### $\ddot{ }$

# **GENERAL EARTHWORK AND GRADING SPECIFICATIONS**

#### **1.0 GENERAL INTENT**

These specifications present general procedures and requirements for grading and earthwork as shown on the approved grading plans, including preparation of areas to be filled, placement of fill, installations of subdrains, and excavations. The recommendations contained in the geotechnical report are a part of the earthwork and grading specifications and shall supersede the provisions contained hereinafter in the case of conflict. Evaluations performed by the consultant during the course of grading may result in new recommendations which could supersede these specifications or the recommendations of the geotechnical report.

#### **2.0 EARTHWORK OBSERVATIONS ANO TESTING**

Prior to the commencement of grading, a qualified geotechnical consultant (soils engineer and engineering geologist, and their representatives) shall be employed for the purpose of observing earthwork procedures and testing the fills for conformance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report and these specifications. It will be necessary that the consultant provide adequate testing and observations so that he may determine that the work was accomplished as specified. It shall be the responsibility of the contractor to assist the consultant and keep him apprised of work schedules and changes so that he may schedule his personnel accordingly.

It shall be the sole responsibility of the contractor to provide adequate equipment and methods to accomplish the work in accordance with applicable grading codes or agency ordinances, these specifications and approved grading plans. If, in the opinion of the consultant, unsatisfactory conditions, such as questionable soil, poor moisture conditions, inadequate compaction, adverse weather, etc., are resulting in a quality of work less than required in these specifications, the consultant will be empowered to reject the work and recommend that construction be stopped until the unsatisfactory conditions are rectified.

Maximum dry density tests used to determine the degree of compaction will be performed in accordance with the American Society of Testing and Materials, test method ASTM D1557-09.

#### **3.0 PREPARATION OF AREAS TO BE FILLED**

#### **3.1 Clearing and Grubbing**

All brush, vegetation, and debris shall be removed or piled and otherwise disposed of.

#### **3.2 Processing**

The existing ground which is determined to be satisfactory for support of fill shall be scarified to a minimum depth of 6 inches. Existing ground which is not satisfactory shall be overexcavated as specified in the following section. Scarification shall continue until the soils are broken down and free of large clay lumps or clods and until the working surface is reasonably uniform and free of uneven features which would inhibit uniform compaction.

### **3.3 Overexcavation**

Soft, dry, spongy, highly fractured or otherwise unsuitable ground, extending to such depth that surface processing cannot adequately improve the condition, shall be overexcavated down to firm ground, approved by the consultant.

### **3.4 Moisture Conditioning**

Overexcavated and processed soils shall be watered, dried-back, blended, and/or mixed, as required to attain a uniform moisture content near optimum.

### **3.5 Recompaction**

Overexcavation and processed soils which have been properly mixed and moisture-conditioned shall be recompacted to a minimum relative compaction of 90 percent.

#### **3.6 Benching**

Where fills are to be placed on ground with slopes steeper than 5:1 (horizontal : vertical), the ground shall be stepped or benched. The lowest bench shall be a minimum of 15 feet wide, shall be at least 2 feet deep, shall expose firm materials, and shall be approved by the consultant. Other benches shall be excavated in firm materials for a minimum width of 4 feet. Ground sloping flatter than 5:1 (horizontal : vertical) shall be benched or otherwise overexcavated when considered necessary by the consultant.

#### **3. 7 Approval**

All areas to receive fill, including processed areas, removal areas and toe-of-fill benches shall be approved by the consultant prior to fill placement.

#### **4.0 . FILL MATERIAL**

#### **4.1 General**

Material to be placed as fill shall be free of organic matter and other deleterious substances, and shall be approved by the consultant. Soils of poor gradation, expansion, or strength characteristics shall be placed in areas designated by consultant or shall be mixed with other soils to serve as satisfactory fill material.

#### **4.2 Oversize**

Oversize materials defined as rock, or other irreducible material with maximum dimension greater than 12 inches, shall not be buried or placed in fills, unless the location, materials, and disposal methods are specifically approved by the consultant. Oversize disposal operations shall be such that nesting of oversize material does not occur, and such that the oversize material is completely surrounded by compacted or densified fill. Oversize material shall not be placed within 10 feet vertically of finish grade or within the range of future utilities or underground construction, unless specifically approved by the consultant.

### **4.3 Import**

If importing of fill material is required for grading, the import material shall meet the requirements of Section 4.1.

#### **5.0 FILL PLACEMENT and COMPACTION**

### **5.1 Fill Lifts**

Approved fill material shall be placed in areas prepared to receive fill in near-horizontal layers not exceeding 6 inches in compacted thickness. The consultant may approve thicker lifts if testing indicates the grading procedures are such that adequate compaction is being achieved with lifts of greater thickness. Each layer shall be spread evenly and shall be thoroughly mixed during spreading to attain uniformity of material and moisture in each layer.

### **5.2 Fill Moisture**

Fill layers at a moisture content less than optimum shall be watered and mixed, and wet fill layers shall be aerated by scarification or shall be blended with drier material. Moisture conditioning and mixing of fill layers shall continue until the fill material is at a uniform moisture content at or near optimum.

#### **5.3 Compaction of Fill**

After each layer has been evenly spread, moisture-conditioned, and mixed, it shall be uniformly compacted to not less than 90 percent of maximum dry density. Compaction equipment shall be adequately sized and shall be either specifically designed for soil compaction or of proven reliability, to efficiently achieve the specified degree of compaction.

#### **5.4 Fill Slopes**

Compacting of slopes shall be accomplished, in addition to nonnal compacting procedures, by backrolling of slopes with sheepsfoot rollers at frequent increments of 2 to 3 feet in fill elevation gain, or by other methods producing satisfactory results. At the completion of grading, the relative compaction of the slope out to the slope face shall be at least 90 percent.

#### **5.5 Compaction Testing**

Field-tests to check the fill moisture and degree of compaction will be perfonned by the consultant. The location and frequency of tests shall be at the consultant's discretion. In general, the tests will be taken at intervals not exceeding 2 feet in vertical rise and/or 1,000 cubic yards of embankment.

#### **6.0 SUBDRAIN INSTALLATION**

Subdrain systems, if required, shall be installed in approved ground to conform to the approximate alignment and details shown on the plans or herein. The subdrain location or materials shall not be changed or modified without the approval of the consultant. The consultant, however, may recommend and upon approval, direct changes in subdrain line, grade or material. All subdrains should be surveyed for line and grade after installation and sufficient time shall be allowed for the surveys, prior to commencement of filling over the subdrain.

#### **7.0 EXCAVATION**

Excavations and cut slopes will be examined during grading. If directed by the consultant, further excavation or overexcavation and refilling of cut areas shall be performed, and/or remedial grading of cut slopes shall be perfonned. Where fill-over-cut slopes are to be graded, unless otherwise approved, the cut portion of the slope shall be made and approved by the consultant prior to placement of materials for construction of the fill portion of the slope.

#### **8.0 TRENCH BACKFILLS**

Trench excavations for utility pipes shall be backfilled under engineering supervision.

After the utility pipe has been laid, the space under and around the pipe shall be backfilled with clean sand or approved granular soil to a depth of at least one foot over the top of the pipe. The sand backfill shall be unifonnly jetted into place before the controlled backfill is placed over the sand.

