Annual Report Template
District of Columbia Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
NPDES Permit Number DC0000221

Reporting Period July 1:	2024	to June 30:	2025	Report Submittal Date	December 1, 2025

Contact Person Name and Title	Jonathan Champion		
Phone Number	202-535-1722	E-mail Address	jonathan.champion@dc.gov
DC Stormwater Website URL	https://doee.dc.gov/service/stormwater-management		

Part 1 DISCHARGES AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS PERMIT

	Yes	No
1. Per Section 1.4.3 of the permit, does the Permittee certify that there are sufficient finances, staff, equipment, and support capabilities to implement the provisions of this permit?	☐	☑

2. Per Section 1.5.3.1 of the permit, fill in only the boxes for prior and current years. Leave boxes for future years empty. PROW acres may also be reported for respective major basins, as relevant. Acres Managed should include all types of installations detailed in Section 3.2 of the permit.

Acres Managed Permit Limits
Annual Report Year (Year in which the report is due)

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Anacostia River	134.16	82.69			
Potomac River	23.24	40.38			
Rock Creek	7.90	38.34			
Public Right-of-Way	87.80	31.03			

3. Net Tree Plantings in the MS4 Permit Area (Section 1.5.3.2)

2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total net tree plantings to date this permit term
6,972	8,215				

	Yes	No
Are tree plantings included in the estimate of Acres Managed in #2?	☑	☐

4. Per Section 1.5.3.3 of the permit, fill in only the boxes for prior and current years. Report the same permit limits for prior years as reported in those annual reports. Leave boxes for future years empty.

Pounds of Trash Permit Limit Annual Report Year (Year in which the report is due)					
	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Pounds of trash captured, removed, or prevented from entering the Anacostia River	1,931,887	1,825,678			

5. Are tables for all WLA benchmarks attached to this annual report?	Yes	No
	✔	☐

Part 2 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING

1. For the Annual Report due December 1, 2025:	Yes	No
a. Is the Stormwater Fee Status Update (Permit Section 2.2.3) attached?	✔	☐
b. Are results of the pilot project to test alternatives for ice and snow management (Permit Section 2.6) attached?	✔	☐
c. Did the permittee submit QAPPs consistent with Permit Sections 4.3 and 4.4.1.1?	✔	☐
d. Was targeted pet waste disposal education/outreach conducted in the Fort Chaplin catchment area? (Permit Section 4.5.2)	✔	☐

2. For the Annual Report due December 1, 2026:	Yes	No
a. Was the FloodSmart Homes Program (permit Section 2.7.2) completed?	✔	☐
b. Was the illicit discharge investigation for the Rock Creek watershed (Permit Section 4.5.2) completed? Are results attached?	✔	☐

3. For the Annual Report due December 1, 2027:	Yes	No
a. Was an Analysis of the impacts of increasing the Retention Standard to 2 inches (Permit Section 2.2.4.3) completed and submitted to EPA? Not Due	☐	✔
b. Has the strategy to support diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice into CWA objectives (Permit Section 7.3.2) been completed?	✔	☐

4. For the Annual Report due December 1, 2028:	Yes	No
a. Were updates to the stormwater regulations (Permit Section 2.2.4) proposed? Not Due	☐	✔

b.	Has the stormwater piping infrastructure maintenance program (Permit Section 3.3.6) been completed?	☐	☑
c.	Was the Consolidated TMDL Implementation Plan revised and made available for public notice during the reporting period? (Permit Section 2.2.5)	Yes ☐	No ☑
d.	List date of notice and link to document below: Not Due		
e.	Was the Stormwater Management Program Plan revised and made available for public notice during the reporting period? (Permit Section 2.9) Not Due	Yes ☐	No ☑
f.	List date of notice and link to document below: Not Due		

5.	For the Annual Report due December 1, 2029:		
a.	Has the development of a comprehensive flood model (Permit Section 2.7.1.1) been completed?	Yes ☑	No ☐
b.	Has the Permittee identified actions for areas of high flood risk that could minimize water quality impacts of a flood event? (Permit Section 2.7.1.2)	Yes ☐	No ☑
c.	Has the Permittee identified areas of highest risk as candidates for stormwater management plans? (Permit Section 2.7.1.3) Not Due	Yes ☐	No ☑
d.	List the candidates below: N/A		
e.	Was the illicit discharge investigation completed for the Fort Dupont and Fort Chaplin catchment areas? (Permit Section 4.5.2) Not Due	Yes ☐	No ☑

