CITY OF TEMECULA
ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

Reporting Period
July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008

Santa Margarita River Watershed

FOR
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
(ORDER NO. R9-2004-001)

PREPARED
OCTOBER 22, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to ensure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Signature

Daniel A. York, City Engineer
Name and Title, Printed or Typed

October 30, 2008
Date

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This annual report represents the current status of the stormwater management program for the City of Temecula (City). This report covers the reporting period between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008. Each section addresses individual programs that were implemented in order to comply with the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm-Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Permit) issued to the Santa Margarita River (SMR) watershed permittees of Riverside County.

The Permit was issued on July 14, 2004 by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Board). Throughout this Permit term, the City has collected a considerable amount of data representing measurable metrics for the purpose of establishing baseline values that are intended to be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment. This data is presented in each section of this report and demonstrates the City's significant investment, positive accomplishments, and commitment in allocating resources to the stormwater program.

In addition to the facts and figures presented throughout this report, the City believes that other indicators provide a good indication of positive results. For example, field observations show that the City's persistent emphasis on education and enforcement is the most contributing factor in promoting and increasing compliance. For example, at active construction sites, superintendents are now enhancing their compliance efforts in order to avoid receiving fines, and have a broader understanding of the NPDES requirements as a result of all of the City's educational efforts. City inspectors have also become proficient at addressing BMP implementation issues due to all of the educational opportunities provided throughout the year.

The City has also observed an increase in awareness among the residential sector of the impacts caused by non-stormwater discharges. This has become quite apparent through a significant increase in the number of Service Order Requests (complaints that were forwarded to City Hall) that the City addressed this reporting period. These observations provide the City with positive feedback indicating that the education and enforcement components of the program are effective.

In addition, in-house support has increased significantly. The program now has full support throughout other City departments, which in turn translates into better cooperation and increased coordination among these departments. For example, the Engineering, Planning, Community Services, and Fire departments now work closely together to ensure that WQMP requirements are addressed early-on into each project to avoid design conflicts during the application and plancheck processes. In essence, the Stormwater Unit has now become a City-wide Stormwater Program.

The City is also partnering with local water districts to address excess irrigation runoff from residential areas, and with the principle permittee to enhance the regional monitoring efforts. As such, the City's limited resources are focusing on a purpose-driven strategy in order to allocate resources in areas requiring the most attention.

In addition to the above accomplishments, the following items represent the significant changes, highlights, and observations noted during the current reporting period.

- The City witnessed a significant decline in the number of issued grading permits and conditioned Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs).
- The number of construction inspections and citations increased.
- Updates were made to the Grading Ordinance, Grading Manual, and standard ESC notes.
- The program was enhanced to include Wet-weather inspections at City-owned, non-construction, vacant properties.
- The program was also enhanced to include stricter Wet-weather inspections at City-owned construction projects.
- The California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Best Management Practices (BMP) Handbook was adopted as the City's set of BMP standards.
- The City completed all High, Medium, and Low-priority business inspections.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The information contained herein is presented in the same format as that outlined in Section III of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) of the City's Permit. Each section addresses individual components of the Permit and summarizes the progress accomplished during the reporting period. These sections include the City's Development Planning process, Construction program, Municipal program, Industrial and Commercial program, Residential program, Education program, and Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program (IC/ID), respectively.

This Annual Report specifically responds to the Permit's reporting requirements and identifies the program's progress and effectiveness. This report will be the third year that the new Permit programs are fully implemented and effectiveness data is collected to establish baseline conditions. The Permit also requires the Permittees to develop a long term strategy for addressing the effectiveness of each jurisdiction's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP). The SWMP represents each jurisdiction's set of written policies and procedures for each component outlined in the Permit. To that end, the Permittees have developed a long term strategy to evaluate the effectiveness of the SWMPs.

The long term strategy for the program effectiveness assessment (PEA) will be conducted at two levels described below. It should be noted that a PEA requires the initial establishment of a set of baseline conditions using measurable metrics. These baseline conditions can then be used to establish measurable goals based on the measured metrics. Thereafter, effectiveness can be evaluated by comparisons of successive years of measurable metrics against the baseline data and measurable goals.

At the first level, or Annual Assessment Level, the PEA will focus on an annual assessment of program implementation and Permit compliance. These assessments will be addressed by completing the Annual Reporting Forms, which will confirm program implementation, Permit compliance, and collection of measurable metrics. These assessments are included at the end of each Annual Report section. Inferences about the compliance of each program (new development, construction, IC/ID, etc.) will predominantly be drawn from both direct and indirect measures of progress for each program.

At the second level, or Long Term Level, the Permittees will collectively evaluate the measurable metrics to assess potential changes in knowledge and behavior, load reductions and improvements in Receiving Water Quality. This long-term analysis will be conducted as part of the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). The results of this long-term assessment will be evaluations of the need to make significant programmatic revisions to the Permit compliance programs, as necessary, to protect Beneficial Uses of Receiving Waters. This level will place more emphasis on using direct measures of progress (monitoring data, long term trend analysis) and will support the review and any revisions to the Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) and Individual SWMPs using information from the measurable metrics that have been collected.

Where the period of evaluation is characterized by the implementation of new program requirements, determinations of program effectiveness will initially be limited to confirmation of program implementation and collection of measurable metrics until baseline conditions can be properly established. Further, it must be recognized that direct measures related to long term program effectiveness may not be available within the timeframe of the Third Term Permit. This arises because:

- Baseline water quality conditions are not readily established;
- Water quality changes in response to program implementation are likely to be very slow; and
- Establishing a link between receiving water condition and program activities is difficult at the watershed scale when programs are being implemented incrementally with the development/redevelopment cycle.

While program effectiveness assessment is a key step in the iterative process of program implementation, it should be realized that effectiveness assessment itself is a part of the management process that is also evolving. Assessing program effectiveness is recognized as a challenge for program managers across California, and the City of Temecula is supporting the effort of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) to develop guidance in this area at a statewide level.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROGRAM

1) Description of any amendments to the General Plan or the development project approval process:

General Plan – There were no modifications to the General Plan during this reporting period.

Development Projects – There were no modifications to the development project approval process during this reporting period.

2) Number of grading permits issued:

TABLE 3-1

Fiscal Year	Permits Issued
2007 – 2008	28
2006 – 2007	38
2005 – 2006	62
2004 – 2005	76

Attachment A includes the list of grading permits issued during this reporting period.

3) Number of developments conditioned to meet WQMP requirements:

TABLE 3-2

Fiscal Year	Projects Requiring a WQMP (1)	Projects Conditioned for a WQMP (2)	Finalized WQMPs (4)
2007-2008	15	5	17
2006-2007	25	14	15
2005-2006	31	31	5
2004-2005	Not Applicable	30 (3)	Not Applicable

(1) These values show all proposed projects requiring WQMPs at the application stage.
(2) The difference between "Projects Requiring a WQMP' and 'Projects Conditioned for a WQMP' is that many projects became inactive prior to reaching the conditioning stage or were delayed into the next reporting period.
(3) These projects required treatment BMPs prior to the start of the WQMP Program.
(4) Most of these projects had been conditioned during the previous reporting periods.

A WQMP tracking log is included in Attachment A and lists all projects, both private and public, requiring a WQMP. In addition, a tally of all WQMPs accepted, to-date, by the City is also included. This tally provides a monthly breakdown, by land-use category (residential, business, municipal), of the number of WQMPs that have been accepted.

