Pima County
2018 Annual Stormwater Report

July 2017 – June 2018
AZPDES Permit No. AZS000002

PIMA COUNTY

October 26, 2018

Stormwater Annual Report

Prepared in cooperation with:
Department of Transportation
Development Services
Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation
Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Regional Flood Control District
Pima Association of Governments

Stormwater Management Program
Pima County Department of Environmental Quality
33 N. Stone Avenue, Suite 700
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1429

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary **1**
1. General Information **3**
2. Annual Report Certification and Legal Authority **7**
3. Narrative Summary of Stormwater Management Program **9**
A. Public Awareness 9
B. Public Participation 11
C. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Activities 12
D. County Facilities 13
E. Industrial and Commercial Facilities 15
F. Construction Sites 15
G. Post Construction 16
H. Non-filer Reporting 16
4. Numeric Summary of Stormwater Management Program Activities **17**
5. Evaluation of Stormwater Management Program **19**
6. Stormwater Management Program Modifications **25**
7. Monitoring Locations **27**
8. Storm Event Records **29**
9. Water Quality Data from Monitor Sites **32**
10. Assessment of Monitoring Data **54**
A. Stormwater Quality 54
B. Surface Water Quality Standards (SWQS) 54
C. Pollutant Concentration Greater than Applicable SWQS 54
11. Estimate of Annual Pollutant Load **62**
A. Method of estimating Pollutant Load 62
B. Results of Calculations 64
C. Evaluation of Results 64
D. Limitations of Pollutant Load Estimation Results 66
12. Annual Expenditures **68**
REFERENCES 70

Appendices

A. Public Awareness: Outreach Materials
A-1. Log of Outreach Materials Distributed
A-2. Outreach Log
A-3. Materials Distributed
A-4. Media Outreach Reports

B. Public Participation: Adopt-A-Roadway Program

C. Public Participation: Household Hazardous Waste Program

D. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program: Complaints

E. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program
   E-1. IDDE Summary of Notices of Violation Statistics
   E-2. IDDE Summary of Notices of Violation by Watershed

F. Outfalls
   F-1. Outfall Inventory
   F-2. Outfall Site Inspection Reports

G. County Industrial Facilities Inventory

H. GIS Map Inventory

I. Infrastructure Maintenance: Roadway System
   I-1. Summary of Road Maintenance
   I-2. Log of Road Maintenance Activities

J. Infrastructure Maintenance: Drainageway System
   J-1. Retention/Detention Basin Maintenance
   J-2. Infrastructure Maintenance

K. Conservation Properties

L. Industrial Facilities
   L-1. Industrial Facility Inventory
   L-2. Industrial Facilities Site Inspection Reports
   L-3. Inventory of Facilities with Potential for Hazardous Substances

M. Plan Reviews for stormwater-related ordinances

N. Floodplain Use Permits (FPUP) and Floodprone Land Acquisition Program (FLAP)

O. Construction Sites
   O-1. Construction Site Inventory
   O-2. Construction Site Inspection Reports

P. Post Construction
   P-1. Post Construction Inspections Due in Fiscal Year 2016-2016
   P-2. Post-construction Site Inspection Reports

Q. Water Quality Laboratory Reports for Monitor Sites #1 - #5

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. 2011 AZPDES Permit Area Map 4
Figure 2. Number of Enforcement Cases related to Pollutants Exposed to Rain of Runoff..... 19
Figure 3. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #1 55
Figure 4. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #2 56
Figure 5 Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #3 57
Figure 6. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #4 58
Figure 7. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #5 59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Business Assistance Program 11
Table 2. Spills within Permit Area..... 13
Table 3. Numeric Summary of Stormwater Management Program Activities..... 17
Table 4. Land Use Area within Unincorporated Pima County..... 20
Table 5. Monitor Site Locations 27
Table 6. Storm Event Records for Monitor Sites..... 29
Table 7. Monitor Site Sample Dates and Type of Sample Set..... 32
Table 8. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #1..... 34
Table 9. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #2..... 38
Table 10. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #3..... 42
Table 11. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #4..... 46
Table 12. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #5..... 50
Table 13. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #1 55
Table 14. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #2 56
Table 15. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #3 57
Table 16. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #4 58
Table 17. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #5 59
Table 18. Pollutant Load Estimates for Monitor Sites..... 65
Table 19. Stormwater Program Costs for Fiscal Year 17/18 & Budget for Fiscal Year 18/19 68

(This page is intentionally blank).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report describes activities performed and data collected for Pima County's Arizona Pollutant Discharge System (AZPDES) Permit No. AZS000002 between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018. This permit authorizes Pima County to discharge stormwater from a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) to waters of the United States.

This report is the eighth annual report prepared under the new state permit issued on June 16, 2011 and effective on July 18, 2011, herein referred to as the 2011 MS4 permit. Under the previous EPA MS4 permit issued on February 14, 1997, 14 annual reports were prepared.

Certification

Pima County's principal executive officer signs and certifies this annual report was prepared by qualified personnel to properly gather and evaluate the information submitted (Part 2).

Stormwater Management Program (SWMP)

Best management practices (BMPs) were implemented in accordance with the SWMP during the reporting period. Information for the SWMP is found in the following parts: Narrative summary of SWMP activities (Part 3 and Appendices), Numeric summary of SWMP activities (Part 4), Evaluation of SWMP (Part 5), and Modifications to SWMP (Part 6).

Wet Weather Monitoring

Water quality samples were collected from two of five Monitoring Sites (Part 7). Storm event records were automatically recorded and summarized (Part 8). Analytical results for the water quality samples (Part 9), the water quality assessment (Part 10) and the estimate of annual pollutant loadings (Part 11) document the quality of surface water flows.

Expenditures and Proposed Budget

A summary of the annual expenditures and the proposed budget are summarized (Part 12).

Conclusions

Pima County implemented the SWMP and Wet Weather Monitoring Program. Activities included maintenance of the roadways and drainage systems. Inspections were performed at 40 outfalls, 47 construction sites, 36 post construction sites, and 3 private industrial facilities. The public reported 1,225 environmental complaints. All were inspected or referred to another jurisdiction. These inspections resulted in 296 Notices of Violation and 267 remediated sites. Two stormwater samples were collected at two monitor sites. Analysis of the water quality results for 133 parameters shows copper and *E. Coli* were the two pollutants detected above Arizona's Surface Water Quality Standards (SWQS). These activities and increasingly effective stormwater stewardship practices by the public contribute to stormwater quality with three parameters outside of standards and meeting the other 102 parameters with established SWQS.

(This page is intentionally blank).

1. General Information

A. Name of Permittee: Pima County

B. Permit Number: AZS000002

C. Reporting Period: July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018

D. Name of Stormwater Management Program Contact: Marie Light

Title: Principal Hydrologist

Mailing Address: 33. N. Stone, Suite 700

City: Tucson

Zip: 85701-1429

Phone: 520-724-7400

Fax Number: 520-838-7432

Email Address: marie.light@pima.gov

E. Name of Certifying Official: Carmine DeBonis

Title: Deputy County Administrator for Public Works

Mailing Address: 130 W. Congress

City: Tucson

Zip: 85701-1317

Phone: 520-724-8474

Fax Number: 520-740-8171

Email Address: carmine.debonis@pima.gov

F. Scope of Permit

The physical components within the permit area include 2,087 miles of roadway, 39 miles of storm drains and appurtenances that collect and convey runoff from precipitation events, with lengths reported by Pima County Department of Transportation (PDOT) and Regional Flood Control District (RFCD, respectively. The permit area is unincorporated Pima County within the Santa Cruz River watershed (Figure 1-1, blue area). In both rural areas and metropolitan areas, runoff collects in ephemeral stream channels and infiltrates into alluvial deposit in the valley (USGS, 1973). Flows in ephemeral stream channels occur in response to rainfall events that are larger than 0.2 inches. Most runoff infiltrates within Pima County.



Figure 1. 2011 AZPDES Permit Area Map

Managements Activities

Management of the program includes coordinating with Pima County departments that maintain roadways and drainageways, purchasing open space to conserve land and managing stormwater operations between five county departments. Pima County collaborates with local jurisdictions, businesses, educational institutions, and interested members of the public to engage the public in restoring and maintaining the integrity of surface waters in the county. Education and training include teaching techniques to keep water clean and using stormwater as a resource for landscape irrigation and other beneficial uses. Staff works with novices to professionals as well as kids to great grandparents.

Field Activities

Pima County inspects outfalls, construction sites, industrial facilities, and reported environmental complaints that could lead to illicit discharge detection and elimination. To characterize water quality, Pima County collects water samples at five monitor sites representing low density residences, medium density residences, high density residences, commercial and industrial land uses.

(This page intentionally blank).

2. ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

Written by: **Date:**

Marie Light 10-26-18

Marie Light
Principal Hydrologist

Reviewed by: **Date:**

R G 10.26.18

Richard Grimaldi
Deputy Director, Department of Environmental Quality

Ursula Nelson 10.26.18

Ursula Nelson
Director, Department of Environmental Quality

Approved by:

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 assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering 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.

10/26/18

Carmine DeBonis
Deputy County Administrator for Public Works

October 26, 2018

(This page is intentionally blank.)

3. Narrative Summary of Stormwater Management Program

Pima County's municipal separate storm sewer storm drain system consists of 2,087 miles of roadways, 39 miles of storm drains, and infrastructure collecting runoff into drainageways or discharging runoff to ephemeral stream channels. Pima County utilizes a Public Awareness Program and a Public Participation Program to invest in behaviors protecting the quality of stormwater as it flows through the county. The public is encouraged to report illegal dumping and unusual environmental conditions to remove materials in washes or on land that could be transported into a wash during rainfall events. Management of Pima County Facilities includes maintenance of infrastructure and acquisition of property to prevent stormwater pollution. Inspections of Industrial Facilities and Construction Sites also reduce stormwater pollution. Post Construction activities include inspections once construction is completed at a site as well as implementation of Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development (GI/LID) to prevent flooding and stormwater pollution.

A. Public Awareness

The public awareness program involves on-going education of the public and businesses, and contributes to environmental and stormwater educational events. Pima County DEQ staff delivered the keep-stormwater-clean message using literature, promotional materials, presentations, and assistance to business. A wide range of literature provided to the public includes 48 types ranging from bookmarks, booklets, brochures, posters, stickers, bags and fact sheets (Appendix A). Literature is being prepared in both Spanish and English as the demographic population is 35% Hispanic or Latino.

<u>Conferences, Seminars and Presentations</u>
Presentations to professionals include the importance of LID to preventing flooding to the Arizona Builders Association (ABA), an organization supporting the construction industry, on January 18, 2018. A second seminar was presented the ABA regarding construction best management practices on January 18, 2018.

The topics presented to the general public include wash protection, illicit discharges, illegal dumping and Low Impact Development. Special outreach was developed for Basis grade school children using the Byrd Taylor post and *Desert Dwellers Know* coloring book and poster. Teaching sessions ranged between school staff and water professionals to poetry readings. Topics covered desert plants, animals, landforms and adaptive strategies used by plants and animals. The example of the plants and animals illustrated how humans have adapted historically and how we can adapt today.

MS4s within Pima County, ADEQ and the construction industry meet regularly at the Stormwater Management Working Group (SWMWG) hosted by Pima Association of Governments (PAG) to develop a stormwater message for the area. PDEQ helped define messages for residents, homeowners, schools and the development community. The group developed a multi-media outreach campaign designed to educate residents about stormwater pollution, watershed

awareness, wash protection, illicit discharges and illegal dumping. Public events, media interviews, magazine ads, articles, signage, website and social media communication, promotional materials and educational literature formed the multi-media campaign.

Pima Association of Government's (PAG) slogan "Clean Water Starts with Me" was used for the tenth consecutive year to increase familiarity with the successful message. Artwork and style matches the imagery used by the local jurisdictions in school programs. Primary topics address E. coli pollution, transportation pollutant mitigation, Low Impact Development and Water Quality assurance. The outreach impressions were 1,659 for professional audiences and 33,418 for the public. Specifics from PAG's report describe their outreach on behalf of the MS4s:

> PAG shared interactive educational displays related to stormwater at the Sahuarita Sci-Tech Festival and Pima County's Loop Completion Celebration at Brandi Fenton Park with the intention of testing new regional messaging regarding *E. coli* pollution. In addition, PAG's stormwater pollution prevention materials were distributed by partners at other community events throughout the region, including libraries and the Pima County GIS Fair. Materials distributed both at events and to MS4s and partners included watershed pocket guides, pet waste stickers, transportation rack cards, water footprint bookmarks, children's activity sheets and reusable water bottles.
>
> PAG coordinated with Tucson Conserve2Enhance (C2E) to incorporate stormwater quality messaging into outreach materials and grant activities. These include C2E postcards, ads, demonstration site signage and grant applications.
>
> To better connect messaging to that of other PAG programs, the Clean Water Starts with Me Facebook page was merged into the Pima Association of Governments page in July 2017. Updates related to PAG's stormwater pollution prevention activities are now shared on the PAG Facebook page. Posts have included sort news-style videos produced by PAG related to water quality.
>
> Additionally, PAG participated in a working group with members of Stormwater Outreach for Regional Municipalities (STORM) to produce stormwater pollution prevention PSAs. Topics included pet waste, yard care and pool maintenance. The videos are available through STORM.
>
> In November 2017, PAG was awarded a 604(b) grant from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) for water quality management planning. Through the end of the fiscal year, PAG developed Low Impact Development (LID)/Green Infrastructure (GI) treatment plans and pollution prevention engagement plans to address *E. coli* in waterways. Non-point sources of *E. coli* are a concern locally, as contributions during storm events have resulted in the impaired status of a stretch of the Santa Cruz River within Pima County.

A phone survey was conducted in May 2017 to assess the public's attitudes towards stormwater and their trash disposal behaviors. The results were finalized in a report (FMR Associates, 2018) and the results were presented to Pima County, Town of Oro Valley, City of Tucson, Town of Marana and PAG staff working on air and water quality public outreach in early June 2018. Outreach efforts have improved the general public's understanding that stormwater goes to washes and is not treated from 44% in 2013 to 53% in 2018.

EcoNook for Desert Dwellers and Eco Kids Corner

This community outreach project continues to provide a significant source of stormwater literature to the public at 27 Pima County Public Libraries and 6 community centers. Librarians and program staff are invited to create special areas within each library where free environmental literature is available for patrons. "EcoNook for Desert Dwellers" targets teenagers and adults while "Eco Kids Corner" serves children 12 years and under. Educational materials cover stormwater quality topics including stormwater pollution prevention, water harvesting, desert gardening, and Green Infrastructure/Low Impact Development. Other organizations that provide environmental literature are now taking their literature to the libraries as well.

Business Assistance Program

Activities in the Business Assistance Program help local businesses comply with applicable environmental requirements (Table 2). Pima County DEQ staff assists businesses in the completion of permit applications, clarifies the complex regulations, identifies potential violations, informs businesses about pollution prevention methods and makes suggestion to reducing stormwater discharges to stay in compliance. Free literature is provided upon request.

Table 1. Summary of Business Assistance Program

Type of Assistance	Number
Telephone/E-mail inquiries	200
DEQ office assistance visits	10
Letters/information mailed	20
Educational literature distributed	13,021
Seminars/presentations given	2
Number of times stormwater website or LID website was visited	769
Number of times website for Water & Wastewater Infrastructure, Supply & Planning Study	479
Number of times Pima County's Comprehensive Plan Pima Prospers website was visited (chapters containing stormwater management, rainwater harvesting or LID) was visited	253

B. Public Participation

Engaging the public in substantive actions to reduce pollutants from entering stormwater is key to long-term success. Members of the public clean trash from roadways and drainageways, recycle

or dispose of hazardous materials at the Household Hazardous Waste Facility and report environmental issues to Pima County DEQ.

Adopt-a-Roadway Program

Volunteers in Pima County's Adopt-a-Roadway program clean up roadways and public lands. The program had 355 clean-up events over a total length of 569 miles. Volunteers removed 6,700 bags removed from the adopted roads (Appendix B).

