

Storm Water Management Fact Sheet Record Keeping

DESCRIPTION

Keeping records of spills, leaks, and other discharges can help a facility run more efficiently and cleanly. Records of past spills contain useful information for improving Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent future spills. Typical items that should be recorded include the results of routine inspections, and reported spills, leaks, or other discharges.

Records should include:

- The date, exact place, and time of material inventories, site inspections, sampling observations, etc.
- Names of inspector(s) and sampler(s).
- Analytical information, including the date(s) and time(s) analyses were performed or initiated, the analysts' names, analytical techniques or methods used, analytical results, and quality assurance/quality control results of such analyses.
- The date, time, exact location, and a complete characterization of significant observations, including spills or leaks.
- Notes indicating the reasons for any exceptions to standard record keeping procedures.
- All calibration and maintenance records of instruments used in storm water monitoring.

- All original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring equipment.
- Records of any non storm water discharges.

Figure 1 shows a sample worksheet for tracking spills and leaks.

Record keeping is usually coordinated with internal reporting and other BMPs, and is often integrated into the development of a facility's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as part of the facility's NPDES storm water discharge permit.

APPLICABILITY

Records keeping is a basic business practice and is applicable to all facilities. If a separate record keeping system for tracking BMPs, monitoring results, etc., is not currently in place at a facility, existing record keeping structures can be easily adapted to incorporate this data. An ideal tool for implementation is the record keeping procedures laid out in an SWPPP.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Record keeping is a simple, easily implemented, and cost effective management tool. Complete, well-organized records can help ensure proper maintenance of facilities and equipment and can aid in determining the causes of spills and leaks; thus, record keeping can protect water quality by helping to prevent future leaks and spills.

Limitations of a record keeping system may including the following:

- Records must be updated regularly.
- Personnel completing and maintaining records must be trained to update records correctly.
- The records need to be readily accessible.
- Records containing any confidential information must be secured.

IMPLEMENTATION

The key to maintaining records is continual updating. Ensure that new information, such as analytical results, is added to existing inspection records or spill reports as it becomes available. In addition, update records if there are changes to the number and location of discharge points, principal products, or raw material storage procedures. Maintain records for least five years from the date of sample observation, measurement, or spill report. Some simple techniques used to accurately document and report results include:

- Field notebooks.
- Timed and dated photographs.
- Videotapes.
- Drawings and maps.
- Computer spreadsheets and database programs.

COSTS

Costs are those associated with staff hours used to develop and implement a record keeping system, costs for analyzing samples, and company overhead costs. Figure 2 is a sample worksheet that can be used to determine annual record keeping costs. Table 1 is an example of a completed record keeping costs sheet.

REFERENCES

1. California Environmental Protection Agency, August 17, 1992. Staff Proposal

for Modification to Water Quality Order No. 91-13 DWQ Waste Discharge Requirements for Dischargers of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities, Draft Wording, Monitoring Program and Reporting Requirements.

- 2. U.S. EPA, 1981. NPDES BMP Guidance Document.
- 3. U.S. EPA, Pre-print, 1992. Storm Water Management for Industrial Activities: Developing Pollution Prevention Plans and Best Management Practices. EPA 832-R-92-006.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Center for Watershed Protection Tom Schueler 8391 Main Street Ellicott City, MD 21043

Northern Virginia Planning District Commission David Bulova 7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 100 Annandale, VA 22003

Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Don Mooney Water Quality Division, Storm Water Unit P.O. Box 1677 Oklahoma City, OK 73101-1677

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission Bob Biebel 916 N. East Avenue, P.O. Box 1607 Waukesha, WI 53187

United States Postal Service Charles Vidich 6 Griffin Road North Windsor, CT 06006-7030

The mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for the use by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

| LIST | liFi(| CANT SPILLS | S AND LEA | ıks | Worksheet Completed by: Title: Date: | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Directions: | | | w all significant e of the permit. | spills and si | gnificant le | aks of toxic o | or hazardo | us pollutant tha | at have occurred | at the facility in the three years prior to the | |
| Definitions | • | | Significant spi | ills include, b | ut are not l | imited to, rel | eases of c | oil or hazardous | s substances in | excess of reportable quantities. | |
| 1st Year Prior | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Descri | ption | | Response Procedure | | | |
| Date (mo/day/yr) | Spill | L e a k | Location (as indicated on site map) | Type of Material | Quantity | Source, If Known | Reason | Amount of Material Recovered | Material No Longer Exposed to Storm Water (True / False) | Preventive Measure Taken | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd Year Prior | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Desc | | | | Response Procedure | | | |
| Date (mo/day/yr) | Spill | L e a k | Location (as indicated on site map) | Type of Material | Quantity | Source, If Known | Reason | Amount of Material Recovered | Material No Longer Exposed to Storm Water (True / False) | Preventive Measure Taken | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3rd Year Prior | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Description | | | Response Procedure | | | | |
| Date (mo/day/yr) | Spill | L e a k | Location (as indicated on site map) | Type of Material | Quantity | Source, If Known | Reason | Amount of Material Recovered | Material No Longer Exposed to Storm Water (True / False) | Preventive Measure Taken | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: U.S. EPA, 1992.

| Title | Quantity | Average Hourly Rate (\$) | Overhead Multiplier | Estimated Yearly Hours on SW Training | Estimated Annual Cost(\$) | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | х | х | х | =(A) | | | | | | |
| | | х | х | х | =(B) | | | | | | |
| | | х | х | х | =(C) | | | | | | |
| | | х | х | х | =(D) | | | | | | |
| | Total Estimated Annual Reporting Cost | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (Sum of A+B+C+D) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: U.S. EPA, 1992.

FIGURE 2 SAMPLE ANNUAL RECORD KEEPING COST WORKSHEET

TABLE 1 EXAMPLE OF ANNUAL RECORD KEEPING COSTS

| Title | Quantity | | Average Hourly Rate (\$) | | Overhead* Multiplier | | Estimated Yearly Hours on SW Training | E | Estimated Annual Cost (\$) |
|-------------------------|----------|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Storm Water Engineer | 1 | х | 15 | х | 2.0 | Х | 20 | = | 600 |
| Plant Management | 5 | х | 20 | x | 2.0 | X | 10 | = | 2,000 |
| Plant Employees | 100 | х | 10 | x | 2.0 | X | 5 | = | 10,000 |
| | | | | | | - | Total Estimated Annu | st: \$12,600 | |

^{*}Note: Defined as a multiplier (typically ranging between 1 and 3) that takes into account those costs associated with payroll expenses, etc

Source: U.S. EPA, 1992.

For more information contact:

Municipal Technology Branch U.S. EPA Mail Code 4204 401 M St., S.W. Washington, D.C., 20460