The onsite materials, or other soils approved by the soil engineer, shall be watered and mixed as necessary prior to placement in lifts· over the sand backfill.

The controlled backfill shall be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density as detennined by the ASTM D1557-09 test method.

Field density tests and inspection of the backfill procedures shall be made by the soil engineer during backfilling to see that proper moisture content and unifonn compaction is being maintained. The contractor shall provide test holes and exploratory pits as required by the soil engineer to enable sampling and testing.

**Soil Exploration Co., Inc. Appendix E-3 Appendix E-3 Appendix E-3** 





# SOIL EXPLORATION COMPANY, INC.

Soil Engineering, Environmental Engineering, Materials Testing, Geology

December 16, 2019

Project No. 13167-01

TO· West Coast Hotels Group LLC 19215 Wild Mustang Ct. Apple Valley, CA 92307

ATTENTION. Hitesh Patel

- SUBJECT California Building Code (CBC) 2016 Seismic Update, Proposed 8.B±Acre, 14 Lot Residential Subdivision, SEC Victoria Avenue and La Sierra Avenue, City of Riverside, California
- REFERENCES: Soil Exploration Co., Inc., "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation/Liquefaction Evaluation/Infiltration Tests Report, Proposed 8.8± Acre, 14 Lot Residential Subdivision, SEC of Victoria Avenue and La Sierra Avenue (APN 136-220-016), City of Riverside, California", Dated January 24, 2014 (Project No. 13167-01).

#### **Introduction**

As requested, we have prepared the following updated seismic parameters for the subject site.

#### **CBC 2016 Seismic Parameters**

The CBC (2016) seismic parameters for the site are tabulated below:



References·

- Earthquake.usgs.gov/research/hazmaps/design
- 2016 California Building Code, California Code of Regulations. Trtle 24, Part 2, Volume 2 of 2, Section 1613, Earthquake Loads

7535 Jurupa Ave., Unit C • Riverside, CA 92504 • Tel: (951) 688-7200 • Fax: (951) 688-7100 soilexploration@yahoo.com • www.soilexp.com

#### **Foundation Plan ReviewlAdditional Observations and Testing**

Soil Exploration Co., Inc. should review the foundation plans and observe and/or test at the following stages of construction:

- During any additional grading or fill placement.
- Following footings excavation and prior to placement of footing materials
- During all utility trench backfills and street subgrade/base compaction.
- Following wetting of slab subgrade (1.2.X optimum to a depth of at least 6") and prior to placement of slab materials.
- When any unusual conditions are encountered.

#### **Limitation**

Soil Exploration Co., Inc. has striven to perform our services within the limits prescribed by our client, and in a manner consistent with the usual thoroughness and competence of reputable soils engineers practicing under similar circumstances. No other representation, express or implied, and no warranty or guarantee is included or intended by virtue of the services performed or reports, opinion, documents, or otherwise supplied.

#### **Closure**

If you should have any questions regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact our office. We appreciate this opportunity to be of service.

Very truly yours, Soil Exploration C

Gene K. Luu, PE 53417 Project Engineer

Distribution: [1] Addressee (hitesh@westcoasthotelsgroup.com)

Attachments: Figure 1 Site Location Map

Soil Exploration Co., Inc. **Page 2** 



# Appendix 4: Historical Site Conditions

*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment or Other Information on Past Site Use* 

# Appendix 5: LID Infeasibility

*LID Technical Infeasibility Analysis* 

# Appendix 6: BMP Design Details

*BMP Sizing, Design Details and other Supporting Documentation* 





# Appendix 7: Hydromodification

*Supporting Detail Relating to Hydrologic Conditions of Concern* 



Unit Hydrograph Analysis Copyright (c) CIVILCADD/CIVILDESIGN, 1989 - 2008, Version 8.1 Study date 02/22/24 File: EX2YR242.out ++ -- Riverside County Synthetic Unit Hydrology Method RCFC & WCD Manual date - April 1978 Program License Serial Number 5006 --- English (in-lb) Input Units Used English Rainfall Data (Inches) Input Values Used English Units used in output format --- -- Drainage Area = 7.00(Ac.) = 0.011 Sq. Mi. Drainage Area for Depth-Area Areal Adjustment = 7.00(Ac.) = 0.011 Sq. Mi. Length along longest watercourse = 596.00(Ft.) Length along longest watercourse measured to centroid = 300.00(Ft.) Length along longest watercourse = 0.113 Mi. Length along longest watercourse measured to centroid = 0.057 Mi. Difference in elevation = 26.00(Ft.) Slope along watercourse = 230.3356 Ft./Mi. Average Manning's 'N' = 0.030 Lag time =  $0.038$  Hr. Lag time =  $2.26$  Min. 25% of lag time = 0.56 Min. 40% of lag time = 0.90 Min. Unit time  $=$  5.00 Min. Duration of storm = 24 Hour(s) User Entered Base Flow = 0.00(CFS) 2 YEAR Area rainfall data: Area(Ac.)[1] Rainfall(In)[2] Weighting[1\*2] 7.00 1.80 12.60 100 YEAR Area rainfall data: Area(Ac.)[1] Rainfall(In)[2] Weighting[1\*2] 7.00 6.00 42.00 STORM EVENT (YEAR) = 2.00 Area Averaged 2-Year Rainfall = 1.800(In) Area Averaged 100-Year Rainfall = 6.000(In) Point rain (area averaged) =  $1.800(1n)$ Areal adjustment factor = 100.00 % Adjusted average point rain =  $1.800(1n)$ Sub-Area Data: Area(Ac.) Runoff Index Impervious % 7.000 72.00 0.100 Total Area Entered = 7.00(Ac.) RI RI Infil. Rate Impervious Adj. Infil. Rate Area% F AMC2 AMC-1 (In/Hr) (Dec.%) (In/Hr) (Dec.) (In/Hr) 72.0 53.4 0.537 0.100 0.489 1.000 0.489  $Sum (F) = 0.489$ Area averaged mean soil loss (F) (In/Hr) = 0.489 Minimum soil loss rate ((In/Hr)) = 0.244 (for 24 hour storm duration) Soil low loss rate (decimal) = 0.820 --- U n i t H y d r o g r a p h VALLEY S-Curve -- Unit Hydrograph Data --- Unit time period Time % of lag Distribution Unit Hydrograph (hrs) Graph % (CFS)



 The following loss rate calculations reflect use of the minimum calculated loss rate subtracted from the Storm Rain to produce the maximum Effective Rain value