Environmental Complaints

The public and businesses are encouraged to fax, phone or e-mail information about environmental complaints to Pima County DEQ. Each complaint is inspected or, if the location of the complaint places it within another jurisdiction, the complaint is referred to the responsible jurisdiction. Additional information about the inspection and potential enforcement process is described in the next section on illicit discharge detection and elimination activities.

ABOP Program

Pima County contracted Tucson Recycling & Waste Services on June 1, 2013 to operate the County's landfills and transfer stations. Recycling of antifreeze, batteries, oil and paint (ABOP) occurs at Catalina Transfer Station, Ryan Transfer Station, and Sahuarita Transfer Station. Additionally, used oil is recycled at the Ajo Landfill. Recycling is free and participants are encouraged to be careful with their containers during transport. Tucson Recycling & Waste Services tracks the number or batteries and gallons of paint while they recycle the oil and antifreeze with Arizona Waste Oil Services Inc. who provides an annual estimate of the amounts (Appendix C).

C. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Activities

Pima County DEQ receives complaints from the general public, elected officials, regulators, and local governments identifying potential sources of pollutants that could endanger public health or the environment. Each complaint within Pima County's jurisdiction is inspected to determine if a pollutant has entered the environment and if so, the severity of the problem. The complaint is tracked until it is closed (Appendix D) or is escalated to the enforcement action of a Notice of Violation (NOV). NOVs are closed when the pollutant has been abated (Appendix E).

The number of complaints filed within Pima County's jurisdiction during this fiscal year was 1,225. Stormwater complaints were inspected and the average time between filing the complaint and the inspection was 4.7 days. The number of inspections performed within three days was 14 or 61%, missing the goal of initiating investigation of 80% of potential illicit discharges within three business days. During fiscal year 2017-18 the department conducting the environmental inspections assumed an additional caseload by taking on zoning and building code inspections under the Code Compliance Program. A combination of a greater number of inspections, logistics of implementing a new program and training staff for the new caseload resulted in delays. Additionally, the stormwater program was short-staffed for nine months of the fiscal year leading to unexpected delays.

These inspections led to 296 NOVs. During the fiscal year 269 cases were closed or rescinded, 23 remained open and 4 were in escalated enforcement process such as assessment of penalties, referral to Pima County Attorney's Office, an order to show cause with the court, or contempt of court. The enforcement phase has a closure rate of 90% and average closure time is 84 days. Illicit discharges of solid wastes and improper disposal of solid wastes comprise 66% of complaints received by Pima County DEQ and 83% of issued NOVs.

Illicit discharges of liquids to the MS4 are relatively rare due to the high visibility of the ephemeral stream system and the high likelihood that a liquid illicit discharge will be seen and tracked to the source. The most common illicit discharges are dumping solid waste in a remote location (61%). These types of events are reported by the public as an environmental complaint. Pima County takes the extra step of inspecting 100% of the 40 identified outfalls within the permit area to assess if liquid illicit discharges are taking place (Appendix F-1). This is over and above the permit requirement of inspecting 20% each year. While 23 are rated major outfalls based on size, none have a high priority due to the lack of illicit liquid discharges. In addition, both the Pima County Department of Transportation (PDOT) and Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (RWRD) document when spills occur within the county at county facilities (Table 2); this year no spills were reported for either department.

D. County Facilities

Management of County Facilities includes preparing an inventory of county facilities, GIS mapping of the MS4 features, maintaining roadway and drainageway infrastructure, drainageways, acquiring land to conserve open spaces, inspecting facilities for implementation of Pollution Prevention Plans and training staff directly involved in stormwater activities. All activities are preventive measures to keep stormwater clean.

Table 2. Spills within Permit Area

Date	Department	Location	Township-Range-Section	Description	Response
None	PDOT	None	-	-	-
None	RWRD	None	-	-	-

PDOT = Pima County Department of Transportation
RWRD = Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

<u>County Facility Inventory and Spill Prevention</u>

Pima County owns or operates 34 facilities with the potential to discharge pollutants to receiving waters (Appendix G). Twenty-three facilities are permitted with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality water permits such as Aquifer Protection Permits (APP) and Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES). Nine unpermitted county facilities have a site specific Pollution Prevention Plan and have been inspected to verify the plans are being implemented. One project is pending as the land will be donated to Pima County through the current owner's will. The project will remain on the inventory until the area has been inspected to determine if there is a potential for a discharge of pollutants.

Proper use and storage of chemicals is regulated within Pima County through enforcement of local requirements (environmental nuisance, solid waste, and liquid waste requirements) established in Title 7 of the Pima County Code (Pima County, 2011b). Contractors hired to maintain Pima County landscaped areas and public right-of-ways are required to follow spraying protocols established by State of Arizona rules and manufacturer's recommendations.

GIS Mapping

The layers of Pima County's Geographic Information System (GIS) facilitate the management of stormwater (Appendix H).

Infrastructure Maintenance

Roadways

Pima County Department of Transportation (PDOT) maintains 2,087 miles of roads and the drainageways in the road right-of-ways. The types of roadway maintenance include sweeping, shoulder repairs, pothole repairs, grading and blading, sidewalk and curb repair, street surface repairs and litter and debris removal (Appendix I).

Drainageways

Pima County RFCD maintains 450 miles of drainage, excluding the major water courses of the Santa Cruz River, Rillito River, Pantano Wash and Cañada Del Oro Wash. RFCD prioritizes 150 miles for inspection, and inspects the identified outfalls (Appendix F) and drainage reaches. They then follow up with grading; spot litter, debris, weed control; sediment removal; mowing; and spraying vegetation where needed (Appendix J).

Land Conservation

Land has been purchased under the 1997 Open Space Bond Program (OSBP), the 2004 Conservation Acquisition Bond Program (CABP) and the Flood prone Land Acquisition Program (FLAP) to conserve land (Appendix K). The 1997 OSBP and 2004 CABP protect the region's most prized natural and cultural resources (Pima County, 2011d). The FLAP preserves land in floodways (Appendix N).

Training staff directly working on stormwater control measures

Pima County DOT conducts weekly training for staff in the field that addresses technical as well as safety and stormwater topics. Fiscal year 17/18 was scheduled for the two-year training interval, which was not accomplished due to low staffing. Training is scheduled for fiscal year 18/19.

E. Industrial and Commercial Facilities

The Industrial Facilities Inventory is based on ADEQ's list of facilities that filed for the 2010 Multi-Sector General Permit (2010 MSGP) and facilities which need to file a Notice of Intent for the 2010 MSGP. Facilities located within the permit area and which have the potential to discharge to a Pima County roadway or drainageway were added to the inventory (Appendix L-1). Stormwater inspections are designed to evaluate consistency with the ADEQ's 2010 MSGP and compliance with Pima County ordinances. The Site Inspection Report form was modified to incorporate the 2010 MSGP and Pima County 2011 MS4 permit. Of the 56 industrial facilities, three were inspected during this fiscal year, which is below the 20% requirement, due to low staffing (Appendix L-2). The industrial facilities missed in fiscal year 17/18 will be inspected in the next fiscal year.

F. Construction Sites

Activities reducing pollutants to stream channels include plan reviews, issuance of air quality permits and Floodplain Use Permits, construction site inspections, and staff training.

Plan Reviews

Pima County Development Services Department (DSD) reviews plans before issuing construction permits or building permits. These plans must conform to requirements for Pima County Buffer Overlay Zone (BOZO), grading standards (GS), setback requirements for BOZO and GS, hydro seeding and revegetation, Hillside Development Overlay Zone and surface stabilization (Appendix M). Pima County DSD staff inspects the sites to verify the construction is proceeding according to approved plans.

Pima County Permits

Septic Systems

All new septic systems within Pima County undergo pre-construction design approval, percolation testing, and post-construction installation approval. Septic system failure or exfiltration of water from these systems into the Pima County MS4 rarely occurs. Potential surface discharges from a septic system are regulated under Pima County Code 7 §7.21.025.A.

Floodplain Use Permit (FLUP)

Pima County RFCD issues FLUPs for specific improvements within the regulatory floodplain or erosion hazard area (Appendix N). The permits are required prior to beginning construction in areas were flows exceed 100 cubic feet per second or where sheet flooding occurs.

Pima County Air Quality Activity Permits

Pima County requires air quality activity permits, called fugitive dust activity permits, for trenching operations, road construction, and land stripping or earthmoving activities that disturb one acre or more. Each permit requires the construction site operator to take reasonable

precautions to control fugitive dust emissions from the site. Proper dust suppression techniques prevent the deposition of windblown dust that may later become entrained in stormwater and reduces tracking from construction sites.

Construction Site Inventory and Inspections

Pima County DEQ (PDEQ) prepares a construction site inventory based on ADEQ's list of operators filing for the 2013 Construction General Permit (CGP) as well as identification of sites that need to file an NOI for the 2013 CGP. A total of 47 Notices of Intent (NOI) were inspected during the fiscal year out of a total of 68 active NOIs (Appendix O-1). Construction sites returned to compliance if it was out of compliance within 30 days. During this fiscal year, ADEQ migrated their NOI database platform to new software. The regular updates were delayed during this period, which meant that PDEQ needed to both restructure their database and integrate a large number of records. PDEQ has completed this effort in cooperation with ADEQ and began the routine monthly updates of newly issued NOIs in October 2018.

G. Post Construction

After construction has been completed, an inspection is performed to track the effectiveness of the new construction and if the site has been properly cleaned of temporary sediment and erosion control measures. The post-construction site inventory (Appendix P-1) identifies which sites have been inspected and copies of the site inspection reports show how well the projects are functioning (Appendix P-2). Post-construction inspections are typically conducted within one year after the completion of the project; however, some inspections were delayed during the first quarter. Some post-construction inspections were not completed yet because there was active construction under a different NOI at the same site where the NOT had been filed. The completion of the project is determined by the date of which the notice of termination, (NOT), is submitted to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Post-construction inspections ensure that post-construction stormwater controls are adequate, complete and maintainable. Post-construction inspections also encompass the verification of compliance with specific Pima County ordinances. These ordinances confirm that retention/detention basins do not cause an environmental nuisance, proper disposal of used oil and the removal of construction debris and temporary stormwater controls.

H. Non-filer Reporting

Pima County requests entities provide a copy of the NOI Certificate for activities appearing to qualify for a Construction General Permit or a Multi-Sector General Permit. If an NOI has not been obtained, the name, address and contact information are submitted to the Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment office in Phoenix's main office. Sometimes in the process of making a request, a construction site manager will obtain an NOI, which shifts the status from being a non-filer to a filer. Between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, Pima County did not encounter non-filers.

4. Numeric Summary of Stormwater Management Program Activities

Table 3. Numeric Summary of Stormwater Management Program Activities

Control Measures (number, unless specified otherwise)	**12/13**	**13/14**	**14/15**	**15/16**	**16/17**	**17/18**
Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program (See Appendix D, E & F for details)						
1. County Employee Training						
Training sessions (non-stormwater discharges, IDDE program)	1	1	9	2	0	1
Employees attending training	14	15	14	7	0	1
2. Spill Prevention (Appendix D & E)						
County facilities identified with hazardous materials	9	9	11	34	34	34
Spills in outside areas @ county facilities w/ hazardous materials	0	7	0	3	4	0
Facility assessments completed	10/28/13	4	17	17	17	17
Date of last review of Site Specific Pollution Prevention Plan (materials handling and spill response procedures)	11/12/11	12/01/13	06/30/15	05/23/16	05/23/16	05/23/16
3. Outfall Inspections (Appendix F)						
Outfalls inspected[2]	39	39	40	40	40	40
Priority Outfalls identified to date	39	39	40	40	40	40
Priority Outfalls inspected	39	39	40	40	40	40
Dry weather flows detected	0	0	0	1	0	0
Dry weather flows investigated	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA
Major outfalls sampled during dry weather flows	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illicit discharges identified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illicit discharges eliminated	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Amount of stormwater drainage system inspected	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
Storm drain cross-connection investigations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illicit connections detected	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illicit connections eliminated	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Corrective/enforcement actions* initiated w/ 60 days of identification	523	459	395	355	265	296
Cases* resolved w/ 1 year of original enforcement action (%)	502	423	374	314	230	267
Illicit discharge reports received from public	1,366	1,185	1,330	1,162	1,097	1225
Illicit discharge reports responded to (%)	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Responses initiated within three (3) business days of receipt (%)	81%	108%	95%	75%	57%	61%
County Facilities (See Appendix G, I & J for details)						
1. Employee Training						
Training events (Part 3 for dates & topics)	1	1	1	2	2	1
Staff trained	14	15	8	7	6	1
2. Inventory, Map, or Database of County Owned/Operated Facilities						
Facilities on inventory	39	39	43	43	34	32
Date identification of Higher Risk facilities completed	10/18/13	-	-	-	-	-
Date prioritization of county facilities completed	NA	09/30/13	-	-	-	0

Control Measures (number, unless specified otherwise)	**12/13**	**13/14**	**14/15**	**15/16**	**16/17**	**17/18**
3. Inspections						
Miles of MS4 drainage system prioritized for inspection	150	150	150	150	150	150
Miles of MS4 drainage system visually inspected	238	238	238	238	238	238
Higher Risk county facilities** inspected [no high risk]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Higher Risk county facilities** needing improved stormwater controls	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4. Infrastructure Maintenance						
Linear miles of MS4 drainage system cleaned each year	175	175	175	175	175	175
Street and intersection sweeping (miles)	2,180	2,720	2,740	5,317	2,854	1,342
Catch basins identified to date	0	953	996	1092	1,121	968
Number of retention/detention basins cleaned	52	53	55	54	56	53
Catch basins cleaned	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amount of waste collected from catch basin cleaning (tons)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Industrial & Commercial Sites Not Owned by the County (See Appendix L for details)						
Training events for county staff	1	1	12	1	1	1
County staff trained	14	15	183	4	1	1
Facilities on priority list	51	52	51	50	52	62
Industrial facilities inspected	10	10	12	9	10	3
Corrective/enforcement actions initiated on industrial facilities	9	9	12	9	8	2
Cases resolved w/ 1 year of original enforcement action (%)	8	7	0	1	2	0
Construction Program Activities (See Appendix M & O for details)						
Training events for county staff (Part 3.A for topics)	1	1	5	3	1	1
County staff trained	14	15	34	27	2	1
Construction/grading plans submitted for review	53	72	50	62	92	86
Construction/grading plans reviewed	47	70	50	62	92	86
Construction sites inspected	123	75	39	129	150	68
Corrective/enforcement actions initiated on Construction Sites	25	21	29	89	75	34
Corrective/enforcement actions resolved on Construction Sites	23	15	23	89	75	34
Post Construction Program Activities (Appendix P)						
Post-construction inspections completed for Post Construction	52	35	56	89	79	30
Corrective/enforcement actions initiated for Post Construction	2	1	4	16	7	4

* Enforcement actions and cases resolved are all environmental complaints where the property owner was initially unresponsive.

** High risk facilities have been permitted with an MSGP. All reporting, including inspections and improvements are reported pursuant to the facility MSGP.

NA Not applicable

5. EVALUATION OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Activities of the Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) include control measures to reduce discharges in stormwater through public awareness and public involvement programs, maintenance of roadways and drainage ways, and investigation of illicit connection and illegal dumping, new development and significant redevelopment programs, industrial facility inspections, construction site inspections, and enforcement actions. Water quality data from five monitor points documents runoff quality. Inspections at construction sites and industrial facilities maintain awareness of the importance of following Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans. Regular inspections and business assistance is needed to maintain surface water quality consistent with state SWQS and AZPDES permits.

Update of Recommendations

Recommendations with from previous annual reports have been continued. Completed recommendations are no longer reported on and additional analyses were implemented this year to improve the program. A summary is described below.

1. **Assess Effectiveness of Environmental Complaint Enforcement.**
   PDEQ frequently issues NOVs for solid waste on private property and wildcat dumping on public land in the Upper Santa Cruz watershed and the Brawley watershed. The average annual number of enforcement cases is declining by about 23 cases each year. The general trend is significant as the annual number of NOVs in 1996 reached nearly 900 and fell in 2018 to below 300.



