimum effective area criteria for BMPs and still does not achieve the DCV, then the unmet portion of the DCV must be addressed in an alternative compliance plan.
- To demonstrate infeasibility of on-site infiltration BMPs, the infiltration factor of safety will be based on project-specific considerations. Section 5.4.2 and Appendix D describe how to compute an infiltration safety factor and apply it in evaluating LID infiltration BMPs for full capture of DCV.

Table 5-7. Minimum Effective Area[1] Required for LID BMPs (surface + subsurface facilities) for Project WQMP to Demonstrate Infeasibility[2] (% of site)

Project Type	New Development	Redevelopment
SF/MF Residential < 7 du/ac	10%	5%
SF/MF Residential 7 – 18 du/ac	7%	3.5%
SF/MF Residential > 18 du/ac	5%	2.5%
Mixed Use, Commercial/Industrial w/ FAR < 1.0	10%	5%
Mixed Use, Commercial/Industrial w/ FAR 1.0 – 2.0	7%	3.5%
Mixed Use, Commercial/Industrial w/ FAR > 2.0	5%	2.5%
Podium (parking under > 75% of project)	3%	1.5%
Zoning allowing development to property lines	2%	1%
Transit Oriented Development[3]	5%	2.5%
Parking	5%	2.5%

[1] "Effective area" is defined as area which 1) is suitable for a BMP (for example, if infiltration is potentially feasible for the site based on infeasibility criteria, infiltration must be allowed over this area) and 2) receives runoff from impervious areas.
[2] Criteria for only required if the Project WQMP seeks to demonstrate that the full DCV cannot be feasibly managed on-site.
[3] Transit oriented development is defined as a development with development center within 1/2 mile of a mass transit center.
Key: du/ac = dwelling units per acre, FAR = Floor Area Ratio = ratio of gross floor area of building to gross lot area, MF = Multi Family, SF = Single Family

Local jurisdictions may choose to develop analogous tables that are more, but not less stringent (i.e., higher areas required to be provided) than Table 5-7 (consult the LIP). Projects that demonstrate BMPs are capable of retaining the full DCV (as documented by the Project WQMP) are not required to demonstrate that they meet these minimum criteria for BMP effective area.

If implementation of biotreatment is determined to be infeasible to control the remaining portion of the DCV, then an alternative compliance approach must be developed per Section

XI.E.10 of the MS4 Permit. Section 6 describes the process of developing an alternative compliance plan.

If HCOC must be addressed in the project WQMP, additional BMPs or BMP capacity may be required. Section 5.6 describes these additional requirements. If there are no HCOC present, no additional analyses are required.

5.5.2 Hydrologic Source Controls

Section XI.E of the Permit sets forth the RWQCB's intent to advance and promote the use of LID site design techniques and HSC to minimize a development's impact on the hydrologic cycle. Further, the Permit emphasizes the use of LID preventative measures over mitigative measures. Section 5.2 of this TGD identifies the LID preventative measures consistent with the requirements of Section XI.E of the Permit. In addition, the use of LID site design techniques and the on-site retention of runoff in site HSC BMPs reduces the portion of the DCV that must be addressed in downstream BMPs. For large drainage areas, LID tools are a valuable aid in assisting the project proponent to comply with the requirement for the post-development runoff condition to mimic the pre-development runoff condition.

All applicable HSC shall be provided except where they are mutually exclusive with each other, or with BMPs. Mutual exclusivity may result from overlapping BMP footprints such that either would be potentially feasible by itself, but both could not be implemented

Please note that while there are no numeric standards regarding the use of HSC, if a project cannot feasibly meet BMP sizing requirements or cannot fully address HCOCs, feasibility of all applicable HSC must be part of demonstrating that the BMP system has been designed to retain the maximum feasible portion of the DCV.

5.5.3 LID Infiltration BMPs

This section provides criteria that shall be met to demonstrate that infiltration BMPs have been designed to retain stormwater design volume to the MEP.

- Site design allowances for infiltration BMPs shall meet or exceed project-type specific minimum effective area criteria (see Table 5-7). If the full DCV can be mitigated using infiltration BMPs that occupy a footprint smaller than the project-type specific minimum effective area criteria, then no additional area need be used.
- If individual retention and infiltration, and/or harvest and use BMP (Section 5.5.4) are infeasible or unable to treat the entire DCV, evaluate the use of combinations of LID BMPs to maximize on-site retention of the DCV. If no combination of BMP can mitigate the entire DCV, implement the single BMP type, or combination of BMP types, that maximizes on-site retention of the DCV within the minimum effective area in each DA.

- If the full DCV ***cannot*** be mitigated using infiltration BMPs (after optimizing their use) that occupy a footprint greater than or equal to the project-type specific minimum effective area criteria, the Project Proponent may use BMPs that are lower in the hierarchy; and
- If the full DCV ***cannot*** be mitigated using a combination of retention and infiltration, harvest and use, and biotreatment BMPs that occupy a footprint equal to or greater than the project-type specific minimum effective area criteria, then the unmet portion of the DCV must be addressed in an Alternative Compliance Plan (Section 6)

5.5.4 Harvest and Use BMPs

Demonstration that harvest and use BMPs have been designed to retain the DCV to the MEP requires computation of the wet season irrigation demand for landscaped areas on the project site compared with the DCV, per the formula provided in the Inland Empire Landscape Alliance Model Water Ordinance (see Section 5.4.3). If the entire project site landscaped area wet season demand over a 48-hour period is less than 50 percent of the DCV, then use of harvest and use BMPs can be determined to be infeasible.

To simplify WQMP development, Table 5-8 provides estimates of wet season irrigation demand per impervious acre of drainage area that would be needed to exceed the minimum incremental benefit threshold for use of harvest and use BMPs. Certain project types may be required to include harvest and use, where there is a low imperviousness and high irrigation demand, such as schools, institutional campuses, parks or golf courses.

5.5.5 Biotreatment BMPs

This section provides criteria for adding biotreatment BMPs to a WQMP to manage the remaining DCV to the MEP. If retention and infiltration BMPs have been implemented to the MEP (see Section 5.5.3), and there is still remaining DCV requiring mitigation, biotreatment BMPs shall be added to the system. Biotreatment BMPs shall be implemented such that the footprint of the BMP shall provide for sufficient sizing to treat the entire remaining DCV.

Any stormwater DCV that remains after evaluating biotreatment BMPs alone or in combination with on-site retention and/or infiltration shall be considered infeasible to retain or biotreat on-site and alternative compliance obligations shall be computed as described in Section 6.

Table 5-8. Infeasibility Thresholds for Consideration of Harvest and Use BMPs

P_6 Mean Storm Depth (in)	Harvested Water Demand Needed to Equal or Exceed Minimum Benefit Threshold[1] (cfd/impervious acre)
0.70	1,112
0.80	1,271
0.90	1,430
1.00	1,589
1.10	1,748
1.20	1,907
1.30	2,066
1.40	2,225
1.50	2,384
1.60	2,542
1.70	2,701
1.80	2,860
1.90	3,019
2.00	3,178
2.10	3,337
2.20	3,496
2.30	3,655

[1] Projects with 48-hour wet season irrigation demand below these values can determine infeasibility for harvest and use BMPs and consider use of biotreatment BMPs for remaining DCV

5.5.6 Case Study Conformance Analysis

Selection and evaluation of potential BMPs to address the DCV were completed for the two case studies described in Section 4.3 (Figure 5-3). Table 5-9 shows how the DCV for the two case studies is achieved using a variety of BMPs. The commercial case study, located in an area of highly permeable soils, shows that the DCV is retained on-site using a combination of street trees, permeable pavement, and bioretention without underdrains. For the residential case study, assume infeasibility determinations were completed for infiltration (less than 0.3 in/hr design infiltration rate in underlying soils) and harvest and use BMPs (on-site irrigation demand is < 1,000 cfd/impervious acre) types. Therefore, the full DCV from each DA is addressed with biotreatment BMPs, including both bioretention with underdrains (volume-based BMP) and a bioswale (flow-based BMP).



