

1 STEVE FLEISCHLI, Bar No. 175174  
2 NOAH J. GARRISON, Bar No. 252154  
3 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
4 1314 Second Street  
5 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
6 (310) 434-2300

7 Attorneys for NATURAL  
8 RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
9 AND HEAL THE BAY

10 LIZ CROSSON, Bar No. 262178  
11 TATIANA GAUR, Bar No. 246227  
12 LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
13 120 Broadway, Suite 105  
14 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
15 (310) 394-6162

16 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES  
17 WATERKEEPER  
18 AND HEAL THE BAY

19 DANIEL COOPER, Bar No. 153576  
20 LAWYERS FOR CLEAN WATER, INC.  
21 1004A O'Reilly Avenue  
22 San Francisco, CA 94129  
23 (415) 440-6520

24 Attorney for LOS ANGELES  
25 WATERKEEPER  
26

27 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
28 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

29 In the Matter of the Petition of NRDC, Los  
30 Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, for  
31 Review of Action by the California Regional  
32 Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles  
33 Region, in Adopting the Los Angeles County  
34 Municipal Separate Stormwater National  
35 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System  
36 (NPDES) Permit; Order No. R4-2012-0175;  
37 NPDES Permit No. CAS004001

38 ) PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS  
39 ) ANGELES REGIONAL WATER  
40 ) QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
41 ) ACTION OF ADOPTING ORDER  
42 ) NO. R4-2012-0175

1 In accordance with Section 13320 of the California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title  
2 23 of the California Code of Regulations, the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”), Los  
3 Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay (collectively “Petitioners”) hereby petition the State  
4 Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”) to review the final decision of the California  
5 Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Los Angeles Region (“Regional Board”) in  
6 adopting the Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)  
7 Discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, with the Exception of  
8 Discharges Originating from the City of Long Beach MS4; Order No. R4-2012-0175; NPDES  
9 Permit No. CAS004001 (“2012 Permit”). The Regional Board adopted the final order in this  
10 matter on November 8, 2012.

11 The 2012 Permit regulates stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer  
12 systems (“MS4s”) and other designated stormwater discharges within a defined portion of Los  
13 Angeles County. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the County of Los Angeles, and  
14 84 incorporated cities within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (“LACFCD”) with  
15 the exception of the City of Long Beach are Permittees.

16 The Permittees occupy an area of more than 3,000 square miles and serve a population of  
17 over 9.8 million people. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District includes the vast majority  
18 of drainage infrastructure within incorporated and unincorporated areas in every watershed within  
19 the Los Angeles Region, including 500 miles of open channel, 3,500 miles of underground storm  
20 drains, and an estimated 88,000 catch basins.

21 In December 2001, the Regional Board adopted Order No. 01-182, which granted a  
22 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) municipal stormwater permit for  
23 urban runoff discharges within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the unincorporated  
24 areas of Los Angeles County under County jurisdiction, and 84 Cities within the Los Angeles,  
25 except the City of Long Beach. The Regional Board amended Order 01-182 in 2006 and 2007 by  
26 adopting Orders No. R4-2006-0074 and R4-2007-0042. The Order was amended again by Order  
27 No. R4-2007-0042 on August 9, 2007, and by Order No. R4-2009-0130 on December 10, 2009.

28 ///

1 The Regional Water Board voided and set aside the amendments adopted through Order No. R4-  
2 2006-0074 on April 14, 2011.

3  
4 1. NAME, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE NUMBER, AND E-MAIL ADDRESS OF THE  
5 PETITIONERS:

6 Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.  
7 1314 Second Street  
8 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
9 Attention: Steve Fleischli, Esq. (sfleischli@nrdc.org)  
10 Noah Garrison, Esq. (ngarrison@nrdc.org)  
11 (310) 434-2300

12 Los Angeles Waterkeeper  
13 120 Broadway, Suite 105  
14 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
15 Attention: Liz Crosson (liz@lawaterkeeper.org)  
16 Tatiana Gaur (tgaur@lawaterkeeper.org)  
17 (310) 394-6162

18 Heal the Bay  
19 1444 9th Street  
20 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
21 Attention: Kirsten James (kjames@healthebay.org)  
22 (310) 451-1500

23 2. THE SPECIFIC ACTION OR INACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH THE  
24 STATE BOARD IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW AND A COPY OF ANY ORDER OR  
25 RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH IS REFERRED TO IN THE  
26 PETITION:

27 Petitioners seek review of the Regional Board's November 8, 2012 adoption of the Waste  
28 Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges within  
the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, with the Exception of Discharges Originating  
from the City of Long Beach MS4, Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001. A  
copy of the Order is attached as Exhibit A.