Figure 2. Number of Enforcement Cases related to Pollutants Exposed to Rain of Runoff

2. Evaluate water quality and pollutant loadings by season

Six years of water quality data have been collected under the new permit. Full sets of analytes are collected in both seasons, when water is available. The monitor points have four to six summer samples, and four to six winter samples. The data does not show a season difference, with the exception that hardness can be lower in summer at Site #2. Seasonal differences have not be evident in the water quality data collected between 2011 and 2017.

3. Calculate acres of five land uses within new permit area to facilitate evaluation of pollutant loading estimates by land use.

The areas of the five land uses within the new permit area have been calculated. The MS4 is dominantly Low Density Residential. This trend has not changed in 2018.

Table 4. Land Use Area within Unincorporated Pima County

Land Use	Area (square miles)	Percent
High Density Residential	5.7	0%
Commercial	5.9	0%
Industrial	21.2	1%
Medium Density Residential	160.0	8%
Low Density Residential	1,766.7	90%

4. Develop outreach program to address elevated copper and E. coli at selected monitor site watersheds.

Due to legislation enacted in California and Washington in 2010 mandating the reduction of copper in brakes, the brake manufacturing industry agreed to phase out copper in brakes over a fifteen years (Copper Development Industry, 2013). As a nationwide program has been implemented to address this issue, an outreach program for copper will not be implemented, though relevant information will be provided to interested parties.

5. Improve compliance activities for construction projects.

Transition from one database platform to the next platform delayed tracking compliance as noted in Part 3.F

6. Improve compliance at post-construction projects.

Transition from one database platform to the next platform delayed tracking compliance as noted in Part 3.F

A. Evaluation of 2018 Stormwater Management Program

The Stormwater Management Program has made significant progress and has a high level of success in restoring and maintaining the chemical, biological and physical integrity of the surface waters flowing in Pima County's permit area. The written summary evaluates public education and outreach, public involvement and participation, IDDE, county facility pollution prevention

and good housekeeping practices, residential and commercial control measures, industrial facilities and construction sites.

1. *Program Progress*

Pima County developed a series of documents describing the procedures to be used in various activities impacting stormwater quality and identified in the 2011 MS4 Permit. The current date for the Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) is included.

- STW-001 SOP for Stormwater Inspection at a Construction Site (December, 2014)
- STW-002 SOP for Stormwater Post Construction Inspection (June, 2017)
- STW-003 SOP for Industrial Facility Inspection (December, 2014)
- STW-004 SOP for Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Inspection (June, 2017)
- Sampling and Analysis Plan for Stormwater Management Program (September, 2015)
- Pima County Stormwater Management Program (September, 2015)
- Stormwater Control Measure Field Manual (December, 2014)
- Stormwater Training Program (December, 2014)
- Template for Pollution Prevention Plan for Pima County Facilities (June 2016)

2. *Program Successes*

During the permit cycle, the following successes are attributed to Pima County's Stormwater Management Program and Regional Flood Control District.

- Organized Celebrate World Water Day by Keeping Washes Clean that included a day where citizens were invited to clean up a wash, a TV interview, two fact sheets and a website article.
- EPA Factsheet for Improving Community Resiliency with Green Infrastructure credited Pima County for using GI for flood control and drought management.
- Referral of 254 stormwater-related complaints to other jurisdictions functioning to clean up citizen reported environmental contamination.
- Partnered with University of Arizona's Wet Water Education for Teachers to expand outreach to youth audiences.
- Trained 45 children at Littlestown Community Center how to properly dispose of trash.
- Water conservation radio program to encourage the public to use stormwater to irrigate native plants to save on water utility bills, and potentially electricity bills if the native trees are planted to shade buildings.
- Pima County published the *Low Impact Development and Green Infrastructure Guidance Manual* on March, 2015 describing how stormwater harvesting features effective in the semi-arid climate of Pima County can be implemented at the neighborhood scale.
- The Pima County Board of Supervisors amended Title 18 (Zoning) to include Stormwater Harvesting Systems on March 17, 2015.
- The Pima County Comprehensive Plan *Pima Prospers* was adopted on May 19, 2015 and includes LID in land management and water resource management (Appendix R).
- Pima County Regional Flood Control District published the *Design Standards for Stormwater Detention and Retention Basins* in June, 2014 and was approved by Pima County Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2015. The manual represents a fundamental

shift away from conveying runoff to a small number of downstream points through hydraulically efficient infrastructure toward retaining and using the runoff as close as possible to the source of the runoff for beneficial use.

- The Pima County Subdivision and Development Standards (May, 2016) encourages stormwater harvesting within the right-of-way using the Design Standards for Stormwater Detention and Retention as well as the *Low-Impact Development and Green Infrastructure Guidance Manual*.
- The Arizona American Society of Landscape Architecture (AZ ASLA) awarded Pima County and the other co-authors the "Honor Award" for the *Low-Impact Development and Green Infrastructure Guidance Manual* and associated *Case Studies*.
- The Pima County Board of Supervisors passed two resolutions 2017-39 and 2017-51to align its operational efforts to meet the United States' commitment to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. The fifth of six activities includes installing low impact development features and trees on County properties and rights-of-ways (Pima County, 2017).

3. *Reduction of pollutants to and from the MS4*

The control measures implemented in the stormwater management program include Public Awareness and Public Participation; Anti-freeze, Batteries, Oil and Paint Program; Public Reporting and Response; Infrastructure Maintenance; Land Conservation and Enforcement actions.

a. Public Awareness and Public Participation

Outreach activities provide environmental literal and 13,021 pieces were collected by members of the public at libraries, public events and private events reaching a wide range of people with information specific to their interest. A phone survey conducted in May 2018 assessed the public's attitudes toward Low Impact Development. The information will be used to refine the outreach message to implement the LID Guidance Manual at the neighborhood scale.

Public participation included volunteers in Pima County's Adopt-a-Roadway program clean up roadways and public lands. The program had 354 clean-up events over a total length of 569 miles. Outreach activities reduce the amount pollutants entering the MS4.

b. Anti-freeze, Batteries, Oil and Paint Program

The Pima County ABOP program collected 17,840 gallons of anti-freeze, oil and paint as well as 260 batteries. This recycling prevents the disposal in a landfill or from being dumped in the desert.

c. Public Reporting and Responses

Pima County received 1,225 complaints from the public and responded to them within an average of 5.8 days. Inspections effectively addressed most of the complaints and 296 resulted in an enforcement action of Notice of Violation (NOV). The NOV closure rate of 90% within an average closure period of 61 days, which reduces the amount of pollutants entering stormwater.

d. Infrastructure Maintenance

Roadway maintenance at 16,373 locations removed sediment from streets and repaired roads which stabilized the surface reducing erosion (Appendix I). Drainageway maintenance includes clearing vegetation, mowing, removal of trash, and channel maintenance at 2,465 locations. The infrastructure maintenance reduces the amount of pollutants leaving the permit area.

e. Land conservation

Pima County has invested over $212 million to conserve 58,988 acres thereby preserving the natural landscape and reducing erosion that would contribute a pollutant to stormwater. The two properties add this year were donations to Pima County.

f. The number of environmental complaints that require enforcement has declined from nearly 900 in 1996 to less than 300 in 2018. The consistent effort to teach proper contaminant handling methods or recycling strategies and firm enforcement for those who do not comply has resulted in a cleaner environment.

(This page is intentionally blank.)

6. Stormwater Management Program Modifications

ADEQ issued the new 2011 MS4 permit on June 16, 2011. A new Stormwater Management Program was developed to meet the provisions of the 2011 MS4 permit. Below are the identified changes to the stormwater management program.

1. **Addition of New Control Measures**
   No new control measures were added during the last year.

2. **Addition of Temporary Control Measures**
   No temporary control measures were proposed.

3. **Increase of Existing Control Measures**
   Existing control measures were maintained.

4. **Replacement of Existing Control Measures**
   Existing Control Measures were not replaced.

5. **Modifications to SWMP**
   The Stormwater Management Plan, Appendix D county Facility Inventory was updated to remove the Eric Marcus Municipal Airport as it is located in Ajo, Arizona, which is outside the permit area for the 2011 Permit.

(This page is intentionally blank)

7. Monitoring Locations

Five monitor sites are sampled each summer and winter season for field parameters, microbiology, metals, nutrients, toxic organic pollutants, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-VOCs, PCBs and pesticides, as identified in the permit. Water quality data from each site is intended to characterize the water chemistry of runoff from five land uses, namely low density residential, medium density residential, high density residential, commercial and industrial. Results may also be used to identify and eliminate illicit discharges. The data is evaluated to assess the effectiveness of control measures to reduce the discharge of pollutants.

Table 5. Monitor Site Locations

Site No.	Receiving Water	Monitor Site Location Information				
		Location	Latitude Longitude	Elevation (famsl*)	Drainage Area (acres)	Dominant Land Use
1	Unnamed wash, tributary to Rillito River	Calle Esplendor/ Calle Barril	32°17'46.1" -110°54'30.6"	2642	2.8	Residential Low Density
2	Unnamed wash, tributary to Rillito River	Ruthrauff Road/La Cholla Blvd.	32°17'32.6" -111°00'42.6"	2275	56.8	Residential Medium Density
3	Valley View Wash	Valley View Rd/ Sunrise Drive	32°18'22.9" -110°54'38.8"	2709	7.3	Residential High Density
4	Valley View Wash	Valley View Rd/ Sunrise Drive	32°18'23.0" -110°54'38.8"	2710	41.6	Commercial
5	Unnamed wash, tributary to Tucson Diversion Channel	4101 S. Country Club Rd	32°10'27.5" -110°55'34.1"	2542	52.2	Industrial

* famsl – feet above mean sea level

All sites have an adjacent weather station with a tipping bucket rain gage and remote data collection equipment using Pima County's Automated Local Evaluation in Real Time (ALERT) system. Flow is measured using a depth gage and channel characteristics or the bucket method. When sampling the stormwater, a pH meter with a temperature sensor is used to collect pH. For deep sampling locations, a dipping pole is used to collect the water samples.

(This page is intentionally blank)

8. Storm Event Records

Summer storms in Pima County typically have a short duration and high intensity. Winter storms are generally longer in duration and less intense. The extended event duration in the winter may result in a delay from the time rainfall begins and runoff begins that is greater than one hour. Although permit and guidance documentation indicates the first sample is to be collected within an hour of the start of rainfall, storm runoff may not begin until several minutes or hours after the initial rainfall. In this case, first flush is collected when runoff begins.

During the reporting period there were 34 rainfall events, of which 19 had rainfall 0.20 inches or higher (Table 6). Only seven of the rainfall events qualified for sampling. Many summer rainfall events occurred within the 72-hour limitation and were not representative (NR). Heavy rainfall in short time intervals also caused dangerous conditions (DC). While there were four qualifying rainfall events in the winter, samples were not collected due to technical difficulties associated with inadequate staff. As a consequence of an unusually dry year, dangerous conditions and inadequate staff, two of the ten wet weather samples were collected during the fiscal year.

The annual rainfall at the monitor sites ranged from 8.63 to 11.34 inches, all of which are below the annual normal rainfall of 11.59 inches (National Weather Service Forecast Office, Tucson, AZ, 2011).

Table 6. Storm Event Records for Monitor Sites

Season	Date	Site #1	Rainfall (in)	Site #2	Rainfall (in)	Site #3	Rainfall (in)	Site #4	Rainfall (in)	Site #5	Rainfall (in)
S	07/10/17										0.07
S	07/11/17		0.79	SC	0.87		0.79		0.79		0.51
S	07/12/17	NR	0.44	-	0.35	NR	0.44	NR	0.44		
S	07/13/17	NR	0.35	-	0.20	NR	0.35	NR	0.35	NR	0.23
S	07/14/17		0.04		0.12		0.04		0.04		0.08
S	07/15/17	NR	1.06	-	1.10	NR	1.06	NR	1.06	NR	0.83
S	07/16/17				0.16						0.04
S	07/17/17	NR	0.20			NR	0.20	NR	0.20		
S	07/19/17	NF	0.39		0.19	NF	0.39	NF	0.39	TD	0.39
S	07/20/17	NR	0.79		0.08	NR	0.79	NR	0.79		
S	07/21/17				0.04					NF	0.20
S	07/22/17	NR	0.87	-	0.55	NR	0.87	NR	0.87	NR	1.22
S	07/23/17		0.07		0.08		0.07		0.07		0.08
S	07/24/17									NR	0.39
S	07/26/17				0.08						
S	07/27/17		0.04		0.08		0.04		0.04		

Season	Date	Site #1	Rainfall (in)	Site #2	Rainfall (in)	Site #3	Rainfall (in)	Site #4	Rainfall (in)	Site #5	Rainfall (in)
S	07/28/17				0.08					DC	2.56
S	07/29/17									NR	0.71
S	08/03/17				0.08						
S	08/10/17	NF	0.20	-	0.78	NF	0.20	NF	0.20		0.16
S	08/13/17	AOS	1.22	-	1.70	SC	1.22	AOS	1.22	DC	0.98
S	08/17/17										0.04
S	08/23/17		0.04				0.04		0.04		0.04
S	08/26/17										0.16
S	09/08/17										0.04
W	11/07/17		0.04				0.04		0.04		0.04
W	12/17/17	TD	0.28	TD	0.20	TD	0.28	TD	0.28	TD	0.32
W	01/10/18		0.07	TD	0.24		0.07		0.07		
W	01/20/18		0.08		0.12		0.08		0.08		0.04
W	02/14/18	TD	0.40	TD	0.39	TD	0.40	TD	0.40	TD	0.39
W	02/15/18	NR	0.78	NR	0.83	NR	0.78	NR	0.78	NR	0.99
W	02/16/18		0.12		0.15		0.12		0.12		0.15
W	02/19/18		0.04				0.04		0.04		0.04
W	02/28/18	TD	0.32		0.12	TD	0.32	TD	0.32	TD	0.28
Summer Total			6.50		6.54		6.50		6.50		9.09
Winter Total			2.13		2.05		2.13		2.13		2.25
Annual Total			8.63		8.59		8.63		8.63		11.34

AOS – At other sites
DC – Dangerous conditions
NF – Not sufficient flow
NR – Not representative
SC – Sample collected
TD – Technical difficulty

9. Water Quality Data from Monitor Sites

The permit requires a full suite of water quality parameters on the first, third, and fifth years of the permit. In the other years a smaller set of analytes are defined. Due to drought conditions and missing samples from a monitor site, the pattern of collecting full suites every other year was difficult to track. To maintain a good data set, a full suite is now collected for every event (Table 7).

Table 7. Monitor Site Sample Dates and Type of Sample Set

Site	Summer	Type	Winter	Type
1	-		-	
2	07/11/18	Full suite	-	
3	08/13/18	Full suite	-	
4	-		-	
5	-		-	

Analytical Methods in Full Suite:

- SM 9233B — E. Coli
- SM4500-CN-BCE — Total Cyanide
- EPA 1664A — Oil & Grease, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons
- EPA 624 — Acrolein, Acrylonitrile
- EPA 8260 — Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)
- EPA 625-BNA — Semi-volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)
- EPA 625-P&PCBS — Pesticides and PCBs
- SM 4500-NH3D — Ammonia
- EPA 351.2 — Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
- EPA 365.1 — Total Phosphorus, Ortho Phosphate
- EPA 353.2 — Nitrate-Nitrite
- Hach 8000 — Chemical Oxygen Demand
- EPA 200.8 — Total Metals, Dissolved Metals
- EPA 245.1 — Mercury
- SM 2540C — Total Dissolved Solids
- SM 2450D — Total Suspended Solids
- SM 5210B — Biological Oxygen Demand

Analytical Methods in Small Set: Same as above without VOCs, SVOCs, P&PCBs

(This page is intentionally blank).

