

NCS000601_SAWMILLS 2023 ANNUAL SELF ASSESSMENT

Line No.	Reporting Year (July 1 - June 30)	BMP Ref.	Measurable Goal	Reporting Metric	Comments
2	2	1	Did Sawmills submit the Annual Self-Assessment to NCDEQ prior to August 31 each year?	YES	
11	2	3.B.2.	Did Sawmills develop and distribute new educational fliers about illicit discharges?	YES	
12	2	3.B.2.	If so, how many educational fliers about illicit discharges were distributed?	35	
21	2	4.B.1.	Did Sawmills attend the annual Fall Festival and Tractor Treat to disperse stormwater outreach materials/awareness through the use of interactive educational games and activities?	NO	
22	2	4.B.1.	If so, how many event attendees were engaged in stormwater outreach/received stormwater information?	0	
31	2	4.B.2.	Did Sawmills provide additional outreach supplement or alternative outreach opportunities if the annual Fall Festival was canceled?	YES	Butterfly Festival-400 people event
32	2	4.B.2.	If so, how many attendees were engaged in stormwater outreach?	100	
42	2	5.B.1.	Did Sawmills have WPCOG provide instruction and stormwater educational activities to youth?		
43	2	5.B.1.	If so, how many WPCOG youth education activities/events were provided?	1	
44	2	5.B.1.	If so, how many WPCOG youth event participants were reached?	1	
55	2	5.B.2.	How many storm drains were stenciled?	0	
62	2	5.B.3.	Did Sawmills create a presentation covering stormwater topics to be presented in digital classrooms and/or provided to teachers?	NO	In Progress
63	2	5.B.3.	If so, how many classroom presentations were provided by teachers or staff?	0	
64	2	5.B.3.	If so, how many students were reached by classroom presentations?	0	
77	2	7.B.1.	Did Sawmills provide one presentation about one of the six NPDES Minimum Control Measures at each annual WPCOG Water Quality Conference?	YES	
78	2	7.B.1.	If so, how many attendees were reached during the annual WPCOG Water Quality Conference stormwater presentation?	2	
88	2	8.B.1.	Did Sawmills evaluate the target pollutants and audiences to identify where outreach can be improved?	YES	
89	2	8.B.1.	If so, were any revisions made to target pollutants?	NO	
90	2	8.B.2.	If so, were any revisions made to target audiences?	NO	
104	2	10.B.2.	Was the annual self-assessment uploaded to stormwater website?	YES	WPCOG's website
105	2	10.B.2.	Did any links, contact information, or documents on the stormwater web page need to be updated?	YES	
106	2	10.B.3.	How many hits did the stormwater web page receive?	123	
118	2	11.B.3.	Did Sawmills provide citizen education as part of the enforcement process for illicit discharges, illegal dumping and improper disposal of waste?	YES	
119	2	11.B.3.	If so, how many educational citizen interactions were completed as part of the illicit discharge and illegal dumping enforcement process?	0	
129	2	12.B.3.	How many stormwater hotline calls were received?	0	There were no hotline calls
134	2	12.B.4.	Did Sawmills stormwater hotline staff receive training in general stormwater awareness, complaint call protocols, appropriate contacts for referral, and typical stormwater issues?	YES	
139	2	12.B.5.	Did Sawmills publicize contact information on the municipal Facebook page, and the stormwater program and WPCOG webpages?	YES	
144	2	15.B.2.	How many messages were received via the web based complaint/reporting/input form?	0	
148	2	15.B.3.	Was the web based complaint/ reporting/input form maintained / updated?	YES	
155	2	16.B.1.	Did Sawmills maintain a Facebook page for stormwater messaging?	No	
156	2	16.B.2.	Did Sawmills utilize the Facebook page to promote public involvement in stormwater programs, events and projects and provide outreach/general stormwater awareness messages?		
157	2	16.B.2.	If so, how many posts were made on the Facebook page related to the stormwater program?	0	
170	2	17.B.1.	Did Sawmills participate in quarterly Water Resource Committee meetings?	YES	
171	2	17.B.1.	If so, how many quarterly Water Resource Committee meetings did Sawmills participate in?	2	

