On Tuesday, February 21st, 2017, bacteria samples were collected from a storm drainage manhole in front of Mombo restaurant on Marcy St. in Portsmouth, NH. Samples were also collected from a nearby outfall which releases its effluent into the Piscataqua River off Prescott Parks' shore. Samples were collected by City's Water Quality and Resource Protection Specialist, Jesse Pearce. Ray Pezzullo was present at the time helping direct traffic and assisting with sample collection. Samples were immediately taken to nearby state accredited laboratory, Absolute Resource Associates (ARA), for analyses. Samples were tested for Total Coliform and E. coli. Results were received on Thursday, February 23rd, 2017.

The two initial sample sites were sampled again on Thursday, February 23rd, 2017. An additional site was also sampled from the Piscataqua River, off the shore of Prescott Park to the right of the outfall. Samples were collected by Jesse Pearce with the assistance of Ray Pezzullo and Jim Tow. Fecal Coliform samples were submitted to state accredited laboratory, EnviroSystems in Hampton, NH. Total Coliform and E.coli samples were taken to Absolute Resource Associates.

Samples collected on February 21st and February 23rd were first sampled from the Marcy St. storm drainage manhole by attaching two bacteria bottles to a long sampling pole and lowering the pole into the manhole. Bottles were submersed in the water which collects at the bottom of the manhole and once full, were carefully lifted out. Samples collected from the outfall were collected directly from the outfall by reaching into the outfall about 1-2 feet and allowing the flowing water to fill the bottle. City employees noticed no smell in either the storm drain manhole or the outfall during sampling events on both days. Also, the surrounding vicinity to the outfall was clear of all litter and/or feces on both days. Samples were collected from the river using the sampling pole to reach off-shore and submerse the bottle in the water. In reviewing our bacteria sampling procedures practiced during the two sampling events, the following could have potentially affected the outfall sampling results: a) the upstream manhole from the outlet was sampled prior to sampling the downstream outfall which could have disturbed the sediment at the bottom of the manhole, b) the outfall samples were collected from the top of the discharge stream by placing the collection bottle just under the top of the water and therefore a representative sample of the entire stream was not obtained.

The initial sampling results were above the detection limit for Total Coliform in both samples. E.coli results showed detectable concentrations from both sample sites. Due to the high concentrations of Total Coliform in the initial samples, ARA was instructed to run the follow-up sample analyses using dilutions in order to produce an actual value for reporting. Follow-up sampling results showed Total Coliform and E. coli results far exceeding the initial results. Fecal Coliform results were also elevated, with the highest found at the Prescott Park Outfall which had a concentration 3x higher than that of the Marcy St. storm drainage manhole.

Samples collected from the manhole on 2/21/17 appeared clear and free from suspended solids. Samples taken on 2/23/17 were very turbid and cloudy. On both days, storm water runoff was observed flowing into the storm drain system from roadway snow banks, which contained debris and sand. However, on 2/23/17, the weather was abnormally warm and there was a significant increase in melting of the roadside snow banks due to very warm temperatures. The increased turbidity could be due to the increased runoff from the snow banks containing debris and sand.

Table 1. Prescott Park Storm Water Sampling Results Summary

Sample Date	Feb. 2	1, 2017	I	Feb. 23, 2017	7
Sample Location	Total Coliform (MPN/mL)	E. coli (MPN/mL)	Total Coliform (MPN/mL)	E. coli (MPN/mL)	Fecal Coliform (CFU/mL)
Marcy St. Storm Drain	>2,419.6	36.4	52,310	13,775	5,400
Prescott Park Outfall	>2,419.6	23.7	20,530	4,165	15,273
Shaw Warehouse Bay	-	-	450	52	500

On Thursday, March 2nd, 2017, City personnel collected storm water samples from various locations around Strawberry Bank including Prescott Park outfall, Marcy Street manholes and Washington Street manhole. Samples collected from the manholes and outlet appeared clear and free from suspended solids. City employees noticed no smell in either the storm drain manholes or the outfall during sampling event. Also, the surrounding vicinity to the outfall was clear of all litter and/or feces.