Table 8. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #1

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date				**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**12/17/14**		**09/21/15**				**09/07/16**							
Conventional Parameters		1									0.725274				1						
Average Flow Rate[3] (m3/s)	-		0		0.0004		0.00155		0.000269		0.00198				0.00075						
pH	6.5-9.0			6.9	6.9	8	8	7	7	8.6	8.6			7	7.0						
Temperature (°Celcius)	-				15.1		ND		16.1		23.6				22.9						
Hardness[4] (mg/L)[5]	-			26	26	54.5	54.5	88.9	88.9	58	58			105	105						
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (mg/L)	-				72		150		292		94.3				326						
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	-				62		195		334		331				286						
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) (mg/L)	-				4.9		9.8		3.8		ND				3.5						
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) (mg/L)	-				57		67		88		50				84						
Inorganics																					
Cyanide, total (µg/L)[6]	84				3.78		2.14		ND		ND				ND						
Nutrients																					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)					0.17		0.98		0.36		0.1				0.14						
Ammonia as N (mg/L)					0.53		0.66		0.33		0.19				0.21						
TKN (mg/L)					1.41		1.98		0.82		ND				1.33						
Total Nitrogen					1.58		2.96		1.18		0.10				1.68						
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)					0.15		0.52		0.44		0.33				0.46						
Total Orthophosphate (mg/L)					ND0.50		0.19		0.08		0.04				ND						
Microbiological																					
Escherichia coli (E. coli) (CFU/100 mg or MPN)[7]	575				10		487		15500		1300				200						
Total Metals8																					
AntimonyT (µg/L)	747				0.53		0.43		0.55		ND				0.19						
ArsenicT (µg/L)	200				1.46		2.91		4.49		1.23				4.35						
BariumT (µg/L)	98,000				57.6		93.3		189		84.2				175						
BerylliumT (µg/L)	1,867				0.23		0.53		1.32		0.52				1.41						
CadmiumD (µg/L)				6	ND	13	ND	20	ND	13	ND			24	ND						
ChromiumT (µg/L)	1,000				ND		7.2		15.5		2.02				5.29						
CopperD (µg/L)				6.54	4.20	13.13	5.30	20.82	1.91	13.92	1.45			24.36	2.80						
LeadD (µg/L)				30.62	ND	69.98	ND	119.88	ND	74.96	ND			143.73	0.08						
MercuryT (µg/L)	10.00				0.32		-		0.082		ND				ND						
NickelD (µg/L)				1330.42	1.01	2488.35	1.03	3764.36	0.58	2622.89	0.21			4333.58	0.52						
SeleniumT (µg/L)	33				ND		0.79		0.88		ND				ND						
SilverD (µg/L)				0.32	ND	1.13	ND	2.63	ND	1.26	ND			3.50	42.90						
ThalliumT (µg/L)	75				ND		ND		0.41		ND				0.14						
ZincD (µg/L)				355.15	4.68	664.90	48.30	1006.49	ND	700.90	1.42			1158.93	0.88						
Organic Toxic Pollutants (mg/L)																					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)	-				9.39		7.65		8.35		10.6				2.64						
Total Oil & Grease	-				10.1		11.06		12.59		11.88				3.3						
VOCs[9], Semi-VOCs, and Pesticides																					

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date				**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**12/17/14**		**09/21/15**				**09/07/16**							
Acrolein (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Acrylonitrile (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzene (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Bromoform (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	1,307				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chlorobenzene (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chlorodibromomethane (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2-chloroethylvinyl ether (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chloroform (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	5,900				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,3-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,4-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	6,500				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1-dichloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichloroethane (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	46,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichloropropane (µg/L)	84,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,3-dichloropropylene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Methyl bromide (µg/L)	1,307				ND		ND		0.39		0.32				ND						
Methyl chloride (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		0.3		ND				ND						
Methylene chloride (µg/L)	56,000				-		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Tetrachloroethylene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Toluene (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-trans-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,1-trichloroethane (µg/L)	1,866,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,2-trichloroethane (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Trichloroethylene (µg/L)	280				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Trimethylbenzene (µg/L)	-				-		-		-		-				-						
Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Xylene (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
SVOCs - Acid Extractables																					
2-chlorophenol (µg/L)	4,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dichlorophenol (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dimethylphenol (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,6-dinitro-o-cresol (µg/L)	3,733				-		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dinitrophenol (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date				**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**12/17/14**		**09/21/15**				**09/07/16**							
p-chloro-m-cresol (µg/L)	48,000				-		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Pentachlorophenol (µg/L)				33.2	ND	100.4	ND	36.8	ND	183.5	ND			36.8	ND						
Phenol (µg/L)	180,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4,6-trichlorophenol (µg/L)	130				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
SVOCs - Bases/Neutrals																					
Acenaphthene (µg/L)	56,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Acenaphthylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Anthracene (µg/L)	280,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(a)anthracene (µg/L)	0.20				ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND				ND						
Benzo(a)pyrene (µg/L)	0.20				ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND				ND						
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (µg/L)	1.9				ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND				ND						
Chrysene (µg/L)	19				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (µg/L)	1.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
3,3-dichlorobenzidine (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Diethyl phthalate (µg/L)	746,667				6.68		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dimethyl phthalate (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Di-n-butyl phthalate (µg/L)	1,100				26.6		9.31		ND		ND				6.9						
2,4-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,6-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Di-n-octyl phthalate (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-diphenylhydrazine (as azobenzene)	1.8				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Fluroranthene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Fluorene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorobenzene (µg/L)	747				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorobutadiene (µg/L)	187				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene (µg/L)	11,200				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachloroethane (µg/L)	850				ND2.25		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (µg/L)	1.90				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Isophorone (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Naphthalene (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Nitrobenzene (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodimethylamine (µg/L)	0.03				ND4.23		ND4.23		ND4.23		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine (µg/L)	88,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodiphenylamine (µg/L)	290				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Phenanthrene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Pyrene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		0.1		ND				ND						
PCB/Pesticides															ND						
Aldrin (µg/L)	0.00				ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND						

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date				**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**12/17/14**		**09/21/15**				**09/07/16**							
Alpha-BHC (µg/L)	1,600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Beta-BHC (µg/L)	560				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Gamma-BHC (µg/L)	11				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Delta-BHC (µg/L)	1,600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chlordane (µg/L)	3.2				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDT (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDE (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDD (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dieldrin (µg/L)	0.00				ND0.07		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND						
Alpha-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Beta-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Endosulfan sulfate (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Endrin (µg/L)	0.004				ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND						
Endrin aldehyde (µg/L)	0.7				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Heptachlor (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Heptachlor epoxide (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
PCB-1242 (AROCLOR-1242) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND				ND						
PCB-1254 (AROCLOR-1254) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND				ND						
PCB-1221 (AROCLOR-1221) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND						
PCB-1232 (AROCLOR-1232) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND				ND						
PCB-1248 (AROCLOR-1248) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND				ND						
PCB-1260 (AROCLOR-1260) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.25		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND				ND						
PCB-1016 (AROCLOR-1016) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND						
Toxaphene (µg/L)	0.005				ND5.08		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND				ND						

Note: Results higher than SWQ are shown in red font. Non-detectable results with the Method Detection Limit (MDL) above the SWQS are shown as ND with the MDL in parentheses.

1 - Partial Body Contact (PBC), Aquatic & Wildlife ephemeral (A&We) or Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL).
2 - Surface Water Quality Standards (A.A.C R18-11-101 through Appendix B) selected from lowest of PBC, A&We or AgL.
3 - Average flow rate during the sampling event. m^3/s = meters cubed per second.
4 - Hardness of sample event is used to calculate SWQS for Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Sliver, and Zinc.
5 - mg/l = milligram per liter
6 - µg/L = micrograms per liter
7 - CFU/100 ml = colony forming unit per 100 milliliters, MPN = Most probable number per 100 ml
8 - SWQS for Total Metals are denoted with "T". SWQS for Dissolved Metal for A&We are denoted with a "D".
9 - Volatile Organic Compounds
10 - Dash means information unavailable (ie. SWQS was not established or sample was not collected).
11 - Total of α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC, δ-
12 - Refer to Appendix Q for Analytical Laboratory Reports

Table 9. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #2

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**08/22/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/05/15**		**01/04/16**		**07/28/16**		**12/17/16**		**7/11/17**		**-**	
Conventional Parameters											0.63				0.70212		0.29787		1.00		
Average Flow Rate[3] (m3/s)	-		0.040		0.016		0.0065		0.029		0.027		0.016		0.033		0.014		0.0120		
pH	6.5-9.0			6.7	6.7	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.4	8.4	8.4	8	8	7.7	7.7		6.7	8.73	7.5		
Temperature (°Celcius)	-				13.9		26.9		14.5		26.6		11.8		26.6		11.6		25.4		
Hardness[4] (mg/L)[5]		147	147	62.5	62.5	154	154	57.7	57.7	87.2	87.2	82.2	82.2	64.3	64.3		53.5	54.7	54.7		
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (mg/L)	-		126		114		243		127		150		153		150		122		132		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	-		426		88		316		42		124		100		77		36.7		40.5		
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) (mg/L)	-		12.2		9.3		19		7.6		12.9		14.5		10.1		16.4		21.9		
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) (mg/L)	-		124		107		132		84		132		93.0		87.0		112.0		120		
Inorganics																					
Cyanide, total (ug/L)[6]	84T		1.31		ND1.40		1.73		ND		ND		1.42				ND		ND		
Nutrients																					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)			2.52		0.96		2.08		3.44		1.64		4.54		1.8		2.23		1.98		
Ammonia as N (mg/L)			0.98		0.53		1.58		0.39		0.61		0.63		0.94		0.66		1.1		
TKN (mg/L)			2.83		1.97		4.24		1.56		1.69		1.90		2.52		2.55		2.85		
Total Nitrogen			5.35		2.93		6.32		5		3.33		6.44		4.32		5.44		4.83		
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)			0.23		0.49		1.21		0.3		0.67		0.5		0.5		0.38		0.43		
Total Orthophosphate (mg/L)			0.98		0.22		0.34		0.11		0.27		0.2		0.21		0.22		0.27		
Microbiological																					
Escherichia coli (E. coli) (CFU/100 mg or MPN)[7]	575		19863		4884		24810		14400		14100		12000		582		19900		2010		
Total Metals[8]																					
AntimonyT (µg/L)	747		1.08		0.85		0.96		0.81		0.57		0.56		0.46		0.43		0.62		
ArsenicT (µg/L)	200		4.1		2.11		4.57		1.74		2.05		1.16		1.81		0.99		1.3		
BariumT (µg/L)	98,000		163		83.6		157		58.2		61		53		47.6		28.7		39.5		
BerylliumT (µg/L)	1,867		0.64		0.28		0.88		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
CadmiumD (µg/L)		33	ND	14	ND	35	ND	13	ND	20	15.8	19	ND	15	ND		ND		ND		
ChromiumT (µg/L)	1,000		1.28		0.67		11.8		3.23		2.21		1.45		2.18		1.11		0.13		
CopperD (µg/L)		33.44	8.18	14.94	7.45	34.94	14.40	13.85	11.80	20.44	13.00	19.34	8.98	15.34	19.70	12.90	11.50	13.18	32.20		
LeadD (µg/L)		206.78	0.62	81.41	0.50	217.37	1.24	74.54	0.37	117.38	0.73	110.03	0.37	84.00	0.28		3.77	70.26	0.60		
MercuryT (µg/L)	10.00		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
NickelD (µg/L)		5760.64	0.76	2794.05	0.72	5991.88	1.64	2611.41	0.59	3703.37	0.97	3522.91	0.82	2861.98	0.79		1.84	2496.07	1.29		
SeleniumT (µg/L)	33		0.94		ND		1.36		ND		ND		ND		0.73		ND		ND		
SilverD (µg/L)		6.24	ND	1.43	ND	6.76	1.14	1.25	ND	2.54	ND	2.30	ND	1.51	0.36	1.10	0.54	1.14	0.27		
ThalliumT (µg/L)	75		0.2		ND		0.51		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		0.04		
ZincD (µg/L)		1541.25	7.46	746.71	10.70	1603.21	15.50	697.83	13.27	990.16	8.91	941.84	9.09	764.89	4.19		54.70	666.96	14.70		
Organic Toxic Pollutants																					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) (mg/L)	-		2.09		8.38		6.98		8		6.24		6.56		ND		2.8		3.15		
Total Oil & Grease (mg/L)	-		3.72		8.08		20.93		13.25		9.06		25.89		ND		4.8		3.82		
VOCs[9], Semi-VOCs, and Pesticides																					
Acrolein (µg/L)	467		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Acrylonitrile (µg/L)	37333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**08/22/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/05/15**		**01/04/16**		**07/28/16**		**12/17/16**		**7/11/17**		**-**	
Benzene (µg/L)	3733		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Bromoform (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	1307		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Chlorobenzene (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Chlorodibromomethane (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Chloroethane (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2-chloroethylvinyl ether (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Chloroform (µg/L)	9333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	5,900		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,3-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,4-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	6,500		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,1-dichloroethane (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2-dichloroethane (µg/L)	186,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,1-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	46,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2-dichloropropane (µg/L)	84,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,3-dichloropropylene (µg/L)	28,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	93,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Methyl bromide (µg/L)	1,307		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Methyl chloride (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Methylene chloride (µg/L)	56,000		-		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane (µg/L)	93,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Tetrachloroethylene (µg/L)	9,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Toluene (µg/L)	373,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2-trans-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		N D		ND		ND		
1,1,1-trichloroethane (µg/L)	1,866,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,1,2-trichloroethane (µg/L)	3,733		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Trichloroethylene (µg/L)	280		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Trimethylbenzene (µg/L)	-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		ND		-		
Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	2,800		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Xylene (µg/L)	186,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
SVOCs - Acid Extractables																					
2-chlorophenol (µg/L)	4,667		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2,4-dichlorophenol (µg/L)	2,800		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2,4-dimethylphenol (µg/L)	18,667		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
4,6-dinitro-o-cresol (µg/L)	3,733		-		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2,4-dinitrophenol (µg/L)	1,867		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
4-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
p-chloro-m-cresol (µg/L)	48,000		-		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Pentachlorophenol (µg/L)		NA	ND	27.2	-	20.1	ND	20.1	ND	150.1	ND	100.4	ND	74.3	ND		ND	209.1	ND		
Phenol (µg/L)	180,000		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**08/22/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/05/15**		**01/04/16**		**07/28/16**		**12/17/16**		**7/11/17**		**-**	
2,4,6-trichlorophenol (µg/L)	130		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
SVOCs - Bases/Neutrals																					
Acenaphthene (µg/L)	56,000		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Acenaphthylene (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Anthracene (µg/L)	280,000		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Benzo(a)anthracene (µg/L)	0.2		ND1.44		-		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.25		ND1.25		ND1.25		ND1.25		
Benzo(a)pyrene (µg/L)	0.2		ND1.55		-		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.96		ND1.96		ND1.96		ND1.96		
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (µg/L)	1.9		ND2.28		-		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.29		ND2.29		ND2.29		ND1.58		
Chrysene (µg/L)	19		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (µg/L)	1.9		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
3,3-dichlorobenzidine (µg/L)	3		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Diethyl phthalate (µg/L)	746,667		ND		-		ND		13.8		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Dimethyl phthalate (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Di-n-butyl phthalate (µg/L)	1,100		4.94		-		ND		4.02		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2,4-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	1,867		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
2,6-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	3,733		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Di-n-octyl phthalate (µg/L)	373,333		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2-diphenylhydrazine (as azobenzene)	1.8		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Fluroranthene (µg/L)	37,333		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Fluorene (µg/L)	37,333		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Hexachlorobenzene (µg/L)	747		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Hexachlorobutadiene (µg/L)	187		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene (µg/L)	11,200		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Hexachloroethane (µg/L)	850		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (µg/L)	1.9		ND		-		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.83		ND2.83		ND2.83		ND2.83		
Isophorone (µg/L)	186,667		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Naphthalene (µg/L)	18,667		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Nitrobenzene (µg/L)	467		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
N-nitrosodimethylamine (µg/L)	0.03		ND		-		ND4.23		ND4.23		ND4.23		ND2.09		ND2.09		ND2.09		ND2.09		
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine (µg/L)	88,667		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
N-nitrosodiphenylamine (µg/L)	290		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Phenanthrene (µg/L)	-		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Pyrene (µg/L)	28,000		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (µg/L)	9,333		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
PCB/Pesticides																					
Aldrin (µg/L)	0.003		ND0.10		-		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND		ND0.09		
Alpha-BHC (µg/L)	1,600		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Beta-BHC (µg/L)	560		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Gamma-BHC (µg/L)	11		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Delta-BHC (µg/L)	1600		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**08/22/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/05/15**		**01/04/16**		**07/28/16**		**12/17/16**		**7/11/17**		**-**	
Chlordane (µg/L)	3.2		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
4,4'-DDT (µg/L)	1.1		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
4,4'-DDE (µg/L)	1.1		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
4,4'-DDD (µg/L)	1.1		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Dieldrin (µg/L)	0.003		ND0.07		-		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		
Alpha-endosulfan (µg/L)	3		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Beta-endosulfan (µg/L)	3		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Endosulfan sulfate (µg/L)	3		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Endrin (µg/L)	0.004		ND0.10		-		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		
Endrin aldehyde (µg/L)	0.7		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Heptachlor (µg/L)	0.9		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
Heptachlor epoxide (µg/L)	0.9		ND		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		
PCB-1242 (AROCLOR-1242) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.10		-		ND0.10		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		
PCB-1254 (AROCLOR-1254) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.07		-		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		
PCB-1221 (AROCLOR-1221) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.09		-		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		
PCB-1232 (AROCLOR-1232) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.16		-		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		
PCB-1248 (AROCLOR-1248) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.16		-		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		
PCB-1260 (AROCLOR-1260) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.25		-		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		
PCB-1016 (AROCLOR-1016) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.10		-		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		
Toxaphene (µg/L)	0.005		ND5.08		-		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		

Note: Results higher than SWQ are shown in red font. Non-detectable results with the Method Detection Limit (MDL) above the SWQS are shown as ND with the MDL in parentheses.

