

CITY OF CUPERTINO

Urban Runoff Management Program



Stevens Creek, March 2024

Annual Report FY 2023-2024



ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DIVISION

CITY HALL
10300 TORRE AVENUE • CUPERTINO, CA 95014-3255
(408) 777-3236 • ENVIRONMENTAL@CUPERTINO.ORG
CUPERTINO.ORG

September 30, 2024

Ms. Eileen White
Executive Officer
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612

Subject: **City of Cupertino**
FY 2023-2024 Annual Report

Dear Ms. White:

This letter and Annual Report with attachments is submitted by City of Cupertino pursuant to Permit Provision C.22.a of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP), Order R2-2022-0018, NPDES Permit No CAS612008 issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Annual Report provides documentation of activities conducted during FY 2023-2024 and consists of the following:

- A. Certification Statement
- B. Annual Report Form
 - Table of Contents
 - Completed Annual Report Form Sections

Please contact Ursula Syrova at 408-777-7603 regarding any questions or concerns.

Very truly yours,

Ursula Syrova
Environmental Programs and Sustainability Manager
Public Works Department
City of Cupertino

**CITY OF CUPERTINO
FY 2023-2024 ANNUAL REPORT**

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 by Duly Authorized Representative:



9/24/2024

Chad Mosley
Public Works Director

Date

Table of Contents

| Section | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Section 1 – Permittee Information | 1-1 |
| Section 2 – Provision C.2 Municipal Operations..... | 2-1 |
| Section 3 – Provision C.3 New Development and Redevelopment | 3-1 |
| Section 4 – Provision C.4 Industrial and Commercial Site Controls..... | 4-1 |
| Section 5 – Provision C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination | 5-1 |
| Section 6 – Provision C.6 Construction Site Controls..... | 6-1 |
| Section 7 – Provision C.7 Public Information and Outreach..... | 7-1 |
| Section 9 – Provision C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Controls | 9-1 |
| Section 10 – Provision C.10 Trash Load Reduction | 10-1 |
| Section 11 – Provision C.11 Mercury Controls | 11-1 |
| Section 12 – Provision C.12 PCBs Controls | 12-1 |
| Section 13 – Provision C.13 Copper Controls | 13-1 |
| Section 14 – Provision C.14 Bacteria Control for Impaired Water Bodies..... | 14-1 |
| Section 15 – Provision C.15 Exempted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges..... | 15-1 |
| Section 17 – Provision C.17 Discharges Associated with Unsheltered Homeless Populations..... | 17-1 |

Section 1 – Permittee Information

SECTION I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

| Background Information | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|
| Permittee Name: | City of Cupertino | | |
| Population: | 59,471 ¹ | | |
| NPDES Permit No.: | CAS612008 | | |
| Order Number: | R2-2022-0018 | | |
| Reporting Time Period (month/year): | July 2023 through June 2024 | | |
| Name of the Responsible Authority: | Chad Mosley | Title: | Director of Public Works |
| Mailing Address: | 10300 Torre Avenue | | |
| City: | Cupertino | Zip Code: | 95014 |
| | | County: | Santa Clara |
| Telephone Number: | 408-777-7604 | Fax Number: | 408-777-3333 |
| E-mail Address: | ChadM@cupertino.gov | | |
| Name of the Designated Stormwater Management Program Contact (if different from above): | Ursula Syrova | Title: | Environmental Programs and Sustainability Manager |
| Department: | Public Works Department, Environmental Programs Division | | |
| Mailing Address: | Cupertino City Hall, 10300 Torre Avenue | | |
| City: | Cupertino | Zip Code: | 95014 |
| | | County: | Santa Clara |
| Telephone Number: | 408-777-7603 | Fax Number: | 408-777-3333 |
| E-mail Address: | UrsulaS@cupertino.gov | | |

¹ Population derived from <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/e-5-population-and-housing-estimates-for-cities-counties-and-the-state-2020-2024/>

Cupertino Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| AERC | A full service recycling company facility in Hayward which collects universal waste such as lamps, ballast, batteries, electronic scrap and mercury containing material. AERC Specialists provide regulatory compliance and consulting for handling U-waste. |
| CESSWI | Certified Erosion Sediment Storm Water Inspector |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Project |
| EC | Erosion Control |
| IND/IDDE Inspector | Illegal Discharge Detection and Elimination Inspector |
| MRP | Municipal Regional Permit |
| NPS Inspector | Non Point Source Inspector also called the IND/IDDE Inspector |
| PCA | Pest Control Advisor |
| Pub Ed | TAC Public Education Sub Group |
| PW | Public Works |
| QAC | Qualified Applicator Certificate. A category of the DPR licensing and certification Program. To be certified, the applicant must demonstrate specific knowledge on topics such as pesticide application drift problems and prevention, soil and water problems resulting from restricted use pesticides, phytotoxicity, potential for environmental contamination, etc. |
| R-O-W | Right of Way |
| SCC RWRC TAC | Santa Clara County Recycling & Waste Reduction Commission Technical Advisory Committee |
| WV | West Valley (communities) |
| ZLI | Zero Waste Initiative |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|------------|---|
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ABAG | Association of Bay Area Governments |
| ABC | Annual Budget Review Compilation |
| ACCWP | Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program |
| ACOE | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| AHTG | Ad Hoc Task Group |
| AR | Annual Report |
| ASCE | American Society of Civil Engineers |
| BAAQMD | Bay Area Air Quality Management District |
| BART | San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit |
| BATG | Budget Ad Hoc Task Group |
| Basin | Santa Clara Basin |
| Basin Plan | Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Basin |
| BACWA | Bay Area Clean Water Agencies |
| BAHM | Bay Area Hydrology Model |
| BAMBI | Bay Area Macroinvertebrate Bioassessment Information |
| BASMAA | Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association |
| Bay | San Francisco Bay |
| Bay Area | San Francisco Bay Area |
| BMI | Benthic Macroinvertebrate |
| BMM | Lower South Bay Monitoring and Modeling Subgroup |
| BMP | Best Management Practice |
| BOMA | Building Owners and Managers Association |
| BPP | Brake Pad Partnership |
| BU | beneficial use |
| C | Celsius |
| C.3 | Permit Provision C.3 |
| C3PO | C.3 Provision Oversight |
| CA | California |
| Cal-EPA | California Environmental Protection Agency |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation |
| CAMLnet | California Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Laboratory Network |
| Campaign | Watershed Watch Campaign |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|---------------|---|
| CAP | Copper Action Plan |
| CASQA | California Stormwater Quality Association |
| CB | Copper Baseline |
| CCC | Continuous Concentration Criterion |
| CD-ROM | Compact Disk-Read Only Memory |
| CDS | Continuous Deflective Separation |
| CEP | Clean Estuary Partnership |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CESQG | Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator |
| CESSWI | Certified Erosion Sediment and Storm Water Inspector |
| CEUs | Continuing Education Units |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| cfs | cubic feet per second |
| CI | Continuous Improvement |
| CIWMB | California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| CMIA | Conceptual Model Impairment Assessment |
| CMS | Copper Management Strategy |
| COA | Condition of Approval |
| CoHHW | Santa Clara County Household Hazardous Waste Program |
| CoHHW Program | Santa Clara County Household Hazardous Waste Program |
| COLD | cold freshwater habitat |
| CRMP | Coordinated Resources Management and Planning |
| CSBP | California Stream Bioassessment Procedures |
| CTR | California Toxic Rule |
| Cu | Copper |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| DDD | Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane |
| DDE | Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene |
| DDT | Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane |
| DEH | Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health |
| District | Santa Clara Valley Water District |
| DO | Dissolved Oxygen |
| DOE | Department of Energy |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|---|
| DPR | Department of Pesticide Regulation |
| DWR | Department of Water Resources |
| E. Coli | Enterococcus Coli |
| EEC | SF Bay Wildlife Refuge Environmental Education Center |
| EEDMS | Environmental Enforcement Data Management System |
| EEPS | Exposure and Effects Pilot Study |
| e.g. | for example |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EMAP | Environmental Monitoring Program |
| EMB | Executive Management Board |
| EOA | Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates |
| EPA | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| ERP | Enforcement Response Plan |
| Estuary | San Francisco Bay Estuary |
| F | Fahrenheit |
| FTCD | Full Trash Capture Devices |
| FLT | Fluorescent Light Tube |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GCRCD | Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District |
| GIASP | General Industrial Activities Stormwater Permit |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GRTS | Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified |
| HBANC | Home Builders Association of Northern California |
| Hg | Mercury |
| HHW | Household Hazardous Waste, Santa Clara County |
| HMP | Hydromodification Management Plan |
| HVAC | Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning |
| IBI | Index of Biotic Integrity |
| IDDE | Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination |
| IC/ID | Illicit Connection and Illegal Dumping |
| ID | Identification |
| IND | Industrial/Commercial |
| i.e. | that is |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|---------------|--|
| IPM | Integrated Pest Management |
| JPA | Joint Powers Authority |
| K | Kindergarten |
| KAB | Keep America Beautiful |
| kg | Kilogram |
| L | Liter |
| Lb | Pound |
| LA | load allocation |
| LFA | Limiting Factors Analysis |
| LID | Low Impact Development |
| LID Treatment | Rain water harvesting, Water re-use, Infiltration, Evapotranspiration, or Biotreatment |
| LSSB | Lower South San Francisco Bay |
| LUS | Land Use Subgroup |
| MC | Management Committee |
| MCMP | Metals Control Measures Plan |
| MCTT | Multi-Chambered Treatment Train |
| Mddb | Metadata Database |
| MDL | Most Downstream Location |
| MEP | Maximum Extent Practicable |
| Mercury Plan | Mercury Pollution Prevention Plan |
| Mg | milligram |
| mgd | million gallons per day |
| MIGR | Fish Migration |
| MOA | Memorandum of Agreement |
| MOFO | Morrison & Foerster |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MP | Monitoring Priority |
| MROSD | Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District |
| MRP | Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit – 10/14/2009 |
| MS4 | Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems |
| MYRWMP | Multi-Year Receiving Waters Monitoring Plan |
| NAP | Nickel Action Plan |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| NEMA | National Electrical Manufacturers Association |
| NAIOP | National Association of Industrial and Office Properties |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| ng | Nanogram |
| Ni | Nickel |
| NOI | Notice of Intent |
| NPDES | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| OC | Organochlorine |
| O&M | Operation and Maintenance |
| OP | Organophosphate |
| OPP | U.S. EPA Office of Pesticide Programs |
| OW | U.S. EPA Office of Water |
| OWOW | Our Water Our World |
| P2 | Pollution Prevention |
| PAHs | Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons |
| PBDE | Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether |
| Pb | Lead |
| PCBs | Polychlorinated Biphenyls |
| PCDD | Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins |
| PCDF | Polychlorinated Dibenzofurans |
| PCO | Pest Control Operator |
| pg | Picogram |
| PHAB | Physical Habitat Assessments |
| PIP | Public Information and Participation |
| PI/P | Public Information and Participation |
| PIPP | Public Information and Participation Program |
| PMPS | Pest Management Performance Standard |
| POC | Pollutant of Concern |
| POTW | Publicly Owned Treatment Works |
| PPDC | Pesticide Program Dialogue Program |
| PPPS | Planning Procedures Performance Standard |
| Program | Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program |
| PS | Performance Standard |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|--|
| PSC | CASQA Pesticide Subcommittee |
| PVC | Polyvinyl Chloride |
| Q | Quarter |
| QAPP | Quality Assurance Project Plan |
| QSD | Qualified SWPPP Developer |
| QSP | Qualified SWPPP Practitioner |
| RA | Risk assessment |
| RAC | Regional Ad Campaign |
| RARE | Preservation of rare and endangered species |
| RCRA | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act |
| REC- 1 | Water contact recreation |
| REC-2 | Non-contact water recreation |
| Regional Board | San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| RFP | Request for Proposal |
| RMAS | Regional Monitoring and Assessment Strategy |
| RMP | Regional Monitoring Program |
| RPT | Report Preparation Team |
| RS | Regulatory Subgroup |
| RTA | Rapid Trash Assessment |
| RWQCB | San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| SC | Steering Committee |
| SCC | Santa Clara County |
| SCBWM1 | Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative |
| SCVURPPP | Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program |
| SCVWD | Santa Clara Valley Water District |
| SETAC | Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry |
| SF | San Francisco |
| SFBRWQCB | San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| SFEI | San Francisco Estuary Institute |
| SFEP | San Francisco Estuary Project |
| SIC | Standard Industrial Classification |
| SMaRT® | Sunnyvale Materials Recovery and Transfer |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedures |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|--|
| South Bay | Lower South San Francisco Bay |
| SPCWC | Stevens and Permanente Creeks Watershed Council |
| SPLWG | Sources, Pathways and Loadings Work Group (RMP) |
| SPWN | Fish Spawning |
| SSC | Suspended Sediment Concentration |
| SSI | Inventory of Santa Clara Basin Stream Studies |
| SSO | Water Quality Site-Specific Objective |
| State Board | State Water Resources Control Board |
| STOPPP | San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program |
| SWAMP | Surface Waters Ambient Monitoring Program |
| SWANA | Solid Waste Association of North America |
| SWMP | Stormwater Management Plan |
| SWPPP | Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan |
| SWRCB | State Water Resources Control Board |
| TAC | Technical Advisory Committee |
| TMDL | Total Maximum Daily Load |
| TO | Tentative Order |
| TP | Total Phosphorus |
| TPH | Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons |
| TRC | Technical Review Committee |
| ug | Microgram |
| UP3 | Urban Pesticides Pollution Prevention Partnership |
| UPC | Urban Pesticide Committee |
| URMP | Urban Runoff Management Plan |
| URQM | Urban Runoff Quality Management |
| USA | Unified Stream Assessment |
| USEPA | U. S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| USFWS | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| USGS | U.S. Geological Survey |
| VTA | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority |
| WAC | Watershed Assessment Consultant |
| WAMS | Watershed Assessment and Monitoring Subgroup |
| WAR | Watershed Assessment Report |

SCVURPPP Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|---|
| WARM | Warm Freshwater Habitat |
| Water Board | San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| Water Boards | California State Water Resources Control Board together |
| Water District | Santa Clara Valley Water District |
| WEF | Water Environment Federation |
| WEO | Watershed Education and Outreach |
| WE&O | Watershed Education and Outreach |
| WERF | Water Environment Research Foundation |
| WG | Work Group |
| WILD | Wildlife Habitat |
| WLA | Waste Load Allocation |
| WMI | Watershed Management Initiative |
| Work Group "I" | SCBWMI Phase I Indicators Work Group |
| WP | Work Plan |
| WRPC | Water Resources Protection Collaborative |
| WVC | West Valley Communities |
| WVCWP | West Valley Clean Water Program |
| WW | Watershed Watch |
| WWTP | Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| WY | Water Year |
| YSI | Youth Science Institute |
| Zn | Zinc |

Section 2 – Provision C.2 Reporting Municipal Operations

Program Highlights

Highlight/summarize activities for reporting year:

Summary:

In September of FY 23-24, City staff conducted the annual inspection of the Municipal Service Center (MSC).

A total of 64 MSC staff and two Stormwater Program staff (Program Manager and Specialist) attended the SCVURPPP Municipal Maintenance Stormwater Training Workshop that was conducted on 4-10-24. Topics trained on were as follows:

- Stormwater Pollution Prevention
- Street/Road Repair and Maintenance BMPs
- Bridge and Structure Maintenance BMPs
- Graffiti Removal
- Sidewalk/Plaza Maintenance and Pavement Washing
- Maintenance and Cleanup Activities BMPs
- Spill and Discharge Response and Notification Procedures and Contacts
- Corporation Yard SWPPPs and BMPs

The City continues to participate in the Program's Municipal Operations AHTG. Please refer to the C.2 Municipal Operations section of the SCVURPPP's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a description of activities implemented at the countywide and/or regional level.

C.2.a. ► Street and Road Repair and Maintenance

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| Y | Control of debris and waste materials during road and parking lot installation, repaving, repair, or maintenance activities from polluting stormwater |
| Y | Control of concrete slurry and wastewater, asphalt, pavement cutting, and other street and road maintenance materials and wastewater from discharging to storm drains from work sites |
| Y | Sweeping, vacuuming, and/or other dry methods to remove debris, concrete, or sediment residues, and spills or leaks, from work sites upon completion of work |

Comments:

In FY 23-24 the City continued its robust program of roadway paving, sidewalk repair, and right-of-way accessibility improvements and accomplished the following:

- 19,592.39 SF of sidewalk sections replaced
- 11,525.45 SF of driveway sections replaced
- 30 ADA curb ramps installed
- 5.32 miles of street paving repairs

Implementation and maintenance of stormwater BMPs are required through the contracts established with contractors performing work on behalf of the City. These types of public projects are managed by a Public Works Project Manager, City Maintenance Supervisor, and/or Public Works Inspector who are knowledgeable of BMP implementation and management. In addition, the City's IND/IDDE Inspector also conducts periodic spot inspections of these work areas to ensure BMPs are being maintained during the project. These projects are typically conducted between June and early October to avoid working during the rainy season. BMPs are installed by the contractors prior to street paving/sealing and are removed at the completion of the project. Similarly, curb and gutter improvements are overseen by the Public Works Inspector who checks the work areas for any deficiencies of BMPs or conditions that could or are contributing to water pollution, either actual or threatened.

C.2.b. ► Sidewalk/Plaza Maintenance and Pavement Washing

Place a Y in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented and required to be implemented. If not applicable, type NA in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an N in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not required and implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, and then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|---|---|
| Y | Prevention of polluted wash water and non-stormwater from pavement, sidewalk and plaza cleaning, mobile cleaning, outdoor pressure washing operations, and washing down of trash areas and gas station or mobile fueling service areas from discharging to storm drains |
| Y | Inclusion of sanitizing procedures in BMPs for washing down outside areas of human habitation |
| Y | Implementation of BMPs such as those included in the BASMAA Mobile Surface Cleaner Program |
| Y | Coordination with sanitary sewer agencies to determine if disposal to the sanitary sewer is available for the wastewater generated from these activities, provided that appropriate approvals and pretreatment standards are met |

Comments:

The City does not use surface cleaning power washing as a regular method of cleaning, with exception of one building exterior (Senior Center and attached wood deck) and the swimming pool deck at Blackberry Farm Picnic area. At both locations, storm drains in the vicinity of the surface cleaning area are covered and all wash water is directed to adjacent landscaping for ground percolation. Material spills are contained, cleaning is done with dry methods whenever possible, and staff is trained that wash down is a last resort and any effluent must be contained and discharged to landscaping or the sanitary sewer.

The MSC has several dry method spill kits clearly labeled in various locations around the facility, including the vehicle/equipment fueling island canopy and the roadway legends and paint areas. These are periodically checked and re-supplied as needed. They are also checked during the annual MSC inspection.

The City finalized formal BMPs for washing down outside areas of human habitation which include sanitizing procedures. The BMP sheet will be included in the performance standard for contractors retained to provide such services.

In FY 23-24 surface cleaning was conducted around Quinlan Community Center and the City Hall patio. The work was performed by City staff. There were no storm drain inlets in the work area and nearby storm drain inlets had mat-style BMPs in case of accidental overflow from the contained work area.