Site Location / Personnel	
Associated Sample ID(s): Street Name: Prescott Part C	Sampler: IP Outfall Nearest Address #:
Background Data	
Rainfall (in.): Last 24 hours:(Current Temperature (°F):(o \underset{-}) Land Use in Drainage Area (Check all Industrial	Current Weather Conditions: Somy, Breezy that apply): ### Open Space Park
☐ Ultra – Urban Residential	☐ Institutional
☐ Suburban Residential	Other:
☐ Commercial	Known Industries:
Illustration of Sample Location (e.g s	ample structure, inlet & outlet pipes, outfall)
	w
4	
1	

Section 1: Structure Description

Structure I.D.	Structure Alias	Structure Type	General Structure Condition	Comments
		A Outfall □ Manhole	□ Excellent A/Good	
	いったりのと	□ Catch Basin □ Other:	□ Fair □ Poor	
			□ Other:	

	Comments e.g. site description, sample method	Bay water	into wearing		outtall. not		30 000			
	Flow	Present?: AVYes No Rate: Trickle X Low	□ Moderate □ Other:	⊔ frign		Description (Check all that apply):	Exits pipe before sump/waterbody	**Restrially (circle one 19, 1/2, 3/4 Runs along structure wall / floor before Fully	entering sump / waterbody	Uniter.
	Submerged		Partially (circle one): 14,72,34	- Funy	With sediment (material):		No No	X Partially (circle one 1/4), 1/2, 3/4		
	Diameter (in.)	76	7							
Description	Pipe Material	D PVC CRCP	K Clay HDFE	□ Steel □ CMP	□ Other:					
pie Location	Sample Location	□ Inlet	M Outlet		dwnS □	-	F001	other:	アダナナウの	
Section 7: Sample Location Description	Pipe I.D.									

01	Section 5:	Section 5: Quantitative Characterization	erization				
L	Time Sampled	Parameter	Results	Units	Analysis Location (In-Situ, Accr. Lab, MadLab)	Equipment	Comments
-		Conductivity	31.2	mpkS/cm	17-5:40	Ultra water 11	
L		Chlorine (free)	6.04	mg/L	(n-s:40	Jocket Chlorimater	
L		Ortho-Phosphorous	-	mg/L			
)	10,55	Fluoride		mg/L	AAA		
		Hd					
		Temperature	6.6	υŁ	1, -S: +U	30 ys.	
7	(0:53	Ammonia		7) bui	AMA		
1	16.52	Potassium			AAA.		
)	16.50	Salinity	19.5	ppt	In-5,40/ARA	30 45,	
7	10:52	Surfactants			ARA		
1	05:01	E. coli	8.6.0	MPN	AND		
2	16.48	Enterococci	0.017	NON	ARA		
	10,50	TC. Backi.	2613,0	NOW			Page of