Figure 5-3. WQMP Site Design for Commercial and Residential Case Studies

Table 5-9. Summary of Conformance Analysis for Case Studies

Case Study 1: Commercial project overlying highly permeable soils	Project	Case Study 2: Residential project overlying HSG C soils	DA A	DA B
Design Capture Volume (ft^3)	49,245	Design Capture Volume (ft^3)	4,511	5,638
Retention/Biotreatment in LID BMPs (ft^3)		Retention/Biotreatment in LID BMPs (ft^3)		
Street Trees (ft^3)	475	Bioretention with underdrains	4,905	4,905
Permeable Pavement (ft^3)	18,829	Surplus/(Deficit) Volume Capture (ft^3)	(394)	733
Bioretention without underdrains (ft^3)	30,344	Flow-based biotreatment (cfs)		
Surplus/(Deficit) Volume Capture (ft^3)	(403)	Bioswale	n/a	0.17

5.6 Hydromodification Control

5.6.1 Incorporating Hydromodification into Project WQMPs

Hydromodification control refers to the methods used to address HCOC in a project WQMP. Hydromodification control BMPs range from structural BMPs designed to control flow duration to in-stream measures such as grade control structures. In-stream measures can be desirable where stream channels are already degraded due to hydromodification caused by existing development. There are various alternatives for siting hydromodification control measures, including on-site, in-stream, and regional.

The BMPs included in the WQMP will help contribute to meeting HCOC requirements. The volume of runoff retained by BMPs to meet the water quality DCV will typically serve to reduce the volume computed for the post-developed condition for a 2-year, 24-hour storm event. BMPs will also substantially reduce the post-developed condition runoff hydrograph, including the time of concentration and peak runoff when compared to the potential resulting post-development hydrograph if no BMPs were incorporated. HCOC performance criteria for time of concentration and peak runoff require matching of pre- and post- developed conditions within 5 percent. Inclusion of mitigative BMPs that retain or detain on-site runoff, may make it physically impossible for a project to avoid increasing the time of concentration of a site and reducing peak runoff by more than five percent. These changes to a site's hydrologic regime are less of a concern for downstream HCOCs, as they serve to reduce the frequency of erosive conditions. Therefore, it is interpreted that the five percent post-developed matching criteria only applies to decreases in time of concentration and increases in runoff volume and peak flow rate, which could cause increases in frequency of erosive conditions.

Where necessary, the following steps shall be used to address HCOCs in project WQMP:

- *Step 1:* For a project upstream of non-EHM receiving channels, the WQMP must evaluate the extent to which implementation of BMPs will address runoff volume, time of concentration, and peak flow performance criteria to meet HCOC requirements. If there is still additional HCOC volume reduction needed that is not addressed by BMPs, the project WQMP should consider increasing the size of on-site retention and/or investigate and identify off-site controls to mitigate the additional volume reduction requirements. If additional retention volume can be provided on-site, a revised project layout and preliminary design should be developed to add this volume. If additional volume cannot be provided, then the project shall proceed to Step 2.

- *Step 2:* A site-specific evaluation may be conducted to determine whether an opportunity exists to mitigate potential impacts through in-stream controls. The site-specific evaluation may find that in-stream controls can be feasibly implemented in combination

with on-site and regional volume retention such that the project will not adversely impact downstream erosion and sedimentation cycles, or stream habitat. If in-stream controls can be identified to address the HCOCs, the description and design features must be included in the Project WQMP along with documentation demonstrating that the project and proposed system will not adversely impact downstream erosion and sedimentation cycles, or stream habitat. This approach, including its effectiveness in addressing HCOC and the environmental impacts of any in-stream controls must be analyzed by the local jurisdiction pursuant to CEQA, and the necessary permits from regulatory agencies must be obtained.

- *Step 3:* If the HCOC cannot be feasibly mitigated through one of the above approaches, then the project must participate in an alternative or in-lieu program as described in Section 6.

5.6.2 Hydromodification Control BMPs

5.6.2.1 Detention/Retention Basins

Detention/retention basins are stormwater management facilities that are designed to detain and infiltrate runoff from one or multiple projects or project areas. These basins are typically shallow with flat, vegetated bottoms. Detention/retention basins can be constructed by either excavating a depression or building a berm to create above ground storage. It is clearly advantageous to locate a basin, such that runoff can drain from the project site into the basin by gravity and avoid the need for pumping. Runoff is stored in the basin as well as in the pore spaces of the surface soils.

Detention/retention basins for hydromodification management incorporate outlet structures designed for flow duration control. These basins can also be designed to support flood control and water quality treatment objectives in addition to hydromodification. If underlying soils are not suitable for infiltration, the basin may be designed for flow detention only, with alternative practices to manage increased volumes, such as storage and use, discharge at a rate below the critical rate for adverse impacts, or discharge to a non-susceptible water body. Pretreatment BMPs such as swales, filter strips, and sedimentation forebays minimize fine sediment loading to the basins, thereby reducing maintenance frequencies.

Detention/retention basins should be designed to receive flows from developed areas only, both to optimize design and reduce size, as well as to avoid intercepting coarse sediments from unimproved open spaces that should ideally be passed through to the stream channel. Reduction in coarse sediment loads contributes to downstream channel instability.

For outdoor recreational areas that are undeveloped, but nevertheless impacted and disturbed by these activities, water quality basins are recommended for intercepting runoff, thereby mitigating accelerated erosion and sediment transport from these areas.

5.6.2.2 In-Stream Controls

Hydromodification management can also be achieved by in-stream controls, including drop structures, bed and bank reinforcement, and grade control structures.

- *Drop Structures* - Drop structures are designed to reduce the channel slope, thereby reducing the shear stresses generated by stream flows. These controls can be incorporated as natural appearing rock structures with a step-pool design which allows drop energy to be dissipated in the pools while providing a reduced longitudinal slope between structures.
- *Grade Control Structures* - Grade control structures are designed to maintain the existing channel slope while allowing for minor amounts of local scour. These control measures are often buried and would entail a narrow trench across the width of the stream backfilled with concrete or similar material, as well as the creation of a "plunge pool" feature on the downstream side of the sill by placing boulders and vegetation. A grade control option provides a reduced footprint and impact compared to drop structures, which are designed to alter the channel slope.
- *Bed and Bank Reinforcement* - Channel reinforcement serves to increase bed and bank resistance to stream flows. In addition to conventional techniques such as riprap and concrete, a number of vegetated approaches are increasingly utilized, including products such as vegetated reinforcement mats. This technology provides erosion control with an open-weave material that stabilizes bed and bank surfaces and allows for re-establishment of native plants, which serves to further increase channel stability.

Section 6 – Alternative Compliance Plan

6.1 Introduction

If a Priority Project is not able to fully meet LID requirements based on implementing site design and on-site LID BMPs, nor through participation in available regional/sub-regional LID projects that have been previously identified and approved in the WAP, then a project proponent must develop an alternative compliance plan to address the remainder of the DCV that is neither retained nor treated and released through LID BMPs, either on- or off-site in an approved regional/sub-regional project. Also, some projects may qualify for Water Quality Credits that can be applied to reduce or fully satisfy the remaining DCV that must be treated before evaluating alternative approaches.

These alternative plans may include:

- Implementing on-site treatment control BMPs, sized to treat remaining design capture volume, or
- Implementing off-site watershed-based treatment control BMPs, or
- Contributing to an in-lieu fund, if available, or
- A combination of the above three options, to address all remaining DCV

If treatment control BMPs are used as a complete alternative compliance option, the performance of these BMPs must be compared to unmet LID DCV. The performance assessment must demonstrate that the volume treated by treatment control BMPs must be equal to the DCV for the project, minus any volume retained or treated by LID BMPs incorporated in the project, and that the treatment control BMPs have a medium or high effectiveness rating for removing the Pollutant(s) of Concern (POC) that cause impairment of the receiving water. If a treatment control BMP, or combination of BMPs, can achieve these objectives, the project is considered to be in compliance with the permit requirements and the WQMP can be completed. The WQMP must document the infeasibility analysis demonstrating why the DCV could not be fully met with LID BMPs. However, if the cost of treatment control BMP implementation greatly outweighs the pollution control benefits, a waiver of BMPs may be granted by the local jurisdiction as discussed in Section 6.4, and then the project proponent will be required to participate in an In-lieu fund (if available) or Mitigation Program as described in Section 6.5. The use of on-site treatment control BMPs are required before discharge to receiving waters, unless there are alternative compliance approaches, as identified in the approved WAP, to achieve equivalent or better water quality benefits, and not impair the beneficial uses of receiving waters.