C.2.c. ► Bridge and Structure Maintenance and Graffiti Removal

Place a **Y** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type **NA** in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an **N** in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken.

| | |
|----|---|
| NA | Control of discharges from bridge and structural maintenance activities directly into surface waters or storm drains |
| NA | Control of non-stormwater and wash water discharges from graffiti removal activities |
| NA | Proper disposal for wastes generated from bridge and structure maintenance and graffiti removal activities |
| NA | Employee training on proper capture and disposal methods for wastes generated from bridge and structural maintenance and graffiti removal activities |
| NA | Contract specifications requiring proper capture and disposal methods for wastes generated from bridge and structural maintenance and graffiti removal activities |

Comments:

Graffiti removal throughout the City is generally very minor and localized. The City does not experience significant graffiti on either public or private property and there has not been large scale graffiti removal operations necessary. When there is graffiti removal, it is generally done by the City's maintenance staff who use small amounts of covering paint or graffiti remover to clean roadway signs and poles, and the activity generates little waste or stormwater pollutants to manage. Larger graffiti removal projects would likely involve a contractor performing the work and City staff would ensure that proper installation of BMPs was observed for the duration of the project and include the SCVURPPP Graffiti BMP Fact Sheet with the contract package.

| C.2.e. ► Rural Public Works Construction and Maintenance | |
|--|--|
| Does your municipality own/maintain rural ¹ roads? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| If your answer is No , then skip to C.2.f. | |
| Place a Y in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were implemented. If not applicable, type NA in the box and provide an explanation in the comments section below. Place an N in the boxes next to activities where applicable BMPs were not implemented for one or more of these activities during the reporting fiscal year, then in the comments section below provide an explanation of when BMPs were not implemented and the corrective actions taken. | |
| Y | Control of road-related erosion and sediment transport from road design, construction, maintenance, and repairs in rural areas |
| Y | Identification and prioritization of rural road maintenance based on soil erosion potential, slope steepness, and stream habitat resources |
| Y | Constructing roads and culverts that do not impact creek functions, including migratory fish passage |
| Y | Inspection of rural roads for structural integrity and prevention of impact on water quality |
| Y | Maintenance of rural roads adjacent to streams and riparian habitat to reduce erosion, replace damaging shotgun culverts, and address excessive erosion |
| NA | Re-grading of unpaved rural roads to slope outward where consistent with road engineering safety standards, and installation of water bars as appropriate |
| NA | Inclusion of measures to reduce erosion, provide fish passage, and maintain natural stream geomorphology when replacing culverts or designing new culverts or bridge crossings |
| <p>Comments (including listing increased maintenance in priority areas):</p> <p>The City does not have any unpaved rural roads. The combined length of paved rural roads in Cupertino is less than five miles and includes Regnart Road, Lindy Lane, and Stevens Canyon Road to the southern City limit. In a typical year, inspection and maintenance of this limited amount of rural roadway is part of the City's on-going planned and prioritized street maintenance. Minor maintenance generally consists of vegetation control and management done by hand with City staff employing BMPs as deemed necessary for the conditions.</p> <p>In FY 23-24, the City began re-construction of approximately 300 linear feet of Regnart Road adjacent to Regnart Creek. The scope of work includes roadway widening, pavement replacement, retaining wall reconstruction, and guardrail installation. The retaining wall reconstruction is being done on the creek side of the roadway and on the opposite, uphill side the improvements are providing both roadway stabilization and erosion control. The work began in Spring of FY 23-24 and will be completed in FY 24-25.</p> <p>In FY 23-24, there were no culvert or bridge repair projects.</p> | |

¹Rural means any watershed or portion thereof that is developed with large lot home-sites, such as one acre or larger, or with primarily agricultural, grazing or open space uses.

| C.2.f. ► Corporation Yard BMP Implementation | |
|---|--|
| Place an X in the boxes below that apply to your corporation yard(s): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | We do not have a corporation yard. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Our corporation yard is a filed NOI facility and regulated by the California State Industrial Stormwater NPDES General Permit. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | We have a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the Corporation Yard(s). |
| Place an X in the boxes below next to implemented SWPPP BMPs to indicate that these BMPs were implemented in applicable instances. If not applicable, type NA in the box. If one or more of the BMPs were not adequately implemented during the reporting fiscal year then indicate so and explain in the comments section below: | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Control of pollutant discharges in stormwater such as wash water |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Routine inspection of corporation yard(s) in August or September to ensure non-stormwater discharges have not entered the storm drain system and pollutant discharges are prevented to the maximum extent practicable |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Containment of all vehicle and equipment wash areas through plumbing to sanitary sewer or other collection method |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Use of dry cleanup methods when cleaning debris and spills from corporation yard(s) or collection and disposal of all wash water to sanitary sewer or other location where it does not impact surface or groundwater if wet cleanup methods are used |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Require private companies/contractors to use dry cleanup methods when cleaning debris and spills from corporation yard(s) or collect and dispose of all wash water to sanitary sewer or other location where it does not impact surface or groundwater if wet cleanup methods are used |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cover and/or berm outdoor storage areas containing pollutants |

Comments:

MSC Vehicle and Equipment Closed-loop Wash Rack

The MSC uses a closed loop, self-contained wash rack and pad which does not discharge to the storm or sanitary sewer systems. The wash rack and pad are used to clean mowers, vehicles, and other equipment requiring rinsing and cleaning of pollutants such as sediment, vegetative material, and residual vehicle/equipment fuel and lubricants. These pollutants are captured as sludge and disposed in landfill when solidified and the wash water is recycled. The wash system receives monthly inspection and as-needed cleaning. The MSC staff conduct regular inspections to ensure continued efficiency and proper capture of solids and effluent. The nearest drain inlet to the wash rack and pad, DI#2, is protected with a Full Trash Capture device including a hydrocarbon filter which is cleaned or replaced as needed, three times per year. A permanent rubber berm is installed at the low area of the wash rack and pad to keep run-off from leaving the wash rack area.

MSC Pre-Rainy Season Inspection

The City's contracted street sweeper provides a monthly sweep of the MSC work vehicle/equipment parking lot, open and paved work areas, and paved drive aisles. The MSC undergoes a thorough annual inspection each September pursuant to the MRP. In FY 23-24, the City Environmental Programs Supervisor conducted the inspection. All storm drain inlets, service activity areas, vehicle and equipment parking, and storage areas are inspected to identify deficiencies, potential improvements, and to ensure that the facility is prepared for the upcoming rainy season. Nine of the 17 drain inlets at the facility are fitted with REM Full Trash Capture (FTC) devices including hydrocarbon filters which are inspected, cleaned and/or replaced three times per year by the vendor through a maintenance agreement.

If you have a corporation yard(s) that is not an NOI facility, for inspection results for your corporation yard(s), complete the following table, provide a narrative above, or attach a summary including the following information:

| Corporation Yard Name | Corp Yard Activities w/ site-specific SWPPP BMPs | Inspection Date² | Inspection Findings/Results | Date and Description of Follow-up and/or Corrective Actions |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Municipal Service Center (MSC) | All exterior areas of the MSC including the front employee/customer parking area were inspected. | 9-7-23 | The inspector identified three issues. 1) open-top paint containers air drying; provided recommendation that they be stored in secondary containment and removed. 2) materials and wastes (joint compound or similar) in the roadway sign area: recommended that it be swept up. 3) a previous spill of diesel fuel in the fuel dispensing area that had absorbent that was not swept; recommended that the absorbent be swept after each application. | Re-inspection conducted on 9-14-23. Previous violations corrected and no further violations found. |

² Minimum inspection frequency is once a year between August 1 and September 30.

| C.2.h. ► Staff Training | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|----------------|
| Dates of Training | Training Topics Covered | Total number of Permittee maintenance staff | Permittee maintenance staff who attended training | |
| | | | Number | Percent |
| 4-10-24 | SCVURPPP Municipal Maintenance Stormwater Training Workshop Stormwater pollution prevention; Street/Road repair and maintenance BMPs; Bridge and structure maintenance BMPs; Graffiti removal BMPs; Sidewalk/Plaza maintenance and pavement washing; Maintenance and cleanup activities BMPS; Spill and discharge response and notification procedures and contacts; Corporation yard SWPPPs and BMPs. | 51 | 13 | 25% |
| Comments: | | | | |

Section 3 – Provision C.3 Reporting New Development and Redevelopment

C.3.b.iv.(2) ► Regulated Projects Reporting

Fill in attached table **C.3.b.iv.(2)** or attach your own table including the same information.

 Please refer to Table C.3.b.iv.(2) for the required information.

C.3.e.iv. ► Alternative or In-Lieu Compliance with Provision C.3.c.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|----|
| Is your agency choosing to require 100% LID treatment onsite for all Regulated Projects and not allow alternative compliance under Provision C.3.e.? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No |
| Comments (optional): N/A | | | | |

C.3.e.v ► Special Projects Reporting

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1. In FY 23-24, has your agency received, but not yet granted final discretionary approval of, a development permit application for a project that has been identified as a potential Special Project based on criteria listed in MRP Provision C.3.e.ii(2) for any of the three categories of Special Projects (Categories A, B or C)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No |
| 2. In FY 23-24, has your agency granted final discretionary approval to a Special Project? If yes, include the project in both the C.3.b.iv.(2) Table, and the C.3.e.v. Table. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No |
| If you answered "Yes" to either question, 1) Complete Table C.3.e.v. 2) Attach narrative discussion of 100% LID Feasibility or Infeasibility for each project. Not applicable. | | | | |

C.3.h.v.(2). ► List of Newly Installed¹ Stormwater Treatment Systems and HM Controls

On an annual basis, before the wet season, provide a list of newly installed (installed within the reporting period) stormwater treatment systems and HM controls (for both regulated and non-regulated projects) to the local mosquito and vector control agency and include a copy of that information in the Annual Report. The list shall include the facility locations and a description of the stormwater treatment measures and HM controls installed.
 (Optional) Also complete Table C.3.h.v.(2) ► Reporting Newly Installed Stormwater Treatment Systems and HM Controls

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|----|
| 1. Did your agency provide the list of newly installed Stormwater Treatment Systems and HM Controls to the Vector Control agency, either individually or through the Countywide Program? (If no, provide an explanation.) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|----|

¹Newly Installed" includes those facilities for which the final installation inspection was performed during this reporting year.

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|
| 2. Is a copy of the communication, including the list of newly installed treatment/HM measures, included in your Annual Report? | | Yes, See Appendix 3-1 | X | No, see SCVURPPP Annual Report for a copy of the communication and list. |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|

C.3.h.v.(3)(a) – (c) ▶ Installed Stormwater Treatment Systems Operation and Maintenance Verification Inspection Program Reporting

| Site Inspections Data | Number/Percentage |
|---|-------------------|
| Total number of Regulated Projects (including offsite projects, and Regional Projects) in your agency's database or tabular format at the end of the previous fiscal year (FY 22-23) | 37 |
| Total number of Regulated Projects (including offsite projects, and Regional Projects) in your agency's database or tabular format at the end of the reporting period (FY 23-24) | 38 |
| Total number of Regulated Projects (including offsite projects, and Regional Projects) for which O&M verification inspections were conducted during the reporting period (FY 23-24). Include only stormwater related inspections. | 19 |
| Percentage of the total number of Regulated Projects (including offsite projects, and Regional Projects) inspected during the reporting period (FY 23-24). Include only stormwater related inspections. | 51% ² |

C.3.h.v.(3)(d)-(e) ▶ Installed Stormwater Treatment Systems Operation and Maintenance Verification Inspection Program Reporting

| |
|---|
| Provide a discussion of the inspection findings for the year and any common problems encountered with various types of treatment systems and/or HM controls. This discussion should include a general comparison to the inspection findings from the previous year. |
| <p>Summary: The City's Public Works Engineering Inspector inspects and verifies the Operation & Maintenance (O&M) for the various types of treatment systems for Cupertino's private property regulated projects. The City of Cupertino does not use a third-party for C.3 inspections; however, a few private projects utilize such a third-party to inspect the O&M of those systems and provide reporting to the City. In those instances, the Public Works Engineering Inspector also conducts inspections of the systems to verify the findings of the third-party inspectors. The City's Public Works Engineering Inspector performed inspections of 19 regulated project sites which include the treatment structures at each site. Enforcement in FY 23-24 consisted of two verbal warnings; one for trash accumulation in the vegetated bioretention areas of a shopping center parking lot which was resolved within 48 hours and one for trash accumulation in CDS vortex separator which was vacuumed out within 48 hours.</p> |
| Provide a discussion of the effectiveness of the O&M Program and any proposed changes to improve the O&M Program (e.g., changes in prioritization plan or frequency of O&M inspections, other changes to improve effectiveness of the program). |
| <p>Summary: The post-construction stormwater BMP O&M inspection program inspections for FY 23-24 did not present significant challenges. The combination of increased awareness, education provided by City staff, and meetings at regulated project sites continues to strengthen the program. Property owners have accepted the responsibility of maintaining stormwater treatments and HM controls.</p> <p>The City's Regulated Project O&M inspection program is coordinated through a recorded stormwater BMP O&M agreement between the property owner and the City and is reinforced by requirements in the City's Municipal Code, which provides the City the legal authority to remediate any deficiencies and recover the costs from the private property owner when warranted. Operational procedures that contribute to the program's success include:</p> <p>Selection of Annual O&M Inspection Sites:</p> |

² Based on the number of Regulated Projects in the database or tabular format at the end of the previous fiscal year, per MRP Provision C.3.h.ii.(6)(b).

- All newly installed treatment measures, HM controls, and pervious pavement systems that total at least 3,000 sf are inspected by the Public Works Engineering Inspector upon installation.
- All treatments and controls on at least 20% of the City's C.3 regulated sites are inspected annually, as allowed under C.3.h.ii. (6). In FY23-24, 19 regulated project sites were inspected, which was 50% of the regulated sites.

Inspection Program Responsibilities:

- Public Works engineers review development plans for MRP C.3 compliance.
- The Public Works Engineering Inspector (a certified CESSWI) observes the construction of regulated project treatment measures during his routine construction site inspections (C.6) and performs O&M inspections and enforcement for all the City's C.3 regulated projects. The Inspection details and outcomes are tracked in his Excel regulated project reporting database.
- The Public Works Engineering Inspector field-checks construction of the on-site C.3 treatments and signs off on the grading permits. Prior to City approval for site occupancy and documents when the project was completed.
- The Public Works Inspector submits a Permanent Treatment O&M Inspection summary table for the previous fiscal year to the Environmental Programs Supervisor and Environmental Compliance Technician by August 15th of each year.
- The Environmental Programs Supervisor and Environmental Compliance Technician review the inspection summary table and report the required O&M inspection data in the City's Annual Report.

Pre-Inspection Preparation:

- The Public Works Engineering Inspector reviews the C.3 regulated project reporting table and the O&M Inspection records prior to beginning annual inspections.
- Prior to an initial site inspection, the Public Works Engineering Inspector may review the site's Storm Water Management Plan, including applicable as-built construction plans, for permanent treatment information, as well as treatment types and locations. This will cease to be necessary as he becomes very familiar with the existing treatment measures throughout the City.
- The Public Works Engineering Inspector will review previous City inspection results and the property owner's O&M maintenance records.
- The Public Works Engineering Inspector is familiar with SCVURPPP fact sheets on specific treatment measures and uses them as guidance when addressing questions raised during the inspection by the site owners or operators.

Enforcement Procedures:

- If any deficiency is identified, the Public Works Inspector will document it. If the Inspector issues a written notice of violation, it will include the O&M inspection results, a list of corrective actions needed, and a compliance schedule. This notice is given to the property owner/site manager and compliance will be expected and verified within ten business days of the inspection or before the next anticipated rain, whichever occurs first.
- In the event of a deficiency, the inspector will complete a follow-up inspection, documenting whether all recommended maintenance activities have been completed and if other actions are needed to ensure proper operation of the facility.
- If repairs are not undertaken or are not done properly within the time allotted in the compliance schedule, the City will begin enforcement proceedings as provided in City's C.3 O&M Verification Enforcement Response Plan (ERP) and documented in the Municipal Code. The inspector documents the date that all necessary repairs have been completed in the City's C.3 O&M Excel database, including other pertinent information regarding maintenance of the site.

C.3.i. ► Required Site Design Measures for Small Projects and Smaller Detached Single Family Home Projects

On an annual basis, discuss the implementation of the requirements of Provision C.3.i, including ordinance revisions, permit conditions, development of standard specifications and/or guidance materials, and staff training.

Summary:

BASMAA prepared standard specifications in four fact sheets regarding the site design measures listed in Provision C.3.i, as a resource for Permittees. We have modified local ordinances/policies/procedures and forms/checklists to require all applicable projects approved after December 1, 2012 to implement at least one of the site design measures listed in Provision C.3.i.

In FY 22-23 the City amended Chapter 9.18 of the Cupertino Municipal Code to reflect changes in MRP 3.0. In 2013 Cupertino's City Engineer last modified the City's C.3 regulated project review conditions of approval, policies, procedures, and checklists to require all small and single-family projects approved after December 1, 2012, to direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas and consider implementing additional site design

measures listed in Provision C.3.i. This process continues and there have been no reasons or needs for modification. The City includes BASMAA prepared standard specifications in four fact sheets regarding the site design measures listed in Provision C.3.i, as a resource for Permittees.

C.3.j.iii. ► No Missed Opportunities

On an annual basis, submit a list of green infrastructure projects, public and private, that are planned for implementation during the permit term and infrastructure projects planned for implementation during the permit term that have potential for green infrastructure measures. Include the following information:

- A summary of planning or implementation status for each public and private green infrastructure project that is not also a Regulated Project as defined in Provision C.3.b.ii. (see C.3.j.iii.(2) Table B - Planned Green Infrastructure Projects).
- A summary of how each public infrastructure project with green infrastructure potential will include green infrastructure measures to the maximum extent practicable during the permit term. For any public infrastructure project where implementation of green infrastructure measures is not practicable, submit a brief description of the project and the reasons green infrastructure measures were impracticable to implement (see C.3.j.iii.(2) Table A - Public Projects Reviewed for Green Infrastructure).

Summary of Planning or Implementation Status of Identified Projects:

Please refer to Tables C.3.j.iii.(2)-A and C.3.j.iii.(2)-B for the required information.

C.3.j.iv.(2) ► Participate in Processes to Promote Green Infrastructure

On an annual basis, report on the goals and outcomes during the reporting year of work undertaken to participate in processes to promote green infrastructure.

Please refer to Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of efforts conducted to help regional, State, and federal agencies plan, design and fund incorporation of green infrastructure measures into local infrastructure projects, including transportation projects.

C.3.j.v.(1)(a) ► Non-Regulated (Green Infrastructure) Projects Reporting

Fill in attached table **C.3.j.v.(1)(a)** with information on non-regulated GI projects that have completed construction during the reporting period, or attach your own table including the same information.

No projects met this criteria in FY 23-24.

C.3.j.v.(1)(d) ► Tracking and Mapping Tools

Provide a summary report on the implementation of tracking and mapping tools and provide a link to the component which is available to the public.

Summary Report:

Please refer to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of implementation of the tracking and reporting tools, and a link to the component which is available to the public.

C.3.j.v.(2) ► Green Infrastructure Plan Implementation

(For FY 2023-24 Annual Report Only) Report on updates, addenda, and changes to the programmatic implementation of your Green Infrastructure Plan.

The City has not influenced GSI implementation at local schools. The City did include multi-family and commercial properties in outreach for its Climate Victory Gardens pilot in 2020-2023 and one HOA executed a project to convert turf to drought-tolerant landscaping and it included a rain garden.