6.	Per Section 2.2.1 of the permit, on maintaining and refining the TMDL Implementation Plan Modeling Tool, provide a short status update.
	• Updated the BMP inventory to account for ongoing BMP implementation and retirement. • Seeking funding to update the TMDL Implementation Plan Modeling tool (IPMT): The IPMT was developed in 2013 and continues to be maintained to support DOEE's MS4 program reporting. However, the tool has outlived its intended lifespan of 10 years. DOEE is exploring options to modernize the IPMT to take advantage of improved technologies by converting the tool from a desktop program to a web application and upgrading the supporting database.

7.	Per Section 2.2.5.1 of the permit, have any TMDLs with MS4 WLAs been approved during this permit year?	Yes ☐	No ☑
a.	If so, list the TMDL(s) and briefly note measures taken to develop milestones and benchmarks		
	No new or revised TMDLs have been approved during this permit year. The TMDL for Organics and Metals in the Anacostia River Watershed (2024) was approved towards the end of the previous permit year. The benchmarks for the revised and new MS4 WLAs included in this TMDL have been incorporated into the IPMT and Annual Report analysis. The 2024 TMDL does not change the milestones.		

8. Per Section 2.3 of the permit, on maintaining and implementing the SISR program, provide a short status update.
DOEE reviewed 188 SISR submission during the reporting period, of which 86 submissions were for post-construction stormwater control measures in the MS4. The DOEE Inspection and Enforcement Division continues its efforts to develop a SISR contractor certification process to increase participation in the program.

9. Per Section 2.4 of the permit, list the number of PROW projects in the MS4 Permit Area that utilized Optimal Designs during this reporting period.
None

10. Per Section 2.5.1.1 of the permit, did the Permittee utilize its mobile application for tracking and estimating material removed from catch basins during the reporting period?	Yes ☑	No ☐
11. Per Section 2.5.1.2 of the permit, did the Permittee utilize its mobile application for estimating the amount of pollutant reductions achieved from catch basin cleaning during the reporting period?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. Is the list of pollutants and estimated reductions attached to the Annual Report?	Yes ☑	No ☐
b. If not, list any issues encountered and/or concerns with the program		
N/A		
12. Per Section 2.7.2 of the permit, how many homes were enrolled in the FloodSmart Homes Program during the reporting period?	52	

Part 3 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

1. Per Section 3.2.1.1, is the performance status, including on-site and off-site retention volumes, of all projects subject to the District stormwater regulations posted on the District stormwater website?	Yes ☑	No ☐
2. Per Section 3.2.1.3, does the Permittee maintain a database to track the review, inspection, and performance of each project subject to the stormwater regulations? Please provide URL for database:	Yes ☑	No ☐

https://doee.dc.gov/sgs		

3. Per Section 3.2.1.2, how many site plan reviews were submitted for projects in the MS4 Permit Area during this reporting period?	105	reviews
a. How many of these projects were in public rights-of-way?	8	projects
b. How many site plans were finally approved during this reporting period?	112	approvals

4. How many gallons were retained for development projects completed in the MS4 Permit Area this reporting year subject to the requirements of Sections 3.2.2, 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of the permit?		
a. Total on-site retention	1,923,461	gallons
b. Total off-site retention	16,022	gallons

5. Per Section 3.2.3., is the SRC program (including the SRC Price Lock and SRC Aggregator programs) still implemented?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. Provide a brief description of the status.		
DOEE has enrolled 18 projects in the SRC Price Lock program at the time of this report, with 15 projects receiving a purchase agreement and three projects receiving a subsidy agreement. To date, participants have installed green infrastructure to manage 33.6 acres, with another 8.36 acres in design, permitting, or construction. Additionally, in FY25, DOEE launched the SRC Pathways to Success ("SRC Pathways") program to support small, local businesses seeking to become SRC Aggregators by offering funding and capacity-building resources such as mentorship, templates, and business planning assistance.		
b. At the end of this reporting period how many SRCs more than 1-year old are going unused?	594,603	SRCs