4) Attach one example of a development project that was conditioned to meet WQMP requirements and a description of the required BMPs:

Attachment A includes an approved COA for a new development that was conditioned with the WQMP requirement. The project consisted of expanding the parking lot of an existing Kaiser

medical office building site. The WQMP requirement is referenced in line-items 17, 64, and 65 under the 'General Requirements' section. The BMPs consisted of a perimeter infiltration swale located along the frontage of the site, and another within a landscape median in parking lot itself. Each swale was designed with a catch basin inlet to prevent potential flooding. These inlets were required to be protected with filters to prevent larger trash and debris from exiting the site.

5) Description of any updates to the environmental review process:

There have been no updates to the City's CEQA process during this reporting period.

6) Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period:

a) Training:

TABLE 3-3

Training Dates	Training Description (1)	Number of Staff Attended
3/27/08	LID Workshop	1
4/22/08	LID Workshop	3
12/5/07	Annual WQMP Refresher	19
11/28/07	Annual WQMP Refresher	1
9/10/07	CASQA Conference	2
6/27/07	LID Workshop	1
9/25/06	CASQA Conference	1
6/21/06	Annual WQMP Refresher	26
10/3/05	CASQA Conference	2
5/4/05	Annual WQMP Refresher	19
12/15/04	Annual WQMP Refresher	1
12/10/04	Annual WQMP Refresher	3

(1) – 'Annual Refresher' refers to the sessions conducted by the Principle Permittee.

A copy of the City's NPDES Training Log is included in Attachment A.

b) Summarize any additional education and outreach activities conducted for project applicants, contractors, developers, property owners, and/or other responsible parties in support of the Development Planning Component:

The City's WQMP requirement began on July 1, 2005. WQMP notification flyers continued to be posted at the Public Works and Planning counters throughout this reporting period and on the City's web site. The City's website also includes the County-wide WQMP design

handbook, a downloadable project-specific WQMP template, WQMP checklists, and links to CASQA's BMP handbooks.

7) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment as required in the MS4 Permit.

Due to the current economic conditions throughout this region, the City witnessed a decline in the number of issued grading permits by 35% and conditioned WQMPs by 64% during this reporting period. The City continued to capture all projects meeting the WQMP requirements. This is due to the fact that the City established an across-the-board minimum threshold for applying WQMP requirements of 5,000 square feet of impervious surface, and 2,500 square feet if the project is located within an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). This threshold is more restrictive than that of the MS4 Permit and has been effective in preventing development projects from circumventing the WQMP requirements. Since the beginning of the current Permit term, the City has captured 70 development projects meeting the City's more restrictive WQMP criteria. In addition, as Table 3-3 demonstrates, City staff have been attending workshops, conferences, seminars, and annual refresher courses to ensure that projects correctly identify and address their treatment needs.

4.0 CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted:

TABLE 4-1

Fiscal Year	Private	Public	Total Inspections Conducted
2007 – 2008	2949	145	3,094
2006 – 2007	*	*	2,976
2005 – 2006	*	*	2,154
2004 – 2005	*	*	1,647

* Previous tallys did not differentiate between private versus public projects.

Attachment B includes the tally of Total NPDES Construction Inspections performed during this reporting period. This list is based on the City's monthly NPDES Inspection Frequency Sheets, of which September's set is provided in Attachment B. These sheets provide a project-by-project break-down of the number of inspections conducted during the month and grouped by project priority (high, medium, low), and enforcement actions.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions related to construction sites:

TABLE 4-2

Enforcement Action	Private Projects			Public Projects		
	05-06	06-07	07-08	05-06	06-07	07-08
Verbal Warning	268	633	630	16	43	55
Written Warning	414	116	132	18	7	3
Fines	66	22	71	1	2	1
Stop Work Authority	0	*	*	0	*	*
Permit Revocation/Certificate of Occupancy Denial	0	*	*	0	*	*
Referral to SDRWQCB	0	*	*	0	*	*

* These measures were not required.

3) Description of modifications made to the construction and grading approval process:

During this reporting period, enhancements to this component included the following:

1) Updates to the City's existing Grading Ordinance and Grading Manual. These revisions will go into effect by the end of the current calendar year. These updates include revisions to the NPDES Chapter and will reflect successful and reasonable field practices observed since the previous round of revisions.

2) Updates to the City's existing standard Erosion and sediment Control Notes. These revisions will go into effect by the end of the current calendar year. These updates will reflect successful and reasonable field practices observed since the previous round of revisions.

3) Wet-weather inspections at City-owned, non-construction, vacant properties. It must be noted that the MS4 Permit does not specify inspection obligations at sites that do not require grading, building, or State permits, are vacant, or do not have any ongoing or immediately proposed construction activities. As such, the City implemented this enhancement to the program to further ensure adequate protection of our local waterways. The task primarily consisted of identifying all city-owned vacant properties within and immediately surrounding the City limits, determining which properties required erosion and sediment controls, installing BMPs where deemed necessary, and establishing an inspection frequency schedule as that outlined in the MS4 permit. Currently, BMPs have been implemented at sites that could potentially cause sediment releases.

4) Wet-weather inspections at City-owned construction projects. The City placed an added emphasis on ensuring adequate protection at City-owned active construction projects.

5) Updates to the NPDES Inspection Frequency sheets. These sheets now consolidate all active municipal construction projects into a single section to ensure adequate inspection coverage of these types of projects.

6) Adopting the CASQA BMP Handbook. The CASQA BMP Handbook for Construction Activities now serves as the City's uniform set of standards for construction BMPs.

4) Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period.

a) Training

TABLE 4-3

Training Dates	Training Description	Number of Staff Attended
3/18/08	International Erosion Control Association Seminar	2
2/29/08	BIA SWPPP Workshop	1
1/17/08	Annual ESC Refresher	13

8/22/07	Inland Erosion's Annual SWPPP Seminar	20
10/18/06	Annual ESC Refresher	29
9/28/05	Annual ESC Refresher	3
8/29/05	Inland Erosion's Annual SWPPP Seminar	15
5/3/05	Annual ESC Refresher	7
3/2/05	Annual ESC Refresher	2
8/18/04	Inland Erosion's Annual SWPPP Seminar	30

A copy of the City's NPDES Training Log is included in Attachment A.

b) Summarize any additional education and outreach activities conducted for project applicants, contractors, developers, property owners, and/or other responsible parties in support of the Construction Component:

1) As of September 6, 2007, the City began hand-delivering the City's annual NPDES notification letter to each active construction site currently inspected for NPDES compliance. This letter is a formal notification to all active projects obligating each one to: 1) implement pollution prevention measures year-round, 2) install additional wet-weather BMPs by October 1st, and 3) adhere to the State General Construction Permit, if applicable. All of the active sites that were listed on the September 2007 NPDES Inspection Frequency Sheets, included in Attachment B, were provided a notification letter. At a minimum, approximately 90 letters were delivered to field superintendents. These included both private and public projects. Additional letters were also forwarded to contractors working at these sites. A copy of this letter is included in Attachment B. The City's latest letter (dated August 25, 2008) added the requirement for enhanced protection at developments that were abandoned or have become partially inactive.

2) The City also participated with the Building Industry Association's (BIA) annual all-day Construction Stormwater Compliance Workshop on February 29, 2008 in riverside as a keynote speaker. The City distributed BIA's flyers for this workshop to all active projects in Temecula.

3) The City also distributed Inland Erosion's flyer for their Annual Erosion Compliance Seminar on August 22, 2007.

5) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment as required in the MS4 Permit.