The City has a Green Infrastructure Plan which was approved by the Cupertino City Council in accordance with the MRP. The Plan references inclusion of GSI in other planning documents such as the General Plan, and the Stormwater Program team is included in some CIP (Capital Improvement Projects) projects where GSI may be feasible, notwithstanding the added expense of GSI in a needed CIP project for community benefit. Relevant staff are made aware of any trainings related to GSI or complete streets whenever it is made available, and any new staff joining the CIP division are made aware of the GSI requirements and references, including the GSI Handbook. In August 2019, SCVURPPP completed the SCVURPPP GSI Handbook, which includes GSI project design guidelines, details, and specifications. The GSI Handbook includes two parts. Part 1, General Guidelines, provides guidance on selection, integration, prioritization, siting, and maintenance for GSI applications. Part 2 provides engineering and technical details and specifications that can be customized for construction plan submittals by designers, developers, and municipal agencies. The GSI Handbook is currently being updated, including updates and additions to the details and specifications in Part 2.

The Parks and Recreation System Master Plan adopted in 2020 has established a master plan goal of conservation, including specifically:

- Embrace storm water management, incorporating green infrastructure elements such as rain gardens, bioswales, permeable pavers and detention ponds to help reduce flooding, filter pollutants and replenish groundwater during storm events.
- Focus on storm water management and green infrastructure when designing or renovating City parks. For example, consider installing a 'storm water management garden' on City or public property to showcase green infrastructure techniques.

No new planning documents were developed, or existing documents updated, to include GSI language during the reporting period, but Cupertino continues to monitor for opportunities to include GSI language in planning documents and will make updates to existing documents in alignment with the established/anticipated update timelines for those documents.

The City's Clean Water and Storm Protection parcel fee, which was established in 2019, does list public GSI as an eligible use of funds. While the cost of adding GSI to capital public projects remains prohibitive, Jollyman Park all-inclusive playground (under construction FY 24-25) does have bioretention, and a second Project, Lawrence-Mitty is in design phase and GSI is being considered. The Lawrence-Mitty project is on the border with San Jose and there was discussion with San Jose staff about a co-located GSI element, however San Jose identified it as not being feasible.

The City provides data on all complete GSI projects to the Program for their Countywide Stormwater Data Tracking Portal. Since FY 18-19, SCVURPPP has been using the Stormwater Treatment Measure Data Portal (Data Portal), an online GSI tracking system to obtain, store, and access C.3-regulated and GSI project data at a countywide level. The system also allows projects, control measures, land use type, and acres of treatment to be visualized spatially on the web. The link above has been available to the public via the SCVURPPP website since 2020. Newly constructed Regulated and non-regulated GSI projects are added to the Data Portal each year.

Public outreach has included implementation of a native plant landscaping project with storyboards promoting IPM, GSI, and native, waterwise landscaping practices. City Council also receives an annual presentation on all aspects of the stormwater pollution prevention program during the annual process of renewing the stormwater parcel fees.

When trainings in complete streets and GSI are available, staff are encouraged to attend.

SCVURPPP developed the following resources to educate the general public, municipal staff, and elected officials about GSI and LID techniques and conducted media advertising to promote GSI:

- An interactive [webpage](#) that includes information on rain gardens, rain barrels and pervious surfaces.
- Several [videos and animations](#) on GSI features.
- A [fact sheet](#) for educating the public about GSI.

SCVURPPP conducts trainings to educate municipal staff and consultants on GSI requirements. The following recent SCVURPPP training opportunities were publicized to municipal staff and consultants (when appropriate):

- SCVURPPP staff assisted with the planning of a "Green Streets for Sustainable Communities" Symposium in Fall 2020. The purpose of the symposium was to bring together elected officials, city staff leaders, stormwater experts, complete street/transportation experts, environmental activists, tree and urban ecology experts, and other stakeholders to explore how to better fund, design, build, manage, and maintain streets to optimize performance for people and nature. Details can be found on the [TCSC website](#).
- SCVURPPP planned and held a workshop titled "Moving Forward with Green Stormwater Infrastructure Implementation" on June 10, 2021. The online workshop included presentations on: local and regional GSI projects; overview of new and proposed SCVURPPP products; upcoming MRP 3.0 requirements; information on the design, construction, and maintenance considerations for stormwater tree wells with suspended pavement systems; and a presentation on San Jose's GSI Maintenance Field Guide. A total of 138 municipal staff attended the workshop. The workshop flyer, agenda, evaluation summary, and attendance list posted at [this link](#).
- SCVURPPP conducted a workshop titled "Green Stormwater Infrastructure in the Public Right-of-Way – Implementing New Requirements" on February 28, 2023. The workshop included information on updates to Provision C.3, guidance on evaluation of GSI opportunities in streets and parking lot projects, and two breakout sessions on GSI opportunity screening and policies for implementing GSI in the frontage. A total of 159 municipal staff attended the workshop. The workshop flyer, agenda, evaluation summary, and attendance list are posted at [this link](#).
- SCVURPPP staff presented a workshop for the American Public Works Association, Silicon Valley Chapter on June 21, 2023 covering the new MRP C.3 and GSI requirements, and evaluation of GSI opportunities in streets and parking lots, including review of capital projects for "No Missed Opportunities," GSI location identification and screening, an example desktop screening exercise, and field evaluation.

C.3.j.v.(3) ► Numeric Retrofit Requirements
 In each Annual Report, report on progress made towards the retrofit requirements described in Provision C.3.j.ii.(2).

In FY 22-23 the City completed the first phase of the Memorial Park Master Plan which deconstructed approximately 71,300 SF of concrete liner from a large amenity pond within the park. The pond had been empty for over one year and this phase removed all impervious concrete lining, backfilled with clean fill, and pervious natural turf was planted.

Please refer to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of progress made towards the retrofit requirements described in Provision C.3.j.ii.(2) at the countywide level.

C.3.j.v.(6) ► One-time Offset of Numeric Implementation Retrofit Requirements

| In FY 2022-23, did your jurisdiction submit a report to offset numeric implementation retrofit requirements by a one-time credit of up to 25 percent? (If no, move to the next table.) | Yes | X | No |
|--|-----|---|----|
| Retrofit impervious area treated due to implementation of the ordinance in FY 23-24 (acres): | N/A | | |
| Cumulative area of retrofit impervious area treated due to implementation of the ordinance up to the end of FY 23-24 (acres): | N/A | | |

C.3.b.iv.(2) ► Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 1) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period

| Project Name Project No. | Project Location ³ , Street Address | Name of Developer | Project Phase No. ⁴ | Project Type & Description ⁵ | Project Watershed ⁶ | Total Site Area (Acres) | Total Area of Land Disturbed (Acres) | Total New Impervious Surface Area (ft ²) ⁷ | Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area (ft ²) ⁸ | Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area ⁹ (ft ²) | Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area ¹⁰ (ft ²) |
|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Private Projects | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bianchi Subdivision | 10040-10046 Bianchi Wy | Bianchi Way LLC | NA | Condominium residential subdivision – 7 homes | Calabazas Creek | 0.32 | 0.32 | 6,142 | 5,709 | 5,709 | 11,851 |
| The Rise (formerly Vallco Town Center) | 10123 N Wolfe Rd | Vallco Property Owner LLC | Unknown | Mixed-use redevelopment | Calabazas Creek | 49.48 | 49.48 | 0 | 1,871,405 | 1,960,173 | 1,871,405 |
| Garden of Fountainbleu | 10200 Miller Ave & 19400 Sorenson Ave | Preg Emerson LLC | NA | Site improvements – courtyard beautification | Calabazas Creek | 7.02 | 0.38 | 0 | 16,531 | 211,745 | 211,745 |
| Public Projects | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jollyman Park- All-Inclusive Playground | 1000 S. Stelling Rd | City of Cupertino | N/A | Redevelopment of existing park playground to all-inclusive play and restroom facilities | Guadalupe River | 0.87 | 0.87 | 8,266 | 9,001 | 9,001 | 17,267 |

³ Include cross streets

⁴ If a project is being constructed in phases, indicate the phase number and use a separate row entry for each phase. If not, enter "NA".

⁵ Project Type is the type of development (i.e., new and/or redevelopment). Example descriptions of development are: 5-story office building, residential with 160 single-family homes with five 4-story buildings to contain 200 condominiums, 100 unit 2-story shopping mall, mixed use retail and residential development (apartments), industrial warehouse.

⁶ State the watershed(s) in which the Regulated Project is located. Downstream watershed(s) may be included, but this is optional.

⁷ All impervious surfaces added to any area of the site that was previously existing pervious surface.

⁸ All impervious surfaces added to any area of the site that was previously existing impervious surface.

⁹ For redevelopment projects, state the pre-project impervious surface area.

¹⁰ For redevelopment projects, state the post-project impervious surface area.

C.3.b.iv.(2) ► Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period (private projects)

| Project Name Project No. | Project Status ¹¹ | Estimated or Actual Completion Date ¹² | Source Control Measures ¹³ | Site Design Measures ¹⁴ | Treatment Systems Approved ¹⁵ | Type of Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism ¹⁶ | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria ¹⁷ | Alternative Compliance Measures ^{18/19} | Alternative Certification ²⁰ | HM Controls ^{21/22} |
|--|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Private Projects | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bianchi Subdivision | Entitlement Approval: 1/17/2024 | TBD | Maintenance, storm drain labeling | Cluster structures/pavement, disconnected downspouts, pervious pavement, self-treating areas | Flow through planter, bioretention | O&M agreement with private owner | 2c | N/A | Third Party review and certification by Sandis | Exempt Less than 1 AC impervious area |
| The Rise (formerly Vallco Town Center) | Entitlement Approval: 2/16/2024 | TBD | Wash area/racks & covered dumpster drain to sanitary sewer, sewer connection for swimming pool, beneficial landscaping, maintenance, storm drain labeling | Cluster structures/pavement | Silva Cells with biotreatment soil mix | O&M agreement with private owner | 2a | N/A | Third Party review and certification by Schaaf & Wheeler | Exempt Project is not in a green area on the HM Applicability Map |

¹¹ Provide status of project (e.g., application date, application deemed complete date, project approval date).

¹² Provide an estimate of the construction completion date (e.g., specific month and year, or year). If not known, write "TBD" or not available.

¹³ List source control measures approved for the project. Examples include: properly designed trash storage areas; storm drain stenciling or signage; efficient landscape irrigation systems; etc.

¹⁴ List site design measures approved for the project. Examples include: minimize impervious surfaces; conserve natural areas, including existing trees or other vegetation, and soils; construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces, etc.

¹⁵ List all approved stormwater treatment system(s) to be installed onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility (e.g., flow through planter, bioretention facility, infiltration basin, etc.).

¹⁶ List the legal mechanism(s) (e.g., O&M agreement with private landowner; O&M agreement with homeowners' association; O&M by public entity, etc...) that have been or will be used to assign responsibility for the maintenance of the post-construction stormwater treatment systems.

¹⁷ See Provision C.3.d.i. "Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems" for list of hydraulic sizing design criteria. Enter the corresponding provision number of the appropriate criterion (i.e., 1.a., 1.b., 2.a., 2.b., 2.c., or 3).

¹⁸ For Alternative Compliance at an offsite location in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(1), on a separate page, give a discussion of the alternative compliance site including the information specified in Provision C.3.b.iv.(2)(m)(i) for the offsite project.

¹⁹ For Alternative Compliance by paying in-lieu fees in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(2), on a separate page, provide the information specified in Provision C.3.b.iv.(2)(m)(ii) for the Regional Project.

²⁰ Note whether a third party was used to certify the project design complies with Provision C.3.d.

²¹ If HM control is not required, state why not.

²² If HM control is required, state control method used (e.g., method to design and size device(s) or method(s) used to meet the HM Standard, and description of device(s) or method(s) used, such as detention basin(s), bioretention unit(s), regional detention basin, or in-stream control).

C.3.b.iv.(2) ► Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period (private projects)

| Project Name Project No. | Project Status ¹¹ | Estimated or Actual Completion Date ¹² | Source Control Measures ¹³ | Site Design Measures ¹⁴ | Treatment Systems Approved ¹⁵ | Type of Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism ¹⁶ | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria ¹⁷ | Alternative Compliance Measures ^{18/19} | Alternative Certification ²⁰ | HM Controls 21/22 |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Garden of Fountainbleu | Entitlement Approval: 5/16/2024 | TBD | Maintenance (pavement sweeping, catch basin cleaning, good housekeeping) | Minimize land disturbed, minimize impervious surfaces | Bioretention | O&M agreement with private owner | 3 | N/A | Third Party review and certification by Schaaf & Wheeler | Exempt Less than 1 AC impervi ous area |

C.3.b.iv.(2) ► Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2) – Projects Approved During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period (public projects)

| Project Name Project No. | Approval Date ²³ | Date Construction Scheduled to Begin or Date of Completion | Source Control Measures ²⁴ | Site Design Measures ²⁵ | Treatment Systems Approved ²⁶ | Operation & Maintenance Responsibility Mechanism ²⁷ | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria ²⁸ | Alternative Compliance Measures ^{29/30} | Alternative Certification ³¹ | HM Controls ^{32/33} |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Public Projects | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jollyman Park- All Inclusive Playground | May 2019 (not previously reported) | Start date: July 2024 | Beneficial landscaping, maintenance (pavement sweeping, catch basin cleaning, good housekeeping), and storm drain inlet labeling | Minimize land disturbed, disconnected downspouts, other self-treating areas, preserved open space | Bioretention facilities (three) | City Staff | 2c | N/A | N/A | Exempt- less than one acre impervious area |
| Comments: See above information. | | | | | | | | | | |

²³ For public projects, enter the plans and specifications approval date.

²⁴ List source control measures approved for the project. Examples include: properly designed trash storage areas; storm drain stenciling or signage; efficient landscape irrigation systems; etc.

²⁵ List site design measures approved for the project. Examples include: minimize impervious surfaces; conserve natural areas, including existing trees or other vegetation, and soils; construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces, etc.

²⁶ List all approved stormwater treatment system(s) to be installed onsite or at a joint stormwater treatment facility (e.g., flow through planter, bioretention facility, infiltration basin, etc.).

²⁷ List the legal mechanism(s) (e.g., maintenance plan for O&M by public entity, etc.) that have been or will be used to assign responsibility for the maintenance of the post-construction stormwater treatment systems.

²⁸ See Provision C.3.d.i. "Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems" for list of hydraulic sizing design criteria. Enter the corresponding provision number of the appropriate criterion (i.e., 1.a., 1.b., 2.a., 2.b., 2.c., or 3).

²⁹ For Alternative Compliance at an offsite location in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(1), on a separate page, give a discussion of the alternative compliance site including the information specified in Provision C.3.b.iv.(2)(m)(i) for the offsite project.

³⁰ For Alternative Compliance by paying in-lieu fees in accordance with Provision C.3.e.i.(2), on a separate page, provide the information specified in Provision C.3.b.iv.(2)(m)(ii) for the Regional Project.

³¹ Note whether a third party was used to certify the project design complies with Provision C.3.d.

³² If HM control is not required, state why not.

³³ If HM control is required, state control method used (e.g., method to design and size device(s) or method(s) used to meet the HM Standard, and description of device(s) or method(s) used, such as detention basin(s), bioretention unit(s), regional detention basin, or in-stream control).

C.3.h.v.(2). ► Table of Newly Installed³⁴ Stormwater Treatment Systems and Hydromodification Management (HM) Controls (Optional)

Fill in table below or attach your own table including the same information.
 See the SCVURPPP FY 23-24 Annual Report for a copy of the communication to Vector Control.

| Name of Facility | Address of Facility | Party Responsible ³⁵ For Maintenance | Type of Treatment/HM Control(s) |
|---|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Public or Private Regulated Projects | | | |
| Public Storage | 20565 Valley Green Dr | Storage Equities, Inc. | Bioretention |
| Public or Private Non-regulated GI Projects | | | |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

³⁴ "Newly Installed" includes those facilities for which the final installation inspection was performed during this reporting year.
³⁵ State the responsible operator for installed stormwater treatment systems and HM controls.

| C.3.e.v. Special Projects Reporting Table | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Reporting Period – July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Name & No. | Permittee | Address | Application Submittal Date ³⁶ | Status ³⁷ | Description ³⁸ | Site Total Acreage | Total Impervious Surface Created / Replaced ³⁹ (ft ²) | Gross Density DU/Acre | Density FAR | Special Project Category ⁴⁰ | Category C Projects: # of DUs in each AMI Category and # of Manager's DUs | LID Treatment Reduction Credit Available ⁴¹ | List of LID Stormwater Treatment Systems ⁴² | List of Non-LID Stormwater Treatment Systems ⁴³ |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

³⁶ Date that a planning application for the Special Project was submitted. If a planning application has not been submitted, include a projected application submittal date.

³⁷ Indicate whether final discretionary approval is still pending or has been granted, and provide the date or version of the project plans upon which reporting is based.

³⁸ Type of project (commercial, mixed-use, residential), number of floors, number of units, type of parking, and other relevant information.

³⁹ The total impervious surface in acres created or replaced by the project, which is subject to the treatment requirements listed in Provision C.3.e.ii.(1).

⁴⁰ For each applicable Special Project Category, list the specific criteria applied to determine applicability. For each non-applicable Special Project Category, indicate n/a.

⁴¹ For each applicable Special Project Category, state the maximum total LID Treatment Reduction Credit available. For Category C Special Projects also list the individual Location, Density, and Minimized Surface Parking Credits available.

⁴² List all LID stormwater treatment systems proposed. For each type, indicate the percentage of the total amount of runoff identified in Provision C.3.d. for the Special Project's drainage area.

⁴³ List all non-LID stormwater treatment systems proposed. For each type of non-LID treatment system, indicate: (1) the percentage of the total amount of runoff identified in Provision C.3.d. for the Special Project's drainage area, and (2) whether the treatment system either meets minimum design criteria published by a government agency or received certification issued by a government agency, and reference the applicable criteria or certification.

FY 23-24 Annual Report
Permittee Name: City of Cupertino

C.3 – New Development and Redevelopment

Special Projects Narrative

There were no Special Projects in FY 23-24.

C.3.j.iii.(2) ► Table A - Public Projects Reviewed for Green Infrastructure

| Project Name and Location ⁴⁴ | Project Description | Status ⁴⁵ | GI Included? ⁴⁶ | Description of GI Measures Considered and/or Proposed or Why GI is Impracticable to Implement ⁴⁷ |
|---|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| Memorial Park- Specific Plan Design | Following the findings of the Master Plan process, develop a conceptual design for Phase 1 features and amenities. Features to be considered include walking path improvements, playable water feature, enhancing tree canopy, integrating natural features, and enhancing indoor and outdoor event and gathering spaces. | Completed conceptual design. Next steps TBD. | TBD | Will be evaluated for GSI potential during advanced design phase. |
| Library Vegetated Swale Reconstruction (formerly Library Expansion Project) | Redesign the library parking lot vegetated swales. | Project is pending design. Grant funding awarded. | TBD | Previously constructed vegetated swales (2004) will be evaluated to determine feasibility for conversion of the swales to bioretention to treat impervious parking lot. |
| Alan Row Offsite Improvements (22690 Stevens Creek Blvd) | Installation of new bioretention facilities within the park strips along the Stevens Creek Blvd & Foothill Blvd frontages. | Project has been under construction during FY 23-24 and expected to be completed in FY 24-25. | Yes | New bioretention treatment will provide stormwater treatment for approximately 14,700 SF of the existing adjacent impervious roadway. This is a regulated project. |
| Tamien Innu (Junipero serra Trail) | Three phase construction of an impervious multi-use trail adjacent to the Junipero | This is a multi-year proposed three-phase project that is | No | The project was evaluated for GSI, however due to the minimum trail width requirements, GSI was infeasible. In addition, the trail will be a pervious constructed surface. The current |

⁴⁴ List each public project that is going through your agency's process for identifying projects with green infrastructure potential.