EX2YR24HR Page **3** of **9**







## EX2YR24HR Page **6** of **9**



EX2YR24HR Page **7** of **9**





## EX2YR24HR Page **9** of **9**

PRO 2YR24HR PRO 2YR24HR Unit Hydrograph Analysis Copyright (c) CIVILCADD/CIVILDESIGN, 1989 - 2008, Version 8.1 Study date 02/22/24 File: 2YR242.out ++ -- Riverside County Synthetic Unit Hydrology Method RCFC & WCD Manual date - April 1978 Program License Serial Number 5006 --- English (in-lb) Input Units Used English Rainfall Data (Inches) Input Values Used English Units used in output format --- -- Drainage Area = 7.00(Ac.) = 0.011 Sq. Mi. Drainage Area for Depth-Area Areal Adjustment = 7.00(Ac.) = 0.011 Sq. Mi. Length along longest watercourse = 861.00(Ft.) Length along longest watercourse measured to centroid = 430.00(Ft.) Length along longest watercourse = 0.163 Mi. Length along longest watercourse measured to centroid = 0.081 Mi. Difference in elevation = 16.90(Ft.) Slope along watercourse = 103.6376 Ft./Mi. Average Manning's 'N' = 0.015 Lag time =  $0.029$  Hr. Lag time =  $1.73$  Min. 25% of lag time = 0.43 Min. 40% of lag time = 0.69 Min. Unit time  $=$  5.00 Min. Duration of storm = 24 Hour(s) User Entered Base Flow = 0.00(CFS) 2 YEAR Area rainfall data: Area(Ac.)[1] Rainfall(In)[2] Weighting[1\*2] 7.00 1.80 12.60 100 YEAR Area rainfall data: Area(Ac.)[1] Rainfall(In)[2] Weighting[1\*2] 7.00 6.00 42.00 STORM EVENT (YEAR) = 2.00 Area Averaged 2-Year Rainfall = 1.800(In) Area Averaged 100-Year Rainfall = 6.000(In) Point rain (area averaged) =  $1.800(1n)$ Areal adjustment factor = 100.00 % Adjusted average point rain =  $1.800(1n)$ Sub-Area Data: Area(Ac.) Runoff Index Impervious % 7.000 69.00 0.600 Total Area Entered = 7.00(Ac.) RI RI Infil. Rate Impervious Adj. Infil. Rate Area% F AMC2 AMC-1 (In/Hr) (Dec.%) (In/Hr) (Dec.) (In/Hr) 69.0 49.8 0.574 0.600 0.264 1.000 0.264  $Sum (F) = 0.264$ Area averaged mean soil loss (F) (In/Hr) = 0.264 Minimum soil loss rate ((In/Hr)) = 0.132 (for 24 hour storm duration) Soil low loss rate (decimal) = 0.420 --- U n i t H y d r o g r a p h VALLEY S-Curve -- Unit Hydrograph Data --- Unit time period Time % of lag Distribution Unit Hydrograph (hrs) Graph % (CFS)



 The following loss rate calculations reflect use of the minimum calculated loss rate subtracted from the Storm Rain to produce the maximum Effective Rain value

















# Appendix 8: Source Control

*Pollutant Sources/Source Control Checklist* 

#### STORMWATER POLLUTANT SOURCES/SOURCE CONTROL CHECKLIST

#### How to use this worksheet (also see instructions in Section G of the WQMP Template):

- 1. Review Column 1 and identify which of these potential sources of stormwater pollutants apply to your site. Check each box that applies.
- 2.Review Column 2 and incorporate all of the corresponding applicable BMPs in your WQMP Exhibit.
- 3. Review Columns 3 and 4 and incorporate all of the corresponding applicable permanent controls and operational BMPs in your WQMP. Use the format shown in Table G.1on page 23 of this WQMP Template. Describe your specific BMPs in an accompanying narrative, and explain any special conditions or situations that required omitting BMPs or substituting alternative BMPs for those shown here.



#### STORMWATER POLLUTANT SOURCES/SOURCE CONTROL CHECKLIST



### STORMWATER POLLUTANT SOURCES/SOURCE CONTROL CHECKLIST












 $^6$  The fueling area shall be defined as the area extending a minimum of 6.5 feet from the corner of each fuel dispenser or the length at which the hose and nozzle assembly may be operated plus  $^6$ **a minimum of one foot, whichever is greater.**







# Appendix 9: O&M

*Operation and Maintenance Plan and Documentation of Finance, Maintenance and Recording Mechanisms* 

## **Operations & Maintenance Responsibility for Treatment Control BMP's**



BMP's should start and be inspected prior to forecast rain, daily during extended rain events, after rain events, weekly during the rainy season, and at two-week intervals during the non-rainy season.

## **Funding**

*Funding for Ongoing Maintenance will be provided by the Home Owner's Association.*

## **Basin Site Maintenance Summary Form**



#### WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

City Clerk City of Riverside City Hall, 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92522

Planning Case: P\_\_-\_\_\_

For Recorder's Office Use Only

#### COVENANT AND AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING NOTIFICATION PROCESS AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE

 THIS COVENANT AND AGREEMENT FOR WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_, 20\_\_, by LA SIERRA VICTORIA DEVELOPMENT LLC \_("Declarant"), with reference to the following facts:

 A. Declarant is the fee owner of the real property (the "Property") situated in the City of Riverside, County of Riverside, State of California, and legally described in Exhibit "A", which is attached hereto and incorporated within by reference.

B. Declarant has applied to the City of Riverside ("City") for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_{Insert Project Description for Above Referenced Planning Case}\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ TRACT 38921 DP-2023-01293\_.

 C. As a condition of approval and prior to the map recordation and/or issuance of any permits, the City is requiring Declarant to execute and record an agreement stating that the future property owners shall be informed of the requirements to implement and maintain the Best Management Practices ("BMPs") as described in the approved project specific Water Quality Management Plan.

 D. Declarant intends by this document to comply with the conditions imposed by the City and to impose upon the Property mutually beneficial restrictions, conditions, covenants and agreements for the benefit of Property.

 NOW, THEREFORE, for the purposes of complying with the conditions imposed by the City of Riverside for the approval of Planning Case P\_\_-\_\_\_\_, Declarant hereby declares that the Property is and hereafter shall be held, conveyed, transferred, mortgaged, encumbered, leased, rented, used, occupied, sold and improved subject to the following declarations, limitations, covenants, conditions, restrictions and easements, all of which are imposed as

equitable servitudes pursuant to a general plan for the development of the Property for the purpose of enhancing and protecting the value and attractiveness of the Property, and each Parcel thereof, in accordance with the plan for the improvement of the Property, and to comply with certain conditions imposed by the City for the approval of P\_\_-\_\_\_\_, and shall be binding and inure to the benefit of each successor and assignee in interest of each such party. Any conveyance, transfer, sale, assignment, lease or sublease made by Declarant of a Parcel of the Property shall be and hereby is deemed to incorporate by reference all the provisions of the Covenant and Agreement including, but not limited to, all the covenants, conditions, restrictions, limitations, grants of easement, rights, rights-of-way, and equitable servitude contained herein.

 1. This Covenant and Agreement hereby establishes a notification process for future individual property owners to ensure they are subject to and adhere to the Water Quality Management Plan implementation measures and that it shall be the responsibility of the Declarant, its heirs, successors and assigns to implement and maintain all Best Management Practices (BMPs) in good working order.

 2. Declarant shall use its best efforts to diligently implement and maintain all BMPs in a manner assuring peak performance at all times. All reasonable precautions shall be exercised by Declarant, its heirs, successors and assigns, in the removal and extraction of any material(s) from the BMPs and the ultimate disposal of the material(s) in a manner consistent with all relevant laws and regulations in effect at the time. As may be requested from time to time by the City, Declarant, its heirs, successors and assigns shall provide the City with documentation identifying the material(s) removed, the quantity, and disposal destination.