Page of

Are any Physical Indi-	Are any Physical Indicators Present in the Flow?	□ Yes ☑ No (If no, sl	(If no, skip to section 5)		
Indicator	CHECK if Present	Description		Relative Severity Index (1-3)	x (1-3)
Odor		☐ Sewage ☐ Rancid/sour ☐ Petroleum/gas ☐ Sulfide ☐ Other:	🗆 1 - Faint	\square 2 – Easily detected	☐ 3 – Noticeable from a distance
Color		☐ Clear ☐ Brown ☐ Gray ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Orange ☐ Red ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Faint colors in sample bottle	\square 2 – Clearly visible in sample bottle	□ 3 – Clearly visible in outfall flow
Turbidity		See Severity	☐ 1 – Slight Cloudiness	□ 2 - Cloudy	□ 3 - Opaque
Floatables (Does not include trash)		☐ Sewage (toilet paper, etc.) ☐ Petroleum (oil sheen) ☐ Suds ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Few/slight; origin not obvious	☐ 2 — Some; indications of origin (e.g. possible suds or oil sheen)	☐ 3 – Some; origin clear (e.g. obvious oil sheen, suds, or floating sanitary materials)
Section 5: Physical I Are nhysical indicator	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Flowing Drainage Structures & Outfalls Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	falls (If no, skip to section 6)	tion 6)	
Indicator	CHECK if Present			Comments	
Structural Damage		☐ Spalling, cracking or chipping ☐ Corrosion ☐ Peeling paint		est to the second secon	of) yeth change) is anitose
Deposits / Stains		Flow 1			
Abnormal Vegetation	uc uc	☐ Excessive ☐ Inhibited			
Poor Pool/Sump Quality		□ Odors □ Colors □ Floatables □ Oil Sheen □ Suds □ Excessive Algae □ Other:		Light -	Carthe-Mesty on the Carthe
Pipe Benthic Growth	lh C	☐ Brown ☐ Orange ☐ Green ☐ Other			
Section 6: Overall C	Section 6: Overall Characterization of Drainage Structures / Outfall	ge Structures / Outfall		200	A many const
□ Unlikely □	☐ Potential (presence of two or more indicators)	or more indicators)	re indicators w/ a s	severity of 3) \square Obvious:	: snc

Section 7: Non-Illicit Discharge Concerns (e.g. trash, needed infrastructure repairs?)

Site Location / Personnel	
Date: 4/17/17 Structure II	Sampler: John Adams
Associated Sample ID(s): 9062	(inlet)
Street Name: Marcy	Nearest Address #: Mechanic St.
Personnel:	
Background Data	
Rainfall (in.): Last 24 hours: Current Temperature (°F): 90	Last 48 hours: O Current Weather Conditions: Sundy breeze
Land Use in Drainage Area (Check all tha	at apply):
□ Industrial	Open Space - Dog park
☐ Ultra – Urban Residential	☐ Institutional
☐ Suburban Residential	Other:
☐ Commercial	Known Industries:
Reason to belie	Flow from inlet 9062 Coloured along towards outlet. Sample collected by wottles on to Colour. Le inlet which is connects structure even though the line is plugged, has drainage water. Can see sexpage coming
	aple structure, inlet & outlet pipes, outfall)
- 10 inlets (or 9:	nlets, I outlet) coming into
Structure. Son	nlets, l'outlet) coming into re plugged

Marcy Intechanic MIT Section 1: Structure Description

¥	*			
Structure I.D.	Structure Alias	Structure Type	General Structure Condition	Comments
,		□ Outfall Manhole	□ Excellent □ Good	77.1
N. 226		□ Catch Basin □ Other:	□ Fair □ Poor	
			□ Other:	

	Sample Location	Pipe Material	Diameter (in.)	Submerged	Flow	Comments e.g. site description, sample method
	Inlet	□ PVC □ RCP □ Clay □ HDPE		In water (circle one): clear / turbid □ No □ Partially (circle one): ½, ½, ¾	Present?: XYes No Rate: y Trickle y Low Moderate Other:	- Samples collected a/
C/N/2 Sump	Sump	□ Steel □ CMP		□ Fully With sediment (material):	□ High	to for 11 ecuch individua
7	□ Pool			No ON O	Description (Check all that apply): Kexits pipe before sump waterbody	botto.
	□ Other:			□ Partially (circle one): ¼, ½, ¾ □ Fully	ARuns along structure wall filoor before Sey erackety. Neck of entering sumply waterbody	Seperately. Decto do
						Dottes forched grand

section 5:	Section 3: Quantitative Characterization	erization					
Time Sampled	Parameter	Results	Units	Analysis Location (In-Situ, Accr. Lab, MadLab)	Equipment	Comments	
	Conductivity		μS/cm				
	Chlorine (free)		mg/L				
	Ortho-Phosphorous	1	mg/L				
12,20	Fluoride		mg/L	ARA			
	Hd	1					
	Temperature	f.91	₩ C	1N-Situ	30 VS;	FB meter	
12:19~	Ammonia		mg IL	ARA	_		
12:16	12. No Potassium)	AAB			
(2:20	(2.20 Salinity	_	pp thou.	(n-sito/879	30 1/5,	F13 meter	
THE PARTY	Got Surfactants (2:19			ARB.			
12:18 0	E. coli	1413.6	MPN	ARA			
12:18	17.18 - Enterococci	18.1	NOW	ARA			
81:21	total Colforn	>241916 MPN	MPN	ARA			Pageof