6. Per Section 3.2.6 of the permit, have any modifications been made to the District's *Stormwater Management Guidebook* during this reporting period?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. If so, provide a brief summary of changes.		
DOEE proposed changes to the following sections: as-built data tables conveyance criteria, bioretention design criteria, bioretention landscaping criteria, compliance calculations and design examples, construction inspection checklists, definitions, design of flow control structures, examples of regulated activities, generation, certification, trading, and retirement of stormwater retention credits, green roof design criteria, green roof maintenance criteria, gutters, maintenance inspection, checklists, maximum extent practicable process for existing public right-of-way, off-site, retention forms for regulated sites, open channel design criteria, open channel, feasibility criteria, permeable pavement conveyance criteria, permeable pavement, design criteria, permeable pavement feasibility criteria, permeable pavement, pretreatment criteria, rainwater harvesting treatment and management requirements, resubmission of stormwater management plans, rooftop storage design guidance and criteria, stormwater retention credit forms, submission requirements for relief from extraordinarily difficult site conditions, underground sand filter design example, and use of off-site retention by regulated sites. DOEE is currently undergoing the rule making process and official updates will occur in the 2026 annual reporting period.		
7. Per Section 3.2.7 of the permit, have any modifications been made to the District's Green Area Ratio program during this reporting period?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. If so, provide a brief summary of changes.		
During this reporting period (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025), the Green Area Ratio (GAR) program advanced several key updates to strengthen its role in climate resilience, biodiversity, and urban livability. A primary focus was the assessment and update of the GAR Guidebook to improve clarity,consistency, and alignment with resilience goals. Updates included enhanced guidance on crediting tree preservation and planting, expanded descriptions of landscape practices that provide heat island mitigation and ecological value, and new supporting diagrams to improve usability for designers and reviewers. These revisions ensure the GAR program continues to serve as a complementary tool to stormwater rmanagement requirements, while also advancing broader environmental benefits such as cooling,habitat provision, and air quality improvement.		

8. Per Section 3.2.9 of the permit, did the Permittee make any changes to its suite of RiverSmart programs during this reporting period?	Yes ☐	No ☑

a. If so, provide a brief summary of changes.	

9. Per Section 3.2.10 of the permit, as relevant, provide specific metrics (miles, square feet) for any stream, buffer, or floodplain restoration projects for which the Permittee claims either Acres Managed credits or pollutant reduction credits during this reporting period.	Units 0	
a. Are these projects included in the estimates of acres managed in question #2 in Part 1? No stream restoration projects were completed in this reporting period and therefore no acres managed credit or pollutant reduction credits are claimed for stream restoration.	Yes ☐	No ☑

10. Per Section 3.2.11 of the permit, were at least two projects implemented in priority watersheds during this reporting period?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. Provide a brief description of the activity:		
Nash Run green infrastructure in the right of way: Retrofitted portions of the subwatershed's ROW with permeable parking lanes and bioretention facilities. Pope Branch green infrastructure the right of way: Retrofitted portions of the subwatershed's ROW with permeable parking lanes and bioretention facilities.		

11. Per Section 3.3.1 of the permit, how many SSOs to the MS4 occurred during this reporting year?	32	overflows	
a. Were responses consistent with the requirements of Section 3.3.1 of the permit?		Yes ☑	No ☐

12. Per Section 3.3.2 of the permit, provide the number of District-owned, operated, and leased facilities and job sites within the MS4 Permit Area that conducted industrial activities during this reporting period.	37	facilities/ sites		
a. Provide the number of these facilities with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans meeting the requirements of Section 3.3.2.2 a-e of the permit, or the MSGP.	37	facilities/ sites		
b. If not all facilities have SWPPPs, are they being developed?		Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☑
c. Do all facilities conduct at least quarterly self-inspections per Subsection 3.3.2.3?		Yes ☑	No ☐	
d. If you answered 'no' to either of the questions above, describe corrective actions being taken. N/A				

13. Per Section 3.3.2.4 of the permit, have wash water discharges to the MS4 from District operations been identified and addressed in an effort to effectively eliminate these illicit discharges?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. Please describe all corrective actions being taken.		
During this reporting period, several facilities were identified to have evidence of vehicle washing activities. No washing signs were placed near water spigots and site personnel were informed that the washing of vehicles was not permitted. An alternate location was identified and facility personnel were informed where they could take the vehicles for washing. Some facilities opted to lock the water spigots, with lock-out-tag-out measures put in place to track who signs out the key.		