3. THE DATE ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED OR REFUSED TO ACT  
OR ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD WAS REQUESTED TO ACT:

November 8, 2012.

///  
///

1 4. A FULL AND COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE REASONS THE ACTION OR  
2 FAILURE TO ACT WAS INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER:

3 In approving the Permit, the Regional Board failed to act in accordance with relevant  
4 governing law, acted arbitrarily and capriciously, without substantial evidence, and without  
5 adequate findings. Specifically, but without limitation, the Regional Board:

- 6 A. Failed to make sufficient findings “to bridge the analytical gap between the  
7 raw evidence and ultimate decision”—approval of the Permit. (*Topanga*  
8 *Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles* (1974) 11 Cal.3d  
9 506, 515.) The Board acted arbitrarily and capriciously because the ultimate  
10 decision of adopting the Permit is not supported by the findings and the  
11 findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence in the  
12 administrative record, thus resulting in an abuse of discretion. (Cal. Code  
13 Civ. Proc. § 1094.5.)
- 14 B. Failed to adequately respond to factually and legally specific comments  
15 from public interest organizations concerning significant matters at issue,  
16 such as the Permit’s incorporation of safe harbor provisions and its  
17 noncompliance with state and federal anti-backsliding regulations,  
18 antidegradation requirements, and TMDL requirements.
- 19 C. Improperly adopted safe harbor provisions that excuse compliance with the  
20 2012 Permit’s Receiving Water Limitations provisions in some  
21 circumstances, in violation of federal anti-backsliding regulations under 33  
22 U.S.C. § 402(o) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l).
- 23 D. Improperly adopted safe harbor provisions that excuse compliance with the  
24 2012 Permit’s Receiving Water Limitations provisions in some  
25 circumstances, in violation of state and federal antidegradation  
26 requirements, including 40 C.F.R. § 131.12(a)(1) and State Board  
27 Resolution No. 68-16.

28 ///

1 E. Failed to adequately require in the Permit that certain interim and final  
2 Waste Load Allocations (“WLAs”) established by applicable Total  
3 Maximum Daily Loads (“TMDLs”) are enforceable permit effluent  
4 limitations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)  
5

6 5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED:

7 Petitioners are non-profit, environmental organizations that have a direct interest in protecting,  
8 *inter alia*, the quality of Los Angeles County’s aquatic resources, including Santa Monica Bay, the  
9 Los Angeles River, and other Los Angeles area waters, as well as the health of beachgoers and  
10 other users. NRDC is a non-profit organization whose purpose is to safeguard the Earth: its  
11 people, its plants and animals and the natural systems on which all life depends. NRDC represents  
12 approximately 65,000 members in California, approximately 12,600 of whom reside in Los  
13 Angeles County. Los Angeles Waterkeeper is a non-profit organization dedicated to the  
14 preservation, protection, and defense of the rivers, creeks and coastal waters of Los Angeles  
15 County from all sources of pollution and degradation. Waterkeeper represents approximately  
16 3,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Los Angeles area. Heal the Bay is a  
17 non-profit organization whose mission is making southern California's coastal waters and  
18 watersheds, including Santa Monica Bay, safe, healthy and clean. Heal the Bay represents  
19 approximately 13,000 members in Los Angeles County.

20 Petitioners’ members recreate in and around the waters to which the 2012 Permit regulates  
21 discharges of stormwater runoff and are impacted by pollution in stormwater runoff and its  
22 resulting health impacts, and by beach closures which restrict the ability of residents and visitors in  
23 Los Angeles County to use the beach and local waters for recreation and other purposes. In  
24 particular, Petitioners’ members directly benefit from Los Angeles County waters in the form of  
25 recreational swimming, surfing, diving, photography, birdwatching, fishing, and boating.  
26 Petitioners’ members are aggrieved by the 2012 Permit’s inadequacy to control polluted urban  
27 stormwater runoff or support the beneficial uses of the receiving waters in accordance with the  
28 Clean Water Act.

