			ND (SLAF):	PKOJE(LI CALCULATIO	ONS WORKSHEET	
#1: PROJECT TYPE:			ns Submitted at	STAE Anni	ication		
Type of Stormwater Re		ગુ ર ણ પ્રતાભાવના	ns suvinitted at	STAL APPI	ICACIOII		
Type of Stormwater Re	euont.	I niti:	al Pollutant Load	ina			
Method	Used:	111(1	ar i ondiant ibud	 8			
		BMP Draina	ge Basin Informa	tion (acres	s)		
Pervious Cover=	Impervious Cover=		ime of Concentrati			g Drainage Area=	
	Si	tarting Pollutan	t Load in Draina	ge Area (ll	bs/yr)		
Total Phosphorus=		Total Nitrogen=			Total Suspended So	olids=	
	Existing BMP Typ	e:			Proposed I	BMP Type:	
Existing BMP Efficiency (%)	Downward Modification(s)	Downward Modification (%)	Revised Existing Efficiency Modification(s) (%)	ciency rroposed BMP Efficiency (%) gefficiency ownward ation (%) x		Net Increase in Retrofit Efficiency (%)	
	Select All that Apply (Maximum of 5):	Select the Total Percentage:	Existing Efficiency (%) - (Downward Modification (%) x Existing Efficiency (%			Proposed BMP Efficiency (%) - Revised Existing Efficiency Modification(s) (%)	
TP =	□No Sediment Forebay		TP =	TP =		TP =	
TN=	No Micro-poolNo Outlet ProtectionShort-Circuiting		TN=	TN=		TN=	
TSS=	☐ Undersized TV		TSS=	TSS=		TSS=	
Final Pollutant Load Red	Other(describe below)	(lhs/vr)					
*Total Phosphorus =		*Total Nitrogen =			*Total Suspended S	olids =	
Offset Requirements Addre							
<u> </u>		Project Calc	ulations at Final	Plan Desig	'n		
Type of Stormwater Re	trofit:	<u> </u>					
		Initia	al Pollutant Load	ing			
Method	Used:						
	1		ge Basin Informa				
Pervious Cover=	Impervious Cover=		ime of Concentrati	` ′		g Drainage Area=	
*Total Phosphorus =		*Total Nitrogen =	nt Load in Draina	ge Area (II	*Total Suspended S	olide –	
Total Pilospilorus =			l Efficiency Calcu	lations	Total suspended s	Olius =	
	Existing BMP Typ		i miniency cancu	liations	Proposed F	BMP Type:	
					11000001	in in its angle in the interest of the interes	
Existing BMP Efficiency (%)	Downward Modification(s)	Downward Modification (%)	Revised Existing Efficiency Modification(s) (%)	Proposed BMP Efficiency (%)		Net Increase in Retrofit Efficiency (%)	
	Select All that Apply (Maximum of 5):	Select the Total Percentage:	Existing Efficiency (%) - (Downward Modification (%) x Existing Efficiency (%	5))		(Proposed BMP Efficiency (%) - (Revised Existing Efficiency Modification(s) (%)	
ГР=	□ No Sediment Forebay □ No Micro-pool		TP=	TP=		TP=	
ΓN=	□No Outlet Protection □Short-Circuiting □Undersized TV □Other(describe below)		TN=	TN=		TN=	
ISS=			TSS=	TSS=		TSS=	
	Fina	l Pollutant Load	d Reduction Drai	nage Area	(lbs/yr)		
*Total Phosphorus =		Total Nitrogen =			*Total Suspended S	Solids =	
Offset Requirements Addre	essed (DEQ Guidance Men	no GM20-2003; A	Appendix III):				
Comments							
*Final Pollutant Load Reductio	n Credit = (Starting Pollutant	Load) x (Net Increa	ise in Retrofit Efficien	cy (%))			

#2: PROJECT	TYPE: URBAN S	TREAM RESTORA	TION & OUTFALL	STABILIZATION			
		Project Cal	culations Submitte	d at SIAF Applicat	ion		
Watershed Size	e (ac):	pervious Cover (%):	Managed Tu	urf (%):	Length of Restoration (lf):		
Does restoratio Describe:	on include changes i	in Pattern, Profile, an	d/or Dimension? YES	S□/NO□			
Soil Data							
Number of Soil Borings:		Stream Segment 1	Stream Segment 2 Stream Segment 3		Stream Segment 4	Stream Segment 5	
Composite	BD (lb/ft³)						
Average	TP (lb/T)						
	TN (lb/T)						
	utant Reductions						
Protocol 1 Cred		diment 50% Effective		1			
	Protocol 1	Protocol 2	Protocol 3*	Protocol 4	Protocol 5	TOTAL Load	
C II	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	Reduction (lb/yr)	
Sediment TP							
TN							
111		Droing	L t Calculations at Fi	nal Plan Dasion			
Watershed Size	(ac): Im	pervious Cover (%):		d Turf (%):	Length of Restorat	ion (lf):	
		in Pattern, Profile, an			penger or restorie	wa (a).	
Soil Data							
Number of Soil Borings:		Stream Segment 1	Stream Segment 2	Stream Segment 3	Stream Segment 4	Stream Segment 5	
Composite	BD (lb/ft³)						
Average	TP (lb/T)						
Average	TN (lb/T)						
	utant Reductions						
Protocol 1 Cred		diment 50% Effective	` ' '				
	Protocol 1	Protocol 2	Protocol 3*	Protocol 4	Protocol 5	TOTAL Load	
	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	(lb/yr)	Reduction (lb/yr)	
Sediment							
TP							
TN							