⁴⁵ Indicate status of project, such as: beginning design, under design (or X% design), projected completion date, completed final design date, etc.

⁴⁶ Enter "Yes" if project will include GI measures, "No" if GI measures are impracticable to implement, or "TBD" if this has not yet been determined.

⁴⁷ Provide a summary of how each public infrastructure project with green infrastructure potential will include green infrastructure measures to the maximum extent practicable during the permit term. If review of the project indicates that implementation of green infrastructure measures is not practicable, provide the reasons why green infrastructure measures are impracticable to implement.

FY 23-24 Annual Report
Permittee Name: City of Cupertino

C.3 – New Development and Redevelopment

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| | Serra Channel (owned by Valley Water). | currently in design phase. | | surface of where the trail is being planned is also pervious dirt, so no substantial water quality benefit would be achieved. |
| Bridge Preventative Maintenance Program | Structural evaluation and maintenance of five roadway bridges spanning Stevens and Calabazas Creeks. | Program and associated repair work scheduled to occur in FY 24-25. | No | These are structural maintenance projects. No GSI improvements are feasible within the scope of work. |
| Vai Avenue Outfall Repair | Repair of a collapsing outfall on Vai Avenue discharging to Regnart Creek. | Program and associated repair work scheduled to occur in FY 24-25. | No | This is repair work to damaged infrastructure and GSI implementation is impractical and infeasible. |
| Jollyman Park- All-inclusive playground development | Design and construct an all-inclusive playground within an existing park. | Stormwater Management Plan has been completed. Construction scheduled to begin in late 2023-early 2024. | Yes | Vegetated swales (not full bioretention) are included in this project. ***Note- This project has been updated and moved to Table B below. It is a regulated project. |

C.3.j.iii.(2) ► Table B - Planned Green Infrastructure Projects During the Permit Term

| Project Name and Location ⁴⁸ | Project Description | Planning or Implementation Status | Green Infrastructure Measures Included |
|--|--|---|---|
| Lawrence-Mitty Park | Development of a neighborhood park and trail expansion over several acres of land. This will be a multi-year project from design to build. | Conceptual Plan approved in FY 23-24. Advanced design to continue in FY 24-25. | Due to the proposed size of the park, this may be a regulated project, depending on the amount of impervious surface that would be redeveloped. If not a regulated project, GSI features will be evaluated and could be incorporated to the design element. |
| Memorial Park Pond Repurposing (Memorial Park, 21251 Stevens Creek Blvd) | Removal of approximately 71,300 SF of impervious pavement and replacement. | This project was completed in FY 22-23 and will be removed from this report in FY 24-25. | Removal of approximately 71,300 SF of impervious pavement and replacement with pervious vegetated areas. |
| Jollyman Park- All-inclusive playground development | Design and construct an all-inclusive playground within an existing park. | Stormwater Management Plan was completed which includes bioretention. In the FY 22-23 Annual Report, this was reported as not being full bioretention which was incorrect. Construction began in FY 23-24 and is scheduled to be completed in FY 24-25. | Three bioretention treatment areas have been included in the project scope. This is a regulated project and included in C.3.b.iv.(2)- Regulated Projects Reporting Table (part 2). |

⁴⁸ List each planned (and expected to be funded) public and private green infrastructure project that is not also a Regulated Project as defined in Provision C.3.b.ii. Note that funding for green infrastructure components may be anticipated but is not guaranteed to be available or sufficient.

C.3.j.v.(1)(a)► Non-Regulated (Green Infrastructure) Projects Reporting Table – Projects Constructed During the Fiscal Year Reporting Period

| Project Location, Street Address | Name of Owner | Project Description | Construction Completion Date | Treatment Measures | Party Responsible for O&M | Hydraulic Sizing Criteria ⁴⁹ | Total Area Draining to Treatment Measures (ft ²) | Impervious Area Treated (ft ²) | Pervious Area Treated (ft ²) |
|--|-------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Removal of approximately 71,300 SF of impervious pavement and replacement with pervious vegetated areas. | City of Cupertino | Removal of approximately 71,300 SF of concrete amenity pond liner and replaced with pervious turf. This project was completed in FY 22-23 and will be removed from this report in FY 24-25. | October 2022 | Conversion of impervious concrete to pervious natural turf. | City staff | N/A | N/A | 71,300 SF | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Comments: There were no other non-regulated GSI projects constructed during FY 23-24.

⁴⁹ See Provision C.3.d.i. "Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems" for list of hydraulic sizing design criteria. Enter the corresponding provision number of the appropriate criterion (i.e., 1.a., 1.b., 2.a., 2.b., 2.c., or 3).

Section 4 – Provision C.4 Industrial and Commercial Site Controls

Program Highlights and Evaluation

Highlight/summarize activities for reporting year:

Summary:

Inspection Overview

Consistent with the IND Program Business Inspection Plan, in FY 23-24 the City prioritized and conducted IND facility inspections at businesses identified as having the likelihood of contributing to pollution of stormwater runoff or that had recently documented violations encountered through the IDDE program. The facilities in the IND inspection program included: office parks, hotels, high volume retail and shopping centers, restaurants, grocery stores and markets, automotive facilities, building supplies/services, corporation yards, and garden centers. In FY 23-24, the City inspected 160 different business facilities, an increase in the number inspected the previous FY (136).

The Business Inspection Plan was given an annual review to ensure it meets the MRP requirements and provides a consistent and workable framework to administer the IND program. No changes were identified.

Fines and Fees

The City has a re-inspection fee program that is intended to incentivize property oversight and adherence to stormwater pollution BMPs. It provides for monetary penalties to be assessed for sites that are inspected and found to have violations. In FY 23-24, the re-inspection fee was \$355 per inspection. Typically, the fee is assessed for each inspection which is required to determine compliance and complete mitigation of any potential or actual discharge identified during the initial inspection. In FY 23-24, eleven businesses were found to be in violation. Several months before the IND inspections begin, re-inspection fee letters are mailed to all property and business owners scheduled for an IND inspection. Starting in FY 23-24, we created an online fillable version of the IND re-inspection fee letter to make it easier for businesses and property owners to respond. A QR code was also included in the letter so they can easily access the online version. An explanation of the IND program and educational brochure are provided to encourage active oversight and engagement of the businesses concerning stormwater pollution prevention. Also included is a brochure explaining the County's VSQG program which provides small business owners that may generate modest amounts of hazardous waste (e.g. fluorescent tubes, cleaners, etc.) a low-cost resource for disposal. The goal is to reduce the storage of these unused/broken materials in trash enclosures and other exterior areas which present a threatened discharge condition. The City requests the IND program letters to be signed and returned acknowledging receipt by both the business and the property owner. Of the 276 letters mailed out in FY 23-24, 2 signed letters were received via email, 4 letters were received via the online QR code, and 7 letters were received via mail. A property owner's failure to return the signed letter does not absolve them from any responsibilities under the MRP, municipal code, or the assessment of re-inspection fees or fines. The number of letters mailed out differs from the 160 total facility inspections because some letters only went to property owners as the facility occupant was the same. In addition to the re-inspection fee, businesses and property owners may also be issued an administrative citation for up to \$500 per violation (\$100 for the first violation, \$200 for the second violation, and \$500 for the third and any subsequent violations within 12 months). In FY 23-24, there were no administrative citations issued for violations discovered during IND inspections.

All inspections were completed that were scheduled for FY 23-24. Typically, inspectors meet with staff from the business being inspected to discuss the IND program, review best practices, and to educate for deficiencies identified during the inspections. For businesses that were found to be

closed during the inspection, a perimeter and outside area inspection was conducted. Inspectors did not enter areas behind gates/fences or where otherwise prohibited by law.

The City continues to be an active participant in the SCVURPPP IND/IDDE AHTG. Refer to the C.4. Industrial and Commercial Site Controls section of the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a description of activities of the Program and/or the BASMAA Municipal Operations Committee.

C.4.d.iii.(1)(a) & (c) ► Facility Inspections

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information. Indicate your reporting methodology below.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Permittee reports multiple, discrete, potential and actual discharges at a site as one enforcement action. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Permittee reports the total number of discrete potential and actual discharges at each site. |

| | Number |
|--|--------|
| Total number of inspections conducted (C.4.d.iii.(1)(a)) | 160 |
| Total number of enforcement actions, or discrete number of potential and actual discharges resolved within 10 working days or otherwise deemed resolved in a longer but still timely manner (C.4.d.iii.(1)(c)) | 11 |

Comments:

This FY, the City determined that 11 separate facilities were found to have one or more violations. Of the 11 facilities, there were a total of 10 Verbal Warnings issued, 0 Notices Of Violation (NOV), 1 Pre-Citation Notice, and 0 Administrative Citations. Of the 11 facilities found with violations, 1 facility exceeded 10 business days, but was deemed resolved in a longer but still timely manner due to administration of the ERP. The business is as follows:

1. Whispering Creek Equestrian Center: Site was inspected under the provisions of the IDDE program due to an anonymous complaint, but since it was on the scheduled IND program for FY 23-24 it is also being reported under the IND program. The report concerned an unmaintained manure storage area and it was determined upon inspection there was no active discharge, however the conditions constituted a threatened discharge. The property is very large and through inspection of the entire facility, other areas were identified that needed BMP implementation. The inspector provided BMP factsheets and the facility owner constructed gravel berms, installed additional wattling, and tarped the manure piles and debris boxes. The facility owner advised she will be relocating one of the manure collection areas to another area which is further away from the creek running through the site. Due the size of the facility and obtaining materials, additional time was warranted and during the time needed, there were no known active discharges. Case was open for 15 days.

C.4.d.iii.(1)(b) ► Number of Each Type of Enforcement Conducted

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| | Enforcement Action (As listed in ERP) ¹ | Number of Enforcement Actions Taken |
|--------------|--|--|
| Level 1 | Verbal Warning | 10 |
| Level 2 | Written Notice of Violation (NOV) | 0 |
| Level 3 | Administrative Pre-Citation | 1 |
| Level 4 | Administrative Citation | 0 |
| Level 5 | Referral to City Attorney | 0 |
| Level 6 | Referral to Water Board | 0 |
| Total | | |

C.4.d.iii.(1)(d) ► Frequency of Potential and Actual Non-Stormwater Discharges by Business Category

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| Business Category² | Number of Actual Discharges | Number of Potential Discharges |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Automotive | 1 | 3 |
| Building Supplies/Services | 0 | 0 |
| Grocery | 0 | 1 |
| Corp Yards | 0 | 1 |
| Food Facility | 0 | 1 |
| Other- Pesticide Facilities | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Veterinary | 0 | 0 |
| Shopping Center | 0 | 2 |
| Offices | 0 | 1 |

¹Agencies to list specific enforcement actions as defined in their ERPs.

²List your Program's standard business categories.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Major Retail | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Dry Cleaners | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Religious Organizations | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Hospital | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Continuing Care Retirement | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Commercial Printing | 0 | 0 |
| Other- Agriculture | 0 | 1 |

C.4.e.iii ► Staff Training Summary

| Training Name | Training Dates | Topics Covered | No. of Industrial/ Commercial Site Inspectors in Attendance | Percent of Industrial/ Commercial Site Inspectors in Attendance | No. of IDDE Inspectors in Attendance | Percent of IDDE Inspectors in Attendance |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| IND-IDDE Internal Staff Training | 1/29/2024 | IDDE Emergency Spills and Illicit Discharge Response Plan; IND-IDDE Enforcement Response Plan and Flowchart; IND Business Inspection Plan; IND Site Inspection Guidance (including FTC inspection); IND Billing and IDDE Cost Recovery; Digitizing Forms; Field Supplies Needed. | 5 | 100% | 5 | 100% |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

Section 5 – Provision C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

Program Highlights and Evaluation

Highlight/summarize activities for reporting year:

Provide background information, highlights, trends, etc.

Summary:

Illegal Dumping

Illegal dumping continues to be a challenge and impact to City staff. The City classifies illegal dumping of all materials in the public right-of-way as an IDDE actual discharge and it is reflected in the IDDE database. In most cases, the materials dumped are bulky household items such as furniture and appliances, which while not a direct threat to enter the MS4, could be comingled with other substances such as paint, cleaners, and automotive fluids. The IND/IDDE Inspector responds to these incidents and investigates to identify and locate the responsible party, which includes leaving door hangers as the situation warrants that advise of the incident and include a resource to have these types of materials removed by the City's franchised waste hauler. The dumping locations are random and have proven a challenge to address through digital or police surveillance.

Fire Sprinkler System Planned Water Discharges

The Environmental Programs Division (Stormwater Program) has implemented a building permit application review comment requiring notification if any of the permitted construction would necessitate discharging water from the building fire suppression system and if so, the Fire Sprinkler System Planned Water Discharge Form is required. The City's IND/IDDE Inspector is present during the discharge to ensure proper BMPs are installed and there is no discharge to any inlets or overland sheet flow that would result in residue from the water being deposited to hardscape where rain or irrigation would mobilize it to a storm drain. This notification has resulted in 33 separate forms being submitted for discharge events that the IND/IDDE inspector could witness. This regulatory approach has created considerable staff time impacts on the inspector, Compliance Technician, and Program Supervisor, however, staff believes this approach and added educational outreach opportunity has yielded positive results. In addition, the City applies this practice to one large business that occupies multiple offices/campuses within the City and has established a process by which they notify the Environmental Programs of their planned fire suppression system testing and the volume and location of where this water is to be discharged. Due to staffing levels, the IND/IDDE inspector is unable to be present during all tests, but the discharge locations are reviewed by the Program Specialist and IND/IDDE inspector in advance of the testing discharges.

Fines, Fees, and Cost Recovery

The following is a summary of fines, fees, and cost recovery for remediation of discharges in FY 23-24:

1. Administrative citations: A total of three citations were issued totaling \$1,300.00. One citation was for 3 violations at a restaurant for uncontained litter and recyclables in the trash enclosure, loose litter in the exterior landscaping and sidewalk area, and an overflowing waste trio. The second citation was for the same restaurant, but on a different day, for uncontained litter and recyclables in the trash enclosure and unmaintained storm drain inlet full trash capture devices. The third citation was for an unlawful non-stormwater discharge (soil and hydraulic oil) to the storm drain system at a residential construction site.

2. Fees: A total of four re-inspection fees were issued, totaling \$1,420.00. Two re-inspection fees were issued to the same property owner (Jessica Reyes with JST Auto Care) for two re-inspections to investigate and resolve improperly stored haz-mat barrels, vehicles leaking fluids, oily parts and equipment stored outside of the building, and litter/trash.
3. Cost Recovery (reimbursement of IND/IDDE Inspector and Programs Supervisor payroll expenses due to discharge remediation oversight): Sixteen incidents totaling \$7,845.31 as follows:
 - Fourteen separate incidents of hydraulic fluid discharges from failed hoses on waste hauler vehicles (\$5,509.99)
 - One incident of a water line break by a fiber telecommunications (HP Communications) contractor (\$415.58)
 - One incident of a concrete spill by a fiber telecommunications (HP Communications) contractor (\$1,919.74)

The City is also a regular participant in the Countywide Program's IND/IDDE AHTG to discuss countywide program strategies. Please refer to the C.5 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination section of the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a description of the program.

C.5.c.iii ► Complaint and Spill Response Phone Number
(for FY 23-24 Annual Report only)

C.5.c.iii.(1)(a) List below your complaint and spill response phone number

- Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.: (408) 777-3354
- Monday- Friday, 6 a.m. - 3 p.m.: (408) 777-3269
- After Hours: (408) 299-2507 (Santa Clara County Communications will notify the City's on-call staff)

C.5.c.iii.(1)(a) Provide your complaint and spill response web reporting address or a link to a web-based reporting application, if used

<https://www.cupertino.org/our-city/advanced-components/cupertino-311>

C.5.c.iii.(1)(b) Is a screen shot of your website showing the central contact point included? Yes No

ILLEGAL DUMPING

Font Size: [Share & Bookmark](#) [Feedback](#) [Print](#)

Illegal Dumping/Discharges In or Near Storm Drains

Nothing besides rain water may be dumped or allowed to flow into a storm drain. Common examples of illegal discharges include pesticides, wash waters, sewage, automotive fluids, paint, construction materials and wastes, sediment and/or silt, and food wastes.

To report an illegal discharge or dumping incident, contact the City of Cupertino:

- Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.: (408) 777-3354
- Monday- Friday, 6 a.m. - 3 p.m.: (408) 777-3269
- After Hours: (408) 299-2507 (Santa Clara County Communications will notify the City's on-call staff)
- [Report illegal dumping or discharges online](#) during business hours only. Please do not report dumping or discharges online after hours (before 7:30 a.m. or after 5:30 p.m.).

If No, explain:
 N/A

C.5.c.iii.(1)(c) Provide a discussion of how the central contact point (complaint and spill response phone number and, if used, web reporting address or web-based reporting application) is being publicized to your staff and the public.

The public can find this information by doing a simple internet search containing the words "Cupertino illegal dumping", "storm drain". They can also go online to our 311 reporting system and make a report there. Additionally, all Environmental Programs Division staff include specific language on voicemail and out-of-office email auto-replies of how to report a threatened or actual non-stormwater pollutant discharge providing the telephone number for County Communications.

C.5.d.iii.(1) ► Spill and Discharge Complaint Tracking

Spill and Discharge Complaint Tracking (fill out the following table or include an attachment of the following information)

| | Number |
|---|---------------|
| Discharges reported (C.5.d.iii.(1)(a)) | 121 |
| Discharges reaching storm drains and/or receiving waters (C.5.d.iii.(1)(b)) | 20 |
| Discharges resolved in a timely manner (C.5.d.iii.(1)(c)) | 114 |

Comments:

IDDE Program Staffing

The City has one IND/IDDE inspector who acts as the primary investigator for reports of threatened or actual stormwater pollution discharges. This inspector has worked for the City for over 50 years and has a vast knowledge of the MS4 and outfall locations within the creeks. He has been the City's IND/IDDE inspector for over 16 years and is a tremendous resource to both City staff and the community because of his efficiency at identifying and resolving discharge incidents. The Program Manager, Supervisor, and Technician are also trained and equipped to respond and manage spills and discharges in the absence of the inspector. Reports of discharges, both actual and threatened, are typically responded to within the City's goal of less than 24 hours; however, if a report is received during business hours, the IND/IDDE inspector is immediately dispatched to investigate.

Summary of IDDE Investigations

IDDE investigations are begun through various channels: citizen reported, inspector initiated, interdepartmental referral, and outside agency referrals. Of the 120 total discharges investigated, 74 (62%) were citizen reported, 9 (7.5%) were inspector initiated, 17 (14%) were interdepartmental referral, and 20 (17%) were other agency referrals. This data shows that 22% of all IDDEs investigated in FY 23-24 were through proactive City investigation or other City staff observing noncompliant conditions that warranted follow up by the investigator. This reflects effective intra-agency communication and awareness of the importance for stormwater pollution prevention by all City staff.

Unsubstantiated Reports and Inspector Response

The City documents all calls for service requiring a response to investigate any report of a threatened or actual discharge. Of the data compiled in FY 23-24, there were six reports of discharges (threatened or actual) that were determined to be unsubstantiated upon the inspector's investigation.

When a discharge is reported or observed, the inspector's first objective is to prevent and/or limit the discharge from reaching the storm drain system and/or receiving water. In FY 23-24, of all the discharges investigated, 101 (84%) were contained to the surface area and did not enter the storm drain system (either private or the MS4). Of the 20 discharges that did reach the storm drain, 15 (75%) were the result of broken water lines on either public or private land, were public utility lines within the right-of-way, or were conditionally exempt. Other discharges reaching the storm drain were miscellaneous incidents that were documented in the City's IDDE database.

