



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

**MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4) ANNUAL
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REPORT FOR
COMPREHENSIVE PERMIT (MOR04C)**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
PROJECT ID NUMBER	
DATE RECEIVED	

Part A – MS4 PERMIT HOLDER INFORMATION

1. MS4 NAME Excelsior Springs	2. NPDES PERMIT NUMBER MOR04C043	3. MS4 UNIQUE ID NO. (If applicable – co-permittees only) N/A	
4. ADDRESS 103 E. Water Street	5. CITY Excelsior Springs	6. STATE MO	7. ZIP CODE 64024
8. TELEPHONE NUMBER WITH AREA CODE 816-630-0755	9. NAME OF MS4 CONTACT PERSON Nate Conyers, Stormwater Coordinator		
10. EMAIL OF MS4 CONTACT PERSON NConyers@excelsiorsprings.gov			
11. Is the MS4 contact person listed above different from the most recent MS4 stormwater management program annual report? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
12. Have any areas of the MS4 been added or removed from the MS4 jurisdiction due to annexation or other legal means since the most recent permit application (renewal, new, modification), or most recent MS4 stormwater management program annual report? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes , please provide a map along with a brief description as an attachment.			

Part B – REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1. Is your MS4 subject to a TMDL? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes , you are required to submit the MS4 ARAP report annually. Reports are due Feb. 28 each year. See Part F of this form.
2. Is your MS4 newly permitted (i.e., is this your first MS4 permit)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3. If you are part of a co-permitted MS4 permit, will each co-permitted MS4 submit an individual stormwater management program report, or a combined MS4 stormwater management program report? <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Combined
4. Reporting period year (i.e., the previous year from January 1 st to December 31 st) BEGINNING: <u>January 1, 2025</u> ENDING: <u>December 31, 2025</u>

Part C – STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PARTNERS

1. If another governmental entity implements any BMPs or MCMs for your stormwater program, please provide the following: a. Name of the government entity; b. Name of the primary contact for the government entity; c. Contact information (i.e., address, city, ZIP code, state, and phone number); and d. Specific best management practices or minimum control measures being implemented by the government entity. It is the responsibility of the permittee to provide all information under this report regardless if programmatic BMPs or MCMs are being implemented by another governmental entity. If an entire MCM is being implemented by an alternative governmental entity, please indicated that under the appropriate MCM below.
2. Does the permittee currently utilize, or is working towards develop of an Integrated Plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes , please provide a summary of the status of the Integrated Plan.

PART D – MINIMUM CONTROL MEASURES, BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES, AND MEASURABLE GOALS EVALUATION

An attachment is necessary for many items under the MCMs below to provide information regarding the progress toward achieving the statutory goal of reducing the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 to the maximum extent practicable to the MS4. Provide additional informative data, success stories, and experiences that support the successful implementation of your stormwater management plan (SWMP).

MCM 1. Public Education and Outreach

1. (4.1.A) Who are the target audiences? <u>Residents and Detention Basin Owners</u> Were any changes made to target audiences during reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
--

2. (4.1.B) What are the target pollutants? Common urban SW pollutants & pollutants from land development activities _____
 Were any changes made to target pollutants during reporting period? Yes No

3. (4.1.C) Were any changes made to educational resources to be used as BMPs (materials, postings, etc.) in conjunction with the selected pollutants for the selected target audiences during reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.

4. (4.1.D, 4.1.E) Were any changes made to involvement activities, or support to be used as BMPs (events, activities, etc.) in conjunction with the selected pollutants for the selected target audiences during reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes

5. (4.1.F) Were all BMPs for MCM 1 evaluated during reporting period? Yes No
 If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.

6. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 1 successfully reached? Yes No
 If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? Yes No

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

7. Were the BMPs for MCM 1 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? Yes No
 If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? Yes No

8. Were any changes made to MCM 1 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs?
 Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.