^{*}Protocol 3: <u>Application</u>: Credit for Floodplain Reconnection Volume is an estimate; final credit determined with post-construction As-Built record drawing and modeled floodplain reconnection. <u>Final</u>: Credit for final Floodplain Reconnection Volume as determined by post-construction As-Built record drawing and modeled floodplain reconnection.

#3: PROJECT TYPE: LIVING SHORELINE									
			oject Cal	<u>lculations Su</u>	bmitted at SLA	AF App	<u>lication</u>		
SELECT Type of L			_						
Does Project Meet □	the Qualif	ying Conditions? YES□/N	0□						
	fringe habit	regetated, and excess sedin at (for non-structural & hy			h/dune habitat (for	hybrid w	// breakwater) will be created	d, enhanced, or	
k Submerged Ac	juatic Veg	etation (SAV) present?	YES□/NO	 O□					
		-			□/NO□				
Or on-s	Is the presence of SAV based on VIMS SAV Monitoring Data? YES□/NO□ Or on-site SAV Survey? YES□/NO□								
		s provided for shoreline							
	Sediment	Erosion Rate (E, ft/yr) h	ased on V	/IMS Shoreline	Change Online Vi	ewer?	YES□/NO□		
If No, Describe:	values us	ed in place of 1 or more	of the pr	otocol dofault v	alues for				
						or N se	diment concentration (0.	000205 lb P/lb	
							s/yr), Sedimentation TP or		
							P or TN load reduction ((
		n plantings/yr)? YES□/I							
		ts describing source an				ed.			
		e additional sheets for a							
Length of Sh	oreline	Estimated Shoreline	Erosion	0	Bank Height	1	mated Bank Instability	Area of Marsh Plantings	
(ft)		Rate (ft/yr)			(ft)		Reduction (%)**	(ac)	
Estimated Pollut	ant Reduc	ctions			,		,		
Pollutant		Protocol 1 (lb/yr)	Proto	col 2 (lb/yr)	Protocol 3 (lb	/yr)	Protocol 4 (lb/yr)	TOTAL (lb/yr)	
TP									
TN									
TSS									
Project Calculations at Final Plan Design									
SELECT Type of L	iving Shor	eline:							
Does Project Meet	the Qualif	ying Conditions? YES \square /N	0□						
Site will be graded, vegetated, and excess sediment removed or used, and A marsh fringe habitat (for non-structural & hybrid system w/ sill) or a beach/dune habitat (for hybrid w/ breakwater) will be created, enhanced, or maintained									
k Submerged Ac	matic Veg	etation (SAV) present?	VFS \ /N(<u></u>					
		_			□/NO □				
Is the presence of SAV based on VIMS SAV Monitoring Data? YES□/NO□ Or on-site SAV Survey? YES□/NO□									
		s provided for shoreline	grading	steeper than th	e angle of repose	? YES□]/ NO □		
		Erosion Rate (E, ft/yr) b							
If No, Describe:									
		ed in place of 1 or more							
							ediment concentration (0		
							s/yr), Sedimentation TP o		
reduction (5.289 lb TP or 6,959 lb TSS per ac of marsh plantings/yr), Marsh Redfield Ratio TP or TN load reduction (0.3 lb TP or 6.83 lb TN/ac of marsh plantings/yr)? YES□/NO□									
		its describing source an		s for site-snecif	ic values heing us	æd.			
		e additional sheets for a				· ·			
Length of Sh		Estimated Shoreline			Bank Height	Estir	mated Bank Instability	Area of Marsh Plantings	
(ft)		Rate (ft/yr)		_	(ft)	1	Reduction (%)**	(ac)	
Estimated Pollutant Reductions									
Pollutant		Protocol 1 (lb/yr)	Proto	col 2 (lb/yr)	Protocol 3 (lb	/vr)	Protocol 4 (lb/yr)	TOTAL (lb/yr)	
TP			22010	(20. g2)		J-7	(ID, J1)	_ 0 2.122 (20, J1)	
TN									
TSS									
	ing angle of i	repose exceeds the slope stal	oility thresho	old a detailed site s	∥ lope and bank stabilit	y analysis	to documenting that no addition	al sediment and associated pollutants	
								iment was removed affeite so that the	

will enter the nearshore waters, to include the following conditions: 1) the project was graded and vegetated so that the bank is stable, and 2) excess sediment was removed offsite so that the sediment does not enter the nearshore waters. Bank analysis can demonstrate the site is stable with a minimum risk of erosion. This should be coordinated with appropriate DEQ personnel to ensure proper methods, reporting, and requirements are met, and the project meets this basic qualifying condition. The local or state agency may decide not to issue the credit based on the information regarding site slope and stability assessment that is provided.