Figure 6-1 is a flow chart illustrating the key steps in developing an alternative compliance plan. The following sections describe water quality credits, treatment control BMPs, waivers, in-lieu funds, mitigation programs, and off-site mitigation.



Figure 6-1. Alternative Compliance Plan Flowchart

6.2 Water Quality Credits

6.2.1 Qualifying Projects

For certain types of development projects, LID BMPs may be more difficult to incorporate due to the nature of the development, but the development practices may provide other environmental benefits to communities. For example, infiltration BMPs may not be desirable for a Brownfield re-development site where infiltrated stormwater could cause an adverse impact to groundwater supply, but re-development of the site would be expected to have other environmental benefits such as accelerated site clean-up. Alternatively, a re-development project could be implemented in a way that reduces the overall impervious footprint of the project site rather than increasing it.

Local jurisdictions may develop a water quality credit program that applies to certain types of development projects after they first evaluate the feasibility of meeting LID requirements on-site. If it is not feasible to meet the requirements for on-site LID, project proponents for specific project types can apply credits that would reduce project obligations for selecting and sizing other treatment control BMPs or participating in other alternative programs. Water quality credits can be applied before other alternative programs are evaluated and/or a Waiver request is submitted.

The Permit allows for credits to be applied for hydromodification requirements. Permittee may develop a credit system for hydromodification at a future date and submit this to the Executive Officer for approval.

Projects potentially eligible for consideration for water quality credits include:

- Re-development projects that reduce the overall impervious footprint of the project site;
- Brownfield re-development, meaning re-development, expansion, or reuse of real property which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants, and which have the potential to contribute to adverse ground or surface water quality if not redeveloped (*http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/overview/glossary.htm*);
- Higher density development projects which include two distinct categories (credits can only be taken for one category):
- Those with more than seven units per acre of development (lower credit allowance);
- Vertical density developments, for example, those with a Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) of 2, or those having more than 18 units per acre (greater credit allowance);

- Mixed use development, such as a combination of residential, commercial, industrial, office, institutional, or other land uses which incorporate design principles that can demonstrate environmental benefits that would not be realized through single use projects (e.g. reduced vehicle trip traffic with the potential to reduce sources of water or air pollution);
- Transit-oriented developments, such as a mixed use residential or commercial area designed to maximize access to public transportation; similar to above criterion, but where the development center is within one half mile of a mass transit center (e.g. bus, rail, light rail or commuter train station). Such projects would not be able to take credit for both categories, but may have greater credit assigned;
- Developments with dedication of undeveloped portions to parks, preservation areas and other pervious uses;
- Developments in a city center area;
- Developments in historic districts or historic preservation areas;
- Live-work developments, a variety of developments designed to support residential and vocational needs together – similar to criteria to mixed use development; would not be able to take credit for both categories; and
- In-fill projects, the conversion of empty lots and other underused spaces, substantially surrounded by urban uses, into more beneficially used spaces, such as residential or commercial areas, as defined by the local jurisdiction;
- Developments where a regional treatment system has a capacity to treat flows;
- Developments with offsite mitigation or dedications within the same watershed:

This provision does not exempt the project proponent from first conducting the investigations to determine if it is feasible to fulfill the full LID, treatment control, and hydromodification requirements through a combination of site design practices and BMPs consistent with the permit hierarchy.

6.2.2 Applying Water Quality Credits

To determine the amount of credit a project would qualify for, the first step is to calculate the DCV that would need to be satisfied in the absence of any credits. Any credits would then be taken as a reduction to the DCV. For all categories of projects noted above, the remaining volume to be treated or mitigated would be reduced in accordance with portions of the DCV shown in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1. Water Quality Credits for Applicable Project Categories

Project Category	Water Quality Credit (% of DCV) [1]
Redevelopment projects that reduce the overall impervious footprint of the project site	Percentage of site imperviousness reduced
Historic district, historic preservation area, or similar areas	10%
Brownfield re-development	25%
Higher density development, 7 units/acre or more	5%
Higher density development, vertical density	20%
Mixed use development, transit oriented development or live-work development	20%
In-fill development	10%

1) Maximum total of water quality credits for a project is 50 percent

If more than one category applies to a particular project, the credit percentages would be additive. Applicable performance criteria depend on the number of LID water quality credits claimed by the proposed project. Water quality credits can be additive up to a maximum 50 percent reduction from a proposed project's obligation for sizing treatment control BMPs, contributing to an in-lieu fund, or off-site mitigation projects. The water quality credit would be calculated as the DCV of the proposed condition multiplied by the sum of the credit percentages claimed above.

6.3 Treatment Control BMPs

If it is not feasible to meet LID performance criteria through retention and/or biotreatment provided on-site or at a sub-regional/regional scale, then treatment control BMPs shall be provided on-site prior to discharge to receiving waters. Table 6-2 provides ratings of low, medium, and high for pollutant removal effectiveness for different types of treatment BMPs that employ different unit operations and processes (UOP) to remove pollutants. At a minimum, WQMP that rely upon treatment BMPs must include at least one BMP type that is given a medium or high rating for the POC that cause impairments of receiving waters, for the entire unmet volume. The performance ratings in this table are based on observed effluent quality, observed differences between influent and effluent quality (magnitude and significance), and the assumed UOP provided by each BMP. In order for a BMP to achieve the level of performance anticipated by this table, the BMP must:

- Be designed to industry-adopted design standards based on the criteria contained in the BMP Fact Sheets referenced in the table.

- Include the assumed UOP listed in this table. BMPs not found on this list may be acceptable if they incorporate similar UOP.

Table 6-2. Relative Treatment Performance Ratings of Treatment Control BMPss

Unit Operations and Process	Assumed Principal Unit Operations and Processes Provided	Pathogens (Bacteria / Virus)	Metals	Nutrients		Sediments / Turbidity	Organic Compounds	Oil and Grease	Trash and Debris
				Nitrogen	Phosphorus				
Sand Filter (inert)	Size Exclusion Floatable Capture Inert Media Filtration	**M**	**L/M**	**L**	**M**	**H**	**L**	**H**	**H**
Sand Filter (specialized Media)	Sand Filter UOPs, plus: Sorption/Ion Exchange	**M**	**M/H**	**L**	**M**	**H**	**M**	**H**	**H**
Cartridge Media Filter	Size Exclusion Floatable Capture Inert Media Filtration Sorption/Ion Exchange	**M**	**M**	**L**	**M**	**M**	**M**	**H**	**H**
Hydrodynamic Separator	Particulate Settling (coarse only) Size Exclusion Floatable Capture	**L**	**L**	**L**	**L**	**M**	**L**	**M**	**H**
Catch Basin Insert	Size Exclusion	**L**	**L**	**L**	**L**	**L**	**L**	**M**	**H**

L = Low Effectiveness M = Medium Effectiveness H = High Effectiveness
Sources: Strecker, E.W., W.C. Huber, J.P. Heaney, D. Bodine, J.J. Sansalone, M.M. Quigley, D. Pankani, M. Leisenring, and P. Thayumanavan, "Critical assessment of Stormwater Treatment and Control Selection Issues." Water Environment Research Federation, Report No. 02-SW-1. ISBN 1-84339-741-2. 290pp
International Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database

Sizing of treatment control BMPs shall be based on the unmet volume after claiming applicable water quality credits, if appropriate. If treatment control BMPs can treat all of the remaining unmet volume and have a medium to high effectiveness for reducing the primary POC causing an impairment of a receiving water, the project is considered to be in compliance; a waiver application and participation in an alternative program is not required.

If the cost of providing treatment control BMPs greatly outweighs the pollution control benefits they would provide, a waiver of treatment control and LID requirements can be requested and alternative compliance approaches must be used to fulfill the remaining unmet volume.