 3. In the event Declarant, or its heirs, successors or assigns, fails to undertake the maintenance contemplated by this Covenant and Agreement within twenty-one (21) days of being given written notice by the City, or fails to complete any maintenance contemplated by this Covenant and Agreement with reasonable diligence, the City is hereby authorized to cause any maintenance necessary to be completed and charge the entire cost and expense to the Declarant or Declarant's successors or assigns, including administrative costs, reasonable attorneys fees and interest thereon at the maximum rate authorized by the Civil Code from the date of the notice of expense until paid in full. As an additional remedy, the Public Works Director may withdraw any previous urban runoff-related approval with respect to the Property on which BMPs have been installed and/or implemented until such time as Declarant, its heirs, successors or assigns, repays to City its reasonable costs incurred in accordance with this paragraph.

 4. Any person who now or hereafter owns or acquires any right, title or interest in or to any parcel of the Property shall be deemed to have consented and agreed to every covenant, condition, restriction and easement contained herein.

 5. In addition, each of the provisions hereof shall operate as covenants running with the land for the benefit of the Property and each Parcel thereof and shall inure to the benefit of all owners of the Parcels thereof, their successors and assigns in interest, and shall apply to and bind each successive owner of each Parcel, their successors and assigns in interest.

 6. The terms of this Covenant and Agreement may be enforced by the City, its successors or assigns, and by any owner, lessee or tenant of the Parcels of the Property. Should the City or any owner, lessee or tenant bring an action to enforce any of the terms of this Covenant and Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to costs of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees.

 7. Subject to the prior written approval of the City by its Public Works Director, any provision contained herein may be terminated, modified or amended as to all of the Property or any portion thereof. No such termination, modification or amendment shall be effective until there shall have been executed, acknowledged and recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Riverside County, California, an appropriate instrument evidencing the same including the consent thereto by the City.

 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Declarant has caused this Covenant and Agreement to be executed as of the day and year first written above.

\_ \_

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_{Insert\_Name\_of\_Owner}\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** LA SIERRA VICTORIA DEVELOPMENT LLC

\_

\_

Name: Title:

Name: Title:

APPROVED AS TO FORM: APPROVED AS TO CONTENT

Name: Name:

Deputy City Attorney Public Works Department:



Public, personally appeared \_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence, to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

**EXECUTE:** (SEAL) Notary Public Signature

STATE OF  $\qquad \qquad$  )

COUNTY OF  $\qquad \qquad$  )

On \_, before me, \_, Notary Public, personally appeared \_, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence, to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

)

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

(SEAL)

Notary Public Signature

#### **EXHIBIT A (Legal Description)**

### **EXHIBIT B (Map/Illustration)**

## Appendix 10: Educational Materials

*BMP Fact Sheets, Maintenance Guidelines and Other End-User BMP Information* 



## **Description**

An infiltration basin is a relatively large impoundment that is designed to infiltrate stormwater. Infiltration basins use the natural filtering ability of the soil to remove pollutants in stormwater runoff. Infiltration facilities store runoff until it gradually exfiltrates through the soil and eventually into the water table. This practice removes surface flow and associated pollutants through infiltration and can also help recharge groundwater, thus helping to maintain low flows in stream systems. Infiltration basins

can be challenging to apply on many sites, however, because of soils requirements. In addition, some studies have shown relatively high failure rates compared with other management practices.

## **California Experience**

Infiltration basins have a long history of use in California, especially in the Central Valley. Basins located in Fresno were among those initially evaluated in the National Urban Runoff Program and were found to be effective at reducing the volume of runoff, while posing little long-term threat to groundwater quality (EPA, 1983; Schroeder, 1995). Proper siting of these devices is crucial as underscored by the experience of Caltrans in siting two basins in Southern California. The basin with marginal separation from groundwater and soil permeability failed immediately and could never be rehabilitated. The Water Augmentatoin Study (LASGRWC 2010) perfomred in the Los Angeles region showed no negative impact to ground water from infiltrating stormwater through infiltration practices treating stormwater from sites ranging from 0.5 acres to 7.4 acres.

Infiltration basins have been shown to be effective at reducing many of the pollutants regulated by the State and Regional Water Boards. Additionally, the Water Boards have determined that

#### **Design Considerations**

- Soil for Infiltration
- Slope
- **Aesthetics**





infiltration basins can qualify as a "Full Capture System (FCS)<sup>1</sup>" for trash. Accordingly, in addition to providing general specifications, this fact sheet includes trash-specific information to assist with upgrading either an existing BMP or the design of a planned BMP to meet the FCS definition. See the "**Full Trash Capture Compliance**" section and "*Trash FCS*" subsections in this fact sheet for more information.

#### **Advantages**

- Provides stormwater treatment and can be designed to meet hydromodification management requirements and the full capture system definition for trash control.
- 100% reduction in the load discharged to surface waters.
- Can achieve pre-development hydrology by infiltrating a significant portion of the average annual rainfall runoff.

#### **Limitations**

- Have a high failure rate if soil and subsurface conditions are not suitable.
- May not be appropriate for industrial sites or locations where spills may occur.
- Infiltration basins require a minimum soil infiltration rate of 0.5 inches/hour, not appropriate at sites with Hydrologic Soil Types C or D.

#### **Performance**

As water migrates through porous soil and rock, pollutant attenuation mechanisms include precipitation, sorption, physical filtration, and bacterial degradation (Table 1). Vegetation establishment may improve water quality performance and decrease residence time (i.e., increase water losses). If functioning properly, this approach is presumed to have high removal efficiencies for particulate pollutants and moderate removal of soluble pollutants. Actual pollutant removal in the subsurface would be expected to vary depending upon site-specific soil types. This technology eliminates discharge to surface waters except for the very largest storms; consequently, complete removal of all stormwater constituents can be assumed.



Table 1. Typical pollutant removal for constituents and removal processes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Full Capture System (FCS): A treatment control, or series of treatment controls, including but not limited to, a multi-benefit projector a low impact development control that traps all particles that are 5 mm or greater, and has a design treatment capacity that is either: a) of not less than the peak flow rate, Q, resulting from a one-year, one-hour, storm in the subdrainage area, or b) appropriately sized to, and designed to carry at least the same flows as, the corresponding storm drain.

# **Infiltration Basin TC-11**





<sup>1</sup> Concentrations are based on bioretention performance data. Underlined effluent concentrations were (statistically) significantly lower than influent concentrations, as determined by statistical hypothesis testing on the available sampled data. Effluent concentrations displayed in *italics* were (statistically) significantly higher than influent concentrations.

Groundwater contamination concerns exists for infiltration basins (Lind and Karro, 1995; Datry et al., 2004; Pitt, 1999) but pollutant concentrations in the soil column have been shown to decrease rapidly with depth (within the first 6 to 18 inches) (Dechesne, M. et al., 2004; Dierkes and Geiger, 1999; Mikkelsen et al., 1997; Datry et al., 2004). However, pollutant concentrations can be of concern as deep as 10 feet, preferential flow pathways are suspected as the means of transport in some geologic settings (Winiarski et al. 2006). These observations warrant a 10 foot minimum between infiltration basin bottom and seasonal high water table.

## *Trash FCS*

The Trash Amendments adopted by the State Water Board in April 2015 provide a performance standard for treatment of stormwater for trash in the form of the definition of FCS, which infiltration basin meets (see Section 5.6.1 for FCS details).