MCM 2. Public Involvement and Participation

1. (4.2.A, 4.2.B, 4.2.C) Completing 4.2.A-4.2.C in this form is only applicable during permit renewal OR as a result of major modification to the SWMP. If neither of these apply during this reporting period, please check N/A here and skip to 3 below. N/A

2. Was a public notice period held during reporting period? Yes No
 Was the public notice posted on the MS4 website? Yes No
 Was a public information meeting held for the public notice during this reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, what was the attendance for the meeting? _____
 Were any comments received? Yes No If Yes, how many? _____

3. (4.2.D) Were any changes to publicly available method to accept public inquiries, or concerns, and to take information provided by the public about stormwater and stormwater related topics made during reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.

4. Were all BMPs and tracking methods for 4.2.D evaluated during reporting period? Yes No
 If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.

5. (4.2.E) Does the permittee utilize a stormwater management panel or committee during the reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, was the panel or committee determined to be effective/successful for this reporting period? Yes No
 If the permittee does not currently utilize a stormwater management panel or committee, did the permittee evaluate the potential benefits of utilizing a stormwater management panel or committee? Yes No

6. Were any changes to 4.2.E made during reporting period? Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.

7. (4.2.F) On what date did the permittee provide an update to the governing board on the status of, or updates on, the Stormwater Management Program, including compliance with the program for this reporting period? 4/7/25

8. (4.2.I) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 2 evaluated during this reporting period? Yes No
 If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms were not evaluated.

9. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 2 successfully reached? Yes No
 If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? Yes No

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

10. Were the programmatic BMPs for MCM 2 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? Yes No
 If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? Yes No

11. Were any changes made to MCM 2 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs?
 Yes No
 If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.

12. (4.3.A) Were any changes to the storm sewer system map made during reporting period? Yes No

13. (4.3.C) Were any changes made to the ordinance for prohibition of non-stormwater into the storm sewer system during this reporting period? Yes No

14. (4.3.D) Was the measurable goal for dry weather field screening met? Yes No
 If No, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? Yes No

<p>15. (4.3.H) Were the priority areas evaluated for this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, were the priority areas determined to be appropriate for the next reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Will additional or new priority areas be identified for the next reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>16. (4.3.J) Were any illicit discharge investigations conducted during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, were the investigation procedures, response times, and tracking mechanisms determined to be appropriate for the next reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>17. (4.3.K) Were MCM 3 enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>18. (4.3.L) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 3 evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms were not evaluated.</p>
<p>19. (4.3.M, 4.3.Q) Were all outreach and internal training procedures for MCM 3 evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>20. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 3 successfully reached? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.</p>
<p>21. (4.3.N - 4.3.R) Were the programmatic BMPs for MCM 3 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>22. Were any changes made to MCM 3 during this reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>MCM 4. Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control</p>
<p>1. (4.4.A) Were any changes to the ordinance for construction site stormwater made during this reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>2. (4.4.B) Were the pre-construction plan review procedures evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the review procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>3. (4.4.C) Were the procedures for construction site inspections, evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>4. (4.4.D) Were construction site enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>5. (4.4.E) Were the procedures for requiring construction site operators to conduct site inspections evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>6. (4.4.F, 4.4.G) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 4 evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms and/or databases were not evaluated.</p>
<p>7. (4.4.J) Were all procedures for public submittal of concerns or information related to construction sites evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>8. (4.4.K) Were all internal training procedures for MCM 4 evaluated for effectiveness during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>9. (4.4.L) Were all procedures outlining the local inspection and enforcement for MCM 4 evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why the document(s) were not evaluated.</p>
<p>10. Were the measurable goals for all programmatic BMPs for MCM 4 successfully reached? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the measurable goals or programmatic BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No For each of the programmatic BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.</p>
<p>11. (4.4.H, 4.4.I, 4.4.M) Were the programmatic BMPs and procedures for MCM 4 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>12. Were any changes made to MCM 4 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>MCM 5. Post-Construction Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment</p>