6.4 Waivers

Project proponents can apply for a waiver if it is determined to be infeasible to fulfill the LID performance requirements using either on-site LID practices, through regional LID approaches, through on-site treatment control BMPs, or through watershed approaches contained in the approved WAP. Only those proposed projects that have completed a rigorous feasibility analysis shall be considered for a BMP waiver. A Waiver Request is required if LID BMPs are infeasible and if the cost of treatment control BMPs implementation greatly outweighs the pollution control benefits.

Each local jurisdiction is to use the feasibility criteria described in Section 5.3 or 5.5 to evaluate if Waiver Requests have adequately documented infeasibility. Each jurisdiction will identify in its Local Implementation Plan (LIP) the individual(s) or position(s) that is (are) authorized to review and approve Waivers.

Before a local jurisdiction can approve an alternative compliance plan, a waiver request must be submitted to the local jurisdiction for approval and to the RWQCB Executive Officer in writing 30 days prior to approval by the local jurisdiction. If the RWQCB Executive Officer does not raise an objection to a waiver within 30 days of receiving a WQMP alternative compliance plan, the local jurisdiction may approve the waiver. Before approving a waiver and an alternative compliance plan, the local jurisdiction must determine that the project proponent's alternative compliance plan meets the criteria described in Sections 5.3 or 5.5.

Project proponents that have been granted a waiver must comply with requirements for the alternative compliance plan proposed by the Project Proponent and approved by the Permittee for the proposed project to mitigate potential negative impacts on the watershed due to the infeasibility of fully implementing LID BMPs.

6.5 In-Lieu Fund

For projects granted a LID BMP Waiver, participation in an In-Lieu fund, if available, may be required. Payment into an In-Lieu fund can be used to address the runoff volume or pollutant load that is not addressed through LID BMPs or other alternative compliance options including treatment control BMPs described above. When an approved In-Lieu fund is available, participation in the program is allowable as long as the net effectiveness of the alternative program is the same or better than the project LID BMPs design capture and/or water quality volume that would be achieved with on-site compliance.

The following section describes a general basis and criteria for developing such programs. However, a specific program with established quantitative criteria and cost basis has not been established. It is expected that the local jurisdictions will develop a specific program and

submit this to the RWQCB Executive Officer for future review and approval to allow specific projects to use this approach.

Payment into an In-Lieu fund can be an alternative to on-site treatment control if a waiver has been granted. The amount of the contribution will be based on the unmet difference between the combination of the project LID BMPs design capture and/or water quality volume that would be achieved through full compliance with on-site LID BMPs and the actual LID DCV that can be achieved through the combination of LID practices and treatment control BMPs that can be incorporated in the project. The basis for determining the "value" of the contribution will be determined by additional or future studies by the local jurisdictions.

Certain types of projects may qualify for water quality credits that reduce the LID DCV for the project. The details of the credit program and a description of eligible projects can be found in Section 6.2. Project proponents should determine if a project qualifies for credits and subtract the credited volume from the unmet DCV. If the project can meet the reduced target volume through a combination of LID BMPs or treatment control BMPs, no contribution to an in-lieu fund is required. If there is still an unmet obligation even after applying credits, then a contribution needs to be made to an in-lieu fund.

The In-Lieu fund must be expended for water quality improvement or other related projects. Examples of projects eligible for funding through an in-lieu fund include, but are not limited to:

- Green street projects
- Projects which retrofit existing development areas with LID and other BMPs to reduce existing pollutant loads
- Retrofit incentive programs
- Regional BMP / Sub-Regional BMP
- Stream restoration
- Projects which promote groundwater recharge to increase water supplies
- Other equivalent projects proposed by local jurisdictions

Section 7 – Source Control BMPs

7.1 Introduction

Source control BMPs reduce the potential for stormwater runoff and pollutants from coming into contact with one another. Source control BMPs are defined as any administrative action, structural facility design, usage of alternative materials, and site-specific operation, maintenance, inspection, and compliance activities that eliminate or reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff. Source control BMPs can be separated into non-structural and structural types. Non-structural type BMPs are those which involve a procedure or practice such as stormwater training or trash management and litter control practices, while structural source control BMPs have a physical or structural component to preventing pollutants from contacting stormwater runoff. Structural source control BMPs includes those such as inlet trash racks, trash bin covers, and an efficient irrigation system.

Source control BMPs are required to be incorporated into all new development and significant redevelopment projects, including those identified in an applicable regional watershed or TMDL management plan, unless they do not apply to the proposed project.

Sections 7.2 and 7.3 provide descriptions of non-structural (see Table 7-1) and structural (see Table 7-2) source control BMPs that must be considered when selecting BMPs applicable to the proposed project. The BMPs are numbered for purposes of the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program and Model WQMP.

Section 7.4 includes a Source Control BMPs Selection Worksheet (see Table 7-3), adapted from City of San Diego Countywide Model Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan, which can assist project proponents in identifying appropriate non-structural and structural source control BMPs based on the potential sources of pollutants associated with the proposed project.

7.2 Non-Structural Source Control BMPs

Table 7-1 lists the non-structural source control BMPs that may be required in new development and significant redevelopment projects. This list can be referenced along with Section 7.4, Table 7-3 to assist in BMP selection when completing the WQMP. For purposes of the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program and the Model WQMP, each non-structural source control BMP is numbered with a WQMP reference identifier (e.g., N1, N2, etc). A cross reference to the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) BMP Handbooks (2003) reference number is included in parentheses (e.g., SC-73), where applicable.

Table 7-1. Non-Structural Source Control BMPs

WQMP Reference Identifier	Non-Structural Source Control BMPs
N1	Education for Property Owners, Tenants, and Occupants
N2	Activity Restrictions
N3	Landscape Management (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-73)
N4	BMP Maintenance
N5	Title 22 CCR Compliance
N6	Local Water Quality Ordinance Compliance
N7	Spill Contingency Plan (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-11)
N8	Underground Storage Tank Compliance
N9	Hazardous Materials Disclosure Compliance
N10	Uniform Fire Code Implementation
N11	Litter Control (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-60)
N12	Employee Training
N13	Housekeeping of Loading Docks (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)
N14	Catch Basin Inspection (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-74)
N15	Vacuum Sweep Private Streets and Parking Lots (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-43, SC-70)
N16	Other Non-structural Measures for Public Agency Projects
N17	Comply with all other applicable NPDES permits

CASQA BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment has source control BMP fact sheets referenced as "SD-##", while factsheets from the CASQA Industrial and Commercial BMP Handbook are designated as "SC-##".

- **(N1) Education for Property Owners, Tenants and Occupants** - For developments with no Property Owners Association (POA)[2] or with POA of less than fifty (50) dwelling units, practical information materials will be provided to the first residents/occupants/tenants on general housekeeping practices that contribute to the protection of stormwater quality. These materials will be initially developed and provided to first residents/occupants/tenants by the developer. Thereafter such materials will be available through the local jurisdiction's stormwater education program. Different materials for residential, office commercial, retail commercial, vehicle-related commercial and industrial uses have been developed.

[2] The term "Property Owners' Association" or POA, as used herein, means a nonprofit corporation or unincorporated association created for the purpose of managing a common interest development [from California Civil Code Sec. 1351 (a)].

- For developments with POA and residential projects of more than fifty (50) dwelling units, project conditions of approval will require that the POA periodically provide environmental awareness education materials, made available by the municipalities, to all members. Among other things, these materials will describe the use of chemicals (including household type) that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes via hosing or other direct discharge to gutters, catch basins and storm drains. Educational materials available from the San Bernardino Stormwater Program and can be downloaded at: http://www.sbcountystormwater.org/gov_out.html

- **(N2) Activity Restrictions** - If a POA is formed, conditions, covenants and restrictions (CCRs) must be prepared by the developer for the purpose of surface water quality protection. An example would be not allowing car washing outside of established community car wash areas in multi-unit complexes. Alternatively, use restrictions may be developed by a building operator through lease terms, etc. These restrictions must be included in the Project WQMP.

- **(N3) Landscape Management (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-73)** - Identify on-going landscape maintenance requirements consistent with applicable local ordinances that may include fertilizer and/or pesticide usage. Statements regarding the specific applicable guidelines must be included in the Project WQMP.