Overall, the City improved this component from the previous reporting period by increasing inspections by approximately 4%. The issuance of citations increased by 300%. Additional data is required to determine if increased inspections correlate to an increase or a decrease in citations.

The City also continued to make every attempt to contact owners of inactive projects to repair, replace, and/or enhance the BMPs at their sites. Unfortunately, many owners walked away from their projects, which in turn began delaying crucial compliance efforts. It should be noted that the City also identified vacant parcels that were not construction projects. Although these vacant parcels fall outside of the Permit's construction component, the City actively pursued the responsible parties in efforts to minimize any discharges. Unfortunately, the City's resources are finite and the time required for effective BMP implementation at these sites have extended beyond expectations by the City as well as by the Regional Board.

All in all, field observations indicated that the development community, in general, has become more knowledgeable with the NPDES requirements throughout this Permit term.

5.0 MUNICIPAL PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted at existing Municipal facilities:

The City conducts inspections at all facilities owned or maintained by the City. Inspection frequencies vary between facility category. A detailed listing of these categories is presented in Appendix B of the SWMP. For example, the corporate yard, fire stations, City Hall, and other buildings are maintained daily; parks and landscaped areas are maintained weekly; catch basins and open channels are inspected twice annually; and inspections for streets, curbs, and gutters are addressed weekly through the street sweeping program.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions related to municipal construction sites:

TABLE 5-1

Enforcement Action	Active Construction Projects		
	05-06	06-07	07-08
Verbal Warning	16	43	55
Written Warning	18	7	3
Fines	1	2	1
Stop Work Authority	0	(1)	(1)
Permit Revocation/Certificate of Occupancy Denial	0	(1)	(1)
Referral to SDRWQCB	0	(1)	(1)

(1) These measures were not required.

3) Number of catch basins that were inspected and the number that were cleaned:

TABLE 5-2

	Total on GIS Map (1)	Total in the City (2)	City-Maintained Catchbasins	Minimum Number Inspected (3)	Number Cleaned
2007-2008	1975	1901	1,600	3,200	1,828
2006-2007	1,964	*	1,600	3,200	1,974
2005-2006	*	*	*	3,928	2,946

* Not Available.

(1) Consists of all catch basins located within the City limits and in future surrounding annexation areas.

(2) Consists of all catch basins (city, Caltrans, HOA, etc.) located within the City limits only.
(3) Catch Basins are inspected twice per fiscal year.

All of the 1,600 city-maintained catchbasins currently documented on the City's GIS map were visited twice during the reporting period. Many catchbasins required cleaning during both visits, while others did not. The City maintains a monthly catch basin maintenance log that lists dates, locations, and number of catch basins maintained. Maintenance includes inspections, cleaning, and stencil replacement if required. These stencils are placed at the top of each catchbasin opening and state "Only Rain In The Drain". An example of the monthly log is included in Attachment C.

4) Assessment of the amount and type of debris removed from catch basins, streets, and open channels, including identification of areas that generate the most pollutants:

TABLE 5-3

Facility	Type of Debris	Approx. %	Problem Areas that Generate Most Pollutants
Catch basins (1)	Anthropogenic Litter Green Waste Sediment	25 70 5	Residential and Commercial Total Removed: 180 CY
Street Sweeping (3)	Litter and Sediment	100	Total Removed: 1,761 Tons(2)
Open Channels (1)	Anthropogenic Litter Green Waste Sediment	7 3 90	Natural channels Total Removed: 4,000 CY

Notes:
(1) – These figures are provided by the Maintenance Division of the PW Department.
(2) – This figure is provided by Temecula Community Services Department's "City of Temecula Tonnage Report".
(3) – Street sweeping areas consist of all paved city-maintained streets. Currently, street sweeping is conducted on 283 miles of paved streets.

5) Assessment of effectiveness of BMPs implemented for municipal facilities and activities:

TABLE 5-4

BMP Code	Description	Used	Notes
SC-10	Non-Stormwater Discharges	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-11	Spill Prevention, Control and Clean-up	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-20	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling	☐ Yes ☒ N/A	Fueling is conducted offsite
SC-21	Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning	☒ Yes ☐ No	Oil/Water Separator and Stormcepter systems collect all discharges.
SC-22	Vehicle and Equipment Repair	☐ Yes ☒ N/A	Repairs are conducted offsite
SC-30	Outdoor Loading/Unloading of Materials	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-31	Outdoor Liquid Container Storage	☒ Yes ☐ No	Stored in water-tight bins.
SC-32	Outdoor Equipment Maintenance	☐ Yes ☒ N/A	Repairs are conducted offsite
SC-33	Outdoor Storage of Raw Materials	☒ Yes ☐ No	New facility has been constructed to cover all maintenance equipment
SC-34	Waste Handling and Disposal	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-35	Safe Alternative Products	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-40	Contaminated or Erodible Areas	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-41	Building and Grounds Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-42	Building Repair and Construction	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-43	Parking/Storage Area Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-44	Drainage System Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-60	Housekeeping Practices	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-61	Safe Alternative Products	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-70	Road and Street Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-71	Plaza and Sidewalk Cleaning	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-72	Fountain and Pool Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-73	Landscape Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-74	Drainage System Maintenance	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-75	Waste Handling and Disposal	☒ Yes ☐ No	
SC-76	Water and Sewer Utility Maintenance	☐ Yes ☒ N/A	Provided by RCWD and EMWD

6) Description and number of municipal employee training efforts conducted during the reporting period.

a) Training:

TABLE 5-5

Training Dates	Training Description	Number of Staff Attended
01/17/08	Annual Refresher	29

10/18/06	Annual Refresher	7
04/27/06	Annual Refresher	20
09/26/05	Annual Refresher	4
05/03/05	Annual Refresher	16
10/21/04	Annual Refresher	8

A copy of the City's tracking log for staff training is included in Attachment A.

b) Summarize any additional education and outreach activities conducted for municipal staff in support of the Municipal Component:

The City's field crews undergo continuous informal training throughout the year, on an as-needed basis, as they encounter field conditions requiring BMPs.

7) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, and 5-5 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment as required in the MS4 Permit.

Overall, education was the key element to this component. The City improved this component by empowering the field crews to conduct their own NPDES field inspections. This allowed them to claim ownership for adequate BMP implementation at each of their sites. This action allowed the team members to increase their level of awareness and expertise in implementing BMPs.

6.0 INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL PROGRAM

1) Number of inspections conducted:

TABLE 6-1

	Category			
	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Total Inspections
2007-2008	73	141	147	361
2006-2007	266	61	96	423
2005-2006	252	52	1	305

The City completed all of the annual high, medium, and low-priority inspections this reporting period. These inspections uncovered various facilities that were in different stages of compliance. Each active facility was provided educational materials (brochures), a completed written inspection, a brief explanation of the State and City requirements, and suggestions for BMP implementation. The inspection forms served to document the current conditions at each facility, including any deficiencies observed and areas for improvement. An example of completed inspection forms is included in Attachment D. Follow-up visits were also conducted at specific sites to ensure that these were actively pursuing total compliance. The City's current prioritized inventory of industrial and commercial facilities and the current inspection forms are located in Appendix D of the SWMP.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions taken:

TABLE 6-2

Enforcement Action	05-06	06-07	07-08
Education and Information (1) (3)	305	380	325
Verbal Warning (1) (3)	305	380	325
Written Warning (1) (3)	305	380	325
Fines	8	1	(2)
Business License Denial	(2)	(2)	(2)
Referral to SDRWQCB	(2)	(2)	(2)

1) Education, verbal and written warnings are all addressed through the NPDES Inspection forms. As such, these numbers will be the same for the specific reporting period.
2) These measures were not required.
3) The inspections revealed that approximately 10% of the businesses moved, closed, or had become home-based at the time of the inspections. As such, the number of enforcement actions is less than the total number of inspections.

4) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 6-1 and 6-2 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment as required in the MS4 Permit.

Overall, the City improved this component by completing all of the inspections at each of the inspection priority (high, medium, low) facilities. This cross-section of inspections appears to have been a contributing factor in downgrading enforcement actions to simply verbal and written notices. The collective inspection efforts between the City's business inspection program and the County's Department of Environmental Health (specifically, Haz Mat and Food Services groups) also appear to have encouraged business owners to minimize, and in many instances prevent, discharges and the accumulation of trash and debris. As a result, these repeated inspections have caused the business community, in general, to become aware of the City's NPDES requirements since the start of the business inspection program back in 2005.

7.0 RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM

1) A description of residential areas that were focused on during the past year:

Throughout the previous reporting periods, the City focused on residential areas that had recently been granted occupancies. For the most part, these new neighborhoods generated construction-related discharges due to improvements (pools, patios, hardscape, and other activities requiring a city permit) incurred by the new homeowners. In this annual report, all enforcement actions related to permitted construction activities throughout the residential areas have been shifted to Section 4, under the Construction Program.

For the current reporting period, the City focused on high priority residential activities within existing residential areas that could potentially contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4. According to the MS4 permit, these activities consist of automobile repair, maintenance, washing, parking; garden care; disposal of household waste, pet waste, and green waste; and any other residential source that may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4. As such, NPDES staff addressed all concerns and complaints associated with the activities listed above. Each concern or complaint was logged into the City as a Service Order Request (SOR). Each SOR was addressed within 24 hours. Follow-up visits were conducted on an as-needed basis within 72 hours. These SORs were received from throughout the City and did not provide any indication of any specific residential areas requiring special attention. The City's existing residential efforts are presented in Section 9.0 of the SWMP under Residential Sources.

2) Number and type of enforcement actions taken:

TABLE 7-1

Enforcement Action	07-08
Education and Information	(1)
Verbal Warning	(1)
Written Warning (2)	12
Fines	4

(1) Brochures and verbal warnings were provided on an as-needed, drive-by basis.
(2) Written Warnings were issued when responsible parties could not be contacted.

3) An assessment of program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 7-1 and 7-2 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment as required in the MS4 Permit.

TABLE 7-2

	Residential SORs Received	Trash/Recyclables/Green Waste (Tons)
2007-2008	72	52,277
2006-2007	41	53,692
2005-2006	28	54,429
2004-2005	Not documented	Not documented

Overall, the City continued improving this component from the previous reporting period by further educating staff responsible for collecting SOR information to identify incoming calls associated with NPDES issues. All calls associated with NPDES issues are now being documented as formal written Service Order Requests. As such, staff have increased their base knowledge with the NPDES requirements.

4) Additional Comments/Information:

Public outreach was implemented through the following information and events:

1) Newsletter, Magazines, Flyers. The City's "Inside Temecula" newsletter, "Guide to Leisure Living Activities" guide, "CityWide Clean-up" flyers, and Household Hazardous Waste Collection" flyers were distributed to all City residents during the reporting period. Information pertaining to stormwater, recycling, hazardous waste disposal, community clean-up events, greenwaste management, landscape maintenance, street sweeping, etc. were provided. Relevant sections from the newsletter, guides, and flyers are included in Attachment E.

2) City-Sponsored Clean-Up Events. The City sponsored two community clean-up events on October 20, 2007 and on May 17, 2008.

3) County-Sponsored Household Hazardous Waste Collection Events. City-Hall served as the location for three clean-up events on September 15, 2007, January 19, 2008, and on May 17, 2008.

8.0 EDUCATION PROGRAM

1) Description of education efforts conducted by the Permittee (not collectively with other Permittees) during the previous year:

TABLE 8-1

Audience	Measures
Permittee Departments and Personnel	Number of Permittee employees trained for: • Construction Inspection: * • Industrial/Commercial Inspection: * • Municipal Facilities and Activities: * • Development Planning: * * - City staff are provided with informal in-house training on an individual and as-needed basis. These one-on-one opportunities are not formally documented. However, all formal classroom-type workshops are conducted and documented thru the regional education program administered by the Principle Permitee and paid with contributions from all permittees.
Construction Site Owners and Developers	Outreach: 1) Distributed the City's annual NPDES notification letter to all active projects. 2) Distributed BIA's annual workshop flyer to all active projects. 3) Distributed Inland Erosion's annual workshop flyer to all active projects.
Industrial/ Commercial Owners and Operators	Outreach: 1) Conducted inspections at 361 businesses. 2) Provided educational brochures and written inspection notices at each active facility.
Residential Community, General Public, Other Public Agencies and Students	Number of Media Impressions: • Newspaper: Refer to Watershed Report • Mailings: All outreach material was hand-delivered. • Radio/TV: Refer to Watershed Report • Web Site: In place. • Billboards: Refer to Watershed Report • Brochures: Distributed but not documented Classroom Presentations: 54 presentations were conducted at 6 elementary schools in Temecula during this reporting period. The City contributes funds for NPDES-related presentations at elementary schools. These

	presentations are conducted by the Mission Resource Conservation District through the Principle Permittee. Public Education Events: 1) City-sponsored "City-Wide Cleanup'. 2) County-sponsored 'Household Hazardous Waste Collection'. 3) Earth Day at the Promenade Mall. 4) Temecula Wine and Balloon Festival.

2) Assessment of overall program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:

The information provided in tables 8-1 and 8-2 represents measurable data that the City collected in order to begin establishing baseline values that will be used as the basis for the long-term effectiveness assessment required in the MS4 Permit.

TABLE 8-2

Total Staff Trained (Workshops conducted by the Principle Permittee)				
	New Development	Construction	Municipal	Commercial/ Industrial
2007-2008	20	33	29	1
2006-2007	(1)	29	7	(2)
2005-2006	26	18	24	1
2004-2005	23	39	24	1

(1) – Staff attended training within the calendar year but not within this specific reporting period.
(2) - The City contracted with AEI-CASC to conduct all business inspections. As such, municipal staff do not conduct these inspections.

Table 8-2 shows that City staff have been receiving formal training on an annual basis, at a minimum. Overall, the City continued maintaining a high level of attendance among each training category. Staff have also attended additional workshops hosted by other organizations such as CASQA, BIA, State Water Resources Control Board, universities, etc. These additional efforts are documented in each separate training table throughout this report. Various divisions are represented in each of these training categories; Land Development, Capital Improvement Projects, Public Works Maintenance, NPDES, Community Services, Code Enforcement, and Planning. Throughout this permit term, and through these workshops, the City has become increasingly aware of the NPDES requirements. This awareness has translated into increased efforts to achieve compliance as compared to previous permit terms. As such, the City will continue its current efforts into the subsequent reporting period.

9.0 ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION PROGRAM

1) Number of times City Hall was notified (calls, e-mail, walk-ins, etc.) during the reporting period, as compared to previous reporting periods.