1           The Regional Board’s failure to adequately control urban stormwater runoff through the  
2 2012 Permit, or to assure that the 2012 Permit’s provisions meet the requirements of the Clean  
3 Water Act and assure that pollution in stormwater discharges will not degrade the region’s waters,  
4 has enormous consequences for Los Angeles County residents and Petitioners’ members. Urban  
5 stormwater runoff is one of the largest sources of pollution to the coastal and other receiving  
6 waters of the nation, and is a particularly severe problem in the Los Angeles region. Waters  
7 discharged from municipal storm drains carry bacteria, metals, and other pollutants at unsafe levels  
8 to rivers, lakes, and beaches in Los Angeles County. This pollution has damaging effects on both  
9 human health and aquatic ecosystems, causing increased rates of human illness and resulting in an  
10 economic loss of tens to hundreds of millions of dollars every year from public health impacts  
11 alone. The pollutants also adversely impact aquatic animals and plant life in receiving waters.

12           Receiving waters in the Permittees’ jurisdiction continue to be impaired for a variety of  
13 pollutants, and monitoring data show that stormwater discharges continue to contain pollutants at  
14 levels that can cause or contribute to these impairments.

15           Urban development increases impervious land cover and exacerbates problems of  
16 stormwater volume, rate, and pollutant loading. Consequently, Los Angeles County’s high rate of  
17 urbanization and persistent water quality problems demand that the most effective stormwater  
18 management tools be required. The 2012 Permit, however, often lacks clear, enforceable  
19 standards, and weakens provisions that were required by the previous Los Angeles County MS4  
20 permit, which prohibit discharges of stormwater from causing or contributing to violations of  
21 water quality standards. The 2012 permit further fails to properly incorporate certain interim and  
22 final WLAs for TMDLs adopted in the region to restore impaired waters.

23           All of these documented facts demonstrate the considerable negative impact on Petitioners’  
24 members and the environment that continues today as a result of the Regional Board’s inadequate  
25 efforts to control stormwater pollution through the 2012 Permit.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE STATE OR REGIONAL BOARD WHICH  
2 PETITIONER REQUESTS:

3 Petitioners seek an Order by the State Board that:

4 Overturns the illegal provisions of the Waste Discharge Requirements for  
5 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges within the Coastal  
6 Watersheds of Los Angeles County, with the Exception of Discharges Originating  
7 from the City of Long Beach MS4, Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES Permit No.  
8 CAS004001.

9 Or, alternatively, remands the matter to the Regional Board with specific direction  
10 to the Board to remedy each of its violations of law as further described herein.

11 7. A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION:

12 See, Section 4, above. Petitioners have enclosed a separate Memorandum of Points and  
13 Authorities in support of this Petition.

14 8. A STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE  
15 REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE DISCHARGERS, IF NOT THE PETITIONER:

16 A true and correct copy of this petition was delivered by electronic mail to the Regional  
17 Board on December 10, 2012. A true and correct copy of this petition was also mailed via First  
18 Class mail on December 10, 2012 to the Regional Board and the Permittees.

19 9. A STATEMENT THAT THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES OR OBJECTIONS RAISED IN  
20 THE PETITION WERE RAISED BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD, OR AN  
21 EXPLANATION OF WHY THE PETITIONER WAS NOT REQUIRED OR WAS  
22 UNABLE TO RAISE THESE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES OR OBJECTIONS BEFORE  
23 THE REGIONAL BOARD.

24 All of the substantive issues and objections raised herein were presented to the Regional Board  
25 during the period for public comment on the draft Permit. Petitioners submitted written comments  
26 on July 23, 2012. Petitioners presented testimony before the Regional Board during public  
27 hearings on October 4-5, 2012 and November 8, 2012.

28 ///

///

///

1 Respectfully submitted via electronic mail and Federal Express,  
2

3 Dated: December 10, 2012

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.