1 - Partial Body Contact (PBC), Aquatic & Wildlife ephemeral (A&We) or Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL).
2 - Surface Water Quality Standards (A.A.C R18-11-101 through Appendix B) selected from lowest of PBC, A&We or AgL.
3 - Average flow rate during the sampling event. m3/s = meters cubed per second.
4 - Hardness of sample event is used to calculate SWQS for Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Sliver, and Zinc.
5 - mg/l = milligram per liter
6 - µg/L = micrograms per liter
7 - CFU/100 ml = colony forming unit per 100 milliliters, MPN = Most probable number per 100 ml
8 - SWQS for Total Metals are denoted with "T". SWQS for Dissolved Metal for A&We are denoted with a "D".
9 - Volatile Organic Compounds
10 - Dash means information unavailable (ie. SWQS was not established or sample was not collected).
11 - Total of α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC, δ-BHC.
12 - Refer to Appendix Q for Analytical Laboratory Reports

Table 10. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #3

PARAMETERS	Standard SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		-		11/22/13		08/26/14		01/30/15		07/05/15		-		6/29/16		-		8/13/17		-	
Conventional Parameters											1.00				1.00				1.00		
Average Flow Rate[3] (m3/s)	-				0.200		0.236		0.178		0.182				0.181				0.169		
pH	6.5-9.0			7.1	7.1	-	-	6.2	6.2	8.5	8.5			6.8	6.8				7.2		
Temperature (°Celcius)	-				18.7		-		16.5		27.4				26.5				24.3		
Hardness[4] (mg/L)[5]	-			23.5	23.5	35.9	35.9	27.1	27.1	28.3	28.3			30.9	30.9			29.5	29.5		
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (mg/L)	-				44		42.9		24.3		48				60				52.9		
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	-				18		28		5.5		7.6				9				4.2		
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) (mg/L)	-				5.5		12.4		3.4		9.5				10.3				2.4		
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) (mg/L)	-				42		107		35		63				83				32		
Inorganics																					
Cyanide, total (µg/L)[6]	84T				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND5.0		
Nutrients																					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)					0.22		0.85		0.2		0.33				0.38				0.37		
Ammonia as N (mg/L)					0.49		0.57		0.54		0.66				0.68				0.32		
TKN (mg/L)					1.03		1.52		0.82		0.75				1.31				ND0.8		
Total Nitrogen					1.25		2.37		1.02		1.08				1.69				0.37		
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)					0.16		0.17		ND		0.18				0.18				ND0.5		
Total Orthophosphate (mg/L)					0.1		0.08		ND		0.09				ND				ND0.05		
Microbiological																					
Escherichia coli (E. coli) (CFU/100 mg or MPN)[7]	575				100		10		59		78.6				43.6				231		
Total Metals8																					
AntimonyT (cg/L)	747				0.79		0.83		0.34		0.52				0.46				0.23		
ArsenicT (µg/L)	200				0.42		1.07		0.32		0.57				0.65				0.71		
BariumT (µg/L)	98,000				14		24.2		8.77		13.2				12.9				9.86		
BeryllliumT (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND1.0		
CadmiumD (µg/L)				6	ND	8	ND	6	ND	7	ND			7	ND			7	ND1.0		
ChromiumT (µg/L)	1,000				0.49		1.24		0.32		0.81				0.56				0.45		
CopperD (µg/L)				5.94	8.70	8.86	13.30	6.80	3.90	7.08	8.46			7.69	8.08			12.11	4.90		
LeadD (µg/L)				27.32	ND	43.97	ND	32.08	ND	33.68	ND			37.18	0.09			63.60	0.08		
MercuryT (µg/L)	10.00				0.287		ND		0.044		ND				ND				ND0.2		
NickelD (µg/L)				1221.36	0.98	1747.95	ND	1377.88	0.31	1429.33	0.77			1539.66	0.87			2313.39	0.35		
SeleniumT (µg/L)	33				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND1.0		
SilverD (µg/L)				0.27	ND1	0.55	ND	0.34	ND	0.37	ND			0.43	ND			0.98	0.04		
ThalliumT (µg/L)	75				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND1.0		
ZincD (µg/L)				325.99	70.00	466.81	50.80	367.84	40.70	381.60	69.30			411.10	63.80			618.08	29.60		
Organic Toxic Pollutants																					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) (mg/L)	-				7.37		9.29		10.8		8.12				1.90				ND2.25		
Total Oil & Grease (mg/L)	-				9.29		19.88		15.41		14.59				2.74				ND4.49		
VOCs[9], Semi-VOCs, and Pesticides																					
Acrolein (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Acrylonitrile (µg/L)	37333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		

Benzene (µg/L)	3733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Bromoform (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	1307				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Chlorobenzene (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Chlorodibromomethane (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Chloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2-chloroethylvinyl ether (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Chloroform (µg/L)	9333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	5,900				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,3-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,4-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	6,500				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,1-dichloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2-dichloroethane (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,1-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	46,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2-dichloropropane (µg/L)	84,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,3-dichloropropylene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Methyl bromide (µg/L)	1,307				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Methyl chloride (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Methylene chloride (µg/L)	56,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Tetrachloroethylene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Toluene (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2-trans-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,1,1-trichloroethane (µg/L)	1,866,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,1,2-trichloroethane (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Trichloroethylene (µg/L)	280				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Trimethylbenzene (µg/L)	-				-		-		-		-				-				-		
Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Xylene (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
SVOCs - Acid Extractables																					
2-chlorophenol (µg/L)	4,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,4-dichlorophenol (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,4-dimethylphenol (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
4,6-dinitro-o-cresol (µg/L)	3,733				-		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,4-dinitrophenol (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
4-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
p-chloro-m-cresol (µg/L)	48,000				-		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Pentachlorophenol (µg/L)				40.6	ND	-	ND	16.5	ND	166.0	ND			30.1	ND			0.0	ND		
Phenol (µg/L)	180,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,4,6-trichlorophenol (µg/L)	130				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
SVOCs - Bases/Neutrals																					
Acenaphthene (µg/L)	56,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Acenaphthylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		

Anthracene (µg/L)	280,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Benzo(a)anthracene (µg/L)	0.2				ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND				ND				ND1.25		
Benzo(a)pyrene (µg/L)	0.2				ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND				ND				ND1.96		
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (µg/L)	1.9				ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND				ND				ND2.29		
Chrysene (µg/L)	19				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (µg/L)	1.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
3,3-dichlorobenzidine (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Diethyl phthalate (µg/L)	746,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Dimethyl phthalate (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Di-n-butyl phthalate (µg/L)	1,100				21.6		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,4-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
2,6-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Di-n-octyl phthalate (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2-diphenylhydrazine (as azobenzene)	1.8				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Fluroranthene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Fluorene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Hexachlorobenzene (µg/L)	747				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Hexachlorobutadiene (µg/L)	187				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene (µg/L)	11,200				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Hexachloroethane (µg/L)	850				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (µg/L)	1.9				ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND				ND				ND2.83		
Isophorone (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Naphthalene (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Nitrobenzene (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
N-nitrosodimethylamine (µg/L)	0.03				ND4.23		ND4.23		ND		ND				ND				ND2.09		
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine (µg/L)	88,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
N-nitrosodiphenylamine (µg/L)	290				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Phenanthrene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Pyrene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
PCB/Pesticides																					
Aldrin (µg/L)	0.003				ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND				ND0.09		
Alpha-BHC (µg/L)	1,600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Beta-BHC (µg/L)	560				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Gamma-BHC (µg/L)	11				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Delta-BHC (µg/L)	1600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Chlordane (µg/L)	3.2				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
4,4’-DDT (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
4,4’-DDE (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
4,4’-DDD (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Dieldrin (µg/L)	0.003				ND0.07		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND				ND0.05		
Alpha-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Beta-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Endosulfan sulfate (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		

Endrin (µg/L)	0.004				ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND				ND0.09		
Endrin aldehyde (µg/L)	0.7				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Heptachlor (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
Heptachlor epoxide (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND				ND		
PCB-1242 (AROCLOR-1242) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND				ND				ND0.23		
PCB-1254 (AROCLOR-1254) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND				ND				ND0.07		
PCB-1221 (AROCLOR-1221) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND				ND0.09		
PCB-1232 (AROCLOR-1232) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND				ND				ND0.11		
PCB-1248 (AROCLOR-1248) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND				ND				ND0.19		
PCB-1260 (AROCLOR-1260) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.25		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND				ND				ND0.10		
PCB-1016 (AROCLOR-1016) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND				ND0.05		
Toxaphene (µg/L)	0.005				ND5.08		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND				ND				ND0.71		

Note:Results higher than SWQ are shown in red font. Non-detectable results with the Method Detection Limit (MDL) above the SWQS are shown as ND with the MDL in parentheses.

1 - Partial Body Contact (PBC), Aquatic & Wildlife ephemeral (A&We) or Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL).
2 - Surface Water Quality Standards (A.A.C R18-11-101 through Appendix B) selected from lowest of PBC, A&We or AgL.
3 - Average flow rate during the sampling event. m3/s = meters cubed per second.
4 - Hardness of sample event is used to calculate SWQS for Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Sliver, and Zinc.
5 - mg/l = milligram per liter
6 - µg/L = micrograms per liter
7 - CFU/100 ml = colony forming unit per 100 milliliters, MPN = Most probable number per 100 ml
8 - SWQS for Total Metals are denoted with "T". SWQS for Dissolved Metal for A&We are denoted with a "D".
9 - Volatile Organic Compounds
10 - Dash means information unavailable (ie. SWQS was not established or sample was not collected).
11 - Total of α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC, δ-BHC.
12 - Refer to Appendix Q for Analytical Laboratory Reports

Table 11. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #4

PARAMETERS	SWQS2	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		-		11/22/13		08/12/14		01/08/15-		09/13/15				09/07/16							
Conventional Parameters											0.35										
Average Flow Rate[3] (m3/s)	-				0.39		0.97		0.3365		0.505				0.945						
pH	6.5-9.0			6.7	6.7	7.5	7.5	8.5	8.5	7.9	7.9			7.6	7.6						
Temperature (°Celcius)	-				17		27.4		13.6		28.4				24.5						
Hardness[4] (mg/L)[5]				50	50	35.4	35.4	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2			29.8	29.8						
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (mg/L)	-				114		98		81.4		97.1				80.0						
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	-				12		27		33		20				25.0						
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) (mg/L)	-				7.3				8.9		8.8				46.8						
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) (mg/L)	-				50				78		81				239						
Inorganics																					
Cyanide, total (µg/L)[6]	84T				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Nutrients																					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)					0.39		0.62		0.34		1.01				0.18						
Ammonia as N (mg/L)					0.46		0.64		0.67		0.97				0.28						
TKN (mg/L)					1.43		1.34		1.1		ND				1.07						
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)					1.82		1.96		1.44		1.01				1.25						
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)					0.1		0.19		0.13		0.13				0.14						
Total Orthophosphate (mg/L)					0.09		0.09		0.06		0.04				ND						
Microbiological																					
Escherichia coli (E. coli) (CFU/100 mg or MPN)[7]	575				1178		1850		249		384				3100						
Total Metals[8]																					
AntimonyT (µg/L)	747				1.46		1.33		1.82		1.48				0.98						
ArsenicT (µg/L)	200				1.13		1.35		120		0.95				0.67						
BariumT (µg/L)	98,000				33.7		32.1		40.3		25.9				25.5						
BerylliumT (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
CadmiumD (µg/L)				12	ND	8	ND	9	ND	9	ND			7	0.22						
ChromiumT (µg/L)	1000				0.79		1.58		1.9		1.9				1						
CopperD (µg/L)				12.11	16.00	8.74	23.10	9.39	9.51	9.39	12.60			7.43	6.98						
LeadD (µg/L)				63.60	0.47	43.29	ND	47.13	0.41	47.13	0.32			35.69	6.29						
MercuryT (µg/L)	10				0.185		-		ND		ND				ND						
NickelD (µg/L)				2313.39	2.20	1727.34	1.10	1842.24	1.36	1842.24	0.92			1493.16	0.54						
SeleniumT (µg/L)	33				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
SilverD (µg/L)				0.98	ND1.0	0.54	ND	0.61	ND	0.61	ND			0.40	0.63						
ThalliumT (µg/L)	75				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
ZincD (µg/L)				618.08	67.60	461.29	73.10	492.02	58.10	492.02	62.00			398.66	26.90						
Organic Toxic Pollutants																					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) (mg/L)	-				6.67		7.53		9.76		7.06				3.78						
Total Oil & Grease (mg/L)	-				7.07		13.65		14.88		10.12				5.00						
VOCs[9], Semi-VOCs, and Pesticides																					
Acrolein (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Acrylonitrile (µg/L)	37333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						

PARAMETERS	SWQS2	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**-**		**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**01/08/15-**		**09/13/15**				**09/07/16**							
Benzene (µg/L)	3733				ND		0.03		ND		ND				ND						
Bromoform (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	1307				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chlorobenzene (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chlorodibromomethane (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2-chloroethylvinyl ether (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Chloroform (µg/L)	9333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	18667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	5,900				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,3-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,4-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	6,500				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1-dichloroethane (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichloroethane (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	46,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-dichloropropane (µg/L)	84,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,3-dichloropropylene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Methyl bromide (µg/L)	1,307				ND		ND		ND		0.21				ND						
Methyl chloride (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Methylene chloride (µg/L)	56,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane (µg/L)	93,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Tetrachloroethylene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Toluene (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-trans-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,1-trichloroethane (µg/L)	1,866,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,1,2-trichloroethane (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Trichloroethylene (µg/L)	280				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Trimethylbenzene (µg/L)	-				-		-		-		-				ND						
Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Xylene (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
SVOCs - Acid Extractables																					
2-chlorophenol (µg/L)	4,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dichlorophenol (µg/L)	2,800				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dimethylphenol (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,6-dinitro-o-cresol (µg/L)	3,733				-		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,4-dinitrophenol (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
p-chloro-m-cresol (µg/L)	48,000				-		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Pentachlorophenol (µg/L)				27.2	ND	60.8	ND	166.0	ND	90.8	ND			67.2	ND						
Phenol (µg/L)	180,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						