TABLE 9-1

	NPDES Service Orders Requests
2007-2008	106
2006-2007	41
2005-2006	24
2004-2005	74

2) Number of illicit discharges, connections and spills reported and/or identified during the reporting period:

TABLE 9-2 (1)

	Illicit Discharges	Illicit Connections	Sewage Spills
2007-2008	60	1	0
2006-2007	22	0	2
2005-2006	24	0	0
2004-2005	74	0	2

(1) - Based on Service Order Requests (SORs)

3) Number of illicit discharges or connections investigated during the reporting period and the outcome of the investigations:

All SORs were addressed. Many of the discharges were related to irrigation breaks, or were no longer evident, or had been mitigated prior to the initial site visit. Many of the SORs were disputes between neighbors, while others were called-in as leaks from parked vehicles. Citations were issued against blatant discharges of paints, oils, cements, and pet waste.

4) Number and types of enforcement actions taken for illicit discharges or connections during the reporting period:

TABLE 9-3

Enforcement and Compliance Responses	Private Facilities	Public Facilities
Non-monetary penalties	54	0 (1)
Fines (Residential & Business)	6	0 (1)

(1) – There were no SORs associated with public facilities this reporting period.

5) Number and location of dry weather monitoring sites that were monitored during the reporting period:

Since the beginning of the current permit term, and in concurrence with Regional Board staff at the time of the permit issuance, the City of Temecula has been monitoring 4 sites. These sites consist of the following primary locations:

1. Empire Creek at the Del Rio bridge.
2. Pechanga Parkway stormdrain channel upgradient to the confluence into Temecula Creek.
3. Pechanga Creek at the Rainbow Canyon bridge.
4. Temecula Creek slightly upgradient to the confluence Murrieta Creek.

In addition, the Riverside County Flood Control District selected four separate sites throughout the City that are also monitored in like manner. Their sites consist of the following locations:

1. Long Canyon Wash at the Commerce Center Drive bridge.
2. Murrieta Creek at the USGS station at the end of Pujol street.
3. Redhawk Parkway stormdrain channel near the confluence with Temecula Creek.
4. Santa Gertrudis Creek at the Jefferson Avenue bridge.

The station locations were selected based on the following criteria:

- *Accessibility.* Per the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Part II.B.1.a, all of the stations are open channels, are readily accessible points to City staff, and are located downstream of potential illicit discharges.

- *Assessment of Illegal Discharges.* Since each station is located within a watercourse, these points represent confluences for storm drain lines, catch basins, improved channels, natural tributary drainage courses, outfalls, etc. As such, each location is a critical point in the drainage course of each sub-watershed within the City in which illegal discharges can readily be detected at a single location.

- *Integration with Principle Permittee's stations.* The City coordinated with the Principle Permitee to provide coverage necessary to adequately represent the entire MS4 (MRP II.B.1.a) throughout the City. As such, the City and Principle Permittee collectively monitor a total of eight stations throughout the City.

- *Establishing Numeric Criteria.* These stations were selected based on conditions at each site that would ensure consistency at each station each year. This approach was intended to establish baseline values that could be used in determining meaningful numeric criteria rather than collecting random data from random samples at random locations that have little to no connectivity.

The latest version of the City's Dry-Weather Illicit Discharge Monitoring Log is presented in Appendix E of the SWMP. The results of the field activities conducted during this reporting period are presented in Attachment F herein.

6) **Summary of Illicit Discharge Monitoring Program results, including: 1) All inspection, field screening, and analytical monitoring results; 2) All follow-up and elimination activities; and 3) Any proposed changes to station locations and/or sampling frequencies:**

TABLE 9-4

Date (1)	Location	Monitoring Results	Follow-up and Elimination Activities	Proposed Changes
August 27, 2007	Primary Locations	No indications of illicit discharges	None	No Changes Comment(s):
June 15, 2007	Primary Locations	No indications of illicit discharges	None	No Changes Comment(s):

(1) - Section II.B.1.a of the MRP requires two (at a minimum) sampling events between May 1 and September 30.

7) **Assessment of the overall program effectiveness based on the measurable goals established in the SWMP:**

Overall, all of the primary dry-weather monitoring locations were monitored, and all SORs were investigated. The City did not encounter any illicit connections into or at any of the monitoring locations, and all of the SORs resulted in either verbal, written, or monetary enforcement actions. Although the number of SORs increased by 259% from the previous reporting period, the number of citations remained the same. Additional data is obviously necessary to attempt to correlate the number of SORs with the number of illicit discharges, or citations with increases or decreases in compliance. To date, this data is inconclusive. The City is in the process of identifying either additional monitoring locations or alternate stations that will represent the upper portions of the City's drainage systems in order to enhance this component. This will further be addressed in the upcoming ROWD.

10.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1) A description of efforts to include the public in urban runoff management programs during the reporting period.

The City conducted various outreach efforts to the public this reporting period. The most visible programs consisted of the community clean-up activities on September 15, 2007, October 20, 2007, May 17, 2008, January 19, 2008, and on May 17, 2008. The less visible programs included personal contact with the public regarding pollution prevention. These opportunities were conducted thru the business inspections, responses to Service Order Requests, in-house meetings with project applicants, and field meetings with developers.

11.0 ASSESSMENT OF OVERALL SWMP EFFECTIVENESS

The SWMP continued to be implemented in its entirety this reporting period. Each section provides sufficient detail to successfully implement each of the components of the permit.

12.0 FISCAL ANALYSIS

1) A summary of the reporting period's expenditures and estimated budget for the upcoming reporting period.

Program Element	Fiscal Year 2006-2007		Fiscal Year 2007-2008		Fiscal Year 2008-2009 (Estimated)	
	Capital Expenditures	Capital Expenditures	Capital Expenditures	O&M/Admin Expenditure	Capital Expenditures	O&M/Admin Expenditure
Program Management (1)	--	118,261	--	122,747	--	126,836
Annual Fee for NPDES Permit from SWRCB	--	11,109 (actual invoice)	--	11,109 (actual invoice)	--	14,875
Implementation Agreement (I.A.) Shared Cost	--	129,769	--	130,173	--	163,768
Construction Inspections (2)	--	62,798	--	63,163	--	65,389
Development Planning (WQMP reviews)	--	12,224 (3a)	--	10,000 (3a)	--	30,000 (3b)
Industrial and Commercial Inspections (4)	--	51,791	--	70,000	--	60,000
IC/ID Program	--	1,000	--	1,000	--	1,000
Municipal Programs (PW Maint) (5)	--	150,000 (Dryer than average Wet-Weather Season)	--	400,000	--	400,000
Municipal Programs (TCSD) (6)	--	6,381,136	--	7,134,931	--	7,848,424
Public Outreach (i.e. classrooms, brochures, etc.)	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.
Monitoring Program	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.	--	Included in the I.A.
Other (7)	--	30,000	--	30,000	--	30,000
Total (8)		**$566,952**		**$838,192**		**$891,868**
Grand Total	**$ 0**	**$6,948,088**	**$ 0**	**$7,973,123**	**$ 0**	**$8,740,292**

Notes:
(1) This cost reflects program administrator time.
(2) This costs reflects NPDES inspector time plus 10K vehicle expenses
(3a) This cost reflects out-sourced WQMP reviews
(3b) This cost reflects in-house staff time based on one WQMP per month.
(4) This cost reflects out-sourced inspection services
(5) This cost reflects drainage channel clearing and catchbasin maintenance.
(6) This cost reflects the operating budgets for refuse/recycling, street sweeping, landscape/slope programs through Temecula Community Services District.
(7) This cost reflects staff's time for formal classroom training, conferences, inspection forms, citation books, mailings, etc.
(8) This total does not include the refuse/recycling, street sweeping, landscape/slope programs.