Are any Physical Indi-	Are any Physical Indicators Present in the Flow?	□ Yes ☑ No (If no, sl	(If no, skip to section 5)		
Indicator	CHECK if Present	Description		Relative Severity Index (1-3)	x (1-3)
Odor		☐ Sewage ☐ Rancid/sour ☐ Petroleum/gas ☐ Sulfide ☐ Other:	🗆 1 - Faint	\square 2 – Easily detected	☐ 3 – Noticeable from a distance
Color		☐ Clear ☐ Brown ☐ Gray ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Orange ☐ Red ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Faint colors in sample bottle	\square 2 – Clearly visible in sample bottle	□ 3 – Clearly visible in outfall flow
Turbidity		See Severity	☐ 1 – Slight Cloudiness	□ 2 - Cloudy	□ 3 - Opaque
Floatables (Does not include trash)		☐ Sewage (toilet paper, etc.) ☐ Petroleum (oil sheen) ☐ Suds ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Few/slight; origin not obvious	☐ 2 — Some; indications of origin (e.g. possible suds or oil sheen)	☐ 3 – Some; origin clear (e.g. obvious oil sheen, suds, or floating sanitary materials)
Section 5: Physical I Are nhysical indicator	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Flowing Drainage Structures & Outfalls Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	falls (If no, skip to section 6)	tion 6)	
Indicator	CHECK if Present			Comments	
Structural Damage		☐ Spalling, cracking or chipping ☐ Corrosion ☐ Peeling paint		est to the second secon	of) yeth change) is anitose
Deposits / Stains		Flow 1			
Abnormal Vegetation	uc uc	☐ Excessive ☐ Inhibited			
Poor Pool/Sump Quality		□ Odors □ Colors □ Floatables □ Oil Sheen □ Suds □ Excessive Algae □ Other:		Light -	Carthe-Mesty on the Carthe
Pipe Benthic Growth	lh C	☐ Brown ☐ Orange ☐ Green ☐ Other			
Section 6: Overall C	Section 6: Overall Characterization of Drainage Structures / Outfall	ge Structures / Outfall		200	A many const
□ Unlikely □	☐ Potential (presence of two or more indicators)	or more indicators)	re indicators w/ a s	severity of 3) \square Obvious:	: snc

Section 7: Non-Illicit Discharge Concerns (e.g. trash, needed infrastructure repairs?)

Site Location / Personnel
Date: 4/17/17 Structure ID: 5430 Sampler: JP Associated Sample ID(s): Marcy MH 5430 (Inlet 9254), 9210 (9709) Street Name: Marcy St. Personnel:
Background Data
Rainfall (in.): Last 24 hours: Last 48 hours: Current Temperature (°F): Current Weather Conditions: Sunny
Land Use in Drainage Area (Check all that apply): □ Industrial □ Ultra – Urban Residential □ Institutional
□ Suburban Residential Other:
☐ Commercial Known Industries:
Notes (e.g. origin of outfall, if known): 1st sampled forom 9254 which Coloured along structure wall. Had to sample by placing hottles on wall, allowing the water to Colour in! 2nd Sampled sipe inlet 9210, incorrectly labeled "9209" on hottles. Water exited the sipe ~ 1/z-1 foot allower sump. Flow was moderate - strong. Callected scamples strongths
Illustration of Sample Location (e.g sample structure, inlet & outlet pipes, outfall)
description of the sample Thickle, Could not sample Could not sample

