

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

*Short Form – Storm Water Data Report*



Dist-County-Route: 03-Sie-49  
 Post Mile Limits: 35.0/47.4  
 Project Type: Preventative Maintenance  
 Project ID (or EA): 03-XXXXXX  
 Program Identification: 20.80.010.010  
 Phase:         PID  
                   PA/ED  
                   PS&E

Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): Central Valley

- |    |  |                              |  |
|----|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Is the project required to consider incorporating Treatment BMPs?                                    | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | Does the project disturb 5 or more acres of soil?  | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | Does the project disturb more than 1 acre of soil and not qualify for the Rainfall Erosivity Waiver? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. | Does the project potentially create permanent water quality impacts?                                 | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. | Does the project require a notification of ADL reuse   | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer to any of the preceding questions is "Yes", prepare a Long Form – Storm Water Data Report.

Estimate Construction Start Date: 6/1/11                      Construction Completion Date: 8/1/11  
 Separate Dewatering Permit (if yes, permit number)      Yes  Permit # \_\_\_\_\_ No   
 Erosivity Waiver    Yes  Date: \_\_\_\_\_ No

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

*Betsy Ross*

*09/23/10*

[Betsy Ross), Registered Project Engineer/Landscape Architect      Date  
 I have reviewed the stormwater quality design issues and find this report to be complete, current and accurate:

*Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben*

*09/23/10*

[Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben), District/Regional SW      Date  
 Coordinator or Designee

[Stamp Required for PS&E only)

## 1. Project Description

This project proposes to place a microsurfacing seal coat consisting of asphaltic emulsion and aggregate on the existing pavement to prolong the life of the roadway in Sierra County near Sierra City on State Route (SR) 49 from 0.7 miles east of Gold Lake Road to the northern SR 49/89 junction. Prior to placing the microsurfacing, cracks will be sealed, and failed pavement will be replaced by grinding to a maximum depth of 3 inches and repaving with hot mix asphalt (HMA). Damaged asphalt concrete dikes will be replaced in kind, and shoulder backing will be constructed behind these dikes. All pavement delineation affected will be replaced in kind.

Per the EPA definition for the CGP, this project is considered routine maintenance because it maintains the original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, and original purpose of the facilities. This project provides preventative maintenance to existing highway facilities and will maintain existing facility functions. Since this project is routine maintenance, it is exempt from the Construction General Permit requirements.

Receiving water bodies for this project are Salmon Creek, Howard Creek, Haskell Creek, Chapman Creek, Lunch Creek, and the North Fork Yuba River. None of these is on the 2006 Clean Water Act 303(d) list for Water Quality Limited Segments or has a specified total maximum daily load.

This project should have minimal water quality impacts because it does not disturb soil and does not create any new impervious area. With the exception of temporary construction area sign placement and placement of shoulder backing behind HMA dikes, all work is within existing pavement limits and does not count toward the calculation of disturbed soil area. The project is not located within the area of a local Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permittee.

## 2. Construction Site BMPs

This project has no disturbed soil area, and therefore will require a Water Pollution Control Program rather than a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Because the project disturbs less than one acre of soil, neither a Rainfall Erosivity Waiver nor a Risk Assessment is required. Temporary construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) will minimize water pollution. The short construction period of two months during a time of year with little historical rainfall will further reduce the potential for water quality impacts. Projects with similar scope and range of construction activities typically require general housekeeping BMPs listed under Construction Site Management. Various waste management, materials handling and other housekeeping BMPs should be used throughout the duration of the project. Stockpiles are anticipated and should be maintained with the appropriate BMPs. Construction scheduling should be sequenced to minimize stormwater impacts.

The cost of stormwater BMPs was estimated using the Historical Project Method as outlined in Appendix F.6.2 of the Caltrans *Project Planning and Design Guide*. Items and costs were taken from the SR 89 Microsurfacing Project, a recent project of similar size and scope to this one that is approximately 15 miles to the north. The values reflect an average of all five bids. Because this is a recent project, cost indexes were not used to adjust for variations in construction costs over time.