2) A description of the source(s) of funds that were utilized during the previous fiscal year and the source(s) of funds proposed to meet the necessary expenditures for the subsequent year, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.

Source of Funds	Percent of Program Funding	Restrictions on Use (if applicable)
General Fund	93	Allocations to other departments and divisions.
WQMP Review Fees	4	Based on project size
ESC Review Fees	3	Based on project's cost estimate

13.0 NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES

Permittees shall report on any discharge category listed in Requirement B.2 of Order No. R9-2004-001 that was identified as a source of pollutants during the reporting period. For each identified category, the Permittee shall report whether it elected to prohibit the discharge or to require BMPs to reduce pollutants in the discharge to the MEP. If the discharge is not prohibited, the BMPs that will be implemented, or required to be implemented, shall be described in each SWMP Annual Report.

Category	Prohibited	BMP to be Implemented
Diverted stream flows	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Rising ground waters	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Uncontaminated ground water infiltration [as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)] to MS4s	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Uncontaminated pumped ground water	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Foundation drains	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Springs	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Water from crawl space pumps (Identified as a source of pollutants when commingled with construction-related sediment).	☐ Yes ☒ No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Footing drains	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Air conditioning condensation	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Water line flushing. (Identified as a source of pollution when commingled with construction-related sediment).	☐ Yes ☒ No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Landscape irrigation	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Discharges from potable water sources not subject to NPDES Permit No. CAG679001, other than water main breaks. (Identified as a source of pollutants when commingled with construction-related sediment).	☐ Yes ☒ No	Filtered through gravel-bag chevrons prior to entering a CB
Irrigation water	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Lawn watering	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Individual residential car washing	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Non-emergency fire fighting flows	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable
Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges	☐ Yes ☒ No	Not Applicable

14.0 RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

This section includes the report required pursuant to Requirement C.2.a. of Order No. R9-2004-001, if applicable. Requirement C.2.a. states:

"Upon a determination by either a Permittee or the SDRWQCB that MS4 discharges are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable water quality standard, the Permittee shall promptly notify and thereafter submit a report to the SDRWQCB that describes BMPs that are currently being implemented and additional BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards. The report may be incorporated in the SWMP Annual Report unless the SDRWQCB directs an earlier submittal. The report shall include an implementation schedule. The SDRWQCB may require modifications to the report."

The City is not aware of any exceedances to any water quality standards in this area during the reporting period. Please refer to the watershed annual report for a detailed review of the monitoring data collected throughout the Santa Margarita River in Riverside County.

15.0 SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL URBAN RUNOFF DATA

This section is a summary of all urban runoff related data not included in the annual monitoring report (e.g., special investigations).

The City of Temecula did not conduct any special investigations during this reporting period.

16.0 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SWMP

This section includes proposed revisions to the Individual SWMP, including areas in need of improvement based on the assessment of effectiveness of each program component.

There were no significant programmatic changes to the City's SWMP during this reporting period. Attachment G includes a list of revisions that have been incorporated into the SWMP since July 1, 2005.

ATTACHMENT A

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROGRAM

- List of Issued Grading Permits
- Monthly tally of Finalized WQMPs
- Example of Final Conditions of Approval
- NPDES Training Log

CITY OF TEMECULA
Land Development Activity Report

Reporting Period 7/1/2007 through 6/30/2008

Activity	Type of Plan		Status	Address	Description	Plan Checker
LD07-125GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	26232 MAP 2	PCL 5 - 8	CW
LD05-057GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	27427 BOSTIK CT	PCL 12 & 13	JP
LD07-096GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28220 JEFFERSON AV	PARCEL 1 - 3 & 6 - SPRINGHILL SUITES	
LD07-012GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28530 MAP	PARCEL "F" OF LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT NO. PA03-0657	RJ
LD07-090GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28530 MAP	PCL F OF LLA03-0657 EAST PARKING STRUCTURE	RJ
LD07-081GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28544 OLD TOWN FRONT ST	MB 15/726 BLK 21 LT 30-32	CW
LD08-030GR	LD_GRADE	MGR_RG	ISSUED	28771 PUJOL ST	LOTS 1 - 13 TM 8643 & LOTS 1 - 13 & LOT A TM 10291 - MASS GRADING	JP
LD07-114GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28870 PUJOL ST	TEMECULA COMMUNITY CENTER PRECISE GRADING PLAN	JP
LD07-047GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	28975 OLD TOWN FRONT ST	PCL 5	JP
LD07-049GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	29119 MARGARITA RD	LOT 14 - SOUTHWEST RIVERSIDE FAMILY YMCA	JP
LD07-094GR	LD_GRADE	MGR_RG	ISSUED	29710 VIA LAS COLINAS	PARCEL 2 MASS GRADING & EROSION CTRL	CW
LD07-069GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	30705 PAUBA RD	PCL 2 DETACHED GARAGE	CW
LD07-091GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	30935 AVENIDA DEL REPOSO	LOT 396 - PRECISE GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN -	JP
LD08-010GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	33371 WOLFE ST	LOT 22 OF TR- 26941 - EARTHWORK INCLUDE 100 CY CUT AND FILL. MAX	RJ
LD07-008GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	35181 MAP	LOTS 3 & 4	ABL
LD07-121GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	35481 MAP	PARCEL 1 & 2	CW
LD07-057GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	40390 CALLE FIESTA	LOT 273	KHM
LD08-023GR	LD_GRADE	MGR_RG	ISSUED	41863 MAIN ST	OLD TOWN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT - TOWN SQUARE	
LD07-031GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	43055 BLACKDEER LOOP	PCL 10 & 11	CW
LD07-054GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	43599 CALLE DE VELARDO	LOT 10	CV
LD08-012GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	43910 FLORES DR	LOT 53 2ND DWELLING UNIT - MANSER RESIDENCE - CASITAS	RJ
LD07-113GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	43950 MARGARITA RD	PARCEL 2	JP
LD07-109GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	44045 MARGARITA RD	LOT 26 - DE PORTOLA PROFESSIONAL CENTER	KHM

Activity	Type of Plan		Status	Address	Description	Plan Checker
LD08-014GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	44060 MARGARITA RD	LOT 25	CW
LD07-048GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	44092 MARGARITA RD	PARCEL 7 - REDHAWK TIRE STORE	CW
LD08-038GR	LD_GRADE	SFR	ISSUED	44217 LA PAZ ST	GRADING PERMIT - ADMINISTRATIVE	SC
LD05-022GR	LD_GRADE	PA_PGP	ISSUED	44651 AVENIDA DE MISSIONES	PARCELS 3-5	JP
LD08-040GR	LD_GRADE	MGR_RG	ISSUED	4646 MAP	GRADING PERMIT - MATERIAL CRUSHING	SC

5

MONTHLY TALLY OF FINALIZED WQMPS

	Residental	Com/Ind	Mun	Total Accepted
	2006			
Jan-06				0
Feb-06		1		1
Mar-06				0
Apr-06				0
May-06		2		2
Jun-06		1	1	2
Jul-06		1		1
Aug-06	1	1		2
Sep-06		1		1
Oct-06	1	2		3
Nov-06		2		2
Dec-06				0
TOTALS	**2**	**11**	**1**	**14**
	2007			
Jan-07				0
Feb-07		1		1
Mar-07				0
Apr-07		1		1
May-07		2		2
Jun-07		2		2
Jul-07	1	1		2
Aug-07		1		1
Sep-07		2		2
Oct-07	2	5		7
Nov-07		1		1
Dec-07				0
TOTALS	**3**	**16**	**0**	**19**
	2008			
Jan-08		1		1
Feb-08				0
Mar-08				0
Apr-08		1		1
May-08				0
Jun-08		2		2
Jul-08		1		1
Aug-08		1	1	2
Sep-08		2		2
Oct-08				0
Nov-08				0
Dec-08				0
TOTALS	**0**	**8**	**1**	**9**
	2009			
Jan-09				0
Feb-09				0
Mar-09				0
Apr-09				0
May-09				0
Jun-09				0
TOTALS	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Cumulative Total	**5**	**35**	**2**	**42**