<p>1. (4.5.A) Were any changes to the ordinance for post-construction runoff site stormwater made during this reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>2. (4.5.B) Were any changes to the permittee's strategy to minimize water quality impact made during this reporting period? This includes any policy or ordinance changes to either structural or non-structural controls. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>3. Were all strategies (programmatic BMPs) for 4.5.B evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.</p>
<p>4. (4.5.C) Were the pre-construction plan review procedures evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>5. (4.5.D) Were procedures for long-term operation and maintenance of the post-development BMPs evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>6. (4.5.E) Were the procedures for inspections or requiring inspections, evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>7. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for 4.5.E successfully reached? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>8. (4.5.F, 4.5.G) Were compliance and enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.</p>
<p>9. (4.5.H) Was the inventory of all post-construction BMPs, including the tracking mechanism, evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>10. (4.5.I) Were all tracking mechanisms for post-construction BMP inspections, including the tracking mechanism, evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated.</p>
<p>11. (4.5.L) Were all training procedures for inspections evaluated for effectiveness during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated</p>
<p>12. Were the measurable goals for all programmatic BMPs for MCM 5 successfully reached? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the measurable goals or programmatic BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.</p>
<p>13. (4.5.J, 4.5.K, 4.5.M) Were programmatic BMPs and procedures for MCM 5 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, were the programmatic BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>14. Were any changes made to MCM 5 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>MCM 6. Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations</p>
<p>1. (4.6.A) Did the permittee maintain and utilize an employee training program for MS4 municipal operations staff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No What date or dates was the training held during this reporting period? <u>March 2025</u></p>
<p>2. Were any changes to the training program made during reporting this period? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes.</p>
<p>3. (4.6.B) Were the following topics covered during training for this reporting period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle and equipment washing; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Fluid disposal and spills; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Fleet, equipment, and building maintenance; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Park, open space maintenance procedures (including fertilizer, herbicide, pesticide application); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • New construction, road maintenance, and land disturbances; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Stormwater system maintenance; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • MS4 operated salt and de-icing operations; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Fueling; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Solid waste disposal; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Street sweeper operations; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable • Illicit Discharges; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<p>4. (4.6.C) Were training materials, written procedures for the training program, and a schedule for topics evaluated during this reporting period? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.</p>

5. (4.6.D) Was a list of municipal operations/facilities impacted by the MS4 permit maintained and evaluated during this reporting period?
 Yes No

6. (4.6.E) Was a list of all industrial facilities owned or operated by the permittee which are subject to NPDES permits for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activity, maintained and evaluated during this reporting period? Yes No

7. (4.6.F) Were controls and procedures for reducing or eliminating the discharge of floatables and pollutants from municipal facilities evaluated during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **No**, please include an attachment describing what elements and procedures were not evaluated and why.

8. Were inspections conducted on these facilities at minimum annually? Yes No

9. Were the stormwater control measures and other programmatic BMPs for 4.6.E determined effective/successful for this reporting period?
 Yes No
 If **No**, were the BMPs, and procedures determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement?
 Yes No

10. (4.6.G) Were procedures for proper disposal of waste removed from the MS4 structures and areas of jurisdiction evaluated during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **No**, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated.

11. (4.6.H) Was washing of municipal vehicles and/or equipment taking place on a facility owned and/or operated by the permittee during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **Yes**, were procedures for proper disposal of wash water evaluated during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **No**, please include an attachment describing what procedures were not evaluated and why.

12. (4.6.I) Did the permittee maintain written Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans or an Operations and Maintenance Manual for all applicable MS4 facilities during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **No**, please include an attachment describing why the document(s) were not created and/maintained.

13. Did the permittee evaluate the results, controls, and inspection procedures to ensure compliance with the permit and determine if changes are needed? This evaluation may also aid in finding priority areas or pollutants in relation to MCM 3, or adding more education in relation to MCM 1. Yes No
 If **No**, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why.

14. (4.6.J) Were any new flood management projects reviewed or begun during this reporting period? Yes No
 If **Yes**, were procedures used to determine if there are impacts to water quality for the new project? Yes No

15. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 6 successfully reached? Yes No
 If **No**, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? Yes No

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

16. (4.6.K, 4.6.L, 4.6.M) Were BMPs for MCM 6 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? Yes No
 If **No**, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? Yes No

17. Were any changes made to MCM 6 during the reporting period that were not covered above? Yes No
 If **Yes**, please include an attachment describing changes.

Part E – MONITORING DATA WATER SAMPLE(S) ANALYSIS

Please include monitoring data collected during the reporting period.