Section 1: Structure Description

Structure I.D.	Structure Alias	Structure Type	General Structure Condition	Comments
	March St MI	Marca St Ml - Outfall &Manhole	□ Excellent	
5420	The same	□ Catch Basin □ Other:	□ Fair □ Poor	à .
	Mowbo WIF		□ Other:	

Section 2: Sample Location Description

Comments e.g. site description, sample method	In Il buttles had	to touch structure	wall to get		
Flow		her:	Description (Check all that apply):	# Exits pipe before/sump/waterbody Exits pipe directly into sump/waterbody WRuns along structure/wall)/ floor before entering/sump/ waterbody	□ Other:
Submerged	In water (circle one): clear / turbid Present?: Af Yes No Rate: Trickle A Low	ially (circle one): ¼, ½, ¾, 34	With sediment (material):	□ No □ Partially (circle one): ¼, ½, ¾ □ Fully	
Diameter (in.)			Tu		
Pipe Material	□ PVC □ RCP	□ Clay □ HDPE □ Steel □ CMP	□ Other:		
Pipe I.D. Sample Pipe Ma	W Inlet	□ Outlet	duns 🗆	□ Pool	
Pipe I.D.			d154	St. MH	2480:

Section 3:	Section 3: Ouantitative Characterization	erization				
Time	Parameter	Results	Units	Analysis Location (In-Situ, Accr. Lab, MadLab)	Equipment	Comments
	Conductivity		μS/cm			
	Chlorine (free)		mg/L			
	Ortho-Phosphorous		mg/L			
11.24	Fluoride		mg/L	ARA		
	Hd					
	Temperature	13.0	3 A.	1n-5.40	VSI 30	FB met
47:11 -	Ammonia		1 6w	ARA		
11:24	Potassium			ARA,		
- 117.24	Salinity	3	60	1, -S,40/ARA	ysi 30	FB meter
11:24	Surfactants			ARA 1		
41:33	E. coli	23.5	MPN	ARA		
-11.35	Enterococci	0	MPW	ARA		
11:35	TC Back.	1986.3	MCIN	AKA		Page $\frac{2}{3}$ of $\frac{3}{3}$

Are any Physical Indi-	Are any Physical Indicators Present in the Flow?	□ Yes ☑ No (If no, sl	(If no, skip to section 5)		
Indicator	CHECK if Present	Description		Relative Severity Index (1-3)	x (1-3)
Odor		☐ Sewage ☐ Rancid/sour ☐ Petroleum/gas ☐ Sulfide ☐ Other:	□ 1 - Faint	\square 2 – Easily detected	☐ 3 – Noticeable from a distance
Color		☐ Clear ☐ Brown ☐ Gray ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Orange ☐ Red ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Faint colors in sample bottle	\square 2 – Clearly visible in sample bottle	☐ 3 — Clearly visible in outfall flow
Turbidity		See Severity	☐ 1 – Slight Cloudiness	□ 2 - Cloudy	□ 3 - Opaque
Floatables (Does not include trash)		☐ Sewage (toilet paper, etc.) ☐ Petroleum (oil sheen) ☐ Suds ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Few/slight; origin not obvious	☐ 2 — Some; indications of origin (e.g. possible suds or oil sheen)	☐ 3 — Some; origin clear (e.g. obvious oil sheen, suds, or floating sanitary materials)
Section 5: Physical I	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Flowing Drainage Structures & Outfalls Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	falls (If no, skip to section 6)	tion 6)	
Indicator	CHECK if Present			Comments	
Structural Damage		☐ Spalling, cracking or chipping ☐ Corrosion ☐ Peeling paint		est temperature of the second	of yet dangery is animal
Deposits / Stains		Flow 1			
Abnormal Vegetation	u(☐ Excessive ☐ Inhibited			
Poor Pool/Sump Quality		□ Odors □ Colors □ Floatables □ Oil Sheen □ Suds □ Excessive Algae □ Other:		Tage 1	Caston Message on the caston of the caston o
Pipe Benthic Growth	lh l	☐ Brown ☐ Orange ☐ Green ☐ Other			
Section 6: Overall C	Section 6: Overall Characterization of Drainage Structures / Outfall	ge Structures / Outfall		531	A many change
□ Unlikely □	☐ Potential (presence of two or more indicators)	or more indicators)	re indicators w/ a	severity of 3) \square Obvious:	: sno

Section 7: Non-Illicit Discharge Concerns (e.g. trash, needed infrastructure repairs?)