- **(N4) BMP Maintenance** - Identify responsibility for implementation of each non-structural BMP and scheduled cleaning and/or maintenance of all structural BMP facilities.

- **(N5) Title 22 CCR Compliance** - Compliance with Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) and relevant sections of the California Health & Safety Code regarding hazardous waste management is enforced by County Department of Environmental Health Services on behalf of the State. The Project WQMP must describe how the proposed development will comply with the applicable hazardous waste management section(s) of Title 22.

- **(N6) Local Water Quality Ordinances** – Comply with any applicable local water quality ordinances. The local jurisdiction, under local water quality ordinances, have authority to ensure clean stormwater discharges from fuel dispensing areas and other areas of concern to public properties.

- **(N7) Spill Contingency Plan (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-11)** – This Plan is prepared by the building operator for use by specified types of building or suite occupancies. The Plan mandates stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials, documentation, etc.

- (**N8) Underground Storage Tank Compliance** – This BMP addresses compliance with State regulations dealing with underground storage tanks, enforced by County Environmental Health Services on behalf of State.

- **(N9) Hazardous Materials Disclosure Compliance** - Compliance with local ordinances for the management of hazardous materials is typically enforced by local fire protection agencies. San Bernardino County, health care agencies, and/or other appropriate agencies (i.e. Department of Toxics Substances Control) are typically responsible for enforcing hazardous materials and hazardous waste handling and disposal regulations.

- **(N10) Uniform Fire Code Implementation** - Compliance with Article 80 of the Uniform Fire Code enforced by the fire protection agency.

- **(N11) Litter Control (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-60)** - For industrial/commercial developments and for developments with POAs, the owner/POA are required to implement trash management and litter control procedures in the common areas aimed at reducing pollution of drainage water. The owner/POA may contract with their landscape maintenance firms to provide this service during regularly scheduled maintenance, which should consist of litter patrol, emptying of trash receptacles in common areas, and noting trash disposal violations by tenants/homeowners or businesses and reporting the violations to the owner/POA for investigation.

- (**N12) Employee Training** – This BMP requires an education program (see N1) as it would apply to future employees of individual businesses. The developer prepares manual(s) for initial purchasers of a business site or for a development that is constructed for an unspecified use, the developer makes a commitment on behalf of POA or future business owner to prepare the training. An example would be a provision to provide training on the proper storage and use of fertilizers and pesticides, or training on the implementation of hazardous spill contingency plans.

- **(N13) Housekeeping of Loading Docks (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)** - Loading docks typically found at large retail and warehouse-type commercial and industrial facilities should be kept in a clean and orderly condition through a regular program of sweeping and litter control and immediate cleanup of spills and broken containers. Cleanup procedures should minimize or eliminate the use of water. If wash water is used, it must be disposed of in an approved manner and not discharged to the storm drain system. If there are no other alternatives, discharge of non-stormwater flow to the sanitary sewer may be considered only if allowed by the local sewerage agency through a permitted connection.

- **(N14) Catch Basin Inspection (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-74)** - For industrial/commercial developments and for developments with privately maintained

drainage systems, the owner is required to have at least 80 percent of drainage facilities inspected, cleaned and maintained on an annual basis with 100 percent of the facilities included in a two-year period. Cleaning should take place in the late summer/early fall prior to the start of the rainy season. Drainage facilities include catch basins (storm drain inlets) detention basins, retention basins, sediment basins, open drainage channels and lift stations.

- **(N15) Vacuum Sweep Private Streets and Parking Lots (CASQA BMP Handbook SC-43, SC-70)** - Streets and parking lots are required to be swept on a regular frequency based usage and field observations of waste accumulation, using a vacuum assisted sweeper. At a minimum all paved areas of a business shall be swept, in late summer or early fall, prior to the start of the rainy season or equivalent, as required by the governing jurisdiction.
- **(N16) Other Non-structural Measures for Public Agency Projects** - Other non-structural measures shall be implemented and included in the Project WQMP as applicable for new public agency Priority Projects and as required by the local jurisdiction.
- **(N17) Other NPDES Permits, as applicable** – Permittees shall comply with other NPDES permits such as General Industrial permits, etc., to include BMPs that are required as part of a SWPPP.

7.3 Structural Source Control BMPs

Table 7-2 lists the structural source control BMPs that may be required in new development and significant redevelopment projects. These can be referenced with Section 7.4, Table 7-3, to assist in BMP selection for completing the Project WQMP. For purposes of the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program and WQMP Guidance, each structural source control BMP is numbered with a WQMP reference identifier (e.g., S1, S2, etc). A cross reference for the CASQA BMP Handbook Factsheet reference number is included in parentheses, where applicable.

Table 7-2. Structural Source Control BMPs

WQMP Reference Identifier	Structural Source Control BMPs
S1	Provide storm drain system stenciling and signage (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-13)
S2	Design and construct outdoor material storage areas to reduce pollution introduction (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-34)
S3	Design and construct trash and waste storage areas to reduce pollution introduction (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-32)
S4	Use efficient irrigation systems & landscape design, water conservation, smart controllers, and source control (Statewide Model Landscape Ordinance; CASQA BMP Handbook SD-12)
S5	Finished grade of landscaped areas
S6	Protect slopes and channels and provide energy dissipation
S7	Loading Dock areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)
S8	Maintenance bays (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)
S9	Vehicle wash areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-33)
S10	Outdoor processing areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-36)
S11	Equipment wash areas
S12	Fueling areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-30)
S13	Hillside landscaping (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-10)
S14	Wash water control for food preparation areas
S15	Community car wash racks

- **(S1) Provide Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-13)** - Storm drain stencils are highly visible source control messages, typically placed directly adjacent to storm drain inlets. The stencils contain a brief statement that prohibits the dumping of improper materials into the MS4. Graphical icons, either illustrating anti-dumping symbols or images of receiving water fauna, are effective supplements to the anti-dumping message. Stencils and signs alert the public to the destination of pollutants discharged into stormwater. The following requirements should be included in the project design and shown on the project plans:
  - Provide stenciling or labeling of all storm drain inlets and catch basins, constructed or modified, within the project area with prohibitive language (such as: “No Dumping – Flows to Creek”) and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping.
  - Post signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area.
  - Maintain legibility of stencils and signs.
  - See CASQA Stormwater Handbook BMP Fact Sheet SD-13 for additional information.

- (**S2) Design Outdoor Hazardous Material Storage Areas to Reduce Pollutant Introduction (SD-34)** - Improper storage of materials outdoors may increase the potential for toxic compounds, oil and grease, fuels, solvents, coolants, wastes, heavy metals, nutrients, suspended solids, and other pollutants to enter the MS4. Where the plan of development includes outdoor areas for storage of hazardous materials that may contribute pollutants to the MS4, the following stormwater BMPs are required:
  - Hazardous materials with the potential to contaminate urban runoff shall either be: (a) placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar structure that prevents contact with runoff or spillage to the MS4; or (b) protected by secondary containment structures (not double wall containers) such as berms, dikes, or curbs.
  - The storage area shall be paved and sufficiently impervious to contain leaks and spills.
  - The storage area shall have a roof or awning to minimize direct precipitation and exposure, and collection of stormwater within the secondary containment area.
  - Any stormwater retained within the containment structure must not be discharged to the street or storm drain system.
  - Location(s) of installations of where these preventative measures will be employed must be included on the map or plans identifying BMPs.
  - See CASQA Stormwater Handbook Section 3.2.6 and BMP Fact Sheet SD-34 for additional information.
- **(S3) Trash Enclosures to Reduce Pollutant (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-32)** - Design trash storage areas to reduce pollutant introduction. All trash container areas shall meet the following requirements (limited exclusion: detached residential homes):
  - Paved with an impervious surface, designed not to allow run-on from adjoining areas, designed to divert drainage from adjoining roofs and pavements diverted around the area, screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash; and
  - Provide solid roof or awning to prevent exposure to direct precipitation.
  - Connection of trash area drains to the MS4 is prohibited. See CASQA Stormwater Handbook Section 3.2.9 and BMP Fact Sheet SD-32 for additional information.
- **(S4) Use Efficient Irrigation Systems and Landscape Design (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-12)** The Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006, Assembly Bill 1881 (AB 1881), requires adoption of the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance designed to

improve public and private landscaping and irrigation practices for new development projects or rehabilitation of significant landscape areas. The ordinance reduces outdoor water waste through improvements in irrigation efficiency and selection of plants requiring less water. The ordinance requires development of water budgets for landscaping, use of recycled water if available, routine irrigation audits, and scheduling of irrigation based on localized climate. For existing landscapes greater than one-acre in size, the water purveyors are required to implement programs, such as irrigation water use analyses, irrigation surveys, and irrigation audits to reduce landscape water use to a level not exceeding the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) as specified in the ordinance. Landscape audits are required to be conducted by a certified landscape auditor. Irrigation practices shall also comply with any more stringent local ordinances related to irrigation efficiency. The project proponent should also consult the LIP for the area in which the project is planned for development. In general, the following methods to reduce excessive irrigation runoff shall be considered, and incorporated for all landscaped areas:

- Employing rain shutoff devices to prevent irrigation after precipitation.
- Designing irrigation systems to each landscape area's specific water requirements.
- Using flow reducers or shutoff valves triggered by a pressure drop to control water loss in the event of broken sprinkler heads or lines.
- The timing and application methods of irrigation water shall be designed to minimize the runoff of excess irrigation water into the municipal storm drain system.
- Employing other comparable, equally effective, methods to reduce irrigation water runoff.
- Group plants with similar water requirements in order to reduce excess irrigation runoff and promote surface filtration. Choose plants with low irrigation requirements (for example, native or drought tolerant species). Consider other design features, such as:
- Use mulches (such as wood chips or shredded wood products) in planter areas without ground cover to minimize sediment in runoff.
- Install appropriate plant materials for the location, in accordance with amount of sunlight and climate, and use native plant material where possible and/or as recommended by the landscape architect.
- Leave a vegetative barrier along the property boundary and interior watercourses, to act as a pollutant filter, where appropriate and feasible.

- Choose plants that minimize or eliminate the use of fertilizer or pesticides to sustain growth.

- **(S5) Finished Grade of Landscaped Areas -** All landscape pockets, fingers, setback areas, parkway strips, street medians, etc., shall be finish-graded at a minimum of 1-2 inches below top of curb or sidewalk for increased retention/infiltration of stormwater and irrigation water.

- **(S6) Protect Slopes and Channels** - Project plans should include Source Control BMPs to decrease the potential for erosion of slopes and/or channels. The following design principles should be considered and incorporated and implemented where determined applicable and feasible by the local jurisdiction:

  - Convey runoff safely from the tops of slopes.

  - Avoid disturbing steep or unstable slopes.

  - Avoid disturbing natural channels.

  - Install permanent stabilization BMPs on disturbed slopes as quickly as possible.

  - Vegetate slopes with native or drought tolerant vegetation.

  - Control and treat flows in landscaping and/or other controls prior to reaching existing natural drainage systems.

  - Install permanent stabilization BMPs in channel crossings as quickly as possible, and ensure that increases in runoff velocity and frequency caused by the project do not erode the channel.

  - Install energy dissipaters, such as riprap, at the outlets of new storm drains, culverts, conduits, or channels that enter unlined channels in accordance with applicable specifications to minimize erosion. Energy dissipaters should be installed in such a way as to minimize impacts to receiving waters.

  - On-site conveyance channels should be lined, where appropriate, to reduce erosion caused by increased flow velocity due to increases in tributary impervious area. The first choice for linings should be grass or some other vegetative surface, since these materials not only reduce runoff velocities, but also provide water quality benefits from filtration and infiltration. Irrigation demand of vegetated systems should be considered. If velocities in the channel are large enough to erode grass or other vegetative linings, rock, riprap, concrete soil cement or geo-grid stabilization may be substituted or used in combination with grass or other vegetation stabilization.

- Other design principles which are comparable and equally effective.
- These practices should be implemented, as feasible, consistent with local codes and ordinances. Projects involving an alteration to bed, bank, or channel of a Water of the US may require approval of additional regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over water bodies, (e.g., the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the California Department of Fish and Game).

- **(S7) Loading Dock Areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)** - Loading /unloading dock areas shall include the following:
  - Cover loading dock areas, or design drainage to preclude run-on and runoff, unless the material loaded and unloaded at the docks does not have potential to contribute to stormwater pollution, and this use is ensured for the life of the facility.
  - Direct connections to the municipal storm drain system from below grade loading docks (truck wells) or similar structures are prohibited. Stormwater can be discharged through a permitted connection to the storm drain system with a treatment control BMP applicable to the use.
  - Other comparable and equally effective features that prevent unpermitted discharges to the MS4.
  - Housekeeping of loading docks shall be consistent with Housekeeping of Loading Dock Areas (SD-31).
  - See CASQA BMP Handbook Section 3.2.8 for additional information.

- **(S8) Maintenance Bays (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-31)** - Maintenance bays shall include the following:
  - Repair/maintenance bays shall be indoors; or, designed to preclude urban run-on and runoff.
  - Design a repair/maintenance bay drainage system to capture all wash water, leaks and spills. Provide impermeable berms, drop inlets, trench catch basins, or overflow containment structures around repair bays to prevent spilled materials and wash-down waters from entering the storm drain system. Connect drains to a sump for collection and disposal. Direct connection of the repair/maintenance bays to the MS4 is prohibited. If there are no other alternatives, discharge of non-stormwater flow to the sanitary sewer may be considered only if allowed by the local sewerage agency through permitted connection.

- Other features which are comparable and equally effective that prevent discharges to the MS4 without appropriate permits.
- See CASQA BMP Handbook Fact Sheet SD-31 for additional information.

- **(S9) Vehicle Wash Areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-33)** - Projects that include areas for washing /steam cleaning of vehicles shall use the following:
  - Self-contained or covered with a roof or overhang.
  - Equipped with a wash rack, and with the prior approval of the sewerage agency (Note: Discharge monitoring may be required by the sewerage agency).
  - Equipped with a clarifier or other pretreatment facility.
  - If there are no other alternatives, discharge of non-stormwater flow to the sanitary sewer may be considered only allowed by the local sewerage agency through permitted connection.
  - Other features which are comparable and equally effective that prevent unpermitted discharge, to the MS4.
  - See CASQA BMP Handbook Sections 3.2.7 and 3.2.10 and Fact Sheet SD-33 for additional information.

- **(S10) Outdoor Processing Areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-36)** - Outdoor process equipment operations, such as rock grinding or crushing, painting or coating, grinding or sanding, degreasing or parts cleaning, landfills, waste piles, and wastewater and solid waste handling, treatment, and disposal, and other operations determined to be a potential threat to water quality by the local jurisdiction shall adhere to the following requirements.
  - Cover or enclose areas that would be the sources of pollutants; or, slope the area toward a sump that will provide infiltration or evaporation with no discharge; or, if there are no other alternatives, discharge of non-stormwater flow to the sanitary sewer may be considered only allowed by the local sewerage agency through permitted connection.
  - Grade or berm area to prevent run-on from surrounding areas.
  - Installation of storm drains in areas of equipment repair is prohibited.
  - Other features which are comparable or equally effective that prevent unpermitted discharges to the MS4.

- Where wet material processing occurs (e.g. electroplating), secondary containment structures (not double wall containers) shall be provided to hold spills resulting from accidents, leaking tanks or equipment, or any other unplanned releases .
- Some of these land uses (e.g. landfills, waste piles, wastewater and solid waste handling, treatment and disposal) may be subject to other permits including Phase I Industrial Permits that may require additional BMPs.
- See CASQA Stormwater Handbook Section 3.2.5 for additional information.