PARAMETER OR INDICATOR	FREQUENCY (Ongoing monitoring or single diagnostic event or date)	RESULT	DRY WEATHER SAMPLE?	WET WEATHER SAMPLE?
N/A			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

1. Are any of the parameters being sampled due to the MS4 being subject to an established or approved Total Maximum Daily Load?
 Yes No
 If **Yes**, please indicate the parameter/pollutant.

2. Does the data support water quality attainment or support trend data toward water quality attainment?
 Yes No
 If **Yes**, please describe.

Part F – TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL) ASSUMPTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS ATTAINMENT (ARAP) PLAN

1. Is your MS4 subject to an established or approved TMDL? Yes No
 If **No**, please continue to Part G of this report.

2. Has the permittee submitted the TMDL ARAP to the Department for review and approval? Yes No
 If **No**, please submit the annual status report providing a brief update on the status of completion of the TMDL ARAP per 6.1.H of the permit.

PART G – SUBMIT REPORT TO:

The facility must register in the Department’s eDMR system through the Missouri Gateway for Environmental Management (MoGEM) before the first report is due. Registration and other information regarding MoGEM can be found at; [MoGEM Splash Page](#). Information about the eDMR system can be found at [eDMR Splash Page](#). To access the eDMR system, use: [MoGEM Login](#).
 For assistance using the eDMR system, contact edmr@dnr.mo.gov or call 855-789-3889 or 573-526-2082.

OPTIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING MILITARY SERVICE

Have you or an immediate family member ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, would you like information about military-related services in Missouri?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

PART H - CERTIFICATION

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

SIGNATURE OR PERMITTEE (LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE PERSON)	DATE SIGNED
NAME (PRINTED OR TYPED) Chad Birdsong	TITLE Public Works Director

PART C – STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PARTNERS

The City of Excelsior Springs is a member of the Mid America Regional Council (MARC) Water Quality Education Committee (WQEC) and utilizes MARC's services to augment their local public outreach and education programs. While MARC augments the City's programs, it neither solely operates nor implements any BMP for Excelsior Springs. The City is not working towards the development of an integrated plan. The primary point of contact for MARC is Tom Jacobs (Environmental Programs Director). His contact information:

Email: tjacobs@marc.org

Phone #: 816-474-4240

Address: 600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, MO 64105

PART D–MINIMUM CONTROL MEASURES, BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES, AND MEASURABLE GOALS EVALUATION

MCM 1. Public Education and Outreach

1. (4.1.A) Who are the target audiences? **Residents and Detention Basin Owners**

Were any changes made to target audiences during reporting period? **No**

2.(4.1.B) What are the target pollutants? **Common urban stormwater pollutants (IDDE, lawn chemicals, pet waste and used motor oil) and pollutants associated with land development**

Were any changes made to target pollutants during reporting period? **No**

3.(4.1.C) Were any changes made to educational resources to be used as BMPs (materials, postings, etc.) in conjunction with the selected pollutants for the selected target audiences during reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

4.(4.1.D, 4.1.E) Were any changes made to involvement activities, or support to be used as BMPs (events, activities, etc.) in conjunction with the selected pollutants for the selected target audiences during reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

5. (4.1.F) Were all BMPs for MCM 1 evaluated during reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

6. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 1 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