## **Suitability and Design**

The use of infiltration basins may be limited by a number of factors, including type of native soils, climate, and location of groundwater table. Site characteristics, such as excessive slope of the drainage area, fine-grained soil types, and proximate location of the water table and bedrock, can also preclude the use of infiltration basins. The constraints of each site dictate the appropriate siting and footprint. Fundamental infiltration basin design components are as follows:

- Infiltration rate assessed on-site by a licensed geotechnical engineer or soil scientist.
- Unsuitable if known soil contamination is present, or if upstream drainage area uses or store chemicals or hazardous materials that could drain to the basin.
- 10 feet of separation between bottom of the basin and seasonal high water table.
- Drainage area that has been fully stabilized, plus use of a pretreatment BMP (e.g. grassed swales, gravity separator) at the entry point to ensure longevity.
- 10-ft setback from foundations, 100-ft from septic fields and water supply wells, and 50-ft from steep slopes.

Basin design is highly dependent on the constraints of the considered site. Costs will vary in accordance with the design. [Table 2](#page--1-0) details a number of core construction components and corresponding design considerations.



Table 2. Cost of design components and associated considerations



Ensure that adequate head is available to operate flow splitter structures (to allow the basin to be offline) without ponding in the splitter structure or creating backwater upstream of the splitter.

Basin invert area should be determined by the equation. Where:

$$
A = \frac{WQV}{kt}
$$



#### *Design Variations*

When traditional surface basins are infeasible because of land constraints, subsurface extended detention basin are ideal [\(Figure 1\)](#page--1-1). Open space parks (e.g., baseball fields, etc.) are an example of where a subsurface infiltration basin is ideal because the park's purpose as a recreational area is not compromised. Additionally, recreational areas typical lack large structures, therefore the issue of overhead weight over the subsurface unit is not a concern.



## *Full Trash Capture Compliance*

This section provides trash-specific information to assist with upgrading either an existing BMP or the design of a planned BMP to meet the FCS definition. In addition to developing and adopting the Trash Amendments, the State Water Board provides implementation information on its Trash Implementation web page:

[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/trash\\_implementation.h](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/trash_implementation.html) [tml.](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/trash_implementation.html)

The web page includes information on best management practices or Full Capture Systems, including lists of State-certified Multi-Benefit Trash Treatment Systems. So, when selecting BMPs for trash control, fact sheet users should refer to both this BMP fact sheet and the State Water Board's Trash Implementation web page.

#### *Design Modifications to Prevent Trash Migration, Sustain Capacity, and Prevent Reduced Functionality*

The infiltration basin must be configured to allow trash to enter the system and for trash to remain in the basin until it can be collected and removed. To meet the requirement, inlets must be designed to pass the peak flow produced by the one-year, one-hour design storm or the same flows as the capacity of the inlet storm drain and solids that would be retained by a 5 mm screen or mesh, must remain in the system.

#### *Inlets*

There are a multitude of inlet configurations that will allow trash to enter and be captured in an infiltration basin. An open inlet with a forebay is recommended.

#### *Pretreatment*

Pretreatment is beneficial to increase and consolidate trash capture while managing maintenance requirements. A forebay with mortared cobble is one example of incorporating pretreatment in the inlet [\(Figure 2\)](#page--1-2). This configuration can slow flow and allow trash and gross solids to settle out while consolidating at the edge of the infiltration basin to make it easier for maintenance crews to collect and remove.



#### *Trash Containment*

Once trash has been captured in an infiltration basin it must be contained so trash does not

escape the infiltration basin. Containment may be provided by one or more of these features:

- an external design feature or upgradient structure designed to bypass flows exceeding the region-specific one-year, onehour storm event; or
- $\blacksquare$  the BMP having sufficient capacity to trap particles from flows exceeding those generated by the one-year, one-hour storm event; or
- $\blacksquare$  the BMP having sufficient capacity to treat either the



design flows or volumes through media filtration or infiltration into native or amended soils; or

use of a maximum 5 mm mesh screen on all outlets.

#### **Maintenance**

A considerable cost concern associated with infiltration practices is the maintenance burden and longevity. If improperly maintained, infiltration basins have a high failure rate. Thus, it may be necessary to replace the basin with a different technology after a relatively short period of time. To mitigate failure, ensure particulate loading of the stormwater is minimal, or is reduced with an adjacent pretreatment (i.e. vegetated buffer strip). Reducing the particulate loading enables the soils infiltrative capacity to stay high and functional.

Clogged infiltration basins reduced water quality performance but can also enable standing water to become a nuisance due to mosquito breeding. If the basin takes more than 48 hours to drain, then the rock fill should be removed and all dimensions of the basin should be increased by 2 inches to provide a fresh surface for infiltration. To mitigate failure, ensure particulate loading of the stormwater is minimal, or is reduced with an adjacent pretreatment [\(Figure 2\)](#page--1-2). Reducing particulate loading enables the soil's infiltrative capacity to remain high and functional. Table 3 provides maintenance activity details, frequency, and costs.

Table 3. Typical maintenance activities and associated costs and frequency





Water Board maintenance criteria for Multi-Benefit Treatment Systems to be qualified as Full Capture Systems.

### *Trash FCS*

### *Maintenance to Prevent Trash Migration, Sustain Capacity, and Prevent Reduced Functionality*

For Multi-Benefit Treatment Systems to be qualified as Full Capture Systems, the State Water Board requires regular maintenance to maintain adequate trash capture capacity and to ensure that trapped trash does not migrate offsite. Additionally, the State Water Board requires the BMP owner to establish a maintenance schedule based on site-specific factors, including the design trash capacity of the Infiltration Basin Multi-Benefit Trash Treatment System, storm frequency, and estimated or measured trash loading from the drainage area. To meet those criteria, it is likely that the frequency of trash and debris removal will have to be increased above the recommended monthly interval during the wet season to prevent trash from being blown from the BMP or being washed out of the infiltration basin in the subsequent rain events (see Table 3). Depending on the frequency and size of storms, and upstream pollutant characteristics, trash and debris removal can be as frequent as before and after every wet weather event. The optimum maintenance frequency is best determined by site observation over an average water year.

Trash maintenance not only plays a role in the functionality of the infiltration basin but also in the aesthetics and public perception of the infiltration basin (and of all BMPs). Part of maintaining positive perception among the public is the visibility of a well-maintained BMP. This positive perception can self-perpetuate further support for integrated stormwater management practices and therefore further investment in regular maintenance.

#### **Schematic**



## **References and Sources of Additional Information**

Brown, W., and T. Schueler. 1997. *The Economics of Stormwater BMPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region*. Prepared for the Chesapeake Research Consortium, Edgewater, MD, by the Center for Watershed Protection, Ellicott City, MD.

Clark, S.E., and R. Pitt. 2009. Storm-water filter media pollutant retention under aerobic versus anaerobic conditions. Journal of Environmental Engineering 135(5):367–371.

Caltrans, 2002, BMP Retrofit Pilot Program Proposed Final Report, Rpt. CTSW-RT-01-050, California Dept. of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.

Datry, T., F. Malard, J. Gibert. 2004. Dynamics of solutes and dissolved oxygen in shallow urban groundwater below a stormwater infiltration basin. Science of the Total Environment 329: 215– 229.

Davis, A.P. 2007. Field performance of bioretention: Water quality. *Environmental Engineering Science* 24(8):1048–1063.

Dechesne, M., S. Barraud, J. Bardin. 2004. Spatial distribution of pollution in an urban stormwater infiltration basin Journal of Contaminant Hydrology 72: 189– 205.

