

WDID 937C371940 (Mohawk and Keeney St Grading Plan): 6 January 2016 Inspection

Chiu, Wayne@Waterboards

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 9:02 AM

To: Eric Malcolm [eric@ercdev.com]

Cc: Walsh, Laurie@Waterboards; Clemente, Chiara@Waterboards; Joe Kuhn [jkuhn@ci.la-mesa.ca.us]

Attachments: 2016-0106 Inspection Photo~1.pdf (391 KB)

Hi Eric:

Thanking you for taking the time to discuss your with me on Wednesday, January 6. This email is to document my observations, as well as provide you an opportunity to provide information that will demonstrate the site has been brought into compliance with the requirements of Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, the Statewide Construction General Storm Water Permit (CGP). According to the Storm Water Multiple Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS) you are the Legally Responsible Person (LRP) listed for the site, and the site was determined to be a Risk Level 2 construction site, subject to the requirements in Attachment D to the CGP.

During the inspection, I observed several requirements for a Risk Level 2 construction site that were not implemented or inadequately implemented in compliance with the CGP. Attached are photos taken during the inspection that show the areas that needed to be addressed to demonstrate compliance with the CGP requirements for a Risk Level 2 site.

1. All Risk Level 2 site are required to implement effective soil cover for inactive areas. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to implement appropriate erosion control BMPs (runoff control and soil stabilization) in conjunction with sediment control BMPs for active areas. Areas that were inactive should have had already had effective soil cover or soil stabilization implemented before the storm event. Runoff controls and soil stabilization are expected to be implemented prior to a predicted rain event for all active areas. Photos 1 and 2 show evidence of significant sediment transport, which is a clear indication that the site lacked appropriate erosion control BMPs to prevent erosion for inactive or active areas. Photo 3 shows an area that could be scheduled to be inactive and provided effective soil cover before the storm events, and Photo 4 also show an area that could be considered active that should have been protected prior to and during the storm events. I did not observed any BMPs that provided effective soil cover or soil stabilization anywhere onsite.
2. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to contain and securely protect stockpiles construction and waste material from wind and rain at all times unless actively being used. Photo 5 shows a stockpile that did not have protection or containment prior to or during the storm event.
3. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to ensure containment of concrete washout areas and other washout areas so there is no discharge to underlying soil and onto surrounding areas. Photo 4 shows concrete or other cementaceous material improperly disposed to disturbed soil areas.
4. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to implement good housekeeping for vehicle storage to prevent oil, grease, or fuel to leak into the ground, storm drains, or surface waters. Photo 6 shows a vehicle lacking a drip pan or other BMPs to prevent oil, grease, or fuel to leak into the ground during a storm event.
5. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to effectively manage all run-on, all runoff within the site and all runoff that discharges from the site. Photos 1 through 4, 7 and 8 show a inadequate controls to manage runoff within the site (Photos 1 and 4) and runoff that is discharging from the site (Photos 7 and 8).
6. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to establish and maintain effective perimeter controls to sufficiently control erosion and sediment discharges from the site. Photo 7 shows a lack of perimeter controls to sufficiently control discharges of sediment from the site.
7. All Risk Level 2 sites are required to minimize or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges through the use of controls, structures, management practices that achieve BCT for conventional pollutants. Photo 8 shows evidence of sediment conveyed in storm water runoff discharged to an offsite storm drain

inlet. The sediment in the discharge was observed to originate from runoff that flowed through the unprotected areas in Photos 4 and 7.

Each of these violations of the CGP are subject to enforcement action and potential civil liabilities of up to \$10,000 per day per violation.

Please send me the following information and documentation, or a date by which you can provide the information, by COB Friday, **January 18, 2016**:

- 1) Copies of the weekly BMP inspection reports for the last 3 months.
- 2) Copies of the REAPs for the last 3 months.
- 3) Copies of any inspection reports or enforcement action issued to the site by City of La Mesa storm water inspectors.
- 4) A description of the BMPs that will be implemented on the site to address the deficiencies already identified in this email to comply with the BMP requirements for a Risk Level 2 construction site.
- 5) A schedule of when BMPs will be implemented.
- 6) Photo documentation of the BMPs after they have been implemented.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Wayne Chiu, PE

Water Resource Control Engineer

Storm Water Management Unit

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

San Diego Region

2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100

San Diego, CA 92108

Direct Line: (619) 521-3354

Main Line: (619) 516-1990



Photo 1



Photo 2



Photo 3



Photo 4



Photo 5



Photo 6



Photo 7



Photo 8