PARAMETERS	SWQS2	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**-**		**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**01/08/15-**		**09/13/15**				**09/07/16**							
2,4,6-trichlorophenol (µg/L)	130				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
SVOCs - Bases/Neutrals																					
Acenaphthene (µg/L)	56,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Acenaphthylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Anthracene (µg/L)	280,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(a)anthracene (µg/L)	0.2				ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND				ND						
Benzo(a)pyrene (µg/L)	0.2				ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND				ND						
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (µg/L)	1.9				ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND				ND						
Chrysene (µg/L)	19				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (µg/L)	1.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
3,3-dichlorobenzidine (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Diethyl phthalate (µg/L)	746,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dimethyl phthalate (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Di-n-butyl phthalate (µg/L)	1,100				25		10.7		2.03		ND				8.72						
2,4-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	1,867				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
2,6-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	3,733				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Di-n-octyl phthalate (µg/L)	373,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2-diphenylhydrazine (as azobenzene)	1.8				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Fluroranthene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Fluorene (µg/L)	37,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorobenzene (µg/L)	747				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorobutadiene (µg/L)	187				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene (µg/L)	11,200				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Hexachloroethane (µg/L)	850				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (µg/L)	1.9				ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND				ND						
Isophorone (µg/L)	186,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Naphthalene (µg/L)	18,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Nitrobenzene (µg/L)	467				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodimethylamine (µg/L)	0.03				ND4.23		ND4.23		ND4.23		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine (µg/L)	88,667				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
N-nitrosodiphenylamine (µg/L)	290				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Phenanthrene (µg/L)	-				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Pyrene (µg/L)	28,000				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (µg/L)	9,333				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
PCB/Pesticides																					
Aldrin (µg/L)	0.003				ND0.1		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND						
Alpha-BHC (µg/L)	1,600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Beta-BHC (µg/L)	560				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Gamma-BHC (µg/L)	11				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Delta-BHC (µg/L)	1600				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						

PARAMETERS	SWQS2	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**-**		**11/22/13**		**08/12/14**		**01/08/15-**		**09/13/15**				**09/07/16**							
Chlordane (µg/L)	3.2				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDT (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDE (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
4,4'-DDD (µg/L)	1.1				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Dieldrin (µg/L)	0.003				ND0.07		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND						
Alpha-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Beta-endosulfan (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Endosulfan sulfate (µg/L)	3				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Endrin (µg/L)	0.004				ND		ND		ND0.09		ND				ND						
Endrin aldehyde (µg/L)	0.7				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Heptachlor (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
Heptachlor epoxide (µg/L)	0.9				ND		ND		ND		ND				ND						
PCB-1242 (AROCLOR-1242) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND				ND						
PCB-1254 (AROCLOR-1254) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND				ND						
PCB-1221 (AROCLOR-1221) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND				ND						
PCB-1232 (AROCLOR-1232) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND				ND						
PCB-1248 (AROCLOR-1248) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.16		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND				ND						
PCB-1260 (AROCLOR-1260) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.25		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND				ND						
PCB-1016 (AROCLOR-1016) (µg/L)	0.001				ND0.10		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND				ND						
Toxaphene (µg/L)	0.005				ND5.08		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND				ND						

Note:Results higher than SWQ are shown in red font. Non-detectable results with the Method Detection Limit (MDL) above the SWQS are shown as ND with the MDL in parentheses.

1 - Partial Body Contact (PBC), Aquatic & Wildlife ephemeral (A&We) or Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL).
2 - Surface Water Quality Standards (A.A.C R18-11-101 through Appendix B) selected from lowest of PBC, A&We or AgL.
3 - Average flow rate during the sampling event. m3/s = meters cubed per second.
4 - Hardness of sample event is used to calculate SWQS for Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Sliver, and Zinc.
5 - mg/l = milligram per liter
6 - µg/L = micrograms per liter
7 - CFU/100 ml = colony forming unit per 100 milliliters, MPN = Most probable number per 100 ml
8 - SWQS for Total Metals are denoted with "T". SWQS for Dissolved Metal for A&We are denoted with a "D".
9 - Volatile Organic Compounds
10 - Dash means information unavailable (ie. SWQS was not established or sample was not collected).
11 - Total of α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC, δ-BHC.
12 - Refer to Appendix Q for Analytical Laboratory Reports

Table 12. Water Quality Data Monitor Site #5

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**07/05/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/13/15**		**01/04/16**		**08/09/16**		**12/22/16**		**-**		**-**	
Conventional Parameters			0.5								0.042131				0.9917		0.0083				
Average Flow Rate[3] (m3/s)	-		0.0206		0.0206		0.0403		0.00508		0.00117		0.0266		1.0915		0.00911				
pH	6.5-9.0	7.6	7.6	6.8	6.8	7.5	7.5	6.8	6.8	8.5	8.5	6.4	6.4	8.7	8.7		7.9				
Temperature (°Celcius)	-		27.5		15.4		27.4		14.1		31.7		10.3		26.3		14.5				
Hardness[4] (mg/L)[5]		185	185	86.7	86.7	466	466	55.6	55.6	101	101	112	112	175	175		55.1				
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (mg/L)	-		269		162		620		104		166		121		100		154				
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	-		336		68		1020		35.5		202		203		468		40				
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD)	-		37.4		11.7		81.7		5.8		28.9		10.7		5.2		15.8				
Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	-		244		65		450		52		205		101		91		99				
Inorganics																					
Cyanide, total (µg/L)[6]	84T		2.43		ND		2.62		ND		2.37		ND				ND				
Nutrients																					
Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)			4.35		1.47		8.31		1.68		1.21		3.25		0.85		2.92				
Ammonia as N (mg/L)			1.28		0.36		2.04		0.19		1.01		0.22		0.35		0.29				
TKN (mg/L)			5.75		1.83		10.9		0.67		3.22		1.81		2.33		2.27				
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)			10.10		3.30		19.21		2.35		4.43		5.06		3.18		5.48				
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)			1.02		0.48		2.01		0.19		0.78		0.54		0.6		0.55				
Total Orthophosphate (mg/L)			0.45		0.29		0.6		0.1		0.43		0.22		ND		0.38				
Microbiological																					
Escherichia coli (CFU/100 mg or MPN)[7]	575		11199		3873		181		7270		450		551		6130		3080				
Total Metals8																					
AntimonyT (µg/L)	747		2.28		4.5		2.85		0.78		1.66		0.85		0.64		0.95				
ArsenicT (µg/L)	200		5.6		3.21		12		1.69		2.82		2.2		5.38		2.15				
BariumT (µg/L)	98,000		19.3		81.2		519		53.6		90.2		92.1		165		53.5				
BerylliumT (µg/L)	1,867		0.39		ND		1.05		ND		ND		ND		0.29		ND				
CadmiumD (µg/L)		20	ND	20	ND	88	ND	13	ND	23	ND	25	ND	39	ND		0.23				
ChromiumT (µg/L)	1000		1.41		1.38		31		2.92		4.9		2.79		6.96		3.65				
CopperD (µg/L)		41.53	60.20	20.33	28.90	85.88	132.00	13.38	17.10	23.48	32.90	25.88	23.40	39.41	12.00	13.27	35.20				
LeadD (µg/L)		264.46	1.94	116.64	1.03	592.71	2.56	71.54	0.59	137.78	1.78	154.16	0.61	249.24	0.40		10.30				
MercuryT (µg/L)	10		ND0.2		0.136		0.272		ND		ND		0.08		ND		ND				
NickelD (µg/L)		6997.58	3.29	3685.40	1.28	13435.79	6.32	2530.78	1.00	4193.50	2.17	4576.77	1.04	6676.22	0.63		3.03				
SeleniumT (µg/L)	33		0.34		0.82		4.23		ND		2.28		0.85		3.48		1.04				
SilverD (µg/L)		9.27	ND1.0	2.52	ND	34.91	ND	1.17	ND	3.27	ND	3.91	ND	8.42	0.17	1.15	0.15				
ThalliumT (µg/L)	75		0.18		ND		0.4		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
ZincD (µg/L)		1872.75	34.70	985.34	12.50	3599.40	59.30	676.25	6.65	1121.41	36.20	1224.07	6.52	1786.61	2.86		65.50				
Organic Toxic Pollutants																					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)	-		2.00		7.88		7.3		11.06		8.59		9.00		2.33		5.06				
Total Oil & Grease (mg/L)	-		2.89		10.61		25.23		6.24		11.88		29.56		3.49		5.84				
VOCs9, Semi-VOCs, and Pesticides																					
Acrolein (µg/L)	467		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Acrylonitrile (µg/L)	37333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**07/05/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/13/15**		**01/04/16**		**08/09/16**		**12/22/16**		**-**		**-**	
Benzene (µg/L)	3733		ND		ND		0.05		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Bromoform (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Carbon tetrachloride (µg/L)	1307		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Chlorobenzene (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Chlorodibromomethane (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Chloroethane (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2-chloroethylvinyl ether (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Chloroform (µg/L)	9333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	18667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	5,900		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,3-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		0.11		ND		0.11		ND				
1,4-dichlorobenzene (µg/L)	6,500		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,1-dichloroethane (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2-dichloroethane (µg/L)	186,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,1-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	46,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2-dichloropropane (µg/L)	84,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,3-dichloropropylene (µg/L)	28,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	93,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Methyl bromide (µg/L)	1,307		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Methyl chloride (µg/L)	-		ND		0.11		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Methylene chloride (µg/L)	56,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane (µg/L)	93,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Tetrachloroethylene (µg/L)	9,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Toluene (µg/L)	373,333		ND		0.06		0.09		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2-trans-dichloroethylene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,1,1-trichloroethane (µg/L)	1,866,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,1,2-trichloroethane (µg/L)	3,733		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Trichloroethylene (µg/L)	280		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Trimethylbenzene (µg/L)	-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-				
Vinyl chloride (µg/L)	2,800		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Xylene (µg/L)	186,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
SVOCs - Acid Extractables																					
2-chlorophenol (µg/L)	4,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2,4-dichlorophenol (µg/L)	2,800		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2,4-dimethylphenol (µg/L)	18,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
4,6-dinitro-o-cresol (µg/L)	3,733		-		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2,4-dinitrophenol (µg/L)	1,867		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
4-nitrophenol (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
p-chloro-m-cresol (µg/L)	48,000		-		-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Pentachlorophenol (µg/L)		67.2	ND	30.1	ND	60.8	ND	30.1	ND	166.0	ND	20.1	ND	202.9	ND	0.00	ND				
Phenol (µg/L)	180,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**07/05/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/13/15**		**01/04/16**		**08/09/16**		**12/22/16**		**-**		**-**	
2,4,6-trichlorophenol (µg/L)	130		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
SVOCs - Bases/Neutrals																					
Acenaphthene (µg/L)	56,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Acenaphthylene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Anthracene (µg/L)	280,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Benzo(a)anthracene (µg/L)	0.2		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.44		ND1.25		ND1.44		ND1.25				
Benzo(a)pyrene (µg/L)	0.2		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.55		ND1.96		ND1.55		ND1.96				
Benzo(b)fluoranthene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Benzo(k)fluoranthene (µg/L)	1.9		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.28		ND2.29		ND2.28		ND2.29				
Chrysene (µg/L)	19		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene (µg/L)	1.9		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
3,3-dichlorobenzidine (µg/L)	3		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Diethyl phthalate (µg/L)	746,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		7.09		ND		7.09		ND				
Dimethyl phthalate (µg/L)	-		ND		8.7		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Di-n-butyl phthalate (µg/L)	1,100		ND		ND		ND		1.69		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2,4-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	1,867		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
2,6-dinitrotoluene (µg/L)	3,733		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Di-n-octyl phthalate (µg/L)	373,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2-diphenylhydrazine (as azobenzene)	1.8		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Fluroranthene (µg/L)	37,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Fluorene (µg/L)	37,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Hexachlorobenzene (µg/L)	747		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Hexachlorobutadiene (µg/L)	187		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene (µg/L)	11,200		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Hexachloroethane (µg/L)	850		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (µg/L)	1.9		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.25		ND2.83		ND2.25		ND2.83				
Isophorone (µg/L)	186,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Naphthalene (µg/L)	18,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Nitrobenzene (µg/L)	467		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
N-nitrosodimethylamine (µg/L)	0.03		ND4.23		ND4.23		ND4.23		-		ND4.23		ND2.09		ND4.23		ND2.09				
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine (µg/L)	88,667		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
N-nitrosodiphenylamine (µg/L)	290		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Phenanthrene (µg/L)	-		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Pyrene (µg/L)	28,000		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (µg/L)	9,333		ND		ND		ND		ND		0.12		ND		0.12		ND				
PCB/Pesticides																					
Aldrin (µg/L)	0.003		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09				
Alpha-BHC (µg/L)	1,600		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Beta-BHC (µg/L)	560		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Gamma-BHC (µg/L)	11		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Delta-BHC (µg/L)	1600		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				

PARAMETERS	SWQS[2]	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2013	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2013-14	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2014	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2014-15	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2015	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2015-16	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2016	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2016-17	Hardness SWQS	Summer 2017	Hardness SWQS	Winter 2017-18
Date		**07/05/13**		**11/22/13**		**07/05/14**		**12/13/14**		**07/13/15**		**01/04/16**		**08/09/16**		**12/22/16**		**-**		**-**	
Chlordane (µg/L)	3.2		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
4,4'-DDT (µg/L)	1.1		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
4,4'-DDE (µg/L)	1.1		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
4,4'-DDD (µg/L)	1.1		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Dieldrin (µg/L)	0.003		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05				
Alpha-endosulfan (µg/L)	3		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Beta-endosulfan (µg/L)	3		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Endosulfan sulfate (µg/L)	3		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Endrin (µg/L)	0.004		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09				
Endrin aldehyde (µg/L)	0.7		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Heptachlor (µg/L)	0.9		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
Heptachlor epoxide (µg/L)	0.9		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND		ND				
PCB-1242 (AROCLOR-1242) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.1		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23		ND0.23				
PCB-1254 (AROCLOR-1254) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.19		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07		ND0.07				
PCB-1221 (AROCLOR-1221) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09		ND0.09				
PCB-1232 (AROCLOR-1232) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.16		ND0.16		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11		ND0.11				
PCB-1248 (AROCLOR-1248) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.16		ND0.16		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19		ND0.19				
PCB-1260 (AROCLOR-1260) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.25		ND0.25		ND0.1		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.10				
PCB-1016 (AROCLOR-1016) (µg/L)	0.001		ND0.10		ND0.10		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05		ND0.05				
Toxaphene (µg/L)	0.005		ND5.08		ND5.08		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71		ND0.71				

Note: Results higher than SWQ are shown in red font. Non-detectable results with the Method Detection Limit (MDL) above the SWQS are shown as ND with the MDL in parentheses.

1 - Partial Body Contact (PBC), Aquatic & Wildlife ephemeral (A&We) or Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL).
2 - Surface Water Quality Standards (A.A.C R18-11-101 through Appendix B) selected from lowest of PBC, A&We or AgL.
3 - Average flow rate during the sampling event. m3/s = meters cubed per second.
4 - Hardness of sample event is used to calculate SWQS for Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Sliver, and Zinc.
5 - mg/l = milligram per liter
6 - µg/L = micrograms per liter
7 - CFU/100 ml = colony forming unit per 100 milliliters, MPN = Most probable number per 100 ml
8 - SWQS for Total Metals are denoted with "T". SWQS for Dissolved Metal for A&We are denoted with a "D".
9 - Volatile Organic Compounds
10 - Dash means information unavailable (ie. SWQS was not established or sample was not collected).
11 - Total of α-BHC, β-BHC, γ-BHC,
12 - Refer to Appendix Q for Analytical Laboratory Reports

10. Assessment of Monitoring Data

A. Stormwater Quality

This report is the seventh of a five year permit that has been administratively continued. Stormwater from all five sites were sampled in the fiscal year and all five sites were sampled for 133 compounds under the expanded list of parameters. Sufficient data has been collected to discern the difference between outliers and trends in the water quality parameters.