Dierkes, C., W. Geiger. 1999. Pollution retention capabilities of roadside soils Water Science & Technology 39: 201-208.

Dorman, T., M. Frey, J. Wright, B. Wardynski, J. Smith, B. Tucker, J. Riverson, A. Teague, and K. Bishop. 2013. San Antonio River Basin Low Impact Development Technical Design Guidance Manual, v1. San Antonio River Authority. San Antonio, TX.

Galli, J. 1992. *Analysis of Urban BMP Performance and Longevity in Prince George's County, Maryland*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC.

Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering. 2012. *International Storm Water BMP Database Pollutant Category Summary Statistical Addendum: TSS, Bacteria, Nutrients, and Metals.* 2012. International Storm Water BMP Database. <http://www.bmpdatabase.org/>

Hathaway, J.M., W.F. Hunt, and S.J. Jadlocki. 2009. Indicator bacteria removal in stormwater best management practices in Charlotte, North Carolina. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 135(12):1275–1285.

Hathaway, J.M., W.F. Hunt, A.K. Graves, and J.D. Wright. 2011. Field evaluation of bioretention indicator bacteria sequestration in Wilmington, NC. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*  137(12):1103–1113.

Hilding, K. 1996. Longevity of infiltration basins assessed in Puget Sound. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(3):124–125.

Hong, E., M. Seagren, and A.P. Davis. 2006. Sustainable oil and grease removal from synthetic stormwater runoff using bench-scale bioretention studies. Water Environment Research. 78(2):141-155.

Hsieh, C.H., and A.P. Davis. 2005. Evaluation and optimization of bioretention media for treatment of urban stormwater runoff. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 131(11):1521– 1531.

Hunt, W.F., and W.G. Lord. 2006. *Bioretention Performance, Design, Construction, and Maintenance.* North Carolina Cooperative Extension, Raleigh, NC.

Hunt, W.F., A.R. Jarrett, J.T. Smith, and L.J. Sharkey. 2006. Evaluating bioretention hydrology and nutrient removal at three field sites in North Carolina. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 132(6):600–608.

Hunt, W.F., A.P. Davis, and R.G. Traver. 2012. Meeting hydrologic and water quality goals through targeted bioretention design. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 138(6):698–707.

Jones, M.P., and W.F. Hunt. 2010. Effect of stormwater wetlands and wet ponds on runoff temperature in trout sensitive waters. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*  136(9):656–661.

Kim, H., E.A. Seagren, and A.P. Davis. 2003. Engineered bioretention for removal of nitrate from stormwater runoff. *Water Environment Research* 75(4):355–367.

Li, M.-H., C.Y. Sung, M.H. Kim, and K.-H. Chu. 2010. *Bioretention for Stormwater Quality Improvements in Texas: Pilot Experiments.* Texas A&M University in cooperation with Texas Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration.

Li, H., and A.P. Davis. 2008. Urban particle capture in bioretention media. I: Laboratory and field studies. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 143(6):409–418.

Lind, B. B., Karro, E. 1995. "Stormwater infiltration and accumulation of heavy metals in roadside green areas in Göteborg, Sweden," *Ecological Engineering*, 5, 533-539.

Maniquiz, M., S. Lee, L. Kim. 2010. Long-Term Monitoring Of Infiltration for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*. 212(1):13-26

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). 2000. *Maryland Stormwater Design Manual*. [http://www.mde.state.md.us/environment/wma/stormwatermanual.](http://www.mde.state.md.us/environment/wma/stormwatermanual) Accessed May 22, 2002.

Mikkelsen, P., Häfliger, M., Ochs, M., Jacobsen, P., Tjell, J. 1997. Pollution of soil and groundwater from infiltration of highly contaminated stormwater-a case study. *Water Science & Technology*, 36, 325-330.

Nightingale, H.I., 1975, "Lead, Zinc, and Copper in Soils of Urban Storm-Runoff Retention Basins," American Water Works Assoc. Journal. Vol. 67, p. 443-446.

Nightingale, H.I., 1987a, "Water Quality beneath Urban Runoff Water Management Basins," Water Resources Bulletin, Vol. 23, p. 197-205.

Nightingale, H.I., 1987b, "Accumulation of As, Ni, Cu, and Pb in Retention and Recharge Basin Soils from Urban Runoff," Water Resources Bulletin, Vol. 23, p. 663-672.

Nightingale, H.I., 1987c, "Organic Pollutants in Soils of Retention/Recharge Basins Receiving Urban Runoff Water," Soil Science Vol. 148, pp. 39-45.

Nightingale, H.I., Harrison, D., and Salo, J.E., 1985, "An Evaluation Technique for Groundwater Quality Beneath Urban Runoff Retention and Percolation Basins," Ground Water Monitoring Review, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 43-50.

Oberts, G. 1994. Performance of Stormwater Ponds and Wetlands in Winter. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(2): 64–68.

Passeport, E., W.F. Hunt, D.E. Line, R.A. Smith, and R.A. Brown. 2009. Field study of the ability of two grassed bioretention cells to reduce stormwater runoff pollution. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 135(4):505–510. Ramsey, C.G. & H. R. Sleeper. 1988. *Architectural Graphic Standards* (Eighth Ed.), Somerset, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Pitt, R., Clark, S., Field, R. 1999. Groundwater contamination potential from stormwater infiltration practices. *Urban Water*, 1:217-236

Scholes, L. M. Revitt, J. Ellis. 2007. A systematic approach for the comparative assessment of stormwater pollutant removal potentials. Journal of Environmental Management, 88(2008): 467–478.

Schueler, T. 1987. *Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC.

Schroeder, R.A., 1995, *Potential For Chemical Transport Beneath a Storm-Runoff Recharge (Retention) Basin for an Industrial Catchment in Fresno, CA*, USGS Water-Resource Investigations Report 93-4140.

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC). 1991. *Costs of Urban Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Control Measures*. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, Waukesha, WI.

Tetra Tech (Tetra Tech, Inc.). 2014. Low Impact Development Handbook Stormwater Management Strategies County of San Diego Department of Public Works by Tetra Tech, Inc., San Diego, CA.

U.S. EPA, 1983, *Results of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program: Volume 1 – Final Report*, WH-554, Water Planning Division, Washington, DC.

Watershed Management Institute (WMI). 1997. *Operation, Maintenance, and Management of Stormwater Management Systems*. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water, Washington, DC.

Winer, R. 2000. National Pollutant Removal Database for Stormwater Treatment Practices (2nd edition). Ellicott City: Center for Watershed Protection.

Winiarski, T., J. Bedell, C. Delolme, Y. Perrodin. 2006. The impact of stormwater on a soil profile in an infiltration basin. Hydrogeology Journal 14: 1244–1251.

#### *Information Resources*

Center for Watershed Protection (CWP). 1997. *Stormwater BMP Design Supplement for Cold Climates*. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. Washington, DC.

Ferguson, B.K., 1994. *Stormwater Infiltration*. CRC Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council (LASGRWC). 2010. Water Augmentation Study, Research, Strategy, and implementation Report.

http://lasgrwc2.org/dataandreference/Document.aspx?search=48

USEPA. 1993. *Guidance to Specify Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters*. EPA-840-B-92-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

# **Site Design & Landscape Planning SD-10**



#### **Design Objectives**

- $\nabla$  Maximize Infiltration
- **☑** Provide Retention
- $\boxtimes$  Slow Runoff
- Minimize Impervious Land Coverage

Prohibit Dumping of Improper **Materials** 

Contain Pollutants

Collect and Convey

#### **Description**

Each project site possesses unique topographic, hydrologic, and vegetative features, some of which are more suitable for development than others. Integrating and incorporating appropriate landscape planning methodologies into the project design is the most effective action that can be done to minimize surface and groundwater contamination from stormwater.