- **(S11) Equipment Wash Areas** - Outdoor equipment/accessory washing and steam cleaning activities shall use the following:
  - Be self-contained or covered with a roof or overhang.
  - Design an equipment wash area drainage system to capture all wash water. Provide impermeable berms, drop inlets, trench catch basins, or overflow containment structures around equipment wash areas to prevent wash -down waters from entering the storm drain system. Connect drains to a sump for collection and disposal. Discharge from equipment wash areas to the MS4 is prohibited. If there are no other alternatives, discharge of non-stormwater flow to the sanitary sewer may be considered, but only when allowed by the local sewerage agency through a permitted connection.
  - Other comparable or equally effective features that prevent unpermitted discharges to the MS4.
- **(S12) Fueling Areas (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-30)** - Fuel dispensing areas shall contain the following:
  - At a minimum, the fuel dispensing area must extend 6.5 feet (2.0 meters) from the corner of each fuel dispenser, or the length at which the hose and nozzle assembly may be operated plus 1 foot (0.3 meter), whichever is less.
  - The fuel dispensing area shall be paved with Portland cement concrete (or equivalent smooth impervious surface). The use of asphalt concrete shall be prohibited.
  - The fuel dispensing area shall have an appropriate slope (2 percent - 4 percent) to prevent ponding, and must be separated from the rest of the site by a grade break that prevents run-on of stormwater.
  - An overhanging roof structure or canopy shall be provided. The cover's minimum dimensions must be equal to or greater than the area of the fuel dispensing area in

the first item above. The cover must not drain onto the fuel dispensing area and the downspouts must be routed to prevent drainage across the fueling area. The fueling area shall drain to the project's Treatment Control BMP(s) prior to discharging to the MS4.

- See CASQA Stormwater Handbook Section 3.2.11 and BMP Fact Sheet SD-30 for additional information.

- **(S13) Site Design and Landscape Planning (Hillside Landscaping), (CASQA BMP Handbook SD-10)** - Hillside areas that are disturbed by project development shall be landscaped with deep-rooted, drought tolerant plant species selected for erosion control, satisfactory to the local jurisdiction.

- (**S14) Wash Water Controls for Food Preparation Areas** - Food establishments (per State Health & Safety Code 27520) shall have either contained areas or sinks, each with sanitary sewer connections for disposal of wash waters containing kitchen and food wastes. If located outside, the contained areas or sinks shall also be structurally covered to prevent entry of stormwater. Adequate signs shall be provided and appropriately placed stating the prohibition of discharging washwater to the storm drain system.

- **(S15) Community Car Wash Racks** - In complexes larger than 100 dwelling units where car washing is allowed, a designated car wash area that does not drain to a storm drain system shall be provided for common usage. Wash waters from this area may be directed to the sanitary sewer (with the prior approval of the sewerage agency); to an engineered infiltration system; or to an equally effective alternative. Pre-treatment may also be required.

7.4 Selecting Source Control BMPs

Identifying appropriate source control BMPs for a project is critical to reducing the potential for sources of pollutants from contacting stormwater runoff. When completing WQMP Template Form 4.1-1 (Non-Structural Source Control BMPs) and Form 4.1-2 (Structural Source Control BMPs), reference Table 7-3 to complete the WQMP Template form. Table 7-3 presents a worksheet for identifying appropriate non-structural and structural source control BMPs, based on project-specific potential sources of pollutants.

Note: Table 7-3 is intended as an *example* worksheet of how to consider selection of source control BMPs based on project-specific characteristics and does not include all possible project characteristics/activities and corresponding applicable source control BMPs.

Table 7-3. Source Control BMP Selection Worksheet

If Potential Source of Runoff Pollutants will be on the Project Site…	…then WQMP shall include these Source Control BMPs	
Project Characteristic/Activity	**Non-structural BMPs**	**Structural BMPs**
Onsite Storm Drain Inlets	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training N14 – Catch Basin Inspection	S1 - Provide Storm Drain Stenciling and Signage
Landscape/ Outdoor Pesticide Use	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N3 – Landscape Management; N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training	S4 – Use Efficient Irrigation Systems and Landscape Design; S5 - BMP S6 – Protect Slopes and Channels S13 – Site Design and Landscape Planning (Hillside Landscaping)
Food Service/Restaurants	N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training	S3 - Design and construct trash and waste storage areas to reduce pollution introduction S14 – Wash Water Controls for Food Preparation Areas
Refuse Areas	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N4 – BMP Maintenance N11 – Litter Control N12 – Employee Training	S3 - Design and construct trash and waste storage areas to reduce pollution introduction
Outdoor Storage of Equipment or Materials	N4 – BMP Maintenance N7 – Spill Contingency Plan N9 – Hazardous Materials Disclosure Compliance N12 – Employee Training	S2- Design Outdoor Materials Storage Areas S10 – Outdoor Processing Areas
Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training	S8 – Maintenance Bays & Docks S9 – Vehicle Wash Areas S11 – Equipment Wash Areas S15 – Community Wash Racks
Vehicle/Equipment Repair & Maintenance	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training	S8 – Maintenance Bays
Fuel Dispensing Areas	N4 – BMP Maintenance N6 – Local Water Quality Permit Compliance N7 – Spill Contingency Plan ; N8 – Underground Storage Tank Compliance; N9 - Hazardous Materials Disclosure Compliance N12 – Employee Training	S12 – Fueling Areas
Loading Docks	N4 – BMP Maintenance N13 – Housekeeping of Loading Docks; N12 – Employee Training	S7 – Dock Areas
Streets and Parking Lots	N1 – Education for POA, Tenants, Occupants N2 – Activity Restrictions N4 – BMP Maintenance N12 – Employee Training; N15 – Street Sweeping Private Streets and Parking Lots	S1 - Provide Storm Drain Stenciling and Signage

Source: Adapted from San Diego Countywide Model SUSMP Manual, SUSMP Requirements for Development Applications, August 2010.

Section 8 – Post-Construction BMP Requirements

This section includes post-construction requirements for operation and maintenance of BMPs incorporated into an approved Project WQMP, and provides guidance for completing WQMP Template, Form 5-1, BMP Inspection and Maintenance.

Scheduled operation and long term maintenance of BMPs is critical to the function and effectiveness of BMPs. Other post-construction requirements include access agreements between the property owner and local jurisdiction and recordation of the maintenance agreements into the local deed records so that BMP maintenance requirements are disclosed as part any property transfers.

8.1 BMP Maintenance Mechanisms

Alternative mechanisms that may be used to ensure on-going BMP maintenance include:

- **Public entity maintenance**: The local jurisdiction with the responsibility for WQMP approval may approve a WQMP that identifies a public or acceptable quasi-public entity (e.g., the City, the County, County Flood Control District, an existing assessment district, an existing utility district, or a conservation conservancy) as assuming responsibility for operation, maintenance, repair and replacement of the BMP. Unless otherwise acceptable to individual local agencies, public entity maintenance agreements shall ensure estimated costs are front-funded or reliably guaranteed, (e.g., through a trust fund, assessment district fees, bond, letter of credit or similar means). In addition, the local jurisdictions may seek protection from liability by appropriate releases and indemnities.

- The project proponent must demonstrate that it has proposed transfer of the BMP maintenance to another public entity. The project proponent will negotiate maintenance requirements with the entity that it is proposing to accept maintenance responsibilities within its jurisdiction; and negotiate with the resource agencies responsible for issuing permits for the construction and/or maintenance of the facilities. If necessary, the public entity will also demonstrate through the CEQA review or the public entity's public review process that it can accept the maintenance responsibility. The local jurisdiction must be identified as a third party beneficiary empowered to enforce any such maintenance agreement within their respective jurisdictions.

- **Project proponent agreement to maintain stormwater BMP:** The local jurisdiction may enter into a contract with the project proponent obligating the project proponent to maintain, repair and replace the stormwater BMP as necessary into perpetuity. Security or a funding mechanism with a "no sunset" clause may be required.

- **Assessment districts**: The local jurisdiction may approve an assessment district or other funding mechanism created by the project proponent to provide funds for stormwater BMP maintenance, repair and replacement on an ongoing basis. Any agreement with an assessment district shall be subject to the public entity maintenance provisions above.
- **Lease provisions**: In those cases where the local jurisdiction holds title to the land in question, and the land is being leased to another party for private or public use, the local jurisdiction may assure stormwater BMP maintenance, repair and replacement through conditions in the lease.
- **Conditional use permits**: For discretionary projects only, the local jurisdiction may assure maintenance of stormwater BMP through the inclusion of maintenance conditions in the conditional use permit. Security may be required.
- **Alternative mechanisms**: The local jurisdiction may accept alternative maintenance mechanisms if such mechanisms are as protective as those listed above.