NCS000601_SAWMILLS 2023 ANNUAL SELF ASSESSMENT

172	2	17.B.1.	If so, how many attendees (total of all meetings) were at quarterly Water Resource Committee meetings that Sawmills participated in?	32	
184	2	18.B.1.	Did Sawmills provide a survey to engage the public and gauge public interest in stormwater issues and the stormwater program?	YES	
185	2	18.B.1.	If so, how many surveys were completed?	0	
196	2	19.B.1.	Did Sawmills provide and promote volunteer stream cleanup activities?	YES	
197	2	19.B.1.	If so, how many stream cleanup events were held?	1	
198	2	19.B.1.	If so, how many stream cleanup participants were there?	2	
199	2	19.B.1.	If so, how many trash bags were filled during stream cleanup events?	8	
213	2	19.B.2.	Did Sawmills provide materials for volunteer stream cleanup activities hosted by Sawmills and WPCOG?	YES	
220	2	19.B.4.	Did Sawmills supplement or replace stream clean-up time with outdoor educational activities if streams do not have adequate litter available for cleanup?	NO	Stream Clean-Up on Catawba River
221	2	19.B.4.	If so, how many supplemental or replacement outdoor educational activities were held?	0	
222	2	19.B.4.	If so, how many supplemental or replacement outdoor educational activity participants were there?	0	
234	2	20.B.1.	Did Sawmills update the existing MS4 map to include open channels, storm drain information and flow direction?	YES	In Progress, Caldwell County is being mapped currently through WPCOG
235	2	20.B.1.	If so, was at least 20% of the MS4 area mapped?	Yes	
243	2	20.B.2.	Did Sawmills add newly constructed infrastructure to the existing MS4 map?	PARTIAL	
248	2	21.B.1.	Did Sawmills review the IDDE ordinance and update if needed?	YES	
255	2	23.B.1.	Did Sawmills review/update priority areas likely to have illicit discharges?	YES	
260	2	24.B.2.	Did Sawmills perform dry weather inspections in accordance with the SOP and schedule?	YES	There are only a couple outfalls, estimated at about 13 total
261	2	24.B.2.	If so, how many dry weather inspections were performed?	0	
262	2	24.B.2.	If so, how many potential illicit/dry weather discharges were identified?	0	
275	2	26.B.1.	Did Sawmills screen priority areas likely to have illicit discharges?	YES	
276	2	26.B.1.	If so, how many illicit discharges were identified in priority areas?	0	
284	2	26.B.3.	Did Sawmills evaluate and assess the IDDE plan/program and revise if necessary?	YES	
290	2	27.B.2.	How many verified IDDE issues were identified?	0	
297	2	27.B.3.	Did Sawmills enforce illicit discharge and illegal dumping violations?	PARTIAL	
298	2	27.B.3.	How many illicit discharge and illegal dumping violations/enforcement actions were issued?	0	There were no Illicit Discharges
299	2	27.B.3.	How many illicit discharge and illegal dumping violations/enforcement actions were resolved?	0	
311	2	27.B.4.	Did Sawmills establish and maintain a list of chronic violators?	PARTIAL	There were no chronic violators
312	2	27.B.4.	If so, how many chronic violators were identified?	0	
319	2	27.B.5.	Did Sawmills evaluate and assess the IDDE Program documentation to identify areas for improvement?	YES	
320	2	27.B.5.	If so, were revisions made to the IDDE tracking sheet?	NO	
330	2	28.B.2.	Did Sawmills train new staff and contractors to identify and report illicit discharges, illicit connections, illegal dumping and spills?	YES	
331	2	28.B.2.	How many new staff and contractors were trained to identify and report illicit discharges, illicit connections, illegal dumping and spills?	2	
339	2	29.B.2.	Did Sawmills utilize social media and the stormwater webpage(s) to publicize contact information for IDDE reporting?	YES	
345	2	32.B.2.	Did Sawmills evaluate the IDDE complaint response time?	YES	
346	2	32.B.2.	If so, what was the average response time for IDDE complaints / reports?	12-24 hours	
356	2	33.B.1.	Did Sawmills train new municipal staff on proper handling of construction site runoff complaints?	YES	
357	2	33.B.1.	How many new staff were trained on proper handling of construction site runoff complaints?	2	
358	2	33.B.2.	How many construction site runoff complaints were received from municipal staff?	0	
370	2	34.B.1.	Did Sawmills administer a public survey to receive perspective on construction site runoff?	YES	
371	2	34.B.4.	Did Sawmills publicize the ability to report concerns about construction runoff issues via the online form on the Sawmills and WPCOG websites and social media?	YES	
380	2	35.B.4.	Did Sawmills maintain/update the adopted construction site waste ordinance?	YES	