- **The City’s stormwater information web pages were up all year. The stormwater quality page had 2760 page views, the stormwater resources page has 2024 page views, the waterways information page had 5335 page views, and the Fishing River Downtown page had 408 page views in 2025. MARC stormwater quality information was available on their web site and linked from the City’s web site. The following pdf files were downloaded: Designing a rain garden (342 downloads), Rain Garden planting (376 downloads), SWMP (1547 downloads), Biennial/Annual Reports (27 downloads) and the Fishing River Watershed Study Open House (370 downloads).**
- **The City’s Stormwater Education Facebook page has 34 followers. Public education on stormwater quality topics was posted quarterly on Facebook:**
 - **March 10, 2025– “Pollution Travels Downstream”**
 - **April 25, 2025 – “Lawn chemical application”**
 - **September 15, 2025 – “Pet waste disposal”**
 - **December 11, 2025-“Used oil disposal”**
 - **57 likes, 11 comments, and 72 shares**
- **In 2025, The Rotary Club along with boy scout troop 309 stenciled 350 storm inlets with stenciled messages. In 2025, 35 inlets were field-verified that the markings were still legible and intact. Also in more recent years, new storm inlets added to the MS4 have been installed with the casting marked with the “No dumping” message. However, in 2025, no new MS4 inlets were constructed and accepted into the City’s system for maintenance.**
- **Paid the annual fee for the MARC water quality committee in February 2025 (\$1150). The City stormwater coordinator keeps a file of the various educational pamphlets from MARC to hand out based on the types of issues he encounters while completing his duties. The Stormwater Coordinator also has joined the MARC Water Quality Committee to improve the voice of the small MS4 communities in order for the program to better benefit Excelsior Springs.**
- **Hosted a cleanup event along the Fishing River and its tributaries as part of an Earth Day celebration April 26, 2025. Approximately 3 miles of riverbank/streambank (and much of the contributing watershed in the downtown area) were cleaned by 67 volunteers resulting in the collection of**

95 large (55 gallon) bags of trash, 13 smaller mesh stream cleanup bags of trash, 12 tires, and 12 large pickup truck (F550) loads of bulky items. City staff organized and advertised the event and provided all of the trash disposal. The Parks Department estimated this at over \$6,731 of cleanup efforts.

- **Yard waste was collected from March 1 to November 30 on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays from 8:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. There was no grinding of the yard waste during this reporting period. Typically, this is done every one to three years based on the volume collected and a large amount was hauled off in 2022 with the next big disposal not occurring until January 2026.**
- **Encouraged citizens to utilize the various permanent and mobile locations for household hazardous waste dropoff around the Kansas City metro area. The City web site has a link to the RecycleSpot.org web site where information about HHW can be taken. During this reporting period, 14,850 pounds of HHW waste were collected from Excelsior Springs citizens (dropped off by 114 cars). Also, 7 volunteers from the Public Works Department attended and assisted with the mobile collection in Richmond in September 2025.**
- **Met with 3 different construction contractors prior to commencement of their projects to explain construction site runoff control expectations.**
- **Met with 5 owners of existing post-construction stormwater BMPs to educate each on the operation and maintenance requirements of their BMPs.**

7. Were the BMPs for MCM 1 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

8. Were any changes made to MCM 1 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

MCM 2. Public Involvement and Participation

3. (4.2.D) Were any changes to publicly available method to accept public inquiries, or concerns, and to take information provided by the public about stormwater and stormwater related topics made during reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No changes**

4. Were all BMPs and tracking methods for 4.2.D evaluated during reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

5. (4.2.E) Does the permittee utilize a stormwater management panel or committee during the reporting period? If Yes, was the panel or committee determined to be effective/successful for this reporting period? If the permittee does not currently utilize a stormwater management panel or committee, did the permittee evaluate the potential benefits of utilizing a stormwater management panel or committee? **No, the City does not have a stormwater management panel or committee. Yes, the City evaluated the potential benefits of utilizing a stormwater management committee and does not believe it makes sense for the City at this time.**

6. Were any changes to 4.2.E made during reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

7. (4.2.F) On what date did the permittee provide an update to the governing board on the status of, or updates on, the Stormwater Management Program, including compliance with the program for this reporting period? **Update on program by Nate Conyers at the City Council Meeting on April 7, 2025.**

8. (4.2.I) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 2 evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms were not evaluated. **Yes**

9. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 2 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

Received 11 public inquires during the reporting period (10 via phone call/voicemail and 1 email). 9 were related to private property flooding issues and two were related to “sinkholes” from pipe or inlet failures. Staff met with 5 property owners in person and spoke with the other property owner on the phone. All necessary follow up (including three capital repairs/replacements) were completed.