4  
5 

6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 Noah Garrison  
8 Steve Fleischli  
9 Attorneys for NATURAL RESOURCES  
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. & HEAL THE BAY

10 Dated: December 10, 2012

LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER

11 

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Elizabeth Crosson  
14 Tatiana Gaur  
15 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
& HEAL THE BAY

16 Dated: December 10, 2012

HEAL THE BAY

17 

18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Kirsten James  
20 Director of Water Quality, HEAL THE BAY  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18  
3 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 1314 Second Street, Santa Monica,  
4 California 90401.

5 On December 10, 2012 I served the within document described as REQUEST FOR  
6 OFFICIAL NOTICE RE: PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER  
7 QUALITY CONTROL BOARD ACTION OF ADOPTING ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 on the  
8 following interested parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in the United States mail  
9 enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

10 Ken Berkman  
11 City Engineer  
12 30001 Ladyface Court  
13 Agoura Hills, CA 91301

14 Terri Rodrigue  
15 City Engineer  
16 6330 Pine Avenue  
17 Bell, CA 90201-1291

18 David Dolphin  
19 111 South First Street  
20 Alhambra, CA 91801-3796

21 John Oropeza  
22 Director of Public Works  
23 7100 South Garfield Avenue  
24 Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293

25 Susannah Turney  
26 Environmental Services Officer  
27 P.O. Box 60021  
28 Arcadia, CA 91066-6021

Bernie Iniguez  
Environmental Services Manager  
16600 Civic Center Drive  
Bellflower, CA 90706-5494

Maria Dadian  
Director of Public Works  
18747 Clarkdale Avenue  
Artesia, CA 90701-5899

Vincent Chee  
Project Civil Engineer  
455 North Rexford Drive  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Carl Hassel  
City Engineer  
213 East Foothill Boulevard  
Azusa, CA 91702

Elroy Kiepke  
City Engineer  
600 Winston Avenue  
Bradbury, CA 91010-1199

David Lopez  
Associate Engineer  
14403 East Pacific Avenue  
Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297

Bonnie Teaford  
Public Works Director  
P.O. Box 6459  
Burbank, CA 91510

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Alex Farassati  
ESM  
100 Civic Center Way  
Calabasas, CA 91302-3172

Mike O'Grady  
Environmental Services  
P.O. Box 3130  
Cerritos, CA 90703-3130

Gina Nila  
2535 Commerce Way  
Commerce, CA 90040-1487

Vivian Castro, Environmental Services  
Manager  
125 East College Street  
Covina, CA 91723-2199

Damian Skinner  
Manager  
9770 Culver Boulevard  
Culver City, CA 90232-0507

Yvonne Blumberg  
P.O. Box 7016  
Downey, CA 90241-7016

James A Enriquez  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 6008  
El Monte, CA 91731

Ron Jackson  
Building Maintenance Supervisor  
P.O. Box 47003  
Gardena, CA 90247-3778

Dave Davies  
Deputy Director of Public Works  
116 East Foothill Boulevard  
Glendora, CA 91741

Patricia Elkins  
Building Construction Manager  
P.O. Box 6234  
Carson, CA 90745

Craig Bradshaw  
City Engineer  
207 Harvard Avenue  
Claremont, CA 91711-4719

Hien Nguyen  
Assistant City Engineer  
205 South Willowbrook Avenue  
Compton, CA 90220-3190

Hector Rodriguez  
City Manager  
P.O. Box 1007  
Cudahy, CA 90201-6097

David Liu  
Director of Public Works  
21825 East Copley Drive  
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177

Steve Esbenshades  
Engineering Division Manager  
1600 Huntington Drive  
Duarte, CA 91010-2592

Stephanie Katsouleas  
Public Works Director  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245-3895

Maurice Oillataguerre  
Senior Environmental Program Scientist  
Engineering Section  
633 East Broadway, Room 209  
Glendale, CA 91206-4308

Joseph Colombo  
Director of Community Development  
21815 Pioneer Boulevard  
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Arnold Shadbehr  
Chief General Service and Public Works  
4455 West 126th Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482

Kimberly Colberts  
Environmental Coordinator  
6165 Spring Valley Road  
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

Mike Nagaoka  
Director of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 3366  
Industry, CA 91744-3995

Kwok Tam  
Director of Public Works  
5050 North Irwindale Avenue  
Irwindale, CA 91706

Shauna Clark  
City Manager  
1245 North Hacienda Boulevard  
La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570