NCS000601_SAWMILLS 2023 ANNUAL SELF ASSESSMENT

386	2	35.B.3.	Did Sawmills train municipal staff on identifying and reporting construction site waste violations?	YES	
387	2	35.B.3.	How many staff were trained on identifying and reporting construction site waste violations?		2
394	2	35.B.5.	Did Sawmills enforce construction site waste violations?	YES	There were no violations at this time
395	2	35.B.5.	How many construction site waste enforcement actions were issued?		0
396	2	35.B.5.	How many construction sitewaste violations were remedied?		0
411	2	36	Did Sawmills track the number of low-density and high-density plan reviews performed?	YES	There were no low density or high density plan reviews
412	2	36	If so, how many low density project reviews were performed?		0
413	2	36	If so, how many high density project reviews were performed?		0
414	2	36	If so, how many low density project reviews were approved?		0
415	2	36	If so, how many high density project reviews were approved?		0
432	2	36	Did Sawmills maintain a current inventory of low-density projects and constructed SCMs, including SCM type or low-density acreage, location, last inspection date and type of enforcement action (if any)?	NO	There are no SCMs in Sawmills
437	2	36	How many high density non-municipally owned SCM inspections were performed?		0
442	2	36	How many low-density inspections were performed?		0
447	2	36	How many post-construction enforcement actions were issued?		0
453	2	38.B.1.	Did Sawmills train field and office staff in Stormwater Ordinance procedures and enforcement actions?	YES	
454	2	38.B.1.	How many staff were trained in Stormwater Ordinance procedures and enforcement actions?		2
464	2	38.B.2.	How many post-construction notices of violation were issued?		0
465	2	38.B.2.	How many post-construction Civil Citations were issued?		0
466	2	38.B.2.	How many post-construction violations are still in process of abatement?		0
477	2	39.B.1.	Did Sawmills review post-construction procedures and documents and update as needed?	PARTIAL	There are no SCMs in Sawmills
489	2	42.B.1.	How many pre-CO SCM inspections were completed?		0
490	2	42.B.1.	How many repeat pre-CO SCM inspections were completed?		0
491	2	40.B.1.	How many permitted projects with O&M Plans received their CO?		0
492	2	42.B.2.	How many SCM inspections were completed by municipal staff?		0
493	2	42.B.2.	How many SCM inspections performed by municipal staff were failed?		0
494	2	42.B.3.	How many qualified licensed professional SCM inspections completed with documentation received?		0
495	2	42.B.3.	How many SCMs are under annual inspection enforcement?		0
496	2	42.B.4.	Did Sawmills conduct inspections of 20% of low-density projects this year?	NO	There are now low density sites in Sawmills
523	2	43.B.3.	Did Sawmills provide educational materials about low density developments during the issuance of zoning permits, distributed through mailings, posted on social media, and handed out at events?	NO	
524	2	43.B.3.	How many low density educational materials were distributed?		0
533	2	44.B.2.	Did Sawmills provide educational materials to developers about high density development during the issuance of zoning permits, distributed through mailings, posted on social media, and handed out at events?	NO	
534	2	44.B.2.	How many high density educational materials were distributed?		0 There are no high density sites in Sawmills
542	2	44.B.3.	Did Sawmills establish/maintain links to all post-construction ordinances, manuals, policies, checklists, design standards, and/or other materials on the website?	YES	via WPCOG's website
548	2	45.B.1.	Did Sawmills maintain a Pet Waste Ordinance?	YES	
549	2	45.B.1.	Did Sawmills implement and enforce the Pet Waste Ordinance?	YES	
558	2	45.B.2.	How many educational awareness materials on fecal coliform pollution associated with maintenance of septic systems were distributed?		35
566	2	47.B.3.	How many municipal facilities were inspected to ensure good housekeeping / spill prevention and control measures are implemented?		1
571	2	47.B.4.	How many municipal facilities implemented corrective action(s) following inspection?		1
577	2	48.B.3.	Did Sawmills review/maintain written spill response plans?	YES	In Progress
578	2	48.B.3.	How many spill response procedure plans were revised?		0
587	2	48.B.5.	How many non-reportable spills were documented according to the spill response SOP?		0
588	2	48.B.5.	How many reportable spills were documented according to the spill response SOP?		0
597	2	49.B.3.	Did Sawmills implement the MS4 O&M Plan?	PARTIAL	In Progress