14. Per Section 3.3.2.5, provide the number of regulatory BMP maintenance inspections of District industrial operations this reporting period.	2	inspections
a. Number of corrective actions taken?	1	actions

15. Per Section 3.3.2.6, is the Permittee maintaining a database inventory of all municipal operations that conduct industrial activities and/or are considered critical sources?	Yes ☑	No ☐

16. Per Section 3.3.2.7 of the permit, are appropriate records being retained?	Yes ☑	No ☐

17. Per Section 3.3.3 of the permit, are those facilities under the purview of DOEE utilizing pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers consistent with District IPM regulations?	Yes ☑	No ☐
a. Number of Integrated Pest Management Plans being implemented by those applicable facilities.	35	plans

18. Per Section 3.3.4 of the permit, how many catch basins are in the MS4 Permit Area?	15,150	basins
a. During this reporting year, how many of those catch basins were inspected?	14,340	basins
b. During this reporting year, how many of those catch basins were repaired?	77	basins
c. During this reporting year, how many of those catch basins were cleaned?	14,307	basins
d. What is the total estimated volume or weight of material removed from the catch basins that were cleaned?	777,663.81	gallons
	1039.59	tons

e. Has the GIS-based mobile field application been implemented to track catch basin maintenance activities?	Yes ✔	No ☐

19. Per Section 3.3.4.3 of the permit, describe any modifications to catch basin cleaning frequencies.
None

20. Per Section 3.3.5 of the permit, how many MS4 outfalls are in the MS4 Permit Area?	587	outfalls
a. During this reporting year, how many of those outfalls were repaired, i.e., repairs completed?	1	outfalls
b. What is the cumulative number of outfalls with repairs completed in this permit term?	5	outfalls

21. Per Section 3.3.7 of the permit, provide miles of streets swept in the MS4 Permit Area in this reporting year:	8,061	miles

22. Per Section 3.3.8 of the permit, are transportation and utility construction activities inspected to ensure that they are implementing all appropriate soil erosion and sedimentation control measures?	Yes ✔	No ☐
a. Describe correction actions being taken when concerns are identified.		
Pre-construction meetings are held with the plan owners and stakeholders to inform them of potential non-compliance issues and inspections schedule, including Compliance Monitoring Inspections, Final Inspection and closing documents needed where applicable. Enforcement has been compliance assistance with corrective actions of repair of perimeter controls, maintaining portable sediment tanks, and repair inlet (catch basin) protection.		

23. Per Section 3.3.9 of the permit, describe any modifications to water quality-related elements of the District's snow and ice management activities and policies during this reporting period.
DOEE, DPW and the Center for Watershed Protection collaboratively developed a Smart Salting Training for winter maintenance staff.

24. Per Section 3.4 of the permit, is the Permittee maintaining an up-to-date inventory of all facilities in the MS4 Permit Area that are defined in the permit as critical sources?	Yes ✔	No ☐
a. Number of inspections of critical source facilities conducted during this reporting year.	105	inspections
b. Number of problems identified during these inspections.	10	problems

c. How many of these problems were resolved?	10	resolved
d. How many are still pending?	0	pending

25. Per Section 3.5.2 of the permit, how many erosion and sediment control plan reviews were completed during this reporting year for projects in the MS4 Permit Area?	623	reviews
a. How many plans were approved?	611	approved
26. Per Section 3.5.3 of the permit, how many site inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	423	inspections
a. How many construction site compliance inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	2234	inspections
b. Were routine compliance monitoring inspections performed at the appropriate frequency depending on size of disturbance?		Yes ☑ No ☐
c. How many construction site follow-up inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	1823	inspections
d. How many construction site final inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	411	inspections
e. How many inspections identified compliance problems?	488	inspections
27. Per Section 3.5.4 of the permit, how many enforcement actions (NOVs, Stop Work Orders, etc.) were initiated?	128	actions