Rationale for Compliance Beyond 10 Business Days

During this reporting period there were seven discharges that exceeded the 10 businesses day compliance period. Summaries of these incidents are as follows:

1. One Apple Park Way (Apple) - complaint via RWQCB for an allegation that subterranean hot water lines on the Apple ring campus are leaking emitting ongoing discharges of up to 200 g/day of polluted water to the ground and to the MS4. This is a follow up complaint from March 2020 and March 2022. The hot water system discharge was unfounded, however there was a conditionally exempt discharge of irrigation water with insufficient BMPs found to be entering the MS4. The irrigation was reduced and inspection was done of the entire irrigation system in this area to check for any broken/damaged irrigation heads. Case was open for 31 days.
2. 10425 S. De Anza Blvd - Uncontained trash, food grease in the trash enclosure, loose litter and illegal dumping in rear of shopping center, leaking trash compactor. Notice of violation issued. First re-inspection, did not pass and second inspection required at which time the property complied. Re-inspection fee of \$355.00 issued. Case was open for 22 days.
3. Stevens Creek- APN 326 17 061 (unimproved parcel) – PG&E subcontractor performed tree pruning and left a significant amount of tree cuttings on the unimproved parcel. PG&E was slow to respond and have the material cleared, despite it being adjacent to a creek. Case open for 36 days.
4. 1375 S. De Anza Blvd (Tien Fu Xiang Hot Pot) - Uncontained/overflowing solid waste receptacles, litter throughout the site, trash in storm drains (on-site) obstructing the FTC devices, no secondary containment of tallow, overflowing waste trio at sidewalk. Also working the County Health for possible food safety handling violations. Two administrative citations issued and \$1,400.00 in re-inspection fees assessed. Case was open for 43 days.
5. 10151 Imperial Avenue (JST Auto Care) - Referral from Santa Clara County Hazardous Material Inspector concerning an automotive facility with a significant amount of improperly stored haz-mat barrels, vehicles leaking fluids, oily parts and equipment stored outside of the building, and litter/trash. Notice of violation issued and partial compliance. Pre-citation issued and compliance achieved. Re-inspection fees were assessed, facility will be added to the IND inspection list for next FY. Case was open for 34 days.
6. 22025 Regnart Rd - Baker tank was being emptied into a tanker truck and there was a failure with the tanker gate and approximately 800 gallons of effluent was discharged to the adjacent storm drain inlet and the creek. The flow was limited in the creek and there was no recovery of the discharge liquid. Laboratory sampling of the discharge was done, and State agencies were notified. The discharge ended within two hours after it occurred on 6/25/24. The corrective action (clean up) exceeded 10 business days, however BMPs were replaced around the inlet receiving the discharge the day of the incident and were periodically checked and shown to be maintained until final cleanup was done on 7/23/24. Consideration for the extended time for remediation was due to the challenge of not being able to utilize hydro-jetting equipment at the outfall due to terrain handwork to clean out an end portion of the lateral, summer months, no rain forecasted, third-party City inspector on site daily during working days, and BMP maintenance. Case was open for 28 days.

7. 10110 California Oak Way (Whispering Creek Equestrian Center) - Complaint filed this date from an incident 11 months prior of inadequate BMPs near a manure collection area of an equestrian center. An inspection was done, and the conditions reported were observed, however there was a straw wattle installed. Further inspection of the site revealed there was inadequate containment of two manure areas. Inspector provided BMP factsheets and gravel berms, additional wattling, and tarping the manure piles and debris boxes was done. Business owner advised she will be relocating one of the manure collection areas to another area which is further away from the creek running through the site. This site was also on the FY 23-24 IND program inspection list and will remain for annual inspection. Case was open for 15 days.

C.5.e.iii.(2)(a)&(c) ▶ Mobile Sources Inspections and Enforcement

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| | Number |
|---|--------|
| Mobile business inspections conducted (C.5.e.iii.(2)(a)) | 1 |
| Summary of the enforcement actions taken against mobile businesses during the reporting year (C.5.e.iii.(2)(c)). | |
| <p>Summary:</p> <p>In FY 23-24 the City received a report of a mobile car wash in a residential neighborhood. The IND/IDDE inspector found wet/soap residue in gutter but the responsible party was gone. Inspector contacted several residents, but nobody knew the house the mobile car was working at and there was no business name to conduct additional follow-up with.</p> | |

C.5.e.iii.(2)(b) ▶ Frequency of Mobile Sources Inspections by Business Type

Fill out the following table or attach a summary of the following information.

| Mobile Business Type ¹ | Number Inspected ² |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| None (see comment above). | 0 |
| | |
| Comments: | |

¹ Including, but not limited to, automobile washing, vehicle fueling, power washing, steam cleaning, graffiti removal and carpet cleaning.

² The number of each type of mobile business inspected

C.5.f.iii ► MS4 Map(s) Availability
(for FY 23-24 Annual Report only)

Discuss how you make your MS4 map(s) available to the public and how you publicize the availability of the MS4 map.

The City's MS4 maps are publicly available on our website in the Environment and Sustainability Clean Water and Storm Protection Program page. The map is also included on the Environmental Programs Division development page at Cupertino.org/greendev in the "Helpful Links" section.

Section 6 – Provision C.6 Construction Site Controls

| C.6.e.iii.(1)(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) ▶ Site/Inspection Totals | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Total number of construction sites requiring inspections during at least part of the Permit year; (C.6.e.iii.1.a) | Total number of active hillside sites disturbing <1 acre of soil requiring inspection (C.6.e.iii.1.b) | Number of High Priority Sites (sites disturbing < 1 acre of soil requiring storm water runoff quality inspection) (C.6.e.iii. 1.d) | Number of sites disturbing ≥ 1 acre of soil (C.6.e.iii.1.c) | Total number of storm water runoff quality inspections conducted (include only Hillside Sites, High Priority Sites and sites disturbing 1 acre or more) (C.6.e.iii. 1.e) |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 252 |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>On August 15, 2023, the Public Works Development Services Division prepared a reminder letter to all site developers and/or owners disturbing one acre or more of soil, hillside projects, and high priority sites to prepare for the upcoming wet season.</p> <p>In FY 23-24, all regulated project construction sites were inspected monthly or until construction was completed by the Public Works Engineering Inspector. Monthly inspections were documented and saved in the City's C.6 database which is maintained by the Public Works Engineering Inspector. When potential/actual discharge violations are observed, the Public Works Engineering Inspector requires immediate correction and monitors ongoing compliance. The City's IND/IDDE inspector also conducts periodic inspections of these site perimeters and if deficiencies are identified, the inspector will address the issue(s) and coordinate further site oversight with the Public Works Engineering Inspector.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Provide the number of inspections that are conducted at sites not within the above categories as part of your agency's inspection program and a general description of those sites, if available or applicable.</p> <p>Does not apply.</p> | | | | |

C.6.e.iii.(1)(f) ► Construction Related Storm Water Enforcement Actions

| | Enforcement Action (as listed in ERP) ¹ | Number Enforcement Actions Issued |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Level 1 ² | Verbal Warning | 17 |
| Level 2 | Written Notice | 0 |
| Level 3 | Pre-Citation Letter and/or Administrative Citation Fines | 0 |
| Level 4 | Stop Work Order | 0 |
| Level 5 | Referral to City Attorney | 0 |
| Level 6 | Referral to Santa Clara County District Attorney/Regional Water Board | 0 |
| Level 7 | City Remediation of a Nuisance | 0 |
| Total | | 17 |

C.6.e.iii.(1)(g), ► Illicit Discharges

| | Number |
|---|---------------|
| Number of illicit discharges, actual and potential, of sediment or other construction-related materials | 0 |

¹ Agencies should list the specific enforcement actions as defined in their ERPs.

² For example, Enforcement Level 1 may be Verbal Warning.

| C.6.e.iii.(1)(h) ► Corrective Actions | |
|--|--|
| Indicate your reporting methodology below. | |
| | Permittee reports multiple discrete potential and actual discharges at a site as one enforcement action. |
| X | Permittee reports the total number of discrete potential and actual discharges on each site. |
| | Number |
| Enforcement actions or discrete potential and actual discharges fully corrected within 10 business days after violations are discovered or otherwise considered corrected in a timely period (C.6.e.iii.1.h) | 30 |
| <p>Comments: Enforcement for potential and/or actual discharges identified during site inspections are investigated and resolved consistent with the Construction Site Control ERP. In FY 23-24, the following violations were identified and resolved by the City's Public Works Engineering Inspector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion Control = 10 • Sediment Control = 16 • Good Site Management = 4 <p>When an actual or potential discharge is observed by the inspector, the construction site project manager is typically given 48 hours to correct the violation. If rainfall is imminent, the responsible person is required to correct the violation immediately. Of the 30 total potential and/or actual discharges that were identified, all 30 were corrected within 10 business days through verbal warning.</p> | |

| C.6.f.iii ► Staff Training Summary | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| Training Name | Training Dates | Topics Covered | Total Number of C.6 inspectors (both municipal and non-municipal staff) | No. of C.6 inspectors in Attendance (both municipal and non-municipal staff) |
| SCVURPPP Construction Site Stormwater Inspector Workshop | 11/29/23 &/or 11/30/23 | MRP and CGP – What's the Difference; Construction Site Fact Sheets; Field Sessions -Slope Protection; Inlet Protection and Check Dams; Stabilized Construction Exits | 1 | 5 |
| | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

Section 7 – Provision C.7. Public Information and Outreach

| C.7.g.iii.(1) ► Reporting | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Submit a table listing the types of outreach programs implemented during that Permit year along with a brief description. The table should be a cumulative table showing the number, if applicable, of each type of outreach campaigns or events occurring during each Permit year. | | | | | | |
| Information provided in the tables below are local activities only, please refer to the C.7 Public Information and Outreach section of the SCVURPPP FY 23-24 Annual Report for outreach activities conducted Countywide by the Program. | | | | | | |
| Type of Outreach Program Implemented | Brief Description of Current Year Campaigns | Number of outreach campaigns or events occurring during each Permit Year, if applicable | | | | |
| | | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 | FY 24-25 | FY 25-26 | FY 26-27 |
| C.7.a. Outreach Campaigns | Not locally applicable – see SCVURPPP Annual Report | | | | | |
| C.7.c. Public Outreach and Citizen Involvement Events | In partnership with Creek Connections Action Group, City of Cupertino hosts creek cleanup events. | Two cleanup events were held: 2022 Coastal Cleanup Day and 2023 National River Cleanup Day. | Two cleanup events were held: 2023 Coastal Cleanup Day and 2024 National River Cleanup Day. | | | |
| | Grassroots Ecology hosts Community and College Field Trips at McClellan Ranch Preserve and Blackberry Farm-Students learned about field techniques in creek science and environmental and ecological implications of different chemical | 237 students participated. | 6 field trips were held. | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>and biological parameters. Students measured water chemistry and learned to identify benthic macroinvertebrates and common riparian vegetation. Lessons also included discussions on water pollution and its effects on ecosystem health. Field trips connected the different activities and imparted students with a big picture understanding of the watershed.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>C.7.d. Watershed Stewardship Collaboration</p> | <p>Watershed Day- Watershed Awareness Volunteer Event- Grassroots Ecology hosted Watershed Day in collaboration with the City of Cupertino, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, and Friends of the Stevens Creek Trail. A four-hour restoration and educational event where visitors rotated between education stations, bird walks along the creek, and invasive species removal in the meadow.</p> | <p>1 community event at Watershed Day, organized by Grassroots Ecology with 119 volunteers. The City of Cupertino Environmental Programs Staff showcased an Enviroscope, a watershed model, to educate the public on watersheds and pollution prevention.</p> | <p>1 community event at Watershed Day, organized by Grassroots Ecology with 67 volunteers. The City of Cupertino Parks & Rec Staff showcased an Enviroscope, a watershed model, to educate the public on watersheds and pollution prevention.</p> | | | |

| Type of Outreach Program Implemented | Brief Description | Number of outreach campaigns or events occurring during each Permit Year, if applicable | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|----------|----------|
| | | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 | FY 24-25 | FY 25-26 | FY 26-27 |
| C.7.e. School-Age Children Outreach | The City hosts a 3rd Grade Education and Field Trip Program. Started in 1995, it continues to be refined to update and incorporate new messages. Students learn about general water and habitat pollution prevention and creek concepts precede the actual creek walk. Cupertino's docents observe what each teacher has spent time in the classroom reviewing to prepare the students for the field trip. | Total participation- Schools hosted: 12 Tours: 24 Students: 968 | Total participation- Schools hosted: 9 Tours: 15 Students: 641 | | | |
| | Annual Earth Day Poster Challenge for grades K-8 children | One contest; total of 56 submissions throughout Santa Clara County. Cupertino students submitted entries and there were two local winners. | One contest; total of 67 submissions throughout Santa Clara County. Cupertino students submitted entries and there was one local winner. | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>High School Youth Stewards program-The Grassroots Ecology Youth Stewards gathered weekly at McClellan for activities and educational discussions revolving around topics such as local watersheds, native flora and fauna, and restoration ecology. Stewards experienced the preserve through active restoration as well as through creative writing/art prompts and scientific observation and analysis.</p> | <p>25 high school students participated.</p> | <p>25 high school students participated.</p> | | | |
| <p>C.7.f. Outreach to Municipal Officials</p> | <p>City Council receives a presentation about the City's stormwater pollution program during the annual parcel fee renewal process.</p> | <p>City Council received the presentation in June 2023.</p> | <p>City Council received the presentation in June 2024.</p> | | | |

C.7.g.iii.(2) ► Stormwater Pollution Prevention Education

No Change.

Section 9 – Provision C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Controls

| C.9.a. ► Implement IPM Policy or Ordinance | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------------|----|
| Is your municipality implementing its IPM Policy/Ordinance and Standard Operating Procedures? | | | | X | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| If no, explain: | | | | | | | |
| Links to IPM policies or ordinances and IPM standard operating procedures: Updated link: https://records.cupertino.org/WebLink/Browse.aspx?id=1050482&dbid=0&repo=CityofCupertino | | | | | | | |
| Report implementation of IPM BMPs by showing trends in quantities and types of pesticides used, and suggest reasons for increases in use of pesticides that threaten water quality , specifically organophosphates, pyrethroids, carbamates, fipronil, indoxacarb, diuron, and diamides. A separate report can be attached as evidence of your implementation. | | | | | | | |
| Trends in Quantities and Types of Pesticide Active Ingredients Used¹ | | | | | | | |
| Pesticide Category and Specific Pesticide Active Ingredient Used | Amount ² of Active Ingredient | | | | | | |
| | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 | FY 24-25 | FY 25-26 | FY 26-27 | | |
| Organophosphates | | | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Chlorpyrifos | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Diazinon | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Malathion | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Pyrethroids (see footnote #2 for list of active ingredients) | | | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Type X | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Type Y | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Carbamates | | | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Carbaryl | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

¹ Includes all municipal structural and landscape pesticide usage by employees and contractors.

² Weight or volume of the active ingredient, using same units for the product each year. Please specify units used. The active ingredients in any pesticide are listed on the label. The list of active ingredients that need to be reported in the pyrethroids class includes: metofluthrin, bifenthrin, cyfluthrin, beta-cyfluthrin, cypermethrin, deltamethrin, esfenvalerate, lambda-cyhalothrin, and permethrin.

| Active Ingredient Aldicarb | 0 | 0 | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Pesticide Category and Specific Pesticide Active Ingredient Used | Amount | | | | |
| | FY 22-23 | FY 23-24 | FY 24-25 | FY 25-26 | FY 26-27 |
| Indoxacarb | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Diuron | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Diamides | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Chlorantraniliprole | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Active Ingredient Cyantraniliprole | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Neonicotinoids | | | | | |
| Active Ingredient Imidacloprid | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Active Ingredient Acetamiprid | 17 fl oz | 0 | | | |
| Active Ingredient Dinotefuran | 0.6 fl oz | 44.4 lbs | | | |
| Fipronil | 0 | 0 | | | |

Reasons for increases in use of pesticides that threaten water quality:

Staff uses products containing Acetamiprid and Dinotefuran to control Scale, Aphids, and Whiteflies on the City's Olive and Ash trees. In spring of 2023 late rains meant staff was unable to apply products as intended, which lead to an increase in pest damage. In FY 23-24, staff was able to resume normal application to reduce damage to the trees and to avoid excessive dripping of aphid-generated "honeydew." In the past staff has tried biological control releases of parasitic wasp and ladybird beetles, but there was little to no success with those methods to control the issues. Product is applied to the basal trunk at very low pressure to reduce the chance of drift or runoff.

IPM Tactics and Strategies Used:

- The Grounds division used pre-emergents that reduced the use of post-emergent pesticides.
- The Grounds division and the Right of Way division installed mulch at many locations to control weeds.
- The contractor for Blackberry Farm Golf Course has been keeping diseases at a minimum by cutting them out and using sulfur to keep them at bay.
- Fence lines and other areas at the Golf Course are being trimmed instead of using chemicals.
- Mole and gopher traps are being used instead of chemicals.
- The Gophernator Carbon Monoxide Machine was used to help exterminate gophers with success.
- The Trees division has been using mulch and weed pulling instead of using herbicides.
- The Trees division has tried washing trees with water to release the predatory insects.

| C.9.b ▶ Train Municipal Employees | |
|---|----|
| Enter the number of employees that apply or use pesticides (including herbicides) within the scope of their duties. | 25 |
| Enter the number of these employees who received training on your IPM policy and IPM standard operating procedures within this reporting year. | 2 |
| Enter the percentage of municipal employees who apply pesticides who have received training in the IPM policy and IPM standard operating procedures within this reporting year. | 8% |
| <p>Type of Training/Comments:</p> <p>In addition to regular staff meetings where IPM methodology is conveyed, and ongoing instruction about updating practices for how to use the least amount of product possible to address pest issues, City of Cupertino staff attended the following trainings where IPM methods were addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCVURPPP Landscape IPM Workshop held on April 25, 2024. • The contracted applicator for Blackberry Farm Golf Course attended the following trainings: 1/31/24 – 2/1/24 – Golf Course Superintendents Conference & Show – Pheonix, AZ 2/28/24 – 2/29/24 – Spring Symposium – Alternative Disease Management Through IPM – Brooks, CA • Cupertino Grounds and Trees Division Staff attended the following trainings: 10/26/23 – Monterey Seminar – Monterey, CA Attendees: 1 4/30/24 – PAPA Zoom Webinar Attendees: 1 6/7/24 - PAPA Zoom Webinar Attendees: 1 <p>City staff provides ongoing communication throughout the year about updating practices to use the least amount of product possible to control issues. In addition to safety training, IPM methodology is communicated to pest management staff in regular meetings with their supervisors.</p> | |

| C.9.c ▶ Require Contractors to Implement IPM | | | |
|---|---|------------|-----------|
| Did your municipality contract with any pesticide service provider in the reporting year, for either landscaping or structural pest control? | X | Yes | No |
| If yes, did your municipality evaluate the contractor's list of pesticides and amounts of active ingredients used? | X | Yes | No |
| <p>If your municipality contracted with any pesticide service provider, briefly describe how contractor compliance with IPM Policy/Ordinance and SOPs was monitored</p> <p>The City of Cupertino employs two contractors (one for buildings and facilities and one for the golf course) who have worked for the City for more than ten years. Each contractor reports to one assigned City staff supervisor from whom they are required to obtain staff approval before applying any pesticides and with whom they have regular in-person contact. Monthly pesticide usage reports for any product applied inside or outside of City buildings are reviewed by City Environmental Division staff to provide an additional level of insurance that IPM application restrictions are continually being implemented.</p> <p>The City of Cupertino's IPM Policy and contract specifications require that contractors follow IPM techniques and use pesticides only as a last resort to protect the health and safety of the community.</p> <p>Additionally, contractors are not allowed to use pesticides of concern.</p> | | | |
| <p>If your agency did not evaluate the contractor's list of pesticides and amounts of active ingredients used, provide an explanation here.</p> <p>N/A</p> | | | |

| C.9.d ▶ Interface with County Agricultural Commissioners | | | |
|--|--|------------|-----------|
| <p>How did your municipality communicate with the County Agricultural Commissioner to: (a) get input and assistance on urban pest management practices and use of pesticides or (b) inform them of water quality issues related to pesticides?</p> <p>See Section 9 of the SCVURPPP FY 23-24 Annual Report for summary of communication with the Santa Clara County Agricultural Commissioner.</p> | | | |
| Did your municipality report any observed or citizen-reported violations of pesticide regulations (e.g., illegal handling and applications of pesticides) associated with stormwater management, particularly the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) surface water protection regulations for outdoor, nonagricultural use of pyrethroid pesticides by any person performing pest control for hire? | | Yes | No |
| <p>If yes, provide a summary of improper pesticide usage reported to the County Agricultural Commissioner and follow-up actions taken to correct any violations. A separate report can be attached as your summary.</p> <p>N/A</p> | | | |

C.9.e.ii (1) ► Public Outreach: Point of Purchase

Provide a summary of public outreach at point of purchase, and any measurable awareness and behavior changes resulting from outreach (here or in a separate report); **OR** reference a report of a regional effort for public outreach in which your agency participates.