B. Surface Water Quality Standards (SWQS)

Analytical results from the sampling period were tabulated along with the applicable SWQS (Part 9). Results higher than SWQS are also reported (Tables 13 through 17, Figures 4 through 8) and discussed. Several parameters, namely Benzo(a)anthracene, Benzo(a)pyrene, Benzo(k)fluoranthene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, N-nitrosodi-methylamine, Aldrin, Dieldrin, Endrin, 7 PCBs and Toxaphene, have Method Detection Limits (MDLs) that are higher than the Surface Water Quality Standards established for the designated uses of the watersheds draining to the five monitor sites. The MDL used by the primary laboratory has been accepted by ADHS under laboratory license AZO159 for the associated methods, as shown in Appendix Q. MDLs are performed in accordance with 40 CFR, part 136 Appendix B. Alteration of this method is considered a major modification and may not be performed without permission from ADHS and Region 9 EPA so the analytical methods limit the direct comparison of results to SWQSs. Two VOCs, Diethyl phthalate and Di-n-butyl phthalate, used as plasticizers, were detected at very low concentrations. Given there were no other organic compounds detected, the stormwater was likely free of the compounds with MDLs above the SWQSs.

C. Pollutant Concentration Greater than Applicable SWQS

A brief summary of the water quality results is provided for the two summer samples. Elevated dissolved copper concentration was observed for Site 2 for the first time at 32.2 µg/L. Elevated *E. coli* concentrations was also observed for Site 2 at 2,010 Most Probable Number. No other parameters were above a SWQS.

A historical description of the water quality parameters that are higher than the SWQS has been prepared for each wet weather monitor site. The data is tabulated and charts are provided for copper and *E. coli* to illustrate temporal trends.

Table 13. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #1

Site ID: 1 Receiving Water: Rillito	**Summer 2011**	**Winter 2011-12**	**Summer 2012**	**Winter 2012-13**	**Summer 2013**	**Winter 2013-14**	**Summer 2014**	**Winter 2014-15**	**Summer 2015**	**Winter 2015-16**	**Summer 2016**	**Winter 2016-17**	**Summer 2017**	**Winter 2017-18**
Sample Date	07/04/11	-	07/15/12	12/14/12	-	11/22/13	08/12/14	12/17/14	09/21/15	-	09/07/16	-	-	-
Hardness (mg/L)	67.0	-	30.7	37.4	-	26.0	54.5	88.9	58.0	-	105.0	-	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	15.9	-	7.6	9.2	-	6.5	13.1	20.8	13.9	-	24.4	-	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	30.8	-	5.8	3.3	-	4.2	5.3	1.9	1.45	-	2.8	-	-	-
Result > SWQS?	Yes	-	No	No	-	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	-	0.42	0.59	-	0.32	1.13	2.63	1.26	-	3.5	-	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	-	<1	2.66	-	<1	<1	<1	<1	-	42.9	-	-	-
Result > SWQS?	-	-	No	Yes	-	No	No	No	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
E.coli Result (MPN)	48,840	-	10	41	-	10	487	15,500	1300	-	200	-	-	-
Result>SWQS?(575 MPN)	Yes	-	No	-	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	-	No	-	-	-
pH Result (SU)	6.4	-	7.6	8.1	-	6.9	8.0	7.0	8.6	-	7	-	-	-
Results > SWQS (6.5-9.0)	Yes	-	No	No	-	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	-	-

* Concentrations are in micrograms per liter, unless noted otherwise.



Figure 3. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #1

The overall trend for water quality at Site #1, low density residential land use, shows a decrease in dissolved copper. Dissolved copper concentrations have been below the SWQS since July 2012. *E. coli* concentrations have been below the SWQS five times and above the SWQS three times. The high *E. coli* concentrations could be related to improper pet waste management or wildlife waste. The site is next to a wash, which acts as a wildlife corridor. There was a one-time occurrence of dissolved silver and pH that were outside the SWQS.

Further actions are not recommended for this wet weather monitoring site.

Table 14. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #2

Site ID: 2 **Receiving Water: Rillito**	**Summer 2011**	**Winter 2011-12**	**Summer 2012**	**Winter 2012-13**	**Summer 2013**	**Winter 2013-14**	**Summer 2014**	**Winter 2014-15**	**Summer 2015**	**Winter 2015-16**	**Summer 2016**	**Winter 2016-17**	**Summer 2017**	**Winter 2017-18**
Sample Date	-	03/18/12	-	01/26/13	08/22/13	11/22/13	07/05/14	12/13/14	07/05/15	01/04/16	7/28/2016	12/17/2016	7/11/2017	-
Hardness (mg/L)	-	50.0	-	48.9	147.0	62.5	154.0	57.7	87.2	82.2	64.3	53.5	54.7	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	12.1	-	11.9	33.4	14.9	34.9	13.9	20.4	19.3	15.3	12.9	13.2	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	61.0	-	6.4	8.2	7.5	14.4	11.8	13.0	9.0	19.7	11.5	32.2	-
Result > SWQS?	-	Yes	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	no	Yes	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	1.0	-	0.9	6.2	1.4	6.8	1.3	2.5	2.3	1.5	1.1	1.1	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	<1	-	<1	<1	<1	1.14	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	-
Result > SWQS?	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-
E.coli Result (MPN)	-	30	-	4,884	19,863	4,884	24,810	14,400	14,100	12,000	582	19,900	2,010	-
Result>SWQS?(575 MPN)	-	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-
pH Result (SU)	-	7.5	-	8.7	-	6.7	6.4	6.4	8.4	8.0	7.7	6.7	7.5	-
Results > SWQS (6.5-9.0)	-	No	-	No	-	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-

* Concentrations are in micrograms per liter, unless noted otherwise.





Figure 4. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #2

The overall trend for water quality at Site #2, medium density residential land use, shows dissolved copper concentrations are typically below the SWQS; however, a spike occurred in the summer of 2017. The *E. Coli* concentrations have been consistently higher than the SWQS since the first sampling in 2011. Two samples had a slightly pH outside the SWQS indicative of acidic conditions in the second half of 2014. The pH has been in the normal range since 2015. The high E. coli concentrations could be related to improper pet waste management in the medium density residential neighborhood. An outreach program is being developed to educate the neighborhood.

The outreach program planned to be implemented in FY17/18 has been delayed to FY18/19 in order to train the addition of new personnel to the stormwater management program.

Table 15. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #3

Site ID: 3 **Receiving Water: Rillito**	**Summer 2011**	**Winter 2011-12**	**Summer 2012**	**Winter 2012-13**	**Summer 2013**	**Winter 2013-14**	**Summer 2014**	**Winter 2014-15**	**Summer 2015**	**Winter 2015-16**	**Summer 2016**	**Winter 2016-17**	**Summer 2017**	**Winter 2017-18**
Sample Date	09/10/11	03/18/12	07/20/12	12/14/12	-	11/22/13	08/26/14	01/30/15	07/05/15	-	6/29/2016	-	8/13/2017	-
Hardness (mg/L)	50.0	50.0	27.4	13.4	-	23.5	35.9	27.1	28.3	-	30.9	-	29.5	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	12.1	12.1	6.9	3.5	-	5.9	8.9	6.8	7.08	-	7.69	-	12.11	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	<1	21.0	10.9	4.7	-	8.7	13.3	3.9	8.46	-	8.08	-	4.9	-
Result > SWQS?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	1.0	0.4	1.0	-	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.4	-	0.43	-	0.98	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	<1	<1	2.3	-	<1	<1	<1	<1	-	<1	-	<1	-
Result > SWQS?	-	No	No	Yes	-	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	No	-
E.coli Result (MPN)	7,701	10	20	63	-	100	10	59	78.6	-	43.6	-	231	-
Result>SWQS?(575 MPN)	Yes	No	No	No	-	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	No	-
pH Result (SU)	6.3	7.4	7.2	7.5	-	7.1	-	6.2	8.5	-	6.8	-	7.2	-
Results > SWQS (6.5-9.0)	Yes	No	No	No	-	No	-	Yes	No	-	No	-	No	-

* Concentrations are in micrograms per liter, unless noted otherwise.



Figure 5 Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #3

The overall trend for water quality at Site #3, high density residential land use, shows dissolved copper concentrations have been slightly higher than the SWQS until the most recent sample when the concentration declined below the SWQS. Aside from the first sampling event, *E. Coli* concentrations have consistently been below the SWQS, reflective of the neighborhood members taking pet waste management very seriously. The dissolved silver concentration was above the SWQS once. The pH has been outside the SWQS range twice.

No further actions are recommended for this site.

Table 16. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #4

Site ID: 4 **Receiving Water: Rillito**	**Summer 2011**	**Winter 2011-12**	**Summer 2012**	**Winter 2012-13**	**Summer 2013**	**Winter 2013-14**	**Summer 2014**	**Winter 2014-15**	**Summer 2015**	**Winter 2015-16**	**Summer 2016**	**Winter 2016-17**	**Summer 2017**	**Winter 2017-18**
Sample Date	09/27/11	03/18/12	07/15/12	12/14/12	-	11/22/13	08/12/14	01/30/15	09/13/15	-	9/7/2016	-	-	-
Hardness (mg/L)	54.0	50.0	42.3	90.9	-	50.0	35.4	38.2	38.2	-	24.5	-	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	10	12.1	10.3	21.3	-	12.1	8.7	9.4	9.4	-	7.43	-	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	29.6	29.0	12.9	12.7	-	16.0	23.1	9.5	12.6	-	7.0	-	-	-
Result > SWQS?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	No	-	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	1	0.7	2.7	-	1	0.5	0.6	0.6	-	0.4	-	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	<1	0.2	1.0	-	<1	<1	<1	<1	-	0.63	-	-	-
Result > SWQS?	-	No	No	No	-	No	No	No	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
E.coli Result (MPN)	12,997	697	1,789	1,850	-	1,178	1,850	249	384	-	3100	-	-	-
Result>SWQS?(575 MPN)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	No	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
pH Result (SU)	7.0	7.4	7.7	7.8	-	6.7	7.5	8.5	7.9	-	7.6	-	-	-
Results > SWQS (6.5-9.0)	No	No	No	No	-	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	-	-

* Concentrations are in micrograms per liter, unless noted otherwise.



Figure 6. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #4

The overall trend for water quality at Site #4, commercial land use, shows dissolved copper concentrations have consistently been higher than the SWQS, with the exception of the 12/14/12 and 09/07/16 samples. *E. coli* concentrations have been above the SWQS, with the exception of the 12/14/12 and 09/07/16 samples. The dissolved silver concentration was slightly higher than the SWQS once. The pH has consistently met the SWQS.

An outreach program is being developed to approach the commercial owners about adding pet waste stations as a way of reducing microbiologic pollution in stormwater. The program intended to be implemented in FY17/18 was delayed to FY18/19 to allow training of new personnel added to the stormwater management program.

Table 17. Summary of Parameters with Concentrations* Higher than SWQS at Site #5

Site ID: 5 Receiving Water: Santa Cruz	**Summer 2011**	**Winter 2011-12**	**Summer 2012**	**Winter 2012-13**	**Summer 2013**	**Winter 2013-14**	**Summer 2014**	**Winter 2014-15**	**Summer 2015**	**Winter 2015-16**	**Summer 2016**	**Winter 2016-17**	**Summer 2017**	**Winter 2017-18**
Sample Date	07/04/11	12/03/11	07/04/12	01/26/13	07/05/13	11/22/13	07/05/14	12/13/14	07/13/15	01/04/16	8/9/2016	12/22/2016	-	-
Hardness (mg/L)	105.0	80.0	143.0	68.7	185.0	86.7	466.0	55.6	101.0	112.0	175	55.1	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	24.2	18.9	32.6	16.3	41.5	20.3	85.9	13.4	23.48	25.88	39.4	13.3	-	-
$Copper_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	35.0	33.0	41.2	19.8	60.2	28.9	132.0	17.1	32.9	23.4	12.0	35.2	-	-
Result > SWQS?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ SWQS (µg/L)	-	2.2	6	1.7	9.3	2.5	34.9	1.2	3.3	3.9	8.42	1.15	-	-
$Silver_{Dissolved}$ Result (µg/L)	-	<1	0.8	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0.15	-	-
Result > SWQS?	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	-	-
E.coli Result (MPN)	242,000	4,611	52	4,106	11,199	3,873	181	7,270	450	551	6,130	3,080	-	-
Result>SWQS?(575 MPN)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	-	-
pH Result (SU)	6.5	8.5	7.8	8.0	7.6	6.8	7.5	6.8	8.4	6.4	8.7	7.9	-	-
Results > SWQS (6.5-9.0)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	-	-

* Concentrations are in micrograms per liter, unless noted otherwise.



Figure 7. Comparison of Copper and *E. coli* Concentration to SWQS at Site #5

The overall trend for water quality at Site #5, industrial land use, shows that dissolved copper has consistently been above the SWQS, with the exception of the 01/04/16 and 08/09/16 samples. The summer 2014 sample was anomalously high for metals and Total Suspended Solids. Summer concentrations are relatively higher than winter samples indicating seasonal influences that may be related to higher intensity summer storms mobilizing particulates that in turn increase concentrations. *E. coli* concentrations have been higher than the SWQS seven times in five years. One pH has been outside the SWQS.

The businesses in this watershed use guard dogs to maintain security. The outreach program developed for Site #2 will be enhanced to address pet wastes from guard dogs at businesses.

A literature review of copper concentration in runoff provides a frame work to compare ambient copper concentrations with those in urban runoff in Pima County and mining district streams. The ambient surface water quality is established by stream data from Cienega Creek, Davidson Canyon, and Harshaw Creek. Near the confluence of Cienega Creek and Davidson Canyon, the concentration of total copper ranged between 1.0 to 2.2 µg/L from stream samples collected between September 2008 and February 2012 (PAG, 2013). The natural background level of dissolved copper in the Harshaw Creek ranged between 2.01 and 3.59 µg/L (ADEQ, 2003). The runoff data from the five monitor sites shows the dissolved copper concentrations range from 3.3 to 132 µg/L since the new permit became effective in July 2011. During the previous permit the total copper concentrations ranged between 1 and 260 µg/L. The few concentrations higher than 100 µg/L were associated with samples having a Total Suspended Solids concentration greater than 230 mg/L (PDEQ, 2011).

Additional data from mining areas in southern Arizona show the maximum dissolved copper concentration was 130 µg/L in the ASARCO Mission Complex (EPA, 2008) and was frequently above 250 µg/L in the mining districts in Alum Gulch and Humboldt Canyon (ADEQ, 2012). This analysis shows ambient dissolved copper concentrations range from 1.0 to 4 µg/L, while urban runoff ranges between 1 to 132 µg/L and mining areas are typically higher than 130 µg/L.

Sources of copper in stormwater include vehicle brake pads; architectural copper; copper pesticides in landscaping, wood preservatives and pool, spa, and fountain algaecides; industrial copper use; deposition of air-borne copper emissions from fossil fuel combustion and industrial facilities; and vehicle fluid leaks and dumping (TDC Environmental, 2006). The Brake Pad Partnership showed brakes account for 35 to 60 percent of copper in California's urban watershed runoff (Copper Development Association, 2013). A study of runoff from copper roofs and gutters shows first flush concentrations immediately downstream from the roof have a mean greater than 1340 ug/L for both total and dissolved copper (Michels, et al, 2001). This study noted roofs with the oxidation by-product brochantite release about half as much as cooper roofs exposed to air.

The outreach program was once intended to include vehicle maintenance for brake pads as well as using pads with lower concentrations of copper. Given the brake manufacturing industry has decided to phase out the use of copper in brake pads in fifteen years, the outreach program will not be providing education materials regarding brake pads. Reviewing the most recent samples for the five sites, only two have shown elevated copper concentrations.

(This page is intentionally blank).