28. Per Section 3.6.1 of the permit, is the Permittee maintaining an up-to-date inventory of all outfalls in the MS4 Permit Area and all illicit discharge information?		Yes ☑ No ☐
a. How many outfalls are included in the geospatial inventory?	587	outfalls
29. Is the Permittee implementing a system for reporting illicit discharges?		Yes ☑ No ☐
a. Number of reports received through the reporting system during this reporting period.	2	reports
b. Number of illicit discharges identified through all mechanisms during this reporting year.	68	identified
c. Number of illicit discharges eliminated during this reporting year.	65	eliminated

30. Per Section 3.6.2 of the permit, summarize illegal disposal incidents documented and corrective actions during this reporting period.
The District Department of Energy & Environment partners with the Metropolitan Police Department's Environmental Crimes Unit and the Department of Public Works to operate DumpBusters, a program that combines large scale dumping cleanups, community outreach, surveillance, and enforcement to address illegal dumping. The program relies on both prevention and penalties, using civil and criminal measures when necessary. The Sixth Police District currently houses the only Environmental Crimes Unit in the city, staffed primarily by three officers, and its success has led to expansion into Ward 5 and selective enforcement efforts across the District. In this reporting period the program addressed 75 dump sites and received inquiries for many more that were referred to other programs. They installed either signage or cameras at these sites. They continued to monitor existing dump sites from past years as well.

31. Per Section 3.7.1.1 of the permit, provide annual trash reductions in the Anacostia River basin for this reporting year. Totals should be reported under Question #4 in Part 1.		
Annual Trash Reductions in the Anacostia River Basin		
	Trash Removed (pounds)	Annual Load Reduction (pounds)
Trash Traps	7,461	7,461
Environmental Hot Spots	3,018	3,018
Clean-up Events	15,395	10,579
Skimmer Boats	90,000	44,177
Clean Teams Program	3,592,175	1,760,201
Bag Law	242	242
Other:		
Other:		
Totals	3,708,291	1,825,678

32. How are these trash reduction technologies and activities being applied in other parts of the MS4 Permit Area?
DOEE tackles trash pollution holistically, combining pollution prevention, pollution mitigation, and litter capture or removal. This strategy relies on District policy, programming, environmental monitoring, and research applied throughout the MS4 Permit Area. DOEE programs that promote education, regional collaboration, and community engagement, reduce the amount of pollution entering the environment. Policies addressing foam and plastic pollution prevent pollution at the source and are applied throughout the entire District. Trash traps and other intervention technologies tackle capture and removal at fixed locations within the MS4 Permit Area. Cleanups take place throughout the MS4 Permit Area at high litter volume locations.

33. Per Section 3.7.2 of the permit, how many bag law compliance inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	537	inspections
a. How many violations were identified?	60	violations
b. How many NOVs were issued, or other corrective actions taken?	60	actions

34. Per Section 3.7.3 of the permit, how many food service ware compliance inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	300	inspections
a. How many violations were identified?	25	violations
b. How many NOVs were issued, or other corrective actions taken?	25	actions

35. Per Section 3.7.5 of the permit, how many coal tar ban compliance inspections were conducted in the MS4 Permit Area?	7	inspections
a. How many violations were identified?	0	violations
b. How many NOVs were issued or other corrective actions taken?	0	actions

36. Per Section 3.7.6 of the permit, how many phosphorus lawn fertilizer compliance inspections were conducted during this reporting period in the MS4 Permit Area?	0	inspections
a. How many violations were identified?	0	violations
b. How many NOVs were issued or other corrective actions taken?	0	actions

	Yes	No
37. Per Section 3.7.7 of the permit, does the District implement a household hazardous waste collection Program?	☑	☐
a. Describe the methods used by the District to encourage residents to properly dispose of household hazardous waste.		
DPW holds two events each quarter for a total of eight events per fiscal year, so District residents have a proper place to dispose of their materials. These events are advertise through DPW outlets such as social media, web site and mailing direct to residents.		