Summary:

See the C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Control section of Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for information on point of purchase public outreach conducted countywide and regionally.

C.9.e.ii (2) ► Public Outreach: Pest Control Contracting Outreach

Provide a summary of outreach to residents who use or contract for structural pest control and landscape professionals); **AND/OR** reference a report of a regional effort for outreach to residents who hire pest control and landscape professionals in which your agency participates.

Summary:

See Section 7 and Section 9 of the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of outreach to residents and businesses that use or hire structural pest control and landscape professionals. In addition, see the FY 23-24 Watershed Watch Campaign Final Report included within Section 7 of the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.9.e.ii.(3) ► Public Outreach: Pest Control Operators

Provide a summary of public outreach to pest control operators and landscapers and reduced pesticide use (here or in a separate report); **AND/OR** reference a report of a regional effort for outreach to pest control operators and landscapers in which your agency participates.

Summary:

See the C.9 Pesticides Toxicity Control section of Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of our participation in and contributions towards countywide and regional public outreach to pest control operators and landscapers to reduce pesticide use.

C.9.f ► Track and Participate in Relevant Regulatory Processes

Summarize participation efforts, information submitted, and how regulatory actions were affected; **AND/OR** reference a regional report that summarizes regional participation efforts, information submitted, and how regulatory actions were affected.

Summary:

During FY 23-24, we participated in regulatory processes related to pesticides through contributions to the countywide Program and CASQA. For additional information, see the Pesticide Annual Report prepared by CASQA in the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

Section 10 – Provision C.10 Trash Load Reduction

| C.10.a.i ► Trash Load Reduction Summary | |
|---|------------|
| For population-based Permittees, provide the overall trash reduction percentage achieved to-date within the jurisdictional area of your municipality that generates problematic trash levels (i.e., Very High, High, or Moderate trash generation). Base the reduction percentage on the information presented in C.10.b i-v and C.10.f.i-ii. Provide a discussion of the calculation used to produce the reduction percentage | |
| Trash Load Reductions | |
| Percent Reduction in All Trash Management Areas (TMAs) due to Full Trash Capture Systems (as reported C.10.b.i) ¹ | 64% |
| Percent Reduction in all TMAs due to Control Measures Other than Full Trash Capture Systems (as reported in C.10.a.ii(b) & C.10.b.iii) ^{1,2} | 33% |
| Subtotal for Above Actions | 97% |
| Trash Reduction Credits and Offsets (Optional) | |
| Reduction Credits due to Jurisdiction-wide Source Control Actions (as reported in C.10.b.v) ³ | 0% |
| Reduction Offset Associated with Additional Creek and Shoreline Cleanups (as reported in C.10.f.i) | 0% |
| Reduction Offset Associated with Direct Trash Discharge Controls (as reported in C.10.f.ii) | 0% |
| Total (Jurisdiction-wide) % Trash Load Reduction through FY 2023-24 | 97% |
| <p>Discussion of Permittee Trash Load Reduction and the Load Reduction Calculation:</p> <p>The City attained and reported 93.5% trash load reduction (including trash offsets) in its FY 22-23 Annual Report. During FY 23-24, the City continued to implement and expand its robust trash control measure program (e.g., small full trash capture devices), which helped the City maintain its trash load reduction above the mandatory 90% trash load reduction requirement included in the MRP. The total (jurisdiction-wide) percent trash load reduction in FY 23-24 is 97%. Descriptions of continued and enhanced actions implemented by the City to achieve this trash load reduction are summarized in this Section. The pdf version of the City's Revised Trash Generation Map can be downloaded at http://scvurppp.org/trash-maps/.</p> | |

¹ See Appendix 10-1 for changes between 2009 and FY 23-24 in trash generation by TMA as a result of Full Capture Systems and Other Trash Control Measures.

² This percentage includes reductions associated with other trash controls implemented to address moderate, high or very high trash generating areas in the public right-of-way and on applicable private lands, including Private Land Drainage Areas (PLDAs).

³ To claim a load percentage reduction value, Permittees must provide substantive and credible evidence that new source control actions are being implemented jurisdiction-wide and reduce trash by the claimed value. Permittees may no longer claim source control actions implemented under previous Permits (i.e., foam foodware and single-use plastic bags).

C.10.a.ii(a) ► Full Trash Capture Systems – Population-based Permittees
C.10.c ► Full Trash Capture Systems – Flood Management Agencies

Provide the following:

- 1) Total number and types of full capture systems (publicly and privately-owned) installed during FY 23-24, and prior to FY 23-24, including inlet-based and large flow-through or end-of-pipe systems, and qualifying low impact development (LID) required by permit provision C.3.
- 2) Total land area (acres) treated by full capture systems for population-based Permittees and total number of systems for flood management agencies compared to the total required by the permit.

| Type of System ⁴ | # of Systems | Areas Treated (Acres) |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| Installed in FY 23-24 | | |
| Catch Basin Insert Devices (Public) | 19 | 32.1 |
| Catch Basin Insert Devices (Private) | 77 | 17.3 |
| Installed Prior to FY 23-24⁵ | | |
| Catch Basin Insert Devices (Public) | 219 | 264.6 |
| Catch Basin Insert Devices (Private) | 514 | 258.4 |
| Multi-beneficial Stormwater Treatment Systems (Private) | 3 | 3.5 |
| Full Trash Capture Systems installed by bordering Permittees with treatment areas extending into City of Cupertino | -- | 1.2 |
| Total for all Devices or Systems Installed To-date | 832 | 577.1 |
| Total # of Systems Required by Permit (Flood Management Agencies) | | N/A |

⁴ The City continued to perform a thorough review of all catch basin insert devices installed on public and private property in FY 23-24. The total of number of devices and acres treated (acres) has been updated based on the City's current catch basin insert device (public and private) inventory. Areas treated include jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional lands (e.g., public K-12 schools and colleges, and freeways).

⁵ A review of parcels with previously installed multi-beneficial stormwater treatment systems (private) indicated that catch basin insert devices (private) were fully treating some parcels previously reported to be treated by these systems. As result, the number and areas treated (acres) for some parcels with multi-beneficial stormwater treatment systems (private) are now accounted as catch basin insert devices (private). Currently, the City is evaluating the three remaining parcels with multi-beneficial stormwater treatment systems (private) to determine if their current trash generation category and if they are fully treated with full trash capture devices.

C.10.a.ii(b) ▶ Trash Generation Area Management - Private Lands

Provide a summary of implementation actions and progress towards meeting the July 1, 2025 requirement for all private lands that are moderate, high, or very high trash generating, and that drain to storm drain inlets that Permittees do not own or operate (private), but that are plumbed to Permittees' storm drain systems. Include descriptions of any trash control measures implemented, or caused to be implemented, by your agency, including full trash capture systems and/or trash discharge control actions equivalent to or better than full trash capture systems. For trash discharge control actions equivalent to or better than full trash capture systems that were implemented on private lands, summarize the methods used to demonstrate that trash discharges are controlled and the extent to which these methods were implemented in FY 23-24.

Summary of Implementation Actions and Trash Load Reduction Progress:

As described in MRP 3.0 Provision C.10.a.ii(b), private properties that 1) generate moderate, high, or very high level of trash, 2) are plumbed to the City's MS4, and 3) are not already addressed by a Full Trash Capture (FTC) system are required to be equipped with a FTC system or be managed by trash control measures equivalent to or better than a FTC system by July 1, 2025. To address trash contributions from these properties, which are referred to as Private Land Drainage Areas (PLDAs), the City has begun the implementation of a PLDA Trash Inspection Program (TIP). Through the TIP, inspections are performed on PLDAs and if the level of trash observed on the property via OVTAs is greater than low trash generation, property owners and/or managers are required to implement additional trash control measures and achieve low trash generation. Trash control measures may include FTC systems or other types of trash control actions. The goal of the TIP is to address trash from all PLDAs in the City by July 1, 2025.

In FY 23-24 the City focused its resources on conducting a thorough review of its initial PLDAs inventory developed in FY 22-23. Based on this review, the City identified roughly 135 potential PLDAs, which was modified from the list of roughly 180 PLDAs initially identified in FY 22-23. City staff have been trained in conducting PLDA inspections. All PLDAs will be inspected in FY 24-25 as part of attaining the 100% trash load reduction goal by June 30, 2025. As such, no trash load reduction percentage associated with trash control measures being implemented on these roughly 135 PLDAs is being reported in FY 23-24. Load reductions for trash controls on PLDAs will be documented and reported in FY 2024-25. Additional details on the City's TIP can be provided in Cupertino's TIP Plan, which is available upon request.

| C.10.a.ii(b) ▶ Trash Generation Area Management – Trash Generation Area Map | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------|-----------|--|------------|
| <i>(For FY 23-24 Annual Report only)</i> | | | | | |
| | Yes. | | No | | N/A |
| Does your FY 23-24 Annual Report include a Revised Trash Generation Area Map that includes trash management areas, as well as private land drainage areas that will be retrofitted with full trash capture devices, or equivalent, by June 30, 2025? | X | See link below | | | |
| Link to Revised Trash Generation Area Map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pdf version of the City's Revised Trash Generation Map can be downloaded at http://scvurppp.org/trash-maps/ The ArcGIS on-line version available to Regional Water Board staff can be viewed at https://eoa-water.maps.arcgis.com/home/group.html?id=bc2078035b1a4f6495e902f153a00967#overview | | | | | |

C.10.b.i and ii ► Trash Reduction - Full Capture Systems

Provide the following:

- 1) Jurisdiction-wide trash reduction in FY 23-24 attributable to full capture systems implemented in each TMA;
- 2) The total number of full capture systems installed to-date in your jurisdiction;
- 3) The percentage of systems in FY 23-24 that exhibited significant plugged/blinded screens or were ≥50% full when inspected or maintained;
- 4) A narrative summary of any maintenance issues and the corrective actions taken to avoid future performance issues; and
- 5) A certification that each full capture system is operated and maintained to meet full capture system requirements in the permit.

| TMA | Jurisdiction-wide Reduction (%) | Total # of Full Capture Systems | % of Systems Exhibiting Plugged/Blinded Screens or ≥ 50% full in FY 23-24 | Summary of Maintenance Issues and Corrective Actions |
|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | 25.8% | 832 | 16% | <p><u>Roadway Trash Full Capture Device Summary</u></p> <p>All publicly owned full trash capture (FTC) devices along roadways in Cupertino are connector pipe screens. These systems are small inlet-based devices that treat surface area runoff entering the catch basin with the FTC device. Inspection, cleaning, and maintenance of inlets equipped with these devices is performed twice per year (typically late summer/early autumn) to prepare for the rainy season and occurs again post rainy season (typically in spring). Although there are 832 FTC devices installed within the City, 632 are privately owned and maintained. As of June 30, 2024 the City has a total of 200 FTC devices which are owned and maintained by the City and are within our ROW. The last week of June 2024, the City installed 19 new small FTC devices, bringing the previous total from 181 to 200 devices. For purposes of this report, the City had 181 devices which were cleaned twice during FY 23-24. Of those 181, 61 FTC devices when inspected, were found to be >50% full (16%). Each device is removed, inspected, cleaned and the interior of the catch basin is vacuumed. In FY 21-22, the City purchased a vactor truck to perform this work. There is a two-person crew on the truck that performs the service and work closely with the Program Supervisor for any issues encountered.</p> <p><u>Associated Capital Costs in FY 23-24</u></p> <p>In FY 23-24, the City installed nineteen new FTC devices within the City right-of-way. The total cost of this project was \$34,850.</p> <p>In FY 23-24, the City replaced ten (5%) FTC devices that were found to be failing and had become difficult to remove for adequate inspection, cleaning, and vacuuming of the catch basin. An additional four (2%)</p> |
| 2 | 20.3% | | | |
| 3 | 3.7% | | | |
| 4 | 8.4% | | | |
| 5 | 1.7% | | | |
| 7 | 1.1% | | | |
| 8 | 3.1% | | | |
| 9 ^s | 0.2% | | | |
| Total | 64.4% | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>devices were damaged and were able to be repaired. The total cost of this project was \$20,555.</p> <p><u>Curb Inlet Screens as Trash Capture, FTC Device Maintenance, Street Sweeping</u> The City's GIS Department has developed an asset management system which tracks the twice-annual inspection and maintenance of publicly owned, inlet-based FTC devices. In FY 23-24, City maintenance crews reported 16% of the inlets with FTC devices were blinded more than 50%. Of the 16%, many of these inlets contained leaf debris from adjacent tree canopies.</p> <p>The City continues to perform street sweeping in both residential and commercial areas. Commercial streets were swept weekly and residential streets were swept bi-monthly. The commercial areas all have a high percentage of FTC devices and curb inlet screens. The enhanced weekly sweeping has a positive impact in the performance of the FTC devices and curb inlet screens. In FY 23-24 the City recorded sweeping a total of 2,340 curb miles in commercial areas removing a total of 663 cubic yards of debris. Residential areas recorded sweeping 5,525 curb miles removing 1,152 cubic yards of debris.</p> <p>The City's total inventory of curb inlet screens is 273. Of that number, 139 curb inlet screens are paired with FTC devices for an added layer added trash capture. The curb inlet screens are an integral component in an effective street sweeping program by keeping litter at street level and out of the inlet where the FTC device is the sole structural method of keeping trash from entering the lateral and ultimately the creeks.</p> <p><u>Public Parks and City Facility Trash Full Capture</u> Approximately 15 years ago the City installed small inlet-based FTC devices in most of the park and building facility parking lots. These devices have been part of a maintenance agreement with the manufacturer, Revel Environmental (REM). REM performs inspection, cleaning, and replacement as-needed three times each calendar year.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------|
| Certification Statement: The City of Cupertino certifies that a full capture system maintenance and operation program is currently being implemented to maintain all applicable systems in a manner that meets the full capture system requirements included in the Permit. | | | | | | |
| Did your agency provide the names and locations of new and existing full trash capture systems to the County vector control agency for FY 23-24? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A |

C.10.b.iii(a) ► Trash Reduction – Other Trash Management Actions
C.10.c ► Requirements for Flood Control Agencies

Provide a summary of trash control actions other than full capture systems, jurisdictional source controls, and trash control actions on private lands that were implemented within each TMA in FY 23-24, including the types of actions, levels, timing, frequency, and areal extent of implementation, whether actions are new, including initiation date, and information relevant to effective implementation of the action or combination of actions.