John DiMario  
Director of Development Services  
15900 East Marin Street  
La Puente, CA 91744-4788

Konya Vivanti  
P.O. Box 158  
Lakewood, CA 90714-0158

Tom A. Odom  
City Administrator  
P.O. Box 339  
Lomita, CA 90717-0098

Josef Kekula  
11330 Bullis Road  
Lynwood, CA 90262-3693

Homayoun Behboodi  
Associate Engineer  
1315 Valley Drive  
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884

Craig Melich  
City Engineer and City Official  
6550 Miles Avenue  
Huntington Park, CA 90255

Lauren Amimoto  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
1 W. Manchester Blvd, 3rd Floor  
Inglewood, CA 90301-1750

Edward G. Hitti  
Director of Public Works  
1327 Foothill Boulevard  
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137

Steve Forster  
Public Works Director  
13700 La Mirada Boulevard  
La Mirada, CA 90638-0828

Daniel Keesey  
Director of Public Works  
3660 "D" Street  
La Verne, CA 91750-3599

Marlene Miyoshi  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
14717 Burin Avenue  
Lawndale, CA 90260

Shahram Kharaghani  
Program Manager  
1149 S. Broadway, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Jennifer Brown  
Environmental Program Analyst  
23825 Stuart Ranch Road  
Malibu, CA 90265-4861

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Brian Wright  
Water Supervisor  
1400 Highland Avenue  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795

Heather Maloney  
415 South Ivy Avenue  
Monrovia, CA 91016-2888

Amy Ho  
John Hunter (Consultant)  
320 West Newmark Avenue  
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896

Allan Rigg  
Director of Public Works  
340 Palos Verdes Drive West  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Stephen Walker  
P.O. Box 7115  
Pasadena, CA 91109-7215

Julie Carver  
Environmental Programs Coordinator  
P.O. Box 660  
Pomona, CA 91769-0660

Mike Shay  
Principal Civil Engineer  
P.O. Box 270  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

Latoya Cyrus  
Environmental Services Coordinator  
245 East Bonita Avenue  
San Dimas, CA 91773-3002

Andre Dupret  
Project Manager  
4319 East Slauson Avenue  
Maywood, CA 90270-2897

Cory Roberts  
1600 West Beverly Boulevard  
Montebello, CA 90640-3970

Chino Consunji  
City Engineer  
P.O. Box 1030  
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030

Chris Cash  
Utility and Infrastructure Assistant Director  
16400 Colorado Avenue  
Paramount, CA 90723-5091

Art Cervantes  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 1016  
Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016  
Ray Holland  
Interim Public Works Director  
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
2 Portuguese Bend Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199

Chris Marcarello  
Director of PW  
8838 East Valley Boulevard  
Rosemead, CA 91770-1787

Ron Ruiz  
Director of Public Works  
117 Macneil Street  
San Fernando, CA 91340

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Daren T. Grilley  
City Engineer  
425 South Mission Drive  
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Travis Lange  
Environmental Services Manager  
23920 West Valencia Blvd, Suite 300  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Neal Shapiro  
Urban Runoff Coordinator  
1685 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295

John Hunter  
2175 Cherry Avenue  
Signal Hill, CA 90755

John Hunter  
8650 California Avenue  
South Gate, CA 90280

Leslie Cortez  
Senior Administrative Assistant  
3031 Torrance Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90503-5059

Jack Yoshino  
Senior Management Assistant  
P.O. Box 682  
Walnut, CA 91788

Sharon Perlstein  
City Engineer  
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard  
West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314

David Mochizuki  
Director of Public Works  
13230 Penn Street  
Whittier, CA 90602-1772

Chuck Richie  
Director of Parks and Public Works  
2200 Huntington Drive  
San Marino, CA 91108-2691

Sarina Morales-Choate  
Civil Engineer Assistant  
P.O. Box 2120  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120

James Carlson  
Management Analyst  
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard  
Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312

John Hunter  
1414 Mission Street  
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298

Joe Lambert  
John Hunter  
9701 Las Tunas Drive  
Temple City, CA 91780-2249

Claudia Arellano  
4305 Santa Fe Avenue  
Vernon, CA 90058-1786

Samuel Gutierrez  
Engineering Technician  
P.O. Box 1440  
West Covina, CA 91793-1440

Roxanne Hughes  
Stormwater Program Coordinator  
31200 Oak Crest Drive  
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Gary Hildebrand  
Assistant Deputy Director, Division Engineer  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803

1 I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing  
2 correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day in the  
3 ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed  
4 invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for  
5 mailing in affidavit.