38. Per Section 3.7.8 of the permit, how many tons of leaves and holiday trees were collected in this reporting year?		
a. tons of leaves	262.54	tons
b. tons of holiday trees	5,853.19	tons

39. Per Section 3.8.1 of the permit, how many District-operated post-construction stormwater control measure maintenance inspections were conducted during this reporting period in the MS4 Permit Area?	70	inspections
a. How many violations were identified?	31	violations
b. How many corrective actions were taken?	31	actions

40. How many District-owned and operated green stormwater infrastructure maintenance activities were conducted during this reporting period in the MS4 Permit Area?	2854	activities

41. Per Section 3.8.2 of the permit, how many Non-District-operated post-construction stormwater control measure maintenance inspections were conducted during this reporting period in the MS4 Permit Area?	303	inspections
a. How many control measures were verified?	303	verified
b. How many violations were identified?	82	identified
c. How many enforcement or corrective actions were taken per practice inspected?	54	actions
d. Provide a brief description of the verification process.		
SWMP verification is completed for new construction by the issuance of A Final Approval Notice indicating full compliance with the district of Columbia regulations for land disturbance, and completion of a regulated stormwater management plan. Verification is further documented by operation and maintenance field inspections, Request for Maintenance Records Notice sent to land or SWMP owners and Self Inspection Self Reporting audits.		

42. Per Section 3.9 of the permit, list stormwater training conducted during this reporting year:

Stormwater Trainings this Year			
Topic	Audience	# Sessions	# People Trained
Chesapeake Bay	Municipal Staff	11	11
Data Analysis and GIS	Municipal Staff	19	19
Equity and Outreach	Municipal Staff	9	9
Flood Resiliency	Municipal Staff	3	3
General Stormwater	Municipal Staff	17	17
General Water Quality	Municipal Staff	11	11
Inspector Training	Municipal Staff	11	11
Plan Review Certification and Training	Municipal Staff	17	17
Restoration	Municipal Staff	9	9
Education	Municipal Staff	7	7
Tree Canopy	Municipal Staff	2	2
Wetlands	Municipal Staff	4	4

43. Per Section 3.10 of the permit, provide the following information regarding targeted public education in this reporting year:

a. Number of views of the District stormwater website.	1840	views
b. Number of impressions and engagements on District website related to stormwater topics.	9,857 view 54 likes 42 retweets	impressions/ engagements
c. For pet waste, number of bag dispensers/disposal containers.	16	units
d. For pet waste, number of pet waste disposal bags used.	4,980	bags
e. Number of RiverSmart audits completed.	858	audits

f. Number of RiverSmart projects installed by type:						
Number of RiverSmart Projects Installed						
185	Rain barrels	71	Rain gardens	54	Permeable pavers	
0	Cisterns	0	Green roofs	0	Stormwater planters	

g. Number of District youth receiving environmental training.	5324	youth
h. Number of District teachers receiving environmental training.	106	teachers
i. Number of participants in environmental boat tours.	4,478	participants

j. Provide a brief summary of the environmental education training programs.

The Aquatic Resources Education Center conducted the Project WILD national certification program for teachers that uses a wildlife-based conservation and environmental education curriculum that fosters responsible actions toward wildlife and related natural resources.
DOEE's Watershed Protection Division grantees continued the Nature Near Schools (MWEE) program with District fourth graders and our 3 day, 2 night Meaningful Watershed Education Experience (MWEE) Overnight program for District fifth graders, and the Middle School MWEE for District 6-8 graders.
RiverSmart Schools is a program that works with schools within the District to install Low Impact Development (LID) practices in an effort to reduce runoff and NPS pollution while providing stormwater-related educational resources.
DOEE also offers watershed experiences such as boat tours and other one-day education efforts. New grant awards were made this reporting period to the Anacostia Riverkeeper and Anacostia Watershed Society to continue the Anacostia River Explorers program.

k. Number of outreach events conducted in historically underserved communities.	28	events
l. Number of multi-lingual educational materials distributed	8	documents translated

m. Describe community level activities performed in underserved areas

The Riversmart Ambassadors contributed 151 hours and participated in 28 events. The events consisted of a variety of environmental education activities. These include neighborhood clean ups, tabling at environmental conferences and community day events, canvassing and flyering local neighborhoods, and garden tours.
Soul Trak Outdoors grant - Soul Trak Outdoors is leading a community-centered initiative in the Anacostia River watershed to improve local waterway health and engage historically excluded communities in environmental stewardship. The project will connect youth and families to the Anacostia Rive through activities, such as hiking, kayaking, and fishing, and build empower residents with the knowledge and tools to advocate for cleaner waterways.