Section 1: Structure Description

Structure Alias Structure Type General Structure Condition Comments

Section 2: Sample Location Description

Comments e.g. site description, sample method	Did not forch wall ground Jia to Sample. Sampled Straight out b
Flow	Present?: WYes No Rate: Trickle A Low Moderate Other: High Description (Check all that apply): WExits pipe before sump/waterbody WExits pipe before sump/waterbody WExits pipe before sump/waterbody Wetens along structure wall floor before entering sump / waterbody Other:
Submerged	In water (circle one): clear / turbid
Diameter (in.)	
Pipe Material	□ PVC □ RCP □ Clay □ HDPE □ Steel □ CMP □ Other:
Pipe I.D. Sample Pipe Ma	gyInlet Outlet Sump Pool
Pipe I.D.	0126

ecuon 3:	Section 3: Quantitative Characterization	rerization				
Time	- C	D 251142	7,57	Analysis Location	1	Commente
Sampled	Farameter	Kesuits	Onits	(In-Situ, Accr. Lab, MadLab)	rdmbmem	Common
	Conductivity	l	μS/cm	T T		
	Chlorine (free)		mg/L			
	Ortho-Phosphorous	1	mg/L			
01-11	Fluoride		mg/L	ARA		
	Hd					
	Temperature	9.3	C	ofis-VI	151 30	FB meter
아.11	Ammonia)		4KB		
아: 1	Potassium			ARA		
04:11	Salinity	2,5	Of Hrus	1/5; 30 RR	5 In-5:40	FB meter
0/1/1	Surfactants		-	, AR/3 '		
15.38 E.coli	E. coli	0.7	MPN	ARA		
11:38	Enterococci	41.0	MAM	ARA		
	Te Bacti.	322.3	MAN	ARA		Dane of

Page of

Are any Physical Indi-	Are any Physical Indicators Present in the Flow?	□ Yes ☑ No (If no, sl	(If no, skip to section 5)		
Indicator	CHECK if Present	Description		Relative Severity Index (1-3)	x (1-3)
Odor		☐ Sewage ☐ Rancid/sour ☐ Petroleum/gas ☐ Sulfide ☐ Other:	□ 1 - Faint	\square 2 – Easily detected	☐ 3 – Noticeable from a distance
Color		☐ Clear ☐ Brown ☐ Gray ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Orange ☐ Red ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Faint colors in sample bottle	\square 2 – Clearly visible in sample bottle	☐ 3 — Clearly visible in outfall flow
Turbidity		See Severity	☐ 1 – Slight Cloudiness	□ 2 - Cloudy	□ 3 - Opaque
Floatables (Does not include trash)		☐ Sewage (toilet paper, etc.) ☐ Petroleum (oil sheen) ☐ Suds ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Few/slight; origin not obvious	☐ 2 — Some; indications of origin (e.g. possible suds or oil sheen)	☐ 3 — Some; origin clear (e.g. obvious oil sheen, suds, or floating sanitary materials)
Section 5: Physical I	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Flowing Drainage Structures & Outfalls Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	falls (If no, skip to section 6)	tion 6)	
Indicator	CHECK if Present			Comments	
Structural Damage		☐ Spalling, cracking or chipping ☐ Corrosion ☐ Peeling paint		est temperature of the second	of yet dangery is animal
Deposits / Stains		Flow 1			
Abnormal Vegetation	u(☐ Excessive ☐ Inhibited			
Poor Pool/Sump Quality		□ Odors □ Colors □ Floatables □ Oil Sheen □ Suds □ Excessive Algae □ Other:		Tage 1	Caston Message on the caston of the caston o
Pipe Benthic Growth	lh l	☐ Brown ☐ Orange ☐ Green ☐ Other			
Section 6: Overall C	Section 6: Overall Characterization of Drainage Structures / Outfall	ge Structures / Outfall		531	A many change
□ Unlikely □	☐ Potential (presence of two or more indicators)	or more indicators)	re indicators w/ a	severity of 3) \square Obvious:	: sno