NCS000601_SAWMILLS 2023 ANNUAL SELF ASSESSMENT

601	2	49.B.4.	How many MS4 inspections were completed?		
608	2	50.B.2.	How many comprehensive stormwater training sessions for new staff were held?	1	
609	2	50.B.2.	How many new municipal and contractor staff received comprehensive stormwater training ?	2	
620	2	51.B.1.	Did Sawmills inspect the MS4 infrastructure?	YES	
621	2	51.B.1.	How many MS4 catch basins were inspected?	11	
622	2	51.B.1.	How many MS4 conveyances were inspected?	11	
623	2	51.B.1.	How many MS4 issues were documented?	0	
637	2	52.B.2.	How many MS4 cleanings/maintenance actions were performed?	15	
644	2	53.B.1.	Did Sawmills maintain an inventory of municipally-owned SCMs with information including type, year built, date of last inspection and maintenance actions?	YES	
645	2	53.B.1.	How many municipally-owned SCMs are in the inventory?	0	
646	2	53.B.2.	Did Sawmills develop/maintain a SCM Operation and Maintenance Plan for each municipally-owned SCM?	NO	There are no SCMs in Sawmills
657	2	54.B.3.	How many municipally-owned SCM inspections were performed?	0	
663	2	54.B.4.	How many municipally-owned SCMs had documented deficiencies/required maintenance?	0	
664	2	54.B.4.	How many municipally-owned SCM corrective actions/repairs were performed?	0	
673	2	56.B.1.	Did Sawmills ensure that only certified landscapers/applicators are applying pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers?	YES	
674	2	56.B.1.	How many certified landscapers/applicators are applying pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers?	2	
683	2	57.B.3.	Did Sawmills implement standard operating procedures for vehicle and equipment washing?	YES	120 washings performed
692	2	59.B.1.	Did Sawmills perform annual municipal street/curb and gutter sweeping?	YES	
693	2	59.B.1.	How many lane miles were swept?	4	
694	2	59.B.2.	Did Sawmills track conveyances/infrastructure that have frequent problems with pollution to prioritize their maintenance?	YES	
706	2	59.B.3.	Did Sawmills distribute educational flyers regarding street runoff pollution?	YES	
707	2	59.B.3.	How many educational flyers regarding street runoff pollution were distributed?	75	
716	2	60.B.1.	Did Sawmills service public waste receptacles?	YES	
717	2	60.B.1.	How many trash bags were used/collected?	140	
726	2	60.B.2.	Did Sawmills collect litter on an as-needed basis?	YES	
727	2	60.B.2.	How much trash was collected (pounds)?	4,760	
736	2	61.B.1.	Did Sawmills perform bagged leaf collections?	NO	
737	2	61.B.1.	How many bags of leaves were collected?	0	
746	2	62.B.1.	Did Sawmills train first responders on minimizing, collecting and disposing of fluids and other vehicular pollutants following an accident?	NO	
747	2	62.B.1.	How many first responders were trained on minimizing, collecting and disposing of fluids and other vehicular pollutants following an accident?	0	
756	2	62.B.2.	Did Sawmills equip and maintain spill kits in first responder vehicles?	YES	
757	2	62.B.2.	How many first responder spill kits were maintained / refilled?	0	
765	2	62.B.3.	How many public education materials about vehicle leaks / pollution potential were distributed?	0	
771	2	62.B.4.	Did Sawmills enforce significant vehicle leaks from parked cars under the IDDE ordinance?	YES	No significant leaks were reported
772	2	62.B.4.	How many enforcement actions were issued for significant vehicle leaks from parked cars?	0	