10. Were the programmatic BMPs for MCM 2 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

11. Were any changes made to MCM 2 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

MCM 3. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

1. (4.3.A) Were any changes to the storm sewer system map made during reporting period? **No (no new facilities constructed, no annexation)**

2. (4.3.C) Were any changes made to the ordinance for prohibition of non-stormwater into the storm sewer system during this reporting period? **No**

3. (4.3.D) Was the measurable goal for dry weather field screening met? If No, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

4. (4.3.H) Were the priority areas evaluated for this reporting period? If Yes, were the priority areas determined to be appropriate for the next reporting period? Will additional or new priority areas be identified for the next reporting period? **Yes, they were evaluated. Yes, they are appropriate for the next reporting period. No new areas will be added at this time.**

5. (4.3.J) Were any illicit discharge investigations conducted during this reporting period? If Yes, were the investigation procedures, response times, and tracking mechanisms determined to be appropriate for the next reporting? If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes – illicit discharge investigations were conducted during this reporting period. Yes – investigation procedures, response times and tracking mechanisms appear to be appropriate.**

6. (4.3.K) Were MCM 3 enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

7. (4.3.L) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 3 evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms were not evaluated. **Yes**

8. (4.3.M, 4.3.Q) Were all outreach and internal training procedures for MCM 3 evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

9. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 3 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals or BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

- **35 outfalls were dry weather field screened (25 within the priority areas); The total number of outfalls had previously been established as 84, but with recent training on the definition of outfall, it is expected that this total is much lower as many discharge points of the engineered stormwater collection system will not meet the legal definition of “MS4 Outfall”. The discharge points will be used as “outfalls” until field-evaluated to verify which will be in the outfall total. Only two of the discharge points had dry weather flow. One turned out to be a leak on a potable water main. This line has been fixed. One turned out to be irrigation from upstream.**
- **One illicit discharge was reported by City staff. It was investigated immediately and resolved. City provided personnel and equipment to assist with clean up as needed.**
- **14,850 pounds of HHW collected**
- **24 employees trained on illicit discharges**
- **Facebook post messages covered illicit discharge education (See MCM #1)**
- **Sanitary sewers were inspected for potential for exfiltration of waste that could impact the City’s MS4. In 2025: 6,842 feet of sanitary sewers were inspected via CCTV.**

10. (4.3.N -4.3.R) Were the programmatic BMPs for MCM 3 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

11. Were any changes made to MCM 3 during this reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

MCM 4. Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control

1. (4.4.A) Were any changes to the ordinance for construction site stormwater made during this reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

2. (4.4.B) Were the pre-construction plan review procedures evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the review procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

3. (4.4.C) Were the procedures for construction site inspections evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

4. (4.4.D) Were construction site enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

5. (4.4.E) Were the procedures for requiring construction site operators to conduct site inspections evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

6. (4.4.F, 4.4.G) Were all tracking mechanisms and databases for MCM 4 evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the mechanisms and/or databases were not evaluated. **Yes**

7. (4.4.J) Were all procedures for public submittal of concerns or information related to construction sites evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

8. (4.4.K) Were all internal training procedures for MCM 4 evaluated for effectiveness during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

9. (4.4.L) Were all procedures outlining the local inspection and enforcement for MCM 4 evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the document(s) were not evaluated. **Yes**

10. Were the measurable goals for all programmatic BMPs for MCM 4 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals or programmatic BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the programmatic BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

- **Continued pre-construction plan review of new and redevelopment projects disturbing more than one acre ensuring that selected BMPs are appropriate for the site. The City contract review engineer received and reviewed 2 sets of plans in 2025. This resulted in the issuance of 2 permits.**
- **Continued to receive and log any public input on construction site runoff control. During the reporting period, no complaints were received in regard to 4 active sites. Staff believes that this is directly correlated to the ongoing education efforts by meeting with contractors early in the construction process to ensure they understand the permit requirements and inspectors' expectations.**

- **Continued to require weekly contractor self-inspections of active construction sites that result in land disturbance of greater than or equal to one acre and any smaller land disturbances if part of a greater plan or sale that would exceed the one-acre threshold in aggregate.**
- **In 2025, 67 site inspection visits to 4 active construction sites were completed by the Stormwater Coordinator on grading permits. During this same period, Code Enforcement staff performed 32 inspections on 12 active residential permits.**
- **Continued to take enforcement actions as necessary to ensure proper construction site runoff control on applicable sites. No written violation and 9 verbal warnings were issued by the Stormwater Coordinator on grading permits. Code Enforcement had 14 stormwater related violations on residential permits. All issues were corrected.**
- **Met with three different contractors on-site prior to each of their projects starting to explain expectations for construction site runoff control.**