6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
7 foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed on December 10, 2012, at Santa Monica, California.

9 

10 Anna Kheyfets  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

### LOS ANGELES REGION

320 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California 90013

Phone (213) 576 - 6600 • Fax (213) 576 - 6640

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles>

### ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS004001

#### WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4) DISCHARGES WITHIN THE COASTAL WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, EXCEPT THOSE DISCHARGES ORIGINATING FROM THE CITY OF LONG BEACH MS4

The municipal discharges of storm water and non-storm water by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the County of Los Angeles, and 84 incorporated cities within the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles County with the exception of the City of Long Beach (hereinafter referred to separately as Permittees and jointly as the Dischargers) from the discharge points identified below are subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order.

#### I. FACILITY INFORMATION

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Dischargers</b>	The Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the County of Los Angeles, and 84 incorporated cities within the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles County with the exception of the City of Long Beach (See Table 4)
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) within the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles County with the exception of the City of Long Beach MS4
<b>Facility Address</b>	Various (see Table 2)
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Water Board) have classified the Greater Los Angeles County MS4 as a large municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) pursuant to 40 CFR section 122.26(b)(4) and a major facility pursuant to 40 CFR section 122.2.	

**Table 2. Facility Information**

Permittee (WDID)	Contact Information	
<b>Agoura Hills (4B190147001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	30001 Ladyface Court Agoura Hills, CA 91301
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Ken Berkman, City Engineer kberkman@agoura-hills.ca.us

<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
<b>Alhambra (4B190148001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	111 South First Street Alhambra, CA 91801-3796
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	David Dolphin ddolphin@cityofalhambra.org
<b>Arcadia (4B190149001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	11800 Goldring Road Arcadia, CA 91006-5879
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and E-mail</b>	Vanessa Hevener, Environmental Services Officer (626) 305-5327 vhevener@ci.arcadia.ca.us
<b>Artesia (4B190150001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	18747 Clarkdale Avenue Artesia, CA 90701-5899
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Maria Dadian, Director of Public Works mdadian@cityofartesia.ci.us
<b>Azusa (4B190151001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	213 East Foothill Boulevard Azusa, CA 91702
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Carl Hassel, City Engineer chassel@ci.azusa.ca.us
<b>Baldwin Park (4B190152001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	14403 East Pacific Avenue Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	David Lopez, Associate Engineer dlopez@baldwinpark.com
<b>Bell (4B190153001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	6330 Pine Avenue Bell, CA 90201-1291
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Terri Rodrigue, City Engineer trodrigue@cityofbell.org
<b>Bell Gardens (4B190139002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	7100 South Garfield Avenue Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	John Oropeza, Director of Public Works (562) 806-7700
<b>Bellflower (4B190154001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	16600 Civic Center Drive Bellflower, CA 90706-5494
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Bernie Iniguez, Environmental Services Manager biniguez@bellflower.org
<b>Beverly Hills (4B190132002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	455 North Rexford Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Vincent Chee, Project Civil Engineer kgettler@beverlyhills.org
<b>Bradbury (4B190155001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	600 Winston Avenue Bradbury, CA 91010-1199
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Elroy Kiepke, City Engineer mkeith@cityofbradbury.org
<b>Burbank (4B190101002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 6459 Burbank, CA 91510
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Bonnie Teaford, Public Works Director bteaford@ci.burbank.ca.us
<b>Calabasas (4B190157001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	100 Civic Center Way Calabasas, CA 91302-3172
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Alex Farassati, ESM afarassati@cityofcalabasas.com
<b>Carson (4B190158001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 6234 Carson, CA 90745
	<b>Facility Contact, Title,</b>	Patricia Elkins, Building Construction Manager