WQMP Tracking Log

July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2008

	ID Number		Project Description	Required	Accepted	Description of BMPs
COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENTS						
1	PA04-0584	LD06-096GR	Star World Center	Yes	2/27/07	3 Infil swales, trash grates
2	PA04-0621	LD05-236GR	Butterfield Ranch Shopping Center	Yes	5/19/06	360' perforated CMP; 5 CB filters
3	PA05-0036	LD06-035GR	Temecula Corporate Center	Yes	10/4/06	4 Stormfilters, 5 ponding areas
4	PA05-0086	LD05-186GR	Nelson Auto Service Ctr.	Yes	5/15/07	2 Sand filters, 2 CB filters
5	PA05-0096	LD06-097GR	Westside Business Park	Yes	4/10/07	5 Sandfilters
6	PA05-0100	LD05-242GR	Temecula Lane I (Loma Linda)	Yes	11/20/06	3 Infil Basins,1 Infil Swale, 5 CB Filters
7	PA05-0101	LD05-229GR	Madison Avenue Bldg, Parcel 6	Yes	5/25/06	3 Infil Basins, 4 CB filters, 3 Infil swales
8	PA05-0105	LD06-086GR	Temecula Glass	Yes	8/23/06	80' Swale, 2 Infil Basins
9	PA05-0127	LD05-200GR	Industrial Condominiums of Temecula	Yes	7/24/06	3 sand filters, 150' & 70' swales,3 CB filters
10	PA05-0172	LD07-048GR	Redhawk Tire Store & Car Wash	Yes	9/27/07	710' Infil swale, 4 CB filters
11	PA05-0189	LD06-047GR	Butterfield Storage	Yes	6/26/06	590' Swale, 4 CB filters, 220' Perforated Pipe
12	PA05-0139	LD07-031GR	Redhawk Artisan Communities (PA13) (Deer Hollow)	Yes	6/15/07	105' Grass Sand Filter
13	PA05-0232	LD05-198GR	Marriot Fairfield Inn	Yes	10/31/06	2 Infil Basins
14	PA05-0254	LD06-027GR	Butterfield Station	Yes	5/8/07	3 Infil Swales
15	PA05-0325	LD06-068GR	Guidant/SCE Substation	Yes	2/24/06	Gravel, 1 vegetated swale
16	PA05-0365	LD07-049GR	YMCA	Yes	10/18/07	480 CY Det. Basin, 67' grass swale
17	PA06-0037	LD06-058GR	Dalton III Office Building (Old Town)	Yes	9/18/06	6 Downspout filters
18	PA06-0046	LD06-090GR	Redhawk Pavillion	Yes	10/18/07	3 infil swales (560'), 5 trash grates, 3 CB filters
19	PA06-0048	LD06-071GR	Hine Mazda Dealership	Yes	7/23/07	1 Stormfilter, 5 CB filters
20	PA06-0096	LD06-068GR	Guidant (Abbott) Parking Structure	Yes	11/3/06	1 Vegetated sand detention Basin, 10 CB Filters, 3 Swales
21	PA06-0140	LD07-047GR	Ahmed Medical Office Building	Yes	8/14/07	2 Infil Swales (320')
22	PA06-0178	N/A	Gateway Plaza	Yes	6/2/08	2 Infil Swales, 2 CB Filters, Grasspave System
23	PA06-0201	LD06-175GR	Guidant (Abbott) East Campus	Yes	10/4/07	1 Stormwater Filter, Detention Pipes, Swales, CB Inserts
24	PA06-0278	LD07-109GR	De Portola Professional	Yes	1/30/08	275' Infil Swale, 1 CB Filter, 4 Sand Filters
25	PA06-0293 PA07-0154	LD07-090GR	Promenade Mall Expansion	Yes	10/12/07	Stormfilter, Infiltration pipes
26	PA06-0316	LD07-096GR	Springhill Hotel	Yes	11/28/07	9 Filterra units
27	PA06-0326	LD07-035GR	DCH Honda	Yes	6/6/07	2 Detention basins
28	PA06-0338	LD07-081GR	Old Town Plaza One (Perkins)	Yes	9/24/07	1 Stormfilter
29	PA06-0346	LD07-125GR	Chaparral Village	Yes	4/2/08	380' Infil. Trench
30	PA07-0084	LD07-121GR	Rancho View Professional	Yes	10/11/07	
31	PA07-0337	LD08-024GR	Kaiser Parking	Yes	6/25/08	

WQMP Tracking Log

July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2008

	ID Number		Project Description	Required	Accepted	Description of BMPs
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS						
1	PA05-0375 PA05-0377 PA05-0384 PA05-0387 PA06-0002	LD06-187GR	Roripaugh Ranch, project-wide	Yes	10/31/06	2 Infil Basins, 9 Stormfilters; 401 Cert.
2	PA04-0492	LD06-006GR	Temecula Lane I (Loma Linda)	Yes	8/8/06	1 Infil Basin; 23 CB filters
3	PA05-0236 PA05-0235	LD06-131GR	Summerhouse Condos (Dartolo)	Yes	10/18/07	2100' Infil swales, 23 CB filters 1 stormfilter
4	PA06-0060	LD06-199GR	Redhawk Artisan Communities (PA13) (Deer Hollow)	Yes	7/11/07	410' Perf Pipe, 8 CB Filters, 2 Stormfilters
5	TM 35039	LD06-201GR LD06-295CO	Yvette Anthony, Santiago Road	Yes	10/22/07	
MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENTS						
1	PW99-11		Pechanga Parkway Widening	Yes	6/1/06	5 CB filters; 401 Cert.

EXHIBIT A

FINAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

SCANNED: 6/17/08
G DRIVE: 6/17/08
PERMITS PLUS: 6/17/08
INITIALS: cmf
PLANNER: Schumm

JUN 16 2008

ACCEPTANCE OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

I, Steve Rawlings, understand that Planning Application No. PA07-0337 has been approved with Conditions of Approval which are set forth in Exhibit A. I have read the Conditions of Approval contained in PC Resolution No. 08-20 and understand them. Through signing this ACCEPTANCE OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, I agree and commit to the City of Temecula that I will implement and abide by the Conditions of Approval, including any indemnification requirements imposed by those conditions.

SIGNATURE

6/2/08
DATE

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF TEMECULA

FINAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning Application No.:	PA07-0337
Project Description:	A Major Modification to an approved Development Plan to modify three building entrances, add a trash enclosure, and expand the parking lot to accommodate additional parking for a Kaiser medical facility located at 27309 Madison Avenue
Assessor's Parcel No.:	910-282-012 and 910-272-007
MSHCP Category:	Commercial
DIF Category:	Service Commercial
TUMF Category:	N/A
Approval Date:	May 7, 2008
Expiration Date:	May 7, 2010

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Within 48 Hours of the Approval of This Project

1. The applicant/developer shall deliver to the Planning Department a cashier's check or money order made payable to the County Clerk in the amount of Sixty-Four Dollars ($64.00) for the County administrative fee, to enable the City to file the Notice of Exemption as provided under Public Resources Code Section 21152 and California Code of Regulations Section 15062. If within said 48-hour period the applicant/developer has not delivered to the Planning Department the check as required above, the approval for the project granted shall be void by reason of failure of condition (Fish and Game Code Section 711.4(c)).