11. Estimate of Annual Pollutant Load

A. Method of estimating Pollutant Load

Estimates of the annual pollutant loadings were calculated using the "Simple Method" (SMRC, 2012). The Simple Method uses analytical water quality data, precipitation and percent impervious cover to estimate pollutant loadings in urban areas. The data collected at five monitor points represent five land uses within the MS4, namely low density residential, medium density residential, high density residential, commercial, and industrial. Pima County calculated the annual pollutant load estimate for each Monitor Site and each land use category within the permit area.

The following sections describe the methods Pima County used to calculate statistics and estimate the seasonal pollutant load. The results are presented and evaluated.

The amount of pollutants are estimated by multiplying the volume of water that runs off from a precipitation event and the concentration of the pollutants. Runoff is estimated as a fraction of the precipitation based on the type of land use permeability. Pollutant concentration is measured by collecting the stormwater samples after a representative precipitation event occurs. The pollutant load equation is as follows:

$$L = P * P_f * R_c * C * A * 0.0446$$

where

L = annual pollutant load (tons)
P = annual precipitation (inches)
P_f = annual precipitation fraction producing runoff (given a value of 0.9)
R_c = runoff coefficient (unitless)
C = concentration (event mean) of a pollutant (mg/L)
A = area of catchment draining to sample point (acres)
0.0446 = correction factor for measurement units

The parameters in the equation above are defined as follows:

- ***Pollutant load (L)*** is the estimate of total amount of a specific pollutant discharged per time period for the drainage area of each monitor site. The time period employed for this report was both annual and seasonal (winter and summer).

- ***Annual Precipitation***[1] ***(P)*** is the total inches of rainfall occurring during the reporting period July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. Analysis of available rainfall data for the Tucson metropolitan area shows approximately 52% (or 13.17 cm) of the annual rainfall occurs

[1] The use of average rainfall data for pollutant load calculations de-emphasizes the effect of spatial rainfall variability. This, in turn, makes aggregation of pollutant load estimates less reliable.

during the summer season and 48% (or 12.16 cm) of the annual rainfall occurs during the winter season.

- ***Annual Precipitation fraction***[2] ***(P_f)*** is an adjustment factor for the number of storm events producing measurable runoff. A typical value for this fraction is 0.9 (USEPA, 1992).

- ***Runoff coefficient (Rc)*** is a relative measure of imperviousness, or the percentage of rainfall that becomes surface runoff (EPA, 1992). The following equation was used to calculate "*R*" values for each representative land use category associated with an outfall (EPA, 1992):

  $$R = 0.05 + 0.9*Ia$$

  where *Ia* is the percent impervious area within the drainage area of each monitor site.

- ***Event-mean concentration***[3] ***(C)*** of a pollutant is the flow-weighted average of the pollutant concentration for the summer monsoon sample and the winter rain sample.

  C = Fs/(Fs+Fw)*Cs + Fw/(Fs +Fw)*Cw

  where

  Fs = Flow during summer sample
  Fw = Flow during winter sample
  Cs = Concentration of summer sample
  Cw = Concentration of winter sample

- ***Area (A)*** is the area of the catchment draining to the sample point.

Parameters specific to each catchment, namely *Ia*, *Rc* and *A* were previously derived during preparation of the Sample and Analysis Plan (Pima County, 2012).

The "Simple Method" transforms a complex set of hydrological processes into an empirical equation. This equation is used to provide reasonable estimates of pollutant loads in storm water runoff (Ohrel, 2000). At the same time, by simplifying these processes, the level of uncertainty increases when attempting to distinguish the influences from runoff characteristics such as rainfall intensity, rainfall duration, runoff, first-flush effects concentrating pollutants, land use, and antecedent weather conditions.

---

[2] A measured value is unavailable for the Sonoran Desert region so EPA's standard value (EPA, 1992) was employed.

[3] Analytical results for the monitored parameters ranged from one to five data points per pollutant. These limited data were used to calculate event-mean concentration ("emc") values. As a result, pollutant load estimates may not be representative of the rainfall events, pollutants, outfalls, seasons, and/or land use categories.

Specifically, Schiff (1996) states that "[A]ssumptions based upon extrapolations to un-sampled storms introduces uncertainty because of flow-related variability." For example, he notes the importance of capturing data from representative storm events. Collecting data from the largest storm of the year may result in disproportionately large event mean concentrations and would potentially overestimate un-sampled, smaller storms during the time period of interest. Similarly, capturing smaller storm events might underestimate the actual discharge for a given reporting period. Schiff asserts that "[T]he magnitude of bias associated with un-sampled storm events cannot be assessed" because monitoring programs do not often have sufficient temporal sampling procedures to adequately address the issue. Such is the case for Pima County's monitoring program. This is due, in part, to the fact that the County's program is not designed to measure annual pollutant loads at a specific site, or regional pollutant loads for a specific land use.

According to Dixon and Chiswell (1996), most monitoring programs are instead designed to address regulatory compliance, identify sources of pollutants, and evaluate management actions such as the effectiveness of best management practices. Pima County's program focuses on just such information needs.

Schiff identifies the need to better understand the relationships of water quality to antecedent dry periods and rainfall intensity or duration (pollutant transport). Concepts such as "first flush" and "seasonal flushing" are examples of interactions that have yet to be adequately quantified. The following subsections provide seasonal pollutant load estimates for Pima County's Monitoring sites and identified land use categories within the permit area.

B. Results of Calculations

Analytical results, annual rainfall, drainage area and imperviousness were used to calculate pollutant loads for the five monitor sites were tabulated (Table 18). No loadings were calculated for silver and thallium as the concentrations were below the detection limits.

C. Evaluation of Results

The pollutant load estimates[4] should be used for comparative purposes only. For the reasons discussed in subsection 11.B, these values cannot be interpreted as representing actual pollutant loads for the watersheds within the permit area. Furthermore, it would be equally inappropriate to extrapolate these estimates in order to predict potential impacts to receiving water bodies.

[4] The term "pollutant load estimate" does not have the same meaning as the term "pollutant load." The Simple Method should only be used when *estimates* are desired and should not be used when *load* values are required (Ohrel, 2000).

Table 18. Pollutant Load Estimates for Monitor Sites

	Site #1 Low Density Residential		Site #2 Med Density Residential		Site #3 High Density Residential		Site #4 Commercial		Site #5 Industrial	
Annual Precipitation (in)	**8.6**		**8.6**		**8.6**		**8.6**		**11.3**	
Area (acres)	**3.0**		**12.4**		**2.3**		**59**		**56.9**	
Impervious (%)	**25%**		**65%**		**85%**		**95%**		**70%**	
Parameter	**Flow-weighted Concen-tration**	**Load (tons)**	**Flow-weighted Concen-tration**	**Load (tons)**	**Flow-weighted Concen-tration**	**Load (tons)**	**Flow-weighted Concen-tration**	**Load (tons)**	**Flow-weighted Concen-tration**	**Load (tons)**
Conventional Parameters										
BOD (mg/L)	0.0	0	21.9	59	2.4	2	0.00	0	0.0	0
COD (mg/L)	0.0	0	120.0	326	32.0	21	0.00	0	0.0	0
TDS (mg/L)	0.0	0	132.0	358	52.9	34	0.00	0	0.0	0
TSS (mg/L)	0.0	0	40.5	110	4.2	3	0.00	0	0.0	0
Nutrients										
TN (mg/L)	0.00	0.0	4.8	13.1	0.4	0.2	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0
NH4 (mg/L)	0.00	0.0	1.10	3.0	0.32	0.2	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0
TKN (mg/L)	0.00	0.0	1.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0
TP (mg/L)	0.00	0.0	0.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	000	0.0	0.00	0.0
Total Metals										
Sb (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
As (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	1.30	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ba (µg/L)	0.00	0.06	39.50	0.11	9.86	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Be (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cd (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cr (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cu (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	32.20	0.09	4.90	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pb (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hg (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ni (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	1.29	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Se (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ag (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Th (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Zn (µg/L)	0.00	0.00	14.70	0.04	29.60	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		0		874		60		0		0

Relative comparisons can be made between outfalls and parameters. The conventional parameters contribute to 98% or greater of the pollutant load for each catchment. TSS is the largest contributor to pollutant load in the medium density residential and high density residential. Nutrients contribute less than 2.5% of the pollutant load and metals contribute less than 0.07%. The low contribution of metals is important due to the higher toxicity levels.

D. Limitations of Pollutant Load Estimation Results

The "Simple Method" is an arithmetic equation based on empirical relationships for complex hydrological processes and average pollutant concentrations in storm water runoff. This method can be used to obtain quick and reasonable storm water pollutant load estimates (Ohrel, 2000), but should only be used for planning-level calculations or identifying data-collection needs.

Numerical results presented in Table 18 are pollutant load estimates. Employing event mean concentrations derived from first flush data may result in calculated pollutant load estimates that are higher that the remaining rainfall events.

This type of analysis can be misleading when evaluating potential environmental effects from non-point sources (Silverman et al, 1986). Rainfall events in southern Arizona are sporadic, with loads concentrated into limited periods of time during and after precipitation. Specifically, flow-related variability may introduce uncertainties when extrapolating from sampled to un-sampled rainfall events. Schiff (1996) uses the example of overestimation for data collected from large storms, versus underestimation for data collected from smaller storm events. In the absence of a sufficient temporal sampling program, the error level associated with un-sampled storm events can be substantial, especially when the un-sampled storm events follow the first flush event.

Estimation errors may also be introduced when using average seasonal precipitation values to calculate pollutant loads. For example, smaller runoff volumes (due to low intensity or short duration rainfall events accompanied by extended antecedent dry periods) may produce disproportionately higher pollutant concentrations per sampling event.

Alternatively, dilution from large volume runoffs (accompanied by shorter antecedent dry periods) may produce lower pollutant concentrations per sampling event. Given that the average seasonal precipitation values might not be representative of a specific storm, calculated values for the estimated pollutant loads might in turn be questionable.

Additionally, the monitoring program was not specifically designed to measure pollutant loads. As a result, phenomena such as pollutant build-up, first flush of pollutants, rainfall intensity, duration, and seasonal flushing of pollutants are not adequately addressed by the County's current monitoring program. These phenomena are an unavoidable consequence of the weather conditions and climatology of southern Arizona.

(This page is intentionally blank.)

12. Annual Expenditures

The itemized budget presents total expenditures for activities occurring within all of Pima County (Table 19) for the AZPDES permit.

Table 19. Stormwater Program Costs for Fiscal Year 17/18 & Budget for Fiscal Year 18/19

Activity	Fiscal Year 2017/2018		Fiscal Year 2018/2019	
	Actual Costs	Department Subtotal	Budgeted Costs	Department Subtotal
Environmental Quality		$252,346		$280,000
AZPDES Stormwater	$252,346		$280,000	
Regional Flood Control District		$4,954,837		$6,852,052
Floodplain Permitting (2)	1,614,446		1,585,639	
Engineering Support (2)	797,711		1,266,996	
FEMA/Mappings (3)	103,394		1,323,451	
Drainage Way Maintenance	2,439,286		2,675,966	
Transportation		10,758,863		11,080,000
Environmental Planning &	78,111		80,000	
Maintenance			11,00,000	
Development Services		2,700,964		3,059,333
Development Review (1)	2,700,964		3,059,333	
Regional Wastewater		3,170		15,000
Compliance and Regulatory Affairs Office (CRAO) Laboratory Analysis	3,170		15,000	
Stormwater Program Total	$18,670,180	**$18,670,180**	$21,286,385	**$21,286,385**

(1) Landscaping expenses incorporated.
(2) Plan Reviews and Permit issuance activities are now included in Development Review.
(3) FEMA/Mapping, Basin and Drainage Studies are now budgeted within Planning and Development.

(This page is intentionally blank.)

REFERENCES

ADEQ, 2003. Total Maximum Daily Load for Upper Harshaw Creek, Sonoita Creek Basin, Santa Cruz River Watershed. Coronado National Forest, near Patagonia, Santa Cruz County, Arizona, Publication number OFR-07-09.

ADEQ, 2012. 2010 Status of Water Quality, Arizona's Integrated 305(b) Assessment and 303(d) Listing Report. Publication number EQR-12-01.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, 1990. Public Health Statement, Silver, CAS#: 7440-22-4.

Dixon, W. and B. Chiswell. 1996. *Review of Aquatic Monitoring Program Design*. Water Research, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 1935-1948.

FMR Associates, 2018. *Evaluation of the 2017-2018 Pima County Clean Air Campaign and Clean Water Campaign Survey*, prepared for Pima County Department of Environmental Quality, June 2018.

Michels, H.T., B. Boulanger, N.P Nikolaidis, 2001. Copper Roof Stormwater Runoff – Corrosion and The Environment, downloaded on October 22, 2013 from the Copper Development Association Inc. website at http://www.copper.org/environment/impact/ NACE02225/.

National Weather Service Forecast Office, Tucson, AZ. 2011. Monthly and Daily Normals (1981 – 2010) plus Daily Extremes (1895-2011) for TUCSON, ARIZONA. Downloaded from the National Weather Service, NOAA website on October 5, 2011 from http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/twc/climate/tus.php.

Ohrel, Ron. 2002. *Simple and Complex Stormwater Pollutant Load Models Compared*, tech-nical note from Watershed Protection Techniques, 2(2): 364-368. *in*: *The Practice of Watershed Protection*, edited by Thomas R. Schueler and Heather K. Holland, Center for Watershed Protection.

PAG, 2013. Personal communication with Mead Mier, Water Specialist, Cienega Creek Natural Preserve Water Quality Monitoring Laboratory Results.

PDEQ, 2011. 14th Annual Report, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Stormwater Discharge Permit No. AZS000002, Pima County, Arizona, October 2011.

Pima County, Arizona, 2011. *Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System AZPDES Permit No. AZS000002.*

Pima County, Arizona. 2012. *Sampling and Analysis Plan for Stormwater Management Program*, Pima County Department of Environmental Quality, pp 9-15.

Pima County, Arizona. 2011. *14th Annual Report for Pima County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] Storm Water Discharge Permit No. AZS000002*. Pima County Department of Environmental Quality. September.

Pima County, Arizona, 2011. Code of Ordinances, Title 7, Environmental Quality, http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientID=16119&stateID=3&statename=Arizon.

Pima County, Arizona, 2011. *Protecting Our Land, Water and Heritage, Pima County's Voter-supported conservation Efforts*, Pima County Sonoran Conservation Plan. February.

Pima County, Arizona, 2017. *Resolution 2017-39: Reaffirming County commitment to Address Climate Change and Direction to County Departments and Resolution 2017-51: Furthering Pima County's Commitments to Climate Protection and Joining county Governments across the Nation in signing onto the County Climate Change Coalition in support of the Paris Climate Agreement*. Memorandum from C.H. Huckleberry, County Administrator, to The Honorable Chair and Members of Pima County Board of Supervisors.

Schiff, Kenneth. 1996. *Review of Existing Stormwater Monitoring Programs for Estimating Bight-Wide Mass Emissions from Urban Runoff*. *in:* Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Annual Report -- 1996, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

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

Silverman, Gary S., Michael K. Stenstrom, and Sami Fam. 1986. *Best Management Practices for Controlling Oil and Grease in Urban Stormwater Runoff*. The Environmental Professional, vol. 8, pp. 351-362.

SMRC, 2012. *The Simple Method to Calculate Urban Stormwater Loads*, downloaded on October 1, 2012 from the Stormwater Manager's Resource Center website at http://www.stormwatercenter.net/.

TDC Environmental, 2006. Copper Management Strategy, Development Resources, Final, submitted to Clean Estuary Partnership, prepared by Larry Walker Associates, September, pp. 54.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. *Guidance Manual For The Preparation Of Part 2 Of The NPDES Permit Applications For Discharges From Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems*. Office of Water (EN-336), EPA 833-B-92-002. November.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. *Guidance Manual For The Preparation Of Part 2 Of The NPDES Permit Applications For Discharges From Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems*. Office of Water (EN-336), EPA 833-B-92-002. November.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1973. *Geohydrology and Water Resources of the Tucson Basin, Arizona*, Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1939-E, 80 pp.