11. (4.4.H, 4.4.I, 4.4.M) Were the programmatic BMPs and procedures for MCM 4 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? **Yes**

12. Were any changes made to MCM 4 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

MCM 5. Post-Construction Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment

1. (4.5.A) Were any changes to the ordinance for post-construction runoff site stormwater made during this reporting period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

2. (4.5.B) Were any changes to the permittee's strategy to minimize water quality impact made during this reporting period? This includes any policy or ordinance changes to either structural or non-structural controls. If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

3. Were all strategies (programmatic BMPs) for 4.5.B evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

4. (4.5.C) Were the pre-construction plan review procedures evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

5. (4.5.D) Were procedures for long-term operation and maintenance of the post-development BMPs evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

6. (4.5.E) Were the procedures for inspections or requiring inspections, evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

7. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for 4.5.E successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

8. (4.5.F, 4.5.G) Were compliance and enforcement procedures evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

9. (4.5.H) Was the inventory of all post-construction BMPs, including the tracking mechanism, evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

10. (4.5.I) Were all tracking mechanisms for post-construction BMP inspections, including the tracking mechanism, evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

11. (4.5.L) Were all training procedures for inspections evaluated for effectiveness during this reporting period? No, please include an attachment describing why these procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

12. Were the measurable goals for all programmatic BMPs for MCM 5 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals or programmatic BMPs evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

- **Continued to utilize the various requirements for quantity and quality control on new and redevelopment projects found within the UDO and stormwater ordinances as well as the design criteria located in KC APWA Section 5600 Stormwater Design Criteria and KC APWA/MARC Manual of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality. In 2025, 2 plans for new or redevelopment that included post-construction structural BMPs were reviewed, and 2 permits were issued for construction. This resulted**

in the construction of two detention basins. Each of these BMPs were inspected during construction and upon completion.

- **Continued to require long term operation and maintenance of post-construction BMPs through the execution of recorded maintenance covenants and an annual inspection of all existing BMPs. In 2025, no new maintenance agreements were executed and recorded with Clay County. One new facility that was completed had the maintenance agreement recorded in the prior year. The other new detention facility is City-owned and maintained.**
- **57 existing post-construction BMP inspections were completed. Four facilities had violations (mostly minor mowing and/or litter issues though one had silt fence that had never been removed following construction). Both were corrected following verbal warnings.**

13. (4.5.J, 4.5.K, 4.5.M) Were programmatic BMPs and procedures for MCM 5 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the programmatic BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

14. Were any changes made to MCM 5 during the reporting period that were not covered above, including the addition of programmatic BMPs? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

MCM 6. Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations

1. (4.6.A) Did the permittee maintain and utilize an employee training program for MS4 municipal operations staff? What date or dates was the training held during this reporting period? **24 employees trained in March 2025**

2. Were any changes to the training program made during reporting this period? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**

3. (4.6.B) Were the following topics covered during training for this reporting period?

- Vehicle and equipment washing **Yes**
- Fluid disposal and spills **Yes**
- Fleet, equipment, and building maintenance **Yes**
- Park, open space maintenance procedures (including fertilizer, herbicide, pesticide application) **Yes**
- New construction, road maintenance, and land disturbances **Yes**
- Stormwater system maintenance **Yes**
- MS4 operated salt and de-icing operations **Yes**
- Fueling **Yes**
- Solid waste disposal **Yes**
- Street sweeper operations **Yes**

•Illicit Discharges **Yes**

4. (4.6.C) Were training materials, written procedures for the training program, and a schedule for topics evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

5. (4.6.D) Was a list of municipal operations/facilities impacted by the MS4 permit maintained and evaluated during this reporting period? **Yes**

6. (4.6.E) Was a list of all industrial facilities owned or operated by the permittee which are subject to NPDES permits for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activity, maintained and evaluated during this reporting period? **Yes**