2. The applicant shall review and sign the Acceptance of Conditions of Approval document that will be provided by the Planning Department staff and return the document with an original signature to the Planning Department.

General Requirements

3. The applicant and owner of the real property subject to this condition shall hereby agree to indemnify, protect, hold harmless, and defend the City with Legal Counsel of the City's own selection from any and all claims, actions, awards, judgments, or proceedings against the City to attack, set aside, annul, or seek monetary damages resulting, directly or indirectly, from any action in furtherance of and the approval of the City, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, advisory agency, appeal board or legislative body including actions approved by the voters of the City, concerning the Planning Application. The City shall be

deemed for purposes of this condition, to include any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any of its elected or appointed officials, officers, employees, consultants, contractors, legal counsel, and agents. City shall promptly notify both the applicant and landowner of any claim, action, or proceeding to which this condition is applicable and shall further cooperate fully in the defense of the action. The City reserves the right to take any and all action the City deems to be in the best interest of the City and its citizens in regards to such defense.

4. The permittee shall obtain City approval for any modifications or revisions to the approval of this project.

5. This approval shall be used within two years of the approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within the two year period, which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion, or the beginning of substantial utilization contemplated by this approval.

6. The Director of Planning may, upon an application being filed within 30 days prior to expiration, and for good cause, grant a time extension of up to 3 one-year extensions of time, one year at a time.

7. A separate building permit shall be required for all signage.

8. The development of the premises shall substantially conform to the approved site plan and elevations contained on file with the Planning Department.

9. Landscaping installed for the project shall be continuously maintained to the reasonable satisfaction of the Planning Director. If it is determined that the landscaping is not being maintained, the Planning Director shall have the authority to require the property owner to bring the landscaping into conformance with the approved landscape plan. The continued maintenance of all landscaped areas shall be the responsibility of the developer or any successors in interest.

10. The Conditions of Approval specified in this resolution, to the extent specific items, materials, equipment, techniques, finishes or similar matters are specified, shall be deemed satisfied by staff's prior approval of the use or utilization of an item, material, equipment, finish or technique that City staff determines to be the substantial equivalent of that required by the Conditions of Approval. Staff may elect to reject the request to substitute, in which case the real party in interest may appeal, after payment of the regular cost of an appeal, the decision to the Planning Commission for its decision.

11. Trash enclosures shall be provided to house all trash receptacles utilized on the site. These shall be clearly labeled on site plan.

12. Parking for the project shall be shared across the site, including parking spaces in all lots that are a part of the project.

13. If construction is phased, a construction staging area plan or phasing plan for construction equipment and trash shall be approved the Director of Planning.

Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits

14. A Parcel Merger must be filed and approved to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

15. The following shall be included in the Notes Section of the Grading Plan: "If at any time during excavation/construction of the site, archaeological/cultural resources, or any artifacts or other objects which reasonably appears to be evidence of cultural or archaeological resource are discovered, the property owner shall immediately advise the City of such and the City shall cause all further excavation or other disturbance of the affected area to immediately cease. The Director of Planning at his/her sole discretion may require the property owner to deposit a sum of money it deems reasonably necessary to allow the City to consult and/or authorize an independent, fully qualified specialist to inspect the site at no cost to the City, in order to assess the significance of the find. Upon determining that the discovery is not an archaeological/cultural resource, the Director of Planning shall notify the property owner of such determination and shall authorize the resumption of work. Upon determining that the discovery is an archaeological/cultural resource, the Director of Planning shall notify the property owner that no further excavation or development may take place until a mitigation plan or other corrective measures have been approved by the Director of Planning."

Prior to Issuance of Building Permit

16. The applicant shall submit a photometric plan, including the parking lot to the Planning Department, which meets the requirements of the Development Code and the Palomar Lighting Ordinance. The parking lot light standards shall be placed in such a way as to not adversely impact the growth potential of the parking lot trees.

17. Three copies of Construction Landscaping and Irrigation Plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department. These plans shall conform to the approved conceptual landscape plan, or as amended by these conditions. The location, number, genus, species, and container size of the plants shall be shown. The plans shall be consistent with the Water Efficient Ordinance. The plans shall be accompanied by the following items:

    a. Appropriate filing fee (per the City of Temecula Fee Schedule at time of submittal).

    b. Provide a minimum five foot wide planter to be installed at the perimeter of all parking areas. Curbs, walkways, etc. are not to infringe on this area.

    c. A note on the plans stating that "Two landscape inspections are required: One inspection is required for irrigation lines and a separate inspection is required for final planting inspection."

    d. A note on the plans stating that "The contractor shall provide two copies of an agronomic soils report at the first irrigation inspection."

    e. One copy of the approved Grading Plan.

    f. Water usage calculations per Chapter 17.32 of the Development Code (Water Efficient Ordinance).

    g. Total cost estimate of plantings and irrigation (in accordance with approved plan).

    h. The locations of all existing trees that will be saved consistent with the tentative map.

i. A landscape maintenance program shall be submitted for approval, which details the proper maintenance of all proposed plant materials to assure proper growth and landscape development for the long-term esthetics of the property. The approved maintenance program shall be provided to the landscape maintenance contractor who shall be responsible to carry out the detailed program.

j. Specifications shall indicate that a minimum of two landscape site inspections will be required. One inspection to verify that the irrigation mainline is capable of being pressurized to 150 psi for a minimum period of two hours without loss of pressure. The second inspection will verify that all irrigation systems have head-to-head coverage, and to verify that all plantings have been installed consistent with the approved construction landscape plans. The applicant/owner shall contact the Planning Department to schedule inspections.

k. Precise Grading Plans consistent with the approved rough grading plans including all structural setback measurements.

l. All WQMP information and storm water treatment design details shall be shown on the construction landscape plans. If revisions are made to the WQMP and/or storm water treatment design that result in any changes to the conceptual landscape plans after entitlement, the revisions will be shown on the construction landscape plans, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning.

18. Construction Landscaping and Irrigation Plans shall specify that the hydro-seeded area will be temporarily irrigated.

19. All utilities shall be screened from public view. Landscape construction drawings shall show and label all utilities and provide appropriate screening. Provide a three foot clear zone around fire check detectors as required by the Fire Department before starting the screen. Group utilities together in order to reduce intrusion. Screening of utilities is not to look like an after-thought. Plan planting beds and design around utilities. Locate all light poles on plans and insure that there are no conflicts with trees.

20. Building Construction Plans shall include detailed outdoor areas including but not limited to trash enclosures and hardscape to match the style of the building subject to the approval of the Planning Director.

Prior to Release of Power, Building Occupancy or Any Use Allowed by This Permit

21. An applicant shall submit a letter of substantial conformance, subject to field verification by the Planning Director or his/her designee. Said letter of substantial conformance shall be prepared by the project designer and shall indicate that all plant materials and irrigation system components have been installed in accordance with the approved final landscape and irrigation plans. If a certificate of use and occupancy is not required for the project, such letter of substantial conformance shall be submitted prior to scheduling for the final inspection.