#### **Approach**

Landscape planning should couple consideration of land suitability for urban uses with consideration of community goals and projected growth. Project plan designs should conserve natural areas to the extent possible, maximize natural water storage and infiltration opportunities, and protect slopes and channels.

#### **Suitable Applications**

Appropriate applications include residential, commercial and industrial areas planned for development or redevelopment.

#### **Design Considerations**

Design requirements for site design and landscapes planning should conform to applicable standards and specifications of agencies with jurisdiction and be consistent with applicable General Plan and Local Area Plan policies.



1 of 4

## *Designing* **New** *Installations*

Begin the development of a plan for the landscape unit with attention to the following general principles:

- Formulate the plan on the basis of clearly articulated community goals. Carefully identify conflicts and choices between retaining and protecting desired resources and community growth.
- Map and assess land suitability for urban uses. Include the following landscape features in the assessment: wooded land, open unwooded land, steep slopes, erosion-prone soils, foundation suitability, soil suitability for waste disposal, aquifers, aquifer recharge areas, wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, agricultural lands, and various categories of urban land use. When appropriate, the assessment can highlight outstanding local or regional resources that the community determines should be protected (e.g., a scenic area, recreational area, threatened species habitat, farmland, fish run). Mapping and assessment should recognize not only these resources but also additional areas needed for their sustenance.

Project plan designs should conserve natural areas to the extent possible, maximize natural water storage and infiltration opportunities, and protect slopes and channels.

#### *Conserve Natural Areas during Landscape Planning*

If applicable, the following items are required and must be implemented in the site layout during the subdivision design and approval process, consistent with applicable General Plan and Local Area Plan policies:

- Cluster development on least-sensitive portions of a site while leaving the remaining land in a natural undisturbed condition.
- Limit clearing and grading of native vegetation at a site to the minimum amount needed to build lots, allow access, and provide fire protection.
- Maximize trees and other vegetation at each site by planting additional vegetation, clustering tree areas, and promoting the use of native and/or drought tolerant plants.
- Promote natural vegetation by using parking lot islands and other landscaped areas.
- Preserve riparian areas and wetlands.

#### *Maximize Natural Water Storage and Infiltration Opportunities Within the Landscape Unit*

- Promote the conservation of forest cover. Building on land that is already deforested affects basin hydrology to a lesser extent than converting forested land. Loss of forest cover reduces interception storage, detention in the organic forest floor layer, and water losses by evapotranspiration, resulting in large peak runoff increases and either their negative effects or the expense of countering them with structural solutions.
- Maintain natural storage reservoirs and drainage corridors, including depressions, areas of permeable soils, swales, and intermittent streams. Develop and implement policies and

regulations to discourage the clearing, filling, and channelization of these features. Utilize them in drainage networks in preference to pipes, culverts, and engineered ditches.

Evaluating infiltration opportunities by referring to the stormwater management manual for the jurisdiction and pay particular attention to the selection criteria for avoiding groundwater contamination, poor soils, and hydrogeological conditions that cause these facilities to fail. If necessary, locate developments with large amounts of impervious surfaces or a potential to produce relatively contaminated runoff away from groundwater recharge areas.

*Protection of Slopes and Channels during Landscape Design* 

- Convey runoff safely from the tops of slopes.
- Avoid disturbing steep or unstable slopes.
- Avoid disturbing natural channels.
- Stabilize disturbed slopes as quickly as possible.
- Vegetate slopes with native or drought tolerant vegetation.
- Control and treat flows in landscaping and/or other controls prior to reaching existing natural drainage systems.
- Stabilize temporary and permanent channel crossings as quickly as possible, and ensure that increases in run-off velocity and frequency caused by the project do not erode the channel.
- Install energy dissipaters, such as riprap, at the outlets of new storm drains, culverts, conduits, or channels that enter unlined channels in accordance with applicable specifications to minimize erosion. Energy dissipaters shall be installed in such a way as to minimize impacts to receiving waters.
- Line on-site conveyance channels where appropriate, to reduce erosion caused by increased flow velocity due to increases in tributary impervious area. The first choice for linings should be grass or some other vegetative surface, since these materials not only reduce runoff velocities, but also provide water quality benefits from filtration and infiltration. If velocities in the channel are high enough to erode grass or other vegetative linings, riprap, concrete, soil cement, or geo-grid stabilization are other alternatives.
- Consider other design principles that are comparable and equally effective.

## *Redeveloping Existing Installations*

Various jurisdictional stormwater management and mitigation plans (SUSMP, WQMP, etc.) define "redevelopment" in terms of amounts of additional impervious area, increases in gross floor area and/or exterior construction, and land disturbing activities with structural or impervious surfaces. The definition of "redevelopment" must be consulted to determine whether or not the requirements for new development apply to areas intended for redevelopment. If the definition applies, the steps outlined under "designing new installations" above should be followed.
# **SD-10 Site Design & Landscape Planning**

Redevelopment may present significant opportunity to add features which had not previously been implemented. Examples include incorporation of depressions, areas of permeable soils, and swales in newly redeveloped areas. While some site constraints may exist due to the status of already existing infrastructure, opportunities should not be missed to maximize infiltration, slow runoff, reduce impervious areas, disconnect directly connected impervious areas.

### **Other Resources**

A Manual for the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, May 2002.

Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, Washington State Department of Ecology, August 2001.

Model Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for San Diego County, Port of San Diego, and Cities in San Diego County, February 14, 2002.

Model Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District, and the Incorporated Cities of Orange County, Draft February 2003.

Ventura Countywide Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Measures, July 2002.

# **Roof Runoff Controls**



#### **Design Objectives**

- **1** Maximize Infiltration
- **0** Provide Retention
- **0** Slow Runoff

Minimize Impervious Land Coverage Prohibit Dumping of Improper **Materials** 

**1** Contain Pollutants

Collect and Convey

## **Description**

Various roof runoff controls are available to address stormwater that drains off rooftops. The objective is to reduce the total volume and rate of runoff from individual lots, and retain the pollutants on site that may be picked up from roofing materials and atmospheric deposition. Roof runoff controls consist of directing the roof runoff away from paved areas and mitigating flow to the storm drain system through one of several general approaches: cisterns or rain barrels; dry wells or infiltration trenches; pop-up emitters, and foundation planting. The first three approaches require the roof runoff to be contained in a gutter and downspout system. Foundation planting provides a vegetated strip under the drip line of the roof.

# **Approach**

Design of individual lots for single-family homes as well as lots for higher density residential and commercial structures should consider site design provisions for containing and infiltrating roof runoff or directing roof runoff to vegetative swales or buffer areas. Retained water can be reused for watering gardens, lawns, and trees. Benefits to the environment include reduced demand for potable water used for irrigation, improved stormwater quality, increased groundwater recharge, decreased runoff volume and peak flows, and decreased flooding potential.

# **Suitable Applications**

Appropriate applications include residential, commercial and industrial areas planned for development or redevelopment.