| TMA | Summary of Trash Control Actions Other than Full Capture Systems |
|------------|--|
| TMA 1 | <p>As standard conditions of approval (COAs) for new and redeveloped commercial properties, the City required the following in this TMA (High Trash Generation Area) for one private commercial property remodeling projects:</p> <p>19110 Stevens Creek Boulevard – Commercial Coffee Shop/Shopping Center (0.3 acre site)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (1/1 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices; 2. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on the one inlet on the site. 3. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff’s authority to enforce the City’s Litter Prevention Ordinance. 4. Installation of one cigarette urn. <p>In addition to the above, within the right-of-way, the City: Installed three new FTC devices in inlets in High and Moderate areas.</p> |
| TMA 2 | <p>As standard conditions of approval (COAs) for new and redeveloped commercial properties, the City required the following in this TMA (High Trash Generation Area) for one existing shopping center:</p> <p><u>10118 Bandlely Drive – Marina Shopping Center (4.34 acre site)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (9/9 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. <p>Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on all inlets on the site.</p> |
| TMA 3 | <p>There were no construction projects within this TMA where trash control actions were implemented. This TMA primarily consists of a large PG&E Service Center which is inspected through the C.4 IND program.</p> |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| | <p>Within the right-of-way, the City: Installed five new FTC devices in inlets in High and Low areas.</p> |
| <p>TMA 4</p> | <p>As standard conditions of approval (COAs) for ten redeveloped commercial properties, the City required the following in this TMA (Medium Trash Generation Area) for redevelopment of two retail centers, two gas stations, one common area of a shopping center, three office buildings, and two restaurants:</p> <p><u>19929 Stevens Creek Boulevard – Horizon Bakery (0.46 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on all six inlets. 2. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff’s authority to enforce the City’s Litter Prevention Ordinance. 3. Installation of one cigarette urn. <p><u>11010 N. De Anza Boulevard – Chevron Gas Station (0.71 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (3/3 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on all three inlets. 3. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff’s authority to enforce the City’s Litter Prevention Ordinance. 4. Construction of one new covered trash enclosure. <p><u>10626 S. De Anza Boulevard – Beyer Properties – Shopping Center Common Area (2.21 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets in the common parking lot and walkway areas on the property (7/7 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on 7 inlets in the parking lot and 3 inlets in the walkway areas. <p><u>10650 S. De Anza Boulevard – Byer Properties – Sherwin Williams (0.33 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (1/1 inlet) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on the one inlet on the property. <p><u>10660 S. De Anza Boulevard – Byer Properties – Yiasso (0.22 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (1/1 inlet) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of “No Dumping Drains to Bay” medallions on the one inlet on the property. <p><u>10680 S. De Anza Boulevard – Byer Properties – Professional Building (0.99 acre site):</u></p> |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (6/6 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions on the one inlet on the property. <p><u>10490 S. De Anza Boulevard – 76 Gas Station (0.38 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (3/3 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices as well as two inlets in canopy drainage areas, as this was a C.3 project. 2. Installation of "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions on all five inlets. 3. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff's authority to enforce the City's Litter Prevention Ordinance. 4. Construction of one new covered trash enclosure. <p><u>20480 Pacifica Drive – Pacifica Office Center – (1.03 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (4/4 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions on all four inlets. 3. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff's authority to enforce the City's Litter Prevention Ordinance. 4. Construction of one new covered trash enclosure. |
| <p>TMA 5</p> | <p>There were no construction projects within this TMA where trash control actions were implemented.</p> <p>TMA 5 contains one of the City's two trash hot spot areas, this one being Stevens Creek. Staff conducts extra trash cleanups in this area each year. In FY 23-24, two additional trash cleanups were conducted. The area staff cleans during these extra trash cleanups exceeds the area defined in the MRP as a designated hot spot.</p> |
| <p>TMA 7</p> | <p>As standard conditions of approval (COAs) for one redeveloped commercial property, the City required the following in this TMA (Medium Trash Generation Area) for redevelopment of one commercial property:</p> <p><u>21050 McClellan Road – Bliss and Wisdom Foundation – (0.77 acre site):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Installation and treatment of all storm drain inlets on the property (4/4 inlets) with State-certified trash full capture devices. 2. Installation of "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions on all four inlets. 3. Installation of one waste trio receptacle set (trash/recycling/compost) adjacent to the public right-of-way for pedestrian and community use. Trios are required to be maintained by the property owner in perpetuity under staff's authority to enforce the City's Litter Prevention Ordinance. 4. Construction of one new covered trash enclosure. 5. Installation of one cigarette urn. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | <p>This TMA consists of city parks, schools, and churches. It is partially treated by full capture devices within neighboring TMAs. City parks continue to be maintained multiple times per week by maintenance crews and many City parks and City facilities have inlet-based trash full capture devices installed in parking areas used by patrons of the facilities. The City contracts with the trash full capture vendor, REM, to inspect and clean the devices three times per year.</p> <p>This TMA contains the site of the second of two (former under MRP 2.0) creek hot spots (the other being Stevens Creek as described in TMA 5 above) and is the location of both of the annual community creek clean up events (Coastal Clean Up Day and National River Clean Up Day). In FY 22-23 during National River Clean Up Day, Wilson Park (at Regnart Creek) was a new site selected to host this event as Calabazas Creek has on-going construction within the channel. In FY 23-24, Regnart Creek was again the site for National River Cleanup Day and Coastal Cleanup Day. The selection of this new area allows access to a portion of Calabazas Creek and runs along the newly opened Regnart Creek Trail. These events ran efficiently and the City will likely plan future community based creek clean up events at this location.</p> |
| TMA 8 | <p>With the exception of approximately 12.49 acres of multi-family residential property (one apartment complex) and 17.89 acres of professional office and medical buildings (three total parcels), this TMA is a C.3. regulated project wherein all drain inlets that connect to the City's storm drain system are treated with full capture and/or LID. The project which comprises most of this TMA is a new corporate campus. Apart from the visitor center, this campus is not open to the general public.</p> |
| TMA 9 | <p>TMA 9 is primarily comprised of residential properties and as such, is a low trash generation area. This area does however contain two public golf courses along a riparian area which are inspected as part of the IND program.</p> |
| TMAs 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 | <p>Anti-littering enforcement: Litter Prevention municipal code Section 9.18.215 requires private commercial property owners to maintain a litter-free site, including parking lots and sidewalks at the perimeter of their property. City staff enforce compliance during IND inspections and in response to reports from the public and agency staff through the IDDE program. Re-inspection fees may be assessed for each staff visit to verify compliance after the initial inspection. An annual courtesy letter is mailed to property owners and site operators informing them their commercial site will be inspected at some point within the year and any deficiencies that cannot be resolved while the inspector is on site will result in a \$355 reinspection fee (per inspection) to cover the cost of the inspector's time and to incentivize active site management for trash and other pollutant discharges (actual or potential) and appropriate and effective implementation of BMPs. Refer to Sections C.4 and C.5 of this report for additional information concerning enforcement through the IND and IDDE program.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>TMA 5 and 7</p> | <p>On-land Cleanup: Additional cleanups were conducted at one of the City's two (former) hot spots. Regnart Creek was selected again as the new location of the annual community creek clean up events during May and September. The selection of this new area allows access to a portion of Calabazas Creek and runs along the newly opened Regnart Creek Trail. Stevens Creek was being cleaned by staff monthly until FY 17-18, when trash and litter reduction had been noticeably reduced and bi-monthly cleanups were deemed sufficient. In FY 23-24, staff conducted one additional cleanup at CUO02 (Stevens Creek) exceeding requirements of the MRP. The amount of trash remains at a level that bi-monthly cleanups should be sufficient providing staff availability can be maintained for this extra work. The City did not claim this as an additional trash reduction credit or offset.</p> <p>The City also participated in the SB170 Grant administered by the Santa Clara County Clean Water Program with land area clean up conducted by the San Jose Conservation Corps. Through this program one separate clean up events was conducted on one site consisting of one creek (Stevens). A total of one 32-gallon trash bag was full of trash. The grant ended in April 2024 and the City continued to utilize this program in FY 23-24.</p> |
| <p>TMA 1, 4, 5, and 8</p> | <p>Other Types of Actions: The Environmental Programs Division (Stormwater Program) reviews residential and non-residential development and construction projects at the time of permit submittal. Through this process the City requires full trash capture systems on properties that connect to the City's storm drain system at all commercial and multi-family project sites. Maintenance of the devices is re-checked during IND and IDDE inspections. In FY 23-24 a total of eleven reviewed projects were completed in TMA 1, 4, 5, and 8, which resulted in the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 32 inlet-based full trash capture devices being installed; 2. 32 "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions were installed; |
| <p>TMA 1,4, 5, and 8</p> | <p>Improved Trash and Cigarette Filter Management: The City requires commercial and multi-family residential redevelopment project owners to permanently install and maintain outdoor public waste/recycling/compost "trios" with a cigarette filter urn to provide disposal opportunities for pedestrians. Trios and cigarette urns are requested (this is not currently codified in the municipal code) to be installed on private property adjacent to the public sidewalk to provide convenient opportunities for pedestrians walking with food packaging/beverage containers to dispose of their trash and cigarette filters. In FY 23-24 in TMA 1, 4, 5, and 8:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5 litter trios were installed; 2. 2 cigarette filter urns were installed. <p>There were fewer cigarette urns installed as Apple has established designated smoking areas and have already provided cigarette filter urns in these locations, so they were only required to install the trios. Additionally, due to the City's smoking ordinance, cigarette urns may not be installed near building entrances and in the case of one restaurant, this requirement was not enforced as it would have been in conflict with the municipal code.</p> |
| <p>TMA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8</p> | <p>Street Sweeping: Street sweeping was conducted weekly in all retail and commercial areas (high and medium trash generation areas), as well as residential areas. In FY 23-24, a total of 7,865 miles were swept and a total of 1,815 cubic yards were collected</p> |
| <p>All TMA</p> | <p>Storm Drain Inlet Inspection/Cleaning/Summary: The City has developed an asset management system (CityWorks) that tracks all City owned and maintained stormwater structures, inlets, trash full capture devices, auto-retractable curb screens, no dumping inlet medallions, and includes maintenance history. This management system shows the following in all TMA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 96% of all City maintained storm drain inlets have "No Dumping Drains to Bay" medallions installed; |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>2. 200 City owned and maintained storm drain inlets are fitted with State Water Board certified full trash capture devices (connector pipe screen style);</p> <p>3. 91% of the above referenced 200 storm drain inlet full trash capture devices were inspected and cleaned twice during FY 23-24;</p> <p>4. 273 City owned and maintained storm drain inlets are fitted with retractable curb inlet screens (screens are inspected for functionality during the annual storm drain inlet inspections);</p> <p>139 City owned and maintained storm drain inlets are fitted with both retractable curb inlet screens and trash full capture devices.</p> |
|--|--|

C.10.b.iii(b) ► Trash Reduction – Other Trash Management Actions

Provide the following:

- 1) A summary of the on-land visual assessments conducted in each TMA to demonstrate improvements in the levels of trash generation associated with the public right-of-way, including the street miles available for assessment (i.e., those associated with VH, H, or M trash generation areas not treated by full capture systems), the street miles assessed, the % of available street miles assessed, and the average number of assessments conducted per site within the TMA; and
- 2) Percent jurisdictional-wide trash reduction in FY 23-24 attributable to trash management actions other than full capture systems that have been implemented to address trash generation associated with the public right-of-way in each TMA; OR
- 3) Indicate that no on-land visual assessments were performed.

If no on-land visual assessments were performed in a TMA, check here **and state why:** X **Explanation:** No OVTAs were conducted in TMA #9 because the entire TMA is low trash generating.

| TMA ID <i>or (as applicable) Control Measure Area</i> | Total Street Miles ⁶ Available for Assessment | Summary of On-land Visual Assessments | | | Jurisdictional-wide Reduction (%) |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | Street Miles Assessed | % of Available Street Miles Assessed | Avg. # of Assessments Conducted at Each Site | |
| 1 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 42% | 4.3 | 16.5% |
| 2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 34% | 1.0 | 0.7% |
| 3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 23% | 6.0 | 5.2% |
| 4 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 47% | 5.1 | 7.3% |
| 5 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 33% | 4.5 | 1.6% |

⁶ Street miles are defined as the street length and do not include street median curbs.

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| 7 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 35% | 5.8 | 1.6% |
| 8 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 28% | 4.7 | 0.3% |
| 9 | 0.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | | 4.3 | -- | -- | 33.0% |

C.10.b.v ▶ Trash Reduction – Source Controls

Provide a description of each jurisdiction-wide trash source control action implemented to-date other than those addressed under previous Permits (i.e., foam foodware and single-use plastic bags). For each new control action, identify the trash reduction evaluation method(s) used to demonstrate on-going reductions, summarize the results of the evaluation(s), and estimate the associated reduction of trash within your jurisdictional area. Note: There is a maximum of 10% total credit for source controls.

| Source Control Action | Summary Description & Dominant Trash Sources and Types Targeted | Evaluation/Enforcement Method(s) | Summary of Evaluation/Enforcement Results To-date | % Reduction |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

C.10.d ▶ Long-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan

Did your agency previously submit an Updated Trash Load Reduction Plan to the Water Board in response to the June 30, 2023, 90% benchmark? Yes No X NA

Provide descriptions of significant revisions made to your Long-term Trash Load Reduction Plan submitted to the Water Board in February 2014 or (if applicable) to your Updated Long-term Trash Load Reduction Plan submitted in 2023 in response to the 90% benchmark. Describe significant changes made to trash management areas (TMA), baseline trash generation maps, control measures, or time schedules identified in your plan. Indicate whether your baseline trash generation map was revised and, if so, what information was collected to support the revision. If your baseline trash generation map was revised, attach it to your Annual Report.

| Description of Significant Revision | Associated TMA |
|---|-----------------|
| In FY 19-20, the City refined its Baseline Trash Generation Map based on new information on the levels of trash generated on private lands that drain to inlets located on those properties, but are connected to the City's MS4. In FY 17-18, a total of 528 acres of land area were identified by the City as draining to inlets located on private lands and potentially generating low levels of trash. The process followed to identify these areas was described in the City's FY 17-18 Annual Report and was conducted to address MRP Permit Provision C.10.a.ii.b (Trash Generation Area Management - Identification of Private Drainages >10,000 ft ²). Maps identifying 528 acres of land area were submitted to the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) in September 2018 with the City's FY 17-18 Annual Report. | All TMAs |

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| <p>To gain additional information of the baseline trash levels on these land areas, the City conducted On-land Visual Trash Assessments (OVTAs) in FY 19-20 on parcels that comprised the 528 acres. These parcels had not been assessed during the initial development of the City's baseline map, so the OVTAs conducted in FY 19-20 were the first time these parcels were evaluated for trash generation levels. Two field-based OVTAs using OVTA Protocol C – Area-based Survey (EOA 2018) were conducted for each parcel to confirm parcel accessibility, existence of an inlet, and current trash generation levels. Based on previous technical studies (BASMAA 2017), two assessments events with "A" OVTA scores are needed to identify a parcel as "Low trash generating." If the first assessment event yielded an OVTA score other than an "A", the second assessment event was canceled. Two consultant staff trained in Protocol C conducted all OVTAs. To the extent possible, assessments were performed directly prior to reoccurring trash control measures on parcels to depict maximum trash generation levels.</p> <p>Based on the results of the OVTAs, 322 of the 528 acres of original were reclassified as "low trash generation" on the City's Baseline Trash Generation Map. The pdf version of the City's map can be downloaded at http://scvruppp.org/trash-maps/</p> | |
| <p>In FY 21-22, the City conducted a thorough evaluation of its baseline trash generation map, treatment areas for existing trash full capture systems, and identified which multi-beneficial (bioretention) treatment facilities installed in the City meet the trash full capture design standard, as described in the MRP. The City's 2009 baseline trash generation map was reevaluated to ensure that jurisdictional areas draining to the City's MS4 are included on the map and that these areas were assigned the appropriate trash generation category when the original baseline map was created. Based on the findings of this evaluation, the City's baseline map was refined and now provides a much more accurate illustration of both its jurisdictional areas and the associated baseline level of trash that was generated on these areas in 2009. The areas treated by existing trash full capture systems were also evaluated and refined based on more accurate information on drainage patterns and the configuration of the City's MS4. These refined treatment area boundaries provide a much more accurate illustration of the land areas draining to these full capture systems. Lastly, in FY 21-22 the City began to identify which existing multi-beneficial (bioretention) treatment facilities achieve the trash full capture design standard, as described in the MRP and the State Water Resources Control Board fact sheets on multi-beneficial full capture systems. A technical memorandum describing the analysis conducted by the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Program (SCVURPPP) that supports the criteria used to identify the applicable bioretention facilities is included in the SCVRUPPP FY 21-22 Annual Report (Section 10). The City's Long-term Trash Load Reduction Plan was updated with these refined jurisdictional areas and full capture treatment drainage boundaries and refined baseline trash generation levels, which are included in Appendix 10-1 of this report.</p> | <p>All TMAs</p> |

C.10.f.i ▶ Trash Reduction Offsets –Creek and Shoreline Cleanups

Provide a summary description of creek and shoreline cleanups conducted during FY 23-24 and the water quality benefit achieved. Include information that is sufficient to demonstrate sustained improvement of the creek or shoreline area, the volume of trash removed, and the offset claimed in FY 23-24. Provide the number and frequency of cleanups conducted, locations and cleanup dates.

| Offset Program | Summary Description of Cleanup Actions and the Benefit of Water Quality Achieved | Volume of Trash (CY) Removed/Controlled in FY 23-24 | Offset (% Jurisdiction-wide Reduction) |
|--|--|---|--|
| Additional Creek and Shoreline Cleanups (Max 10% Offset) | N/A – The City has not elected to take this offset. | N/A – The City has elected to not take this offset. | N/A- The City has elected to not take this offset. |

C.10.f.ii ▶ Trash Reduction Offsets – Direct Trash Discharge Controls

For those Permittees with a Direct (Trash) Discharge Control (offset) Program (DDCP) approved by the Water Board Executive Officer, provide a summary description of the trash controls implemented, the volume of trash removed via the DDCP, and the offset claimed in FY 23-24. Attach a report that includes the following:

- For Permittees whose DDCPs address significant discharges from **unsheltered homeless populations**, include a narrative description and quantitative information for the following for the current year and for each prior year of the permit term:
 - The estimated number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness in their jurisdiction;
 - the estimated number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness living within approximately 500 feet of receiving waters;
 - the estimated portion of those populations provided housing as described in Provision C.10.f.ii.b.(i);
 - the estimated portion of those populations served with the services described in Provision C.10.f.ii.b.(i);
 - the number and scope of sanitation controls and services provided to homeless encampments;
 - the number and scope of trash controls and services provided to homeless encampments; and
 - the number and scope of sanitary cleanouts and other services provided to RVs.

- For Permittees whose DDCPs address significant discharges from **illegal dumping sites**, include a narrative description and quantitative information for the following for the current year and for each prior year of the permit term:
 - The total number of active illegal dumping sites;
 - the number of active illegal dumping sites within approximately 500 feet of receiving waters;
 - the number of illegal dumping sites where trash was collected, and the amount of material collected;
 - dumping vouchers (or equivalent) provided (and who they are provided to);

| C.10.f.ii ► Trash Reduction Offsets – Direct Trash Discharge Controls | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ dumping vouchers (or equivalent) used; and ○ outreach and education provided to the public regarding illegal dumping and the availability of dumping vouchers (or equivalent). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Permittees whose DDCPs address significant discharges from <u>both unsheltered homeless populations and illegal dumping sites</u>, include a narrative description and quantitative information for all of the elements listed above for the current year and for each prior year of the permit term. | | | |
| Offset Program | Summary Description of Actions and Assessment Results | Volume of Trash (CY) Removed/Controlled in FY 23-24 | Offset (% Jurisdiction-wide Reduction) |
| Direct Trash Discharge Controls (Max 15% Offset) | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Appendix 10-1. Baseline trash generation and areas addressed by full capture systems and other control measures in Fiscal Year 23-24⁷.

| TMA | 2009 Baseline Trash Generation (Acres) | | | | | Trash Generation (Acres) in FY 23-24 After Accounting for Full Capture Systems | | | | | Jurisdiction-wide Reduction via Full Capture Systems (%) | Trash Generation (Acres) in FY 23-24 After Accounting for Full Capture Systems and Other Control Measures ⁸ | | | | | Jurisdiction-wide Reduction via Other Control Measures (%) ⁸ | Jurisdiction-wide Reduction via Full Capture AND Other Control Measures (%) |
|---------------|--|------------|------------|----------|--------------|--|------------|-----------|----------|--------------|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|---|---|
| | L | M | H | VH | Total | L | M | H | VH | Total | | L | M | H | VH | Total | | |
| 1 | 55 | 43 | 136 | 0 | 235 | 165 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 235 | 25.8% | 220 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 16.5% | 42.3% |
| 2 | 13 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 84 | 82 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 84 | 20.3% | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0.7% | 21.0% |
| 3 | 90 | 17 | 30 | 0 | 137 | 107 | 11 | 19 | 0 | 137 | 3.7% | 120 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 5.2% | 8.9% |
| 4 | 126 | 203 | 3 | 0 | 331 | 235 | 95 | 1 | 0 | 331 | 8.4% | 331 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 7.3% | 15.7% |
| 5 | 122 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 164 | 143 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 1.7% | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 1.6% | 3.3% |
| 7 | 196 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 211 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 1.1% | 231 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 1.6% | 2.7% |
| 8 | 184 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 226 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 3.1% | 230 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 0.3% | 3.3% |
| 9 | 5,212 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5,215 | 5,215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,215 | 0.2% | 5,215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,215 | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Totals | 5,997 | 392 | 241 | 0 | 6,631 | 6,385 | 167 | 79 | 0 | 6,631 | 64.4% | 6,597 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 6,631 | 33.0% | 97.4% |

⁷ Due to rounding, total acres and percentages presented in this table may be slightly different than the sum of the acres/percentages in the corresponding rows/columns.

⁸ Acreage changes and percent reductions reported here only include those associated with other trash controls implemented to address moderate, high or very high trash generating areas in the public right-of-way.

Section 11 – Provision C.11 Mercury Controls

C.11.a ► Assess Mercury Load Reductions from Stormwater

Submit documentation confirming that all control measures effectuated during the previous Permit term for which load reduction credit was recognized continue to be implemented at an intensity sufficient to maintain the credited load reduction.

Summary:

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.11.b.iii (1), (2) ► Program for Source Property Identification and Abatement

Report progress on the acreage of land areas investigated, including progress toward investigation of 100 percent of old industrial land uses. The reporting shall indicate what action was taken for the parcels investigated (e.g., abatement, referral, enforcement). Permittees shall submit all supporting data and information including referral reports.