Section 7: Non-Illicit Discharge Concerns (e.g. trash, needed infrastructure repairs?)

Site Location / Personnel	
Date: 4/17/17 Structure Associated Sample ID(s): Street Name: Washington.	E ID: 3 5476 Sampler: 1 Nearest Address #:
Personnel:	
Background Data	
Rainfall (in.): Last 24 hours: 6 Current Temperature (°F): 71	Current Weather Conditions: Sanny Breeze
Land Use in Drainage Area (Check all	
☐ Industrial	Open Space Dog park
☐ Ultra – Urban Residential	□ Institutional
☐ Suburban Residential	Other:
☐ Commercial	Known Industries:
Notes (e.g. origin of outfall, if known):	Inlet forom Cart not Cowing
Illustration of Sample Location (e.g sa	mple structure, inlet & outlet pipes, outfall)
Eel in sump.	
Salinity = 1.9 m	18
<u>I</u>	

Are any Physical Indi-	Are any Physical Indicators Present in the Flow?	□ Yes ☑ No (If no, sl	(If no, skip to section 5)		
Indicator	CHECK if Present	Description		Relative Severity Index (1-3)	x (1-3)
Odor		☐ Sewage ☐ Rancid/sour ☐ Petroleum/gas ☐ Sulfide ☐ Other:	□ 1 - Faint	\square 2 – Easily detected	☐ 3 – Noticeable from a distance
Color		☐ Clear ☐ Brown ☐ Gray ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Orange ☐ Red ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Faint colors in sample bottle	\square 2 – Clearly visible in sample bottle	☐ 3 — Clearly visible in outfall flow
Turbidity		See Severity	☐ 1 – Slight Cloudiness	□ 2 - Cloudy	□ 3 - Opaque
Floatables (Does not include trash)		☐ Sewage (toilet paper, etc.) ☐ Petroleum (oil sheen) ☐ Suds ☐ Other:	□ 1 – Few/slight; origin not obvious	☐ 2 — Some; indications of origin (e.g. possible suds or oil sheen)	☐ 3 — Some; origin clear (e.g. obvious oil sheen, suds, or floating sanitary materials)
Section 5: Physical I	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-	Section 5: Physical Indicators for Both Flowing & Non-Flowing Drainage Structures & Outfalls Are physical indicators that are not related to flow present?	falls (If no, skip to section 6)	tion 6)	
Indicator	CHECK if Present			Comments	
Structural Damage		☐ Spalling, cracking or chipping ☐ Corrosion ☐ Peeling paint		est temperature of the second	of yet dangery is animal
Deposits / Stains		Flow 1			
Abnormal Vegetation	u(☐ Excessive ☐ Inhibited			
Poor Pool/Sump Quality		□ Odors □ Colors □ Floatables □ Oil Sheen □ Suds □ Excessive Algae □ Other:		Tage 1	Caston Message on the caston of the caston o
Pipe Benthic Growth	lh l	☐ Brown ☐ Orange ☐ Green ☐ Other			
Section 6: Overall C	Section 6: Overall Characterization of Drainage Structures / Outfall	ge Structures / Outfall		531	A many change
□ Unlikely □	☐ Potential (presence of two or more indicators)	or more indicators)	re indicators w/ a	severity of 3) \square Obvious:	: sno

Section 7: Non-Illicit Discharge Concerns (e.g. trash, needed infrastructure repairs?)