8.2 BMP Maintenance Requirements

The following sections describe general requirements that may be applicable to the maintenance of BMPs. Consult the LIP for the jurisdiction in which the project is proposed to determine specific local requirements.

8.2.1 Operation and Maintenance Plan

An Operation and Maintenance Plan (O&M Plan) for the BMPs shall be prepared and included in the Project WQMP. The local jurisdiction requires the O&M Plan be received prior to permit closeout (see Section 8.3) and the issuance of certificates of use and occupancy.

The O&M Plan describes the designated responsible party to manage the stormwater BMPs. It also defines employee training program and duties, operating schedule, maintenance frequency, routine service schedule, specific maintenance activities, copies of resource agency permits, and any other necessary activities.

The final Project WQMP shall require the project proponent or approved maintenance entity to complete and maintain O&M forms to document all maintenance requirements. Parties responsible for the O&M Plan shall retain records for at least 5 years. These documents shall be made available to the local jurisdiction for inspection upon request at any time.

8.2.2 O&M Commitments

At a minimum, the final Project WQMP shall require the inspection and servicing of all structural BMPs on an annual basis. More frequent inspection and servicing requirements may be required by the local jurisdiction.

As part of the maintenance mechanism selected above, the local jurisdiction shall require the inclusion of a copy of an executed access easement that shall be binding on the land throughout the life of the project, until such time that the stormwater BMPs requiring access is replaced, satisfactory to the local agency.

8.2.3 Maintenance Agreements

Maintenance agreements are an effective tool for ensuring long-term maintenance of on-site BMPs. The purpose of a maintenance agreement is to clearly define the responsibilities of each party entering into the agreement. The local jurisdiction may require such an agreement that could include the following:

- **Performance of routine maintenance:** Local jurisdictions often find it easier to have a property owner perform all maintenance according to the requirements of a Design Manual. Other communities require that property owners do aesthetic maintenance (i.e., mowing, vegetation removal) and implement pollution prevention plans, but elect to perform structural maintenance and sediment removal themselves.

- **Maintenance schedules**: Maintenance requirements may vary, but usually local jurisdictions require that all BMP owners perform at least an annual inspection and document the maintenance and repairs performed. An annual report must then be submitted to the local jurisdiction, which may then choose to perform an inspection of the facility.

- **Inspection requirements:** Local jurisdictions may obligate themselves to perform an annual inspection of a BMP, or may choose to inspect when deemed necessary instead. Local agencies may also wish to include language allowing maintenance requirements to be increased if deemed necessary to ensure proper functioning of the BMPs.

- **Access to BMPS**: The agreement should grant permission to a local jurisdiction or its authorized agent to enter onto property to inspect BMPS. If deficiencies are noted, the local stormwater agency will provide a copy of the inspection report to the property owner and provide a timeline for repair of the deficiencies.

- **Failure to maintain:** In the maintenance agreement, the local jurisdiction will repeat the steps available for addressing a failure to maintain situation. Language allowing access to BMPS cited as not properly maintained may be included in the agreement, along with the right to charge any costs for repairs back to the property owner. The local jurisdiction may include deadlines for repayment of maintenance costs, and provide for liens against property up to the cost of the maintenance plus interest.

- **Recording of the Maintenance Agreement:** An important aspect to the recording of the maintenance agreement is that the agreement be recorded into local deed records. This

recordation helps ensure that the maintenance agreement is bound to the property in perpetuity.

- Local jurisdictions may elect to include easement requirements in maintenance agreements. While easement agreements are often secured through a separate legal agreement, recording public access easements for maintenance in a maintenance agreement reinforces a local jurisdiction's right to enter and inspect a BMP. Examples of maintenance agreements may be found at *http://www.stormwatercenter.net/*. Also, consult the LIP to determine if the local jurisdiction has established a Maintenance Agreement form.

8.3 Permit Closeout Requirements

For discretionary projects, the method approved by local jurisdictions for stormwater BMP maintenance shall be incorporated into the project's permit, and shall be consistent with permits issued by resource agencies, if any. Just as with all other aspects of a project's approved plans and designs, the local authority will make a determination whether all requirements of the Project WQMP have been satisfactorily completed prior to close-out of permits and issuance of certificates of use and occupancy.

For projects requiring only ministerial permits, the method approved by local jurisdictions for stormwater BMP maintenance shall be shown on the project plans before the issuance of any ministerial permits. Verification will occur similar to discretionary projects. Local jurisdictions shall not issue construction approvals, permit closeout, and issuance of certificates of use and occupancy prior to receipt of this proof.

In all instances, project proponents shall provide proof of execution of a method (as approved by local jurisdiction) for maintenance, repair, and replacement of BMPs. For all properties, the verification mechanism will include the project proponent's signed statement, as part of the Project WQMP, accepting responsibility for all structural BMP maintenance, repair and replacement or agreeing to an alternative mechanism that is approved by the local authority regarding maintenance, repair and replacement of the structural BMPS.

Local authorities carrying out public projects that are not required to obtain permits shall be responsible for ensuring that stormwater BMP maintenance; repair and replacement requirements are identified prior to the completion of construction and incorporated into the agency's municipal activities program.

Section 9 -References

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). National Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database, Version 1.0

ASCE and USEPA. August 2010. International Stormwater BMP Database, www.bmpdatabase.org.

California State Water Resources Control Board and Low Impact Development Center, 2009. Low Impact Development Manual for Southern California: Technical Guidance and Site Planning Strategies.

CASQA. 2003. California Stormwater BMP Handbooks. Three Handbooks: New Development and Redevelopment, Municipal, and Industrial/Commercial are available at: www.cabmphandbooks.org

Center for Watershed Protection. Better Site Design: A Handbook for Changing Development Rules in Your Community. 1998.

City of Los Angeles. April 2009. Green Infrastructure for Los Angeles: Addressing Urban Runoff and Water Supply Through Low Impact Development.

County of San Diego. February 2010. San Diego Countywide Model Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan, SUSMP Requirements for Development Applications.

County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use. December 31, 2007. Low Impact Development Handbook, Stormwater Management Strategies.

Gregory, J.H.; Dukes, M.D.; Jones, P.H.; and G.L. Miller. Effect of Urban Soil Compaction on Infiltration Rate, Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 2006, 1(3):117-124.

Orange County Stormwater Program. March 22, 2011. Final Draft Model Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP).

Orange County Stormwater Program. March 22, 2011. Final Draft Technical Guidance Document Appendices.

Orange County Stormwater Program, March 22, 2011. Final Draft Technical Guidance Document for the Preparation of Conceptual/Preliminary and/or Project WQMPs.

Riverside County Flood Control and Watershed Conservation District. 2011. Draft Riverside County LID BMP Manual.

Schueler, Thomas R. and Holland, Heather K. Center for Watershed Protection. 2000. The Practice of Watershed Protection.

Urban Runoff Quality Management, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Manual and Report on Engineering Practice No. 87/Water Environment Federation (WEF) Manual of Practice No.23, 1998.

Urban Water Resources Research Council of ASCE Wright Water Engineers. National Stormwater Best Management Practices Database, 2001.

Appendix A - Transportation Project BMP Guidance

Appendix B – WQMP Template

Appendix C – San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual (Selected Figures)

Appendix C-1 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure D-1, Time of Concentration Nomograph

Appendix C - 2 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure C-3, Curve Numbers of Hydrologic Soil

Appendix C - 3 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure C-6, Infiltration Rate for Pervious Areas versus SCS Curve Numbers

Appendix C - 4 – SB County Hydrology Manual Figure D-3, Intensity – Duration Curves Calculation Sheet

Appendix D – Section VII – Infiltration Rate Evaluation Protocol and Factor of Safety Recommendations, Orange County TGD Appendices, May 19, 2011

Appendix E – Section XII – Conceptual Biotreatment Selection, Design, and Maintenance Criteria Orange County TGD Appendices, May 19, 2011

Appendix F – HCOC Exemption Criteria and Map