7. (4.6.F) Were controls and procedures for reducing or eliminating the discharge of floatables and pollutants from municipal facilities evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what elements and procedures were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

8. Were inspections conducted on these facilities at minimum annually? **Yes**

9. Were the stormwater control measures and other programmatic BMPs for 4.6.E determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the BMPs, and procedures determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

10. (4.6.G) Were procedures for proper disposal of waste removed from the MS4 structures and areas of jurisdiction evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the procedures were not evaluated. **Yes**

11. (4.6.H) Was washing of municipal vehicles and/or equipment taking place on a facility owned and/or operated by the permittee during this reporting period? If Yes, were procedures for proper disposal of wash water evaluated during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing what procedures were not evaluated and why. **Yes, there was washing of City vehicles/equipment at City facilities. Yes, standard operating procedures were followed for proper disposal of wash waters.**

12. (4.6.I) Did the permittee maintain written Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans or an Operations and Maintenance Manual for all applicable MS4 facilities during this reporting period? If No, please include an attachment describing why the document(s) were not created and/maintained. **No. Staff used Good Housekeeping Standard Operating Procedures and more site specific SWPPPs were begun, but not finished during the reporting period. They will be finished in the next reporting period.**

13. Did the permittee evaluate the results, controls, and inspection procedures to ensure compliance with the permit and determine if changes are needed? This evaluation may also aid in finding priority areas or pollutants in relation to MCM 3, or adding more education in relation to MCM 1. If No, please include an attachment describing what BMPs were not evaluated and why. **Yes**

14. (4.6.J) Were any new flood management projects reviewed or begun during this reporting period? If Yes, were procedures used to determine if there are impacts to water quality for the new project? **No**

15. Were the measurable goals for all BMPs for MCM 6 successfully reached? If No, were the measurable goals evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the next reporting period? **Yes**

For each of the BMPs under this MCM, please provide a brief summary of how the measurable goals were achieved and documented. For any BMPs where the measurable goals were not achieved, provide a brief summary of how the BMP evaluated/modified in an effort for success in the coming reporting year.

- **Continued to provide employee training on stormwater quality protection. In 2025: 24 employees were trained on stormwater SOPs (March).**
- **Continued to perform maintenance activities on the MS4. Generally, there are approximately 25 grated inlets that tend to clog with leaves and other waste that are checked after rain events and cleaned.**
- **Continued to sweep streets to reduce pollutant loads. In 2025: 409 miles were swept.**
- **Four hundred tons of salt were purchased for the 2024-2025 snow season. The pad outside the salt barn was swept after each snow event.**
- **Continued to have the grit chambers in the maintenance facility cleaned out regularly. Heritage-Crystal Clean LLC cleaned it out in the spring (and again in early January 2026 after the end of the reporting period due to rescheduling issues in the fall).**
- **Continued tire recycling. These are stored until a complete load can be picked up. No tires were recycled in 2025.**
- **Continued to perform inspections of city maintenance facilities. In 2025: all City maintenance facilities were inspected twice each. This included: Public Works and Golf Course. Minor deficiencies were noted and corrected immediately.**
- **Continued to dispose of waste from the MS4 and other maintenance activities appropriately in dumpsters.**
- **The mowing crew picked up 106 bags of trash from City rights-of-way.**

- **One new flood control project was completed (Dry Fork off-line detention). During the planning, design and construction phases (2022-2025), potential water quality impacts were reviewed.**
- **SWPPPs for the maintenance facilities have been started but were not completed during the reporting period. The maps associated with the draft SWPPPs were completed during the reporting period. Staff have continued to use SOPs for all related maintenance activities that occur at these facilities. The final SWPPP documents will simply provide additional site-specific details and maps.**

16.(4.6.K, 4.6.L, 4.6.M) Were BMPs for MCM 6 determined effective/successful for this reporting period? If No, were the BMPs determined to be ineffective/unsuccessful evaluated for modification or replacement? **Yes**

17.Were any changes made to MCM 6 during the reporting period that were not covered above? If Yes, please include an attachment describing changes. **No**