Concurrence to utilize construction site management for all items was received via an email from William Alexander, the Caltrans Construction Storm Water Coordinator, on September 13 2010.

3. Required Attachments<sup>1</sup>

- Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form

4. Supplemental Attachments

- SWDR Tracking Form
- Water Pollution Control Cost Estimate (for Caltrans use only)

EXAMPLE ONLY

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional attachments may be required as applicable or directed by the District/Regional Design Storm Water Coordinator (e.g. BMP line item estimate, DPP, CS checklists, etc).



## Evaluation Documentation Form

DATE: 09-23-11

Project ID ( or EA): 03-XXXXXX

NO.	CRITERIA	YES ✓	NO ✓	SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION
1.	Begin Project Evaluation regarding requirement for consideration of Treatment BMPs	✓		See Figure 4-1, Project Evaluation Process for Consideration of Permanent Treatment BMPs. Go to 2
2.	Is this an emergency project?		✓	If Yes, go to 10. If No, continue to 3.
3.	Have TMDLs or other Pollution Control Requirements been established for surface waters within the project limits? Information provided in the water quality assessment or equivalent document.		✓	If Yes, contact the District/Regional NPDES Coordinator to discuss the Department's obligations under the TMDL (if Applicable) or Pollution Control Requirements, go to 9 or 4.  _____ (Dist./Reg. SW Coordinator initials) If No, continue to 4.
4.	Is the project located within an area of a local MS4 Permittee?		✓	If Yes. (write the MS4 Area here), go to 5. If No, document in SWDR go to 5.
5.	Is the project directly or indirectly discharging to surface waters?	✓		If Yes, continue to 6. If No, go to 10.
6.	Is it a new facility or major reconstruction?		✓	If Yes, continue to 8. If No, go to 7.
7.	Will there be a change in line/grade or hydraulic capacity?		✓	If Yes, continue to 8. If No, go to 10.
8.	Does the project result in a <u>net increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface</u> ?			If Yes, continue to 9. If No, go to 10.  _____ acres (Net Increase New Impervious Surface)
9.	Project is required to consider approved Treatment BMPs.			See Sections 2.4 and either Section 5.5 or 6.5 for BMP Evaluation and Selection Process. Complete Checklist T-1 in this Appendix E.
10.	Project is not required to consider Treatment BMPs.  FWS (Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. Initials) BR (Project Engineer Initials) 09/23/10 (Date)	✓		Document for Project Files by completing this form, and attaching it to the SWDR.

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

**EXAMPLE ONLY**

Report Date	Dist EA	District	EA	County	Route	Beg PM	End PM	Descrip	Phase	LongSWDR	PhaseRptDate	Exempt	TBMP	Pollution Program	Land Disturbance Acreage	AddImpArea	PercentTreated	MS4Area	MS4C/Co	Water Bodies Affected	Criteria	BioStrip	BioSwale	Detention	Infiltration	InfilTrench	GSRD	TST	DryWeath	MedFilter	MCTI	WetBasin	Const Start	Const Comp	SWComment
9/23/2010	03-XXXX	3	XXXXXX	Sie	49	35	47.4	Prevent	PAVED	FALSE	9/23/2010	TRUE	FALSE	WPCP	0	0	0	FALSE	Salmon Creek, Howard	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6/1/2011	8/1/2011		

EXAMPLE ONLY

**EXAMPLE ONLY**

**Water Pollution Control Cost Estimate FOR CALTRANS USE ONLY**

Historical Project Name/EA	BMP Description	Unit of Measurement	Unit Price	Total Dollar Amount
SR 89 Microsurfacing Project/XX-XXXXXX	Water Pollution Control (WPCP)	LS	5,000	\$ 5,000
SR 89 Microsurfacing Project/XX-XXXXXX	Construction Site Management	LS	8,000	\$ 8,000
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 13,000</b>

Notes:

Used Historical Project Cost as Outlined in Section F.6.2 of the PPDG  
 SR 89 Project is similar in size and scope

EXAMPLE ONLY



**EXAMPLE ONLY**