Part 4 WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

	Yes	No
1. Per Section 4.1.3.1 of the permit, are all analyses performed in accordance with analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 and subsequent amendments?	☑	☐

2. Per Section 4.1.3.2 of the permit, describe or provide citation(s) for any alternative method(s) being used.

No alternative method was used.

	Yes	No
3. Per Section 4.1.3.3 of the permit, are appropriate flow measurement devices and methods being utilized?	☑	☐

	Yes	No
4. Per Section 4.1.3.4 of the permit, are monitoring and assessment records being retained for at least five years?	☑	☐

5. Is all wet weather discharge monitoring consistent with the requirements of Section 4.2 of the permit?	Yes ☐	No ☑

6. Per Section 4.2.3, have any oversample sites been substituted for continuous record sites, or other new continuous record sites established?	Yes ☐	No ☑

a. If yes, note the old/oversample sites and the new/continuous sites below.

Old site		New site	
Old site		New site	
Old site		New site	
Old site		New site	

7. **For the 2029 Annual Report only**: Per Subsection 4.3, has the evaluation of all accessible stream reaches been completed by the end of the five-year permit term?	Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☑

8. Do all receiving water assessments adhere to the methods described in the QAPP, and/or all requirements of Section 4.4.1 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

9. Per Section 4.4.1.7, are all data maintained in a central geodatabase?	Yes ☑	No ☐

10. Is all in-stream water quality sampling consistent with the requirements of the QAPP and Section 4.4.2 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

11. Is all benthic macroinvertebrate sampling consistent with the requirements of the QAPP and Section 4.4.3 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

12. Are all geomorphological assessments consistent with the requirements of the RSA QAPP and Section 4.3.1 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

13. Are all habitat assessments consistent with the requirements of the RSA QAPP and Section 4.3.2 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

14. Is all dry weather screening and source identification consistent with the requirements of Section 4.5.1 of the permit?	Yes ☑	No ☐

15. **For 2025-2029 Annual Reports only**: describe the targeted bacteria source reduction efforts undertaken consistent with the requirements of Section 4.5.2 of the permit.

During the 2024-2025 reporting period DOEE implemented an illicit discharge source tracking investigation into the human sources of E. coli identified in DOEE MST study as impacting the Broad Branch monitoring station.
Source tracking investigations performed by DOEE staff and its contractors utilize investigation techniques implemented in a phased approach and adaptive management. Each phase is dependent on the results of the previous phase of work. DOEE selected the specific techniques deployed in the Broad Branch source tracking investigation based on experiences with previous sanitary source tracking investigations. These investigative techniques included:
· Conducting a desktop study,
· Creating an ArcGIS Investigation Map,
· MS4 outfall inspection, sampling, and monitoring.
· Continuous photo monitoring,
· MS4 manhole inspection, sampling, and monitoring,
· Closed-caption Television (CCTV) surveying, and
· Dye Testing
The source tracking investigation has identified several sources of E. coli that DOEE is in the process of eliminating.

