**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-Yub-65
Post Mile Limits: 2.9/R4.7
Project Type: Maintenance
Project ID (or EA): XXXXXXXXX
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 ☐ | No ☒ |
| 2. | Does the project disturb 5 or more acres of soil? | Yes ☐ | No ☒ |
| 3. | Does the project disturb more than 1 acre of soil and not qualify for the Rainfall Erosivity Waiver? | Yes ☐ | No ☒ |
| 4. | Does the project potentially create permanent water quality impacts? | Yes ☐ | No ☒ |
| 5. | Does the project require a notification of ADL reuse | Yes ☐ | No ☒ |

If the answer to any of the preceding questions is "Yes", prepare a Long Form – Storm Water Data Report.
Estimate Construction Start Date: 09/2011 Construction Completion Date: 10/2011
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 Coordinator or Designee* *Date*

*[Stamp Required for PS&E only)*

EXAMPLE ONLY

## 1. Project Description

This is a fully funded HM-1 Maintenance project located on State Route 65 (SR 65) near Wheatland, in Yuba County. This job is expected to begin construction in 2011. The limits are from PM 2.9 to R4.7. The approximate limits are from just north of Dairy Road to approximately 0.5 miles north of Rancho Road.

The existing road surface has deteriorated significantly. This project will replace asphalt concrete within the traveled way in order to preserve the structural section.

The work shall consist of the following activities:

- Cold plane to a maximum depth of 0.25 feet of the existing mainline asphalt surface
- Replace with hot mix asphalt
- Replace existing striping and markings in kind
- Replace center line rumble strip and striping 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. Because the project consists of work only on existing facilities and within existing paved areas, this project also qualifies for a Class 1 Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Because the work shall be confined to the traveled way, no soil disturbance is anticipated. There will be no shoulder backing or changes to the drainage profile. None of the work is scheduled to take place within any railroad right-of-way (R/W) or on bridge structures, and no permits are required. The only project pollutants anticipated are asphalt concrete (AC) grindings, striping paint and other miscellaneous non-stormwater pollutants the contractor may be using on-site.

The receiving water body for this project is Best Slough, which is not on the 2006 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. Because this project does not disturb soil or create new impervious area, the project should have minimal impacts to water quality.

This project is located within the Yuba County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit area.

## 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 there is no disturbed soil area, the project is also exempt from the Construction General Permit and associated risk assessment.

Because there is no disturbed soil area, erosion control is not anticipated to be necessary. Projects similar in size and scope typically require general good housekeeping practices such as proper waste management and materials handling. Stockpiles are anticipated and should be properly stored and protected. Construction sequencing should be scheduled to minimize potential stormwater impacts. The cost of stormwater BMPs was estimated using the Historical Project Method as outlined in Appendix F.6.2 of the PPDG. Items and costs were taken from the SR 191 Rehabilitation Project, a similarly sized asphalt rehabilitation project in nearby Butte County. The values reflect an average of the five lowest bids. Because this is a recent project, cost indexes were not used to adjust for variations in construction costs over time.

EXAMPLE ONLY

Concurrence to exclusively use these items was obtained during a meeting with William Alexander, the Caltrans Construction Storm Water Coordinator, on September 15, 2010. Mr. Alexander gave verbal concurrence to the project engineer and project manager, and this is documented in the meeting minutes.

## 3. Required Attachments[1]

- Vicinity Map
- Evaluation Documentation Form

## 4. Supplemental Attachments

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

EXAMPLE ONLY

[1] 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).

EXAMPLE ONLY

DATE: 09-23-10

Project ID ( or EA): XXXXXXXXX

| 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.<br>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.<br>____ *(Dist./Reg. SW Coordinator initials*)<br>If No, continue to 4. |
| 4. | Is the project located within an area of a local MS4 Permittee? | ✓ | | If **Yes**. *(Yuba County)*, go to 5.<br>If **No**, document in SWDR go to 5. |
| 5. | Is the project directly or indirectly discharging to surface waters? | ✓ | | If Yes, continue to 6.<br>If No, go to 10. |
| 6. | Is it a new facility or major reconstruction? | | ✓ | If Yes, continue to 8.<br>If No, go to 7. |
| 7. | Will there be a change in line/grade or hydraulic capacity? | | ✓ | If Yes, continue to 8.<br>If No, go to 10. |
| 8. | Does the project result in a net increase of one acre or more of new impervious surface? | | | If Yes, continue to 9.<br>If No, go to 10.<br>*0 acres (Net Increase New Impervious Surface)* |
| 9. | Project is required to consider approved Treatment BMPs. | | See Sections 2.4 and either Section 5.5or 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.<br>FWS *(Dist./Reg. Design SW Coord. Initials)*<br>BR *(Project Engineer Initials)*<br>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 BMP*

EXAMPLE ONLY

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 | MS4CiCo | Water Bodies Affected | Criteria | BioStrip | BioSwale | Detention | Infiltration | InfilTrench | GSRD | TST | DryWeath | MedFilter | MCTT | WetBasin | Const_Start | Const_Comp | SWComment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8/26/2010 | 03-XXXX | 3 | XXXXXX | Yub | 65 | 2.9 | R4.7 | Mainten | PID | FALSE | 8/26/2010 | TRUE | FALSE | WPCP | 0 | 0 | 0 | TRUE | Yuba | Best Slough | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9/1/2011 | 10/31/2011 | |

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 191 Rehabilitation Project | Water Pollution Control (WPCP) | LS | 2,500 | $ 2,500 |
| SR 191 Rehabilitation Project | Construction Site Management | LS | 5,000 | $ 5,000 |
| | | | **Total** | **$ 7,500** |

Notes:
Estimated using Historical Project Cost Method as outlined in Section F.6.2 of the PPDG
SR 191 Project is similar in size and scope

EXAMPLE ONLY

EXAMPLE ONLY