

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (ADEM) - FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION
CONSTRUCTION SITE INSPECTION/EVALUATION REPORT

C

COMPANY/OPERATOR NAME Cotswald Development, Ltd.		FACILITY NAME Cotswald Subdivision		PAGE 1	OF 1
CONTACT Ingram Tynes		LOCATION DESCRIPTION Sicard Hollow Road south of Libery Park Sports Complex, Birmingham, AL 35242			
ADDRESS 820 Shades Creek Parkway			CITY Birmingham	STATE AL	ZIP CODE 35209
AUTHORIZATION NUMBER ALR16D930	COUNTY Jefferson	TOWNSHIP, RANGE, SECTION		PHONE NUMBER (205) 877-3199	
ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION Residential Subdivision Development	GPS LATITUDE & LONGITUDE Lat: 33.467900 Long: -86.679500	INSPECTION DATE May 15, 2008		EVALUATION COMPLETE DATE May 16, 2008	
RECEIVING STREAM(S) UT to Little Cahaba River		HUC & SUBWATER CODE - WATERSHED NAME		SITE CONTRACTOR(S)	
OTHER PARTICIPANTS		SITE CONSULTANT(S)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Samples Taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Photos Taken	

Inspection Type: Routine Complaint Follow-up Previous Inspection Date: 2/22/08

Please Mark: "S" = Satisfactory "I" = Needs Improvement "U" = Un-Satisfactory "N" = Not Applicable "E" = Not Evaluated "P" = Not Present

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permit Verified	<input type="checkbox"/> Unpermitted Areas	<input type="checkbox"/> BMP Plan Onsite	<input type="checkbox"/> BMP Design	<input type="checkbox"/> BMPs Implemented
<input type="checkbox"/> BMPs Maintained	<input type="checkbox"/> BMPs Effective	<input type="checkbox"/> SPCC Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Stream Inspection Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Site Inspection Reports
<input type="checkbox"/> Facility ID Displayed	<input type="checkbox"/> Sample Records	<input type="checkbox"/> ECBs, ECRMs, TRMs	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Seed & Mulch	<input type="checkbox"/> Stream Crossings
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Phasing	<input type="checkbox"/> Annual Vegetation	<input type="checkbox"/> Perennial Vegetation	<input type="checkbox"/> Silt Fencing	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Seeding
<input type="checkbox"/> Onsite Rain Gauge	<input type="checkbox"/> Sediment Traps	<input type="checkbox"/> Sediment Basins	<input type="checkbox"/> Straw/Hay Bales	<input type="checkbox"/> Inlet Protection
<input type="checkbox"/> Rip-Rap Installation	<input type="checkbox"/> Diversion Berms	<input type="checkbox"/> Diversion Ditches	<input type="checkbox"/> Check Dams	<input type="checkbox"/> Culvert Installation
<input type="checkbox"/> Slope Stabilization	<input type="checkbox"/> Topsoil Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Fuel/Chemical Handling	<input type="checkbox"/> Fuel/Chemical Spills	<input type="checkbox"/> Vegetated Buffer Zones
<input type="checkbox"/> Streambank Protection	<input type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste Handling	<input type="checkbox"/> Contaminated Soil	<input type="checkbox"/> Discharge Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Instream Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Instream Turbidity	<input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site Erosion	<input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site Sedimentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site Vehicle Tracking	<input type="checkbox"/> Unpermitted Discharges
<input type="checkbox"/> General Housekeeping	<input type="checkbox"/> On-Site Sedimentation	<input type="checkbox"/> On-Site Erosion	<input type="checkbox"/> Gray/Process Wastewaters (Port-o-Let, Washdowns, Etc.)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Instream Sediment Accumulation	<input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site/Up-Gradient Drainage Diverted	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>filtrexx soxx, instream treatment</u>		

OBSERVATIONS/COMMENTS

Implemented BMPs were not adequate to prevent turbid water from being discharged into the UT to Little Cahaba River. Areas that had been seeded and/or mulched needed to be maintained. Turbid water was flowing off of disturbed areas down to the storm drains. Silt fencing had been improperly installed across a stream. Turbid water was flowing off of lots underneath filtrexx soxx. They did not appear to be effectively filtering turbid water. Sediment basin did not appear to allow for adequate holding time or may not be of adequate size for the drainage area. A visible contrast between up and downstream waters was noted. Water Sample Analysis: Upstream: 35.3 NTU; Discharge: 328 NTU; Downstream: 592 NTU. The difference of 556.7 NTU constitutes a water quality violation. Inspector noted onsite erosion and sedimentation.

PREPARED SIGNATURE <i>Amanda L. Farrell</i>	PRINTED NAME Amanda L. Farrell	ADEM SUBDIVISION Birmingham Branch
REVIEW SIGNATURE <i>Derick E. Houston</i>	PRINTED NAME Derick E. Houston	DATE 5/19/2008