16. Is all trash monitoring consistent with the requirements of Section 4.6 of the permit?	Yes	No
	☑	☐

17. Explain any deviations from the required elements of Part 4 of the permit.

5 - In June 2024, a new contract was awarded for the wet weather sampling and analysis activities. The contractor selected (under a lowest bidder invitation) did not have the technical knowledge to appropriately estimate the logistics and costs for the permit required tasks. The contracting office terminated that contract and a new contract was awarded in January 2025. In March 2025, the new contractor's QAPP was approved and monitoring initiated.
Other challenges impacted achieving the collection of data for the minimum number of wet weather events. The requirements of Section 4.2 of the MS4 permit – wet weather discharge monitoring, i.e. the minimum number of three wet weather sampling events per site could not be achieved at all the monitoring sites. The occurrence of the permit's definition of "qualifying weather events" has changed and are now seen less often. The intensity, frequency, duration, and spatial distribution over the MS4 Permit Area has been such that, a few storms had to be precluded from sampling on the basis of the qualifying rainfall specified in the EPA Guidance.
In addition, weather predictions have been found to vary by a wide range of probability. Although the District's MS4 area is relatively small, it is common that it will rain in one part of the city and not in another, thus precluding some sites scheduled for sampling. Lack of rain gauges distributed across the city has limited the confirmation of a qualifying wet weather event.

18. Per Section 4.7.2.1, list Estimated Annual Cumulative Pollutant Loads in this Reporting Year:

	Rock Creek	Anacostia River	Potomac River	Total	
Total Suspended Solids	255.97	1,605.05	682.65	2,543.67	tons
Total Nitrogen	42,131.31	211,504.52	81,913.00	551,073.00	pounds
Total Phosphorus	6,891.74	22,189.38	8,979.42	59,140.00	pounds
Copper	416.67	548.98	497.78	3,267.00	pounds
Lead	79.64	184.26	108.59	717.00	pounds
Zinc	1,467.38	3,427.30	2,281.12	9,832.00	pounds
Cadmium	5.97	18.14	10.32	49.84	pounds
E. coli	8.05E+13	1.82E+15	3.08E+14	1.04E+15	MPN

19. Estimated Annual Cumulative Pollutant Load Reductions in this Reporting Year:

	Rock Creek	Anacostia River	Potomac River	Total	
Total Suspended Solids	4.45	14.58	3.12	22.14	tons

Total Nitrogen	539	1,291	464	2,294	pounds
Total Phosphorus	64	148	53	265	pounds
Copper	8.54	20.42	7.29	36.25	pounds
Lead	2.72	6.27	2.26	11.25	pounds
Zinc	16.77	47.17	14.09	78.02	pounds
Cadmium	2.98	6.86	2.47	12.32	pounds
E. coli	4,121	9,710	3,474	17,305	billion MPN

	Yes	No	
20. Per Section 4.7, is an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Stormwater Management Program attached?	☑	☐	
a. Does it include a synthesis of programmatic and watershed indicators, per Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 of the permit, using data from this reporting year and prior reporting years in order to identify changes or trends over time?	☑	☐	
b. Does it include, per Section 4.7.2.2, an estimate of progress towards all numeric limits in Subsection 1.5.3.1 of the permit?	☑	☐	
c. Per Section 4.7.3.1 of the permit, does the evaluation also include a short synthesis of areas the program deemed effective with ongoing efforts, and areas where additional strategies are needed to effectively tackle certain pollutants or sources?	☑	☐	
d. **For the 2027 Annual Report only**: is a short synopsis of progress towards meeting all WLAs applicable to the MS4 attached (Permit Section 4.7.3.2)?	☐	☑	Not Due
e. Is the development of a multi-faceted suite of indicators on track to be submitted with the updated SWMP in 2027?	☑	☐	

	Yes	No
21. Are all databases being maintained per the requirements of Part 4.8?	☑	☐

Part 7 OTHER REQUIREMENTS

1. Per Section 7.3 of the permit, describe the District's efforts to address environmental justice/equity during this reporting period.

DOEE awarded a grant to conduct enhanced community engagement for stormwater programs on September 4, 2024. The grantee convened an Advisory Committee of Ward 7 and 8 residents to gather public feedback on MS4 permit program implementation. The grantee conducted six meetings with the Ward 7 and 8 advisory committee. This group produced recommendations to enhance community engagement and relationship building related to DOEE's stormwater work. The grantee and advisory committee members conducted three public outreach efforts to solicit feedback on these recommendations. The grantee synthesized the recommendation and feedback into a final strategy to increase public engagement and outreach.

Signature and Certification

This report must be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official, or his or her duly authorized representative. This report may be submitted electronically.

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:	Jonathan Champion	Date:	11/20/2025
Signatory Name:	Jonathan Champion	Signatory Title:	Associate Director Water Quality Division