Summary:

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

Report on ongoing O&M activities associated with all past contaminated property referrals. Prior to all new referrals, Permittees shall submit, for staff review and comment, a detailed description of the enhanced O&M plan for the referred properties.

Summary:

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measure Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.11.c.iii (2) ► Program for Control Measure Implementation in Old Industrial Areas

Submit an account of control measure and stormwater diversion implementation consistent with the plan submitted in March 2023 and any modifications thereto. Include maps of the areas treated, the acreage of catchments addressed, and a description of all control measures, installed treatment devices and routing facilities for each treated catchment.

Summary:

See the Countywide Program's Old Industrial Area Control Measure Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.11.d.iii (1) ► Mercury Collection and Recycling Implemented throughout the Region

Report on efforts to promote recycling of mercury-containing products and efforts to increase effectiveness of those recycling efforts. Report on the mass of mercury-containing material collected throughout the region along with an estimate of the mass of mercury contained in recycled material using the methodology contained in load reduction accounting system described and cited in the Fact Sheet.

Summary:

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.11.h ► Implement a Risk Reduction Program

Report on the status of the risk reduction program, including a brief description of actions taken, an estimate of the number of people reached, and why these people are deemed likely to consume Bay fish.

A summary of Program and regional accomplishments for this sub-provision, including a brief description of actions taken, an estimate of the number of people reached, and why these people are deemed likely to consume Bay fish are included in the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

Cupertino utilizes the Santa Clara County Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Program for its residents to safely dispose of HHW including mercury-containing products. In FY 23-24, the County's HHW Program served a total of 44,609 Santa Clara County residents and collected a total of 2,765,195 pounds of hazardous waste which was managed safely and legally. In addition, the County's CESQG program served 310 small business drop-offs including local governments and community donation centers such as Goodwill Industries and the Salvation Army. The CESQG program brochure is also mailed out to Cupertino businesses with the annual IND letters and distributed as needed during the IND inspections. These brochures are provided to identify a resource for mercury-containing universal waste disposal options that small business owners may not know is available to them at a very low cost. Mercury-containing products collected through the County's HHW collection program in FY 23-24 included:

- Total fluorescent lamps collected – 75,454 pounds
- Total household batteries collected – 172,367 pounds
- Elemental Mercury - 180 pounds (includes thermostats, thermometers, and other products)

The City's franchised waste hauler, Recology, also offers residents options to dispose of mercury containing products. Cupertino residents are encouraged to place household batteries and CFLs in a clear, sealed plastic bag on top of their curbside recycling containers for pickup on their regularly scheduled waste and recycling collection day. In addition, the City and Recology also annually host quarterly free Universal waste drop-off events at De Anza College in Cupertino to encourage residents to drop-off mercury-containing used fluorescent bulbs, U-Waste, and E-Waste for recycling. All four events were held in FY 23-24. Mercury-containing products collected through these City coordinated services include:

- Total fluorescent lamps collected: 3,286 pounds
- Total household batteries collected: 21,476 pounds
- Total E-Waste collected: 61,740 pounds

Section 12 – Provision C.12 PCBs Controls

C.12.a.iii.(1) ▶ Assess PCBs Load Reductions from Stormwater

Submit documentation confirming that all control measures effectuated during the previous Permit term for which load reduction credit was recognized continue to be implemented at an intensity sufficient to maintain the credited load reduction.

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.12.b.iii.(1), (2) ▶ Program for Source Property Identification and Abatement

C.12.b.iii.(1). Report progress on the acreage of land areas investigated, including progress toward investigation of 100 percent of old industrial land uses. The reporting shall indicate what action was taken for the parcels investigated (e.g., abatement, referral, enforcement). Permittees shall submit all supporting data and information including referral reports.

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.12.b.iii.(2). Report on ongoing O&M activities associated with all past contaminated property referrals. Prior to all new referrals, Permittees shall submit, for staff review and comment, a detailed description of the enhanced O&M plan for the referred properties.

Summary:

See the Program's Mercury and PCBs Control Measures Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.12.c.iii.(2) ▶ Program for Control Measure Implementation in Old Industrial Areas

Submit an account of control measures and stormwater diversion implementation consistent with the plan submitted in March 2023 and any modifications thereto. Include maps of the areas treated, the acreage of catchments addressed, and a description of all control measures, installed treatment devices and routing facilities for each treated catchment.

Summary:

See the Program's Old Industrial Area Control Measure Update Report attached to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

C.12.d.iii.(1), (3) ▶ Program for Controlling PCBs from Bridges and Overpasses

C.12.d.iii.(1). In the 2022 Annual Report or the Annual Report immediately following availability of the specification, include a description of the Caltrans specification for managing PCBs-containing materials in bridge or roadway expansion joints during roadway replacement or repair.

Summary:

See the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a description of the Caltrans specification.

C.12.d.iii.(3). Submit documentation confirming the use of the Caltrans specification (once it is available) during all instances of bridge roadway replacement or repair in their jurisdiction during the reporting year and provide an estimate of the volume of material managed and total PCBs mass load reduced resulting from implementation of the specification.

Summary:

The Caltrans specification was not available to be implemented during FY 23-24.

C.12.e.iii.(3), (4) ▶ Program for Controlling PCBs from Electrical Utilities

[Note: Applicable only to municipalities that own electrical utilities]

Does your municipality own an electrical utility? If yes, follow the directions below.

| | | | |
|--|------------|----------|-----------|
| | Yes | X | No |
|--|------------|----------|-----------|

C.12.e.iii.(3). Submit a summary of plans to maintain and upgrade oil-filled electrical equipment (OFEE) for municipally owned electrical utilities.

N/A

Summary:

See the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of plans to maintain and upgrade OFEE for municipally owned electrical utilities.

C.12.e.iii.(4). Submit a summary of the actions undertaken during the FY 2023-24 that remove municipally owned PCBs-containing OFEE along with loads avoided and the details of the calculations and assumptions used to estimate the load reduced.

Summary:

See the Countywide Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of maintenance programs and system upgrades that removed PCBs-containing OFEE from municipally owned electrical utilities and loads avoided.

C.12.g.iii.(1), (3), (4) ► Manage PCB-Containing Materials and Wastes During Building Demolition Activities

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|---|----|
| C.12.g.iii.(1). Did your agency obtain an exemption in FY 2022-23 from Provision C.12.g requirements? If Yes, skip the remainder of this C.12.g section. | | Yes | X | No |
| <p>See the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The number of applicable structures that applied for a demolition permit during the reporting year; (b) A running list of the applicable structures that applied for a demolition permit since July 1, 2019, the number of samples each structure collected, and the concentration of PCBs in each sample; (c) The project address, the demolition date, and a brief description of the PCBs-containing materials for each applicable structure with a PCBs concentration 50 mg/kg or greater; and (d) The address, date building was constructed, and date of demolition for each structure that was constructed or remodeled between the years 1950 and 1980 and requires emergency demolition to protect public health and/or safety. | | | | |
| See the PCBs Controls section of the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report. | | | | |
| <p>C.12.g.iii.(3)(c) and (4). For active demolition sites in FY 2023-24 with structures with PCBs concentrations \geq 50 ppm, list the project address and demolition date, describe the PCBs-containing materials, state whether the site was inspected during demolition, and provide the hazardous waste manifest prepared for transportation of material to a disposal facility for those cases where notification and advance approval from U.S. EPA is not required and were approved for demolition after June 30, 2023.</p> <p>The City did not have any demolition/deconstruction sites with PCBs \geq 50ppm.</p> | | | | |

C.12.g.iii.(4) ► Demolition Sites with PCBs Concentrations \geq 50 ppm

| Site Address | Demolition date | Brief description of the PCBs-containing materials | Was this site inspected during demolition? (Yes/No) | If this site was approved for demolition after June 30, 2023 and did not require notification to and advanced approval from EPA, attach the hazardous waste manifest and indicate it is attached. |
|--------------|-----------------|--|---|---|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Comments: | | | | |

C.12.j.iii. ► Implement a Risk Reduction Program

Report on the status of the risk reduction program, including a brief description of actions taken, an estimate of the number of people reached, and why these people are deemed likely to consume Bay fish.

A summary of Program and regional accomplishments for this sub-provision, including a brief description of actions taken, an estimate of the number of people reached, and why these people are deemed likely to consume Bay fish are included in the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report.

Section 13 – Provision C.13 Copper Controls

C.13.a.iii (3) ► Manage Waste Generated from Cleaning and Treating of Copper Architectural Features

Provide summaries of permitting and enforcement activities to manage waste generated from cleaning and treating of copper architectural features, including copper roofs, during construction and post-construction.

Summary:

The City has a municipal code prohibition against copper roofing materials and ornamental copper for exterior use where oxidation and runoff may occur. New construction and remodeling plan review staff in the Planning, Building, Public Works Development, and Environmental Programs Divisions are all trained in the municipal code prohibition of architectural copper applications. The City developed standard Conditions of Approval (COA) specifically prohibiting the installation and use of copper roofs, gutters, downspouts, and other architectural features. Project applicants are provided with the COA and must sign their acknowledgement of the copper restrictions. These requirements pertain to both residential and non-residential projects being reviewed. In cases where copper was installed prior to municipal code or MRP regulation, the City works with the property owner to remove or replace the copper with an alternative material. If that cannot be accomplished, the City requires the copper to be properly coated and sealed to ensure the copper is appropriately weatherized to prohibit discharging during rain events. Installation of drainage from copper materials to a stormwater treatment facility such as an infiltration device/structure is also considered as a potential method of mitigation.

C.13.b.iii (3) ► Manage Discharges from Pools, Spas, and Fountains that Contain Copper-Based Chemicals

Provide summaries of any enforcement activities related to copper-containing discharges from pools, spas, and fountains.

Summary:

In FY 23-24, there were zero reported IDDE discharges of pool, spa, or fountain water.

C.13.c.iii ► Industrial Sources Copper Reduction Results

Based upon inspection activities conducted under Provision C.4, highlight copper reduction results achieved among the facilities identified as potential users or sources of copper, facilities inspected, and BMPs addressed.

Summary:

The City of Cupertino does not currently have industries such as electroplating, semiconductor manufacturing, or metal finishing which all possess the potential for copper related discharges through their operations. Through the IND program, all business facilities inspected have roof downspout discharge areas inspected for any copper depositions that would indicate rain, dense water vapor (fog) or HVAC condensate are discharging copper leachate from rooftop equipment. Of all facilities inspected through the IND program in FY 23-24, there were no copper discharges identified from rooftop equipment.

Section 14 – Provision C.14 Bacteria Control for Impaired Water Bodies

C.14.a.i. Municipal Operations Bacteria Control [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the BMPs, frequency and location for actions taken to reduce bacteria sources related to municipal operations.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a. ii. Industrial/Commercial Site Bacteria Control and Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the BMPs, frequency, and location for actions taken to reduce bacteria sources related to Industrial and Commercial Site Bacteria Control and Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a.iii. ► Control of Bacteria Sources Related to Unsheltered Homeless Populations [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the BMPs, numbers or frequency (as applicable), and locations of actions taken to reduce bacteria discharges from areas inhabited by unsheltered persons

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a. iv. Pet and Livestock Bacteria Source Control [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the BMPs, numbers or frequency (as applicable), and locations of actions taken to reduce bacteria from domestic animal sources.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a. v. Public Outreach on Bacteria Source Control [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the outreach messages, methods of delivery, audiences, and number of repetitions.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a.vi. ► Coordination with Sanitary Sewerage System Entities [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe the status of any actions taken to coordinate with sanitary sewer entities.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a.vii. ► Prioritize Trash Removal to Control Bacteria Sources [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Describe how the bacteria-reduction benefit of focused trash-control efforts was evaluated, the conclusions reached, and any actions taken during the reporting period to reprioritize trash control areas.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.a.viii. ► Water Quality Monitoring [Note: Applicable only to the Cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale]

Submit the results of all monitoring conducted the previous year, including parameters analyzed, frequencies, and locations, and planned monitoring for the current year, including parameters, frequencies, and locations.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.c.i.(3) ► Control Measures to Achieve Indicator Bacteria Wasteload Allocations [Note: Applicable only to the City of San Mateo]

Summarize the actions taken to satisfy the requirements in Provision C.14.c.i.(2) during October 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024 period. This report shall include:

- The number, type, and locations and/or frequency (if applicable) of control measures;
- The description and scope of pollution prevention measures; and
- A data table and graphs showing Enterococcus data collected during the reporting year for the two San Mateo Lagoon beaches, Parkside Aquatic Park Beach and Lakeshore Park Beach.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

C.14.c.ii.(3) ► Phase II Measures [Note: Applicable only to the City of San Mateo]

Summarize the actions taken to satisfy the requirements in Provision C.14.c.ii.(2) during the foregoing October 1 through September 30 period. This report shall include:

- (a) The number, type, and locations and/or frequency (if applicable) of control measures;
- (b) The description and scope of pollution prevention measures; and
- (c) A data table and graphs showing enterococcus data collected during the reporting year for the two San Mateo Lagoon beaches, Parkside Aquatic Park Beach and Lakeshore Park Beach.

Does not apply to City of Cupertino.

Section 15 – Provision C.15 Exempted and Conditionally Exempted Discharges

C.15.b.iii.(3) ► Emergency Discharges of Fire Fighting Water and Foam Ongoing Implementation Practices

Annually report on the following ongoing practices:

- Ensuring proper BMPs and SOPs are included in contracts for non-municipal (contracted) staff hired by Permittees to assist with containment and cleanup, and to assist with prevention and mitigation of adverse impacts, of discharges associated with firefighting emergencies; and
- Evaluating the adequacy of large industrial sites' BMPs and SOPs for the prevention, containment and cleanup of emergency firefighting discharges into storm drains and receiving waters within Permittees' jurisdictions and cause those BMPs and SOPs to be improved as appropriate.

Summary:

Efforts are underway to address these two tasks in the BAMSC Regional Firefighting Discharges Work Group. Refer to the Program's FY 23-24 Annual Report for a summary of the Work Group's two meetings held this FY and progress towards development of the Regional BMP Report. We anticipate fully implementing these tasks with guidance provided in the Regional BMP Report. We are evaluating how to implement these tasks internally and are providing input for the Regional Report through participation in the SCVURPPP IND/IDDE AHTG [and the BAMSC Work Group, if applicable].

C.15.b.vi.(2) ► Irrigation Water, Landscape Irrigation, and Lawn or Garden Watering

Provide implementation summaries of the required BMPs to promote measures that minimize runoff and pollutant loading from excess irrigation. Generally, the categories are:

- Promote conservation programs
- Promote outreach for less toxic pest control and landscape management
- Promote use of drought tolerant and native vegetation
- Promote outreach messages to encourage appropriate watering/irrigation practices
- Implement Illicit Discharge Enforcement Response Plan for ongoing, large volume landscape irrigation runoff.

Summary:

Promotion of Conservation Programs

The City continues its partnership with Grassroots Ecology (Acterra) and City staff at McClellan Ranch Preserve to promote several volunteer-based conservation programs such as the Habitat Restoration Project, Garden and Pesticide Alternatives, Helping Hands Cleanup, and more. Volunteers spend their time at two City facilities along Stevens Creek (Blackberry Farm Recreational Area and McClellan Ranch Preserve) removing invasive vegetation and re-planting native plants. Volunteers add mulch to the landscape to prevent pests and invasive weeds. Native plant seeds are collected during these events for later use. The goal of these projects is to improve the habitats for local wildlife and conserve native vegetation.

Promotion of Outreach for Less Toxic Pest Control and Landscape Management

Cupertino is one of many Santa Clara County jurisdictions that participates and promotes the My Watershed Watch educational campaign. The purpose of My Watershed Watch is to create public awareness on water pollution prevention by informing the public how typical everyday activities can lead to water pollution and what can be done to prevent it. Cupertino promotes many of My Watershed Watch outreach materials such as Less-Toxic Pest Control for Multi-Unit Properties, Trash Resources & Pathways to Urban Creeks, 10 Most Wanted Bugs and many other less-toxic pest control related materials during events and in displays at the Senior Center, City Hall, and Quinlan Community Center. Each year at the City's annual IPM meeting, the City Arborist, the Public Works Grounds Supervisor, Parks Supervisor, and the City's facilities pest control contractor and golf course superintendent contractor sign and agree to follow the City's Integrated Pest Management Policy. The annual meeting is also a round table discussion of practices that worked over the past year and new IPM methods that they'd like to try in the upcoming year. This commitment to use natural pest control methods, pesticides only as a last resort, and least-toxic pest control available, serves as the basis of the City's IPM policy. City Public Works staff and the two contractors also participate in several pest control trainings held by the County, the City, and other organizations.

Rainwater Capture Rebate Program

The City has used a portion of the Clean Water and Storm Protection fee moneys to match rebates by Valley Water for installation of rain barrels, cisterns, rain gardens, and drought tolerant landscape conversion. Interested Cupertino residents can work directly with Valley Water for rebate assistance. Note that due to budget cuts, only projects approved to proceed by Valley Water before June 30, 2024, will receive the local matching funds. The agreement with Valley Water will continue through June 2025 in order to pay out to projects approved before the deadline that finish installations during the following year.

Composting

The City of Cupertino offers free bulk compost to all Cupertino residents for their home gardening use at two different sites: Stevens Creek Quarry and Sunnyvale's SMaRT station. The compost offered at the quarry location is made from residential food scraps and yard waste collected from Cupertino's organics recycling program and is OMRI certified. Between March and October, the City provides free compost to residents on Friday and Saturday mornings. The compost site will continue to be open on Fridays and Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to noon through October 26, 2024. . Compost helps reduce the amount of chemical pesticides needed for residential landscaping and maintains moisture leading to less watering and potentially, less run-off from overwatering. Residents also have the opportunity to attend free home composting workshops hosted by the County. After attending a workshop, Cupertino residents qualify for a free home composting bin from the City to create their own compost generated from yard trimmings and food scraps.

Promotion of Drought Tolerant and Native Vegetation

The City of Cupertino encourages its residents to plant drought tolerant vegetation by promoting the Valley Water's Landscape Rebate Program on the City website and at local events. The City contributes an additional \$1.00 per square foot to the Water District's rebate for Cupertino residents who replace their lawn with approved drought tolerant plants listed in SCVWD's Plant List.

Promotion of Water Conservation

The City promotes many water conservation programs, including "Graywater, Laundry to Landscape", where the City has partnered with the Water District to offer \$400 to Cupertino residents who install qualifying Laundry to Landscape systems in their homes.

Enforcement Response Plan for irrigation runoff

The City does not permit non-stormwater discharges to enter the storm drain system, including large volume landscape irrigation runoff. The municipal code regulates landscape irrigation runoff and enforcement is conducted through the City's IDDE program. Discharging high volume landscape irrigation runoff is a violation for the water discharge, but also includes scouring and sediment that transport nutrients and other POCs found in roadways and other hardscaped areas to the storm drain system. IDDE inspectors pursue resolution of the discharge with the property owners and property managers in both residential and commercial settings consistent with the IND/IDDE Enforcement Response Plan. These discharges are tracked in the IDDE database. In addition to the discharge violation for irrigation runoff, property owners/managers are also educated on water conservation best practices. An educational door hanger is used for incidents of smaller, residential landscape overspray where water is observed in the gutter, but the specific source of the discharge is not able to be positively identified for direct follow up. Door hangers are left by the IND/IDDE inspector at residences in the vicinity of the wet gutter.

Section 17 – Provision C.17 Discharges Associated with Unsheltered Homeless Populations

There are no reporting requirements for Provision C.17 in FY 23-24.