# **Design Considerations**

#### *Designing New Installations*

#### *Cisterns or Rain Barrels*

One method of addressing roof runoff is to direct roof downspouts to cisterns or rain barrels. A cistern is an above ground storage vessel with either a manually operated valve or a permanently open outlet. Roof runoff is temporarily stored and then released for irrigation or infiltration between storms. The number of rain



barrels needed is a function of the rooftop area. Some low impact developers recommend that every house have at least 2 rain barrels, with a minimum storage capacity of 1000 liters. Roof barrels serve several purposes including mitigating the first flush from the roof which has a high volume, amount of contaminants, and thermal load. Several types of rain barrels are commercially available. Consideration must be given to selecting rain barrels that are vector proof and childproof. In addition, some barrels are designed with a bypass valve that filters out grit and other contaminants and routes overflow to a soak-away pit or rain garden.

If the cistern has an operable valve, the valve can be closed to store stormwater for irrigation or infiltration between storms. This system requires continual monitoring by the resident or grounds crews, but provides greater flexibility in water storage and metering. If a cistern is provided with an operable valve and water is stored inside for long periods, the cistern must be covered to prevent mosquitoes from breeding.

A cistern system with a permanently open outlet can also provide for metering stormwater runoff. If the cistern outlet is significantly smaller than the size of the downspout inlet (say  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch diameter), runoff will build up inside the cistern during storms, and will empty out slowly after peak intensities subside. This is a feasible way to mitigate the peak flow increases caused by rooftop impervious land coverage, especially for the frequent, small storms.

#### Dry *wells and Infiltration Trenches*

Roof downspouts can be directed to dry wells or infiltration trenches. A dry well is constructed by excavating a hole in the ground and filling it with an open graded aggregate, and allowing the water to fill the dry well and infiltrate after the storm event. An underground connection from the downspout conveys water into the dry well, allowing it to be stored in the voids. To minimize sedimentation from lateral soil movement, the sides and top of the stone storage matrix can be wrapped in a permeable filter fabric, though the bottom may remain open. A perforated observation pipe can be inserted vertically into the dry well to allow for inspection and maintenance.

In practice, dry wells receiving runoff from single roof downspouts have been successful over long periods because they contain very little sediment. They must be sized according to the amount of rooftop runoff received, but are typically 4 to 5 feet square, and 2 to 3 feet deep, with a minimum of 1-foot soil cover over the top (maximum depth of 10 feet).

To protect the foundation, dry wells must be set away from the building at least 10 feet. They must be installed in solids that accommodate infiltration. In poorly drained soils, dry wells have very limited feasibility.

Infiltration trenches function in a similar manner and would be particularly effective for larger roof areas. An infiltration trench is a long, narrow, rock-filled trench with no outlet that receives stormwater runoff. These are described under Treatment Controls.

### *Pop-up Drainage Emitter*

Roof downspouts can be directed to an underground pipe that daylights some distance from the building foundation, releasing the roof runoff through a pop-up emitter. Similar to a pop-up irrigation head, the emitter only opens when there is flow from the roof. The emitter remains flush to the ground during dry periods, for ease of lawn or landscape maintenance.

## *Foundation Planting*

Landscape planting can be provided around the base to allow increased opportunities for stormwater infiltration and protect the soil from erosion caused by concentrated sheet flow coming off the roof. Foundation plantings can reduce the physical impact of water on the soil and provide a subsurface matrix of roots that encourage infiltration. These plantings must be sturdy enough to tolerate the heavy runoff sheet flows, and periodic soil saturation.

### *Redeveloping Existing Installations*

Various jurisdictional stormwater management and mitigation plans (SUSMP, WQMP, etc.) define "redevelopment" in terms of amounts of additional impervious area, increases in gross floor area and/or exterior construction, and land disturbing activities with structural or impervious surfaces. The definition of "redevelopment" must be consulted to determine whether or not the requirements for new development apply to areas intended for redevelopment. If the definition applies, the steps outlined under "designing new installations" above should be followed.

# **Supplemental Information**

### *Examples*

- City of Ottawa's Water Links Surface –Water Quality Protection Program
- City of Toronto Downspout Disconnection Program
- City of Boston, MA, Rain Barrel Demonstration Program

### **Other Resources**

Hager, Marty Catherine, Stormwater, "Low-Impact Development", January/February 2003. www.stormh2o.com

Low Impact Urban Design Tools, Low Impact Development Design Center, Beltsville, MD. www.lid-stormwater.net

Start at the Source, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association, 1999 Edition

# **Efficient Irrigation SD-12**



#### **Design Objectives**

- **1** Maximize Infiltration
- **0** Provide Retention
- **0** Slow Runoff

Minimize Impervious Land Coverage Prohibit Dumping of Improper **Materials** 

Contain Pollutants

Collect and Convey

## **Description**

Irrigation water provided to landscaped areas may result in excess irrigation water being conveyed into stormwater drainage systems.

## **Approach**

Project plan designs for development and redevelopment should include application methods of irrigation water that minimize runoff of excess irrigation water into the stormwater conveyance system.

# **Suitable Applications**

Appropriate applications include residential, commercial and industrial areas planned for development or redevelopment. (Detached residential single-family homes are typically excluded from this requirement.)

# **Design Considerations**

### *Designing New Installations*

The following methods to reduce excessive irrigation runoff should be considered, and incorporated and implemented where determined applicable and feasible by the Permittee:

- Employ rain-triggered shutoff devices to prevent irrigation after precipitation.
- Design irrigation systems to each landscape area's specific water requirements.
- Include design featuring flow reducers or shutoff valves triggered by a pressure drop to control water loss in the event of broken sprinkler heads or lines.
- Implement landscape plans consistent with County or City water conservation resolutions, which may include provision of water sensors, programmable irrigation times (for short cycles), etc.



- Design timing and application methods of irrigation water to minimize the runoff of excess irrigation water into the storm water drainage system.
- Group plants with similar water requirements in order to reduce excess irrigation runoff and promote surface filtration. Choose plants with low irrigation requirements (for example, native or drought tolerant species). Consider design features such as:
	- Using mulches (such as wood chips or bar) in planter areas without ground cover to minimize sediment in runoff
	- Installing appropriate plant materials for the location, in accordance with amount of sunlight and climate, and use native plant materials where possible and/or as recommended by the landscape architect
	- Leaving a vegetative barrier along the property boundary and interior watercourses, to act as a pollutant filter, where appropriate and feasible
	- Choosing plants that minimize or eliminate the use of fertilizer or pesticides to sustain growth
- Employ other comparable, equally effective methods to reduce irrigation water runoff.

### *Redeveloping Existing Installations*

Various jurisdictional stormwater management and mitigation plans (SUSMP, WQMP, etc.) define "redevelopment" in terms of amounts of additional impervious area, increases in gross floor area and/or exterior construction, and land disturbing activities with structural or impervious surfaces. The definition of "redevelopment" must be consulted to determine whether or not the requirements for new development apply to areas intended for redevelopment. If the definition applies, the steps outlined under "designing new installations" above should be followed.

#### **Other Resources**

A Manual for the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, May 2002.

Model Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for San Diego County, Port of San Diego, and Cities in San Diego County, February 14, 2002.

Model Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District, and the Incorporated Cities of Orange County, Draft February 2003.

Ventura Countywide Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Measures, July 2002.