<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
	<b>and E-mail</b>	pelkins@carson.ca.us
<b>Cerritos (4B190159001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 3130 Cerritos, CA 90703-3130
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Mike O'Grady, Environmental Services mo'grady@cerritos.us
<b>Claremont (4B190160001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	207 Harvard Avenue Claremont, CA 91711-4719
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Craig Bradshaw, City Engineer cbradshaw@ci.claremont.ca.us
<b>Commerce (4B190161001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	2535 Commerce Way Commerce, CA 90040-1487
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	Gina Nila gnila@ci.commerce.ca.us
<b>Compton (4B190162001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	205 South Willowbrook Avenue Compton, CA 90220-3190
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Hien Nguyen, Assistant City Engineer (310) 761-1476
<b>Covina (4B190163001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	125 East College Street Covina, CA 91723-2199
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Vivian Castro, Environmental Services Manager vcastro@covinaca.gov
<b>Cudahy (4B190164001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 1007 Cudahy, CA 90201-6097
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Hector Rodriguez, City Manager hrodriguez@cityofcudahy.ca.us
<b>Culver City (4B190165001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	9770 Culver Boulevard Culver City, CA 90232-0507
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Damian Skinner, Manager (310) 253-6421
<b>Diamond Bar (4B190166001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	21825 East Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	David Liu, Director of Public Works dliu@diamondbarca.gov
<b>Downey (4B190167001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 7016 Downey, CA 90241-7016
	<b>Facility Contact , Title, and E-mail</b>	Yvonne Blumberg yblumberg@downeyca.org
<b>Duarte (4B190168001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1600 Huntington Drive Duarte, CA 91010-2592
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Steve Esbenshades, Engineering Division Manager (626) 357-7931 ext. 233
<b>El Monte (4B190169001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 6008 El Monte, CA 91731
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	James A Enriquez, Director of Public Works (626) 580-2058
<b>El Segundo (4B190170001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	350 Main Street El Segundo, CA 90245-3895
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and E-mail</b>	Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director (310) 524-2356 skatsouleas@elsegundo.org
<b>Gardena (4B190118002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 47003 Gardena, CA 90247-3778

<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Ron Jackson, Building Maintenance Supervisor jfelix@ci.gardena.ci.us
<b>Glendale (4B190171001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	Engineering Section, 633 East Broadway, Room 209 Glendale, CA 91206-4308
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Maurice Oillataguerre, Senior Environmental Program Scientist moillataguerre@ci.glendale.ca.us
<b>Glendora (4B190172001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	116 East Foothill Boulevard Glendora, CA 91741
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Dave Davies, Deputy Director of Public Works ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us
<b>Hawaiian Gardens (4B190173001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	21815 Pioneer Boulevard Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Joseph Colombo, Director of Community Development jcolombo@ghcity.org
<b>Hawthorne (4B190174001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	4455 West 126 <sup>th</sup> Street Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Arnold Shadbeh, Chief General Service and Public Works ashadbeh@cityofhawthorne.org
<b>Hermosa Beach (4B190175001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1315 Valley Drive Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Homayoun Behboodi, Associate Engineer hbehboodi@hermosabch.org
<b>Hidden Hills (4B190176001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	6165 Spring Valley Road Hidden Hills, CA 91302
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Kimberly Colberts, Environmental Coordinator (310) 257-2004
<b>Huntington Park (4B190177001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	6550 Miles Avenue Huntington Park, CA 90255
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Craig Melich, City Engineer and City Official (323) 584-6253
<b>Industry (4B190178001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 3366 Industry, CA 91744-3995
	<b>Facility Contact and Title</b>	Mike Nagaoka, Director of Public Safety
<b>Inglewood (4B190179001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1 W. Manchester Blvd, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Inglewood, CA 90301-1750
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Lauren Amimoto, Senior Administrative Analyst lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org
<b>Irwindale (4B190180001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	5050 North Irwindale Avenue Irwindale, CA 91706
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Kwok Tam, Director of Public Works ktam@ci.irwindale.ca.us
<b>La Canada Flintridge (4B190181001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1327 Foothill Boulevard La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Edward G. Hitti, Director of Public Works ehitti@lcf.ca.gov
<b>La Habra Heights (4B190182001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1245 North Hacienda Boulevard La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Shauna Clark, City Manager shaunac@lhcity.org
<b>La Mirada</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	13700 La Mirada Boulevard

<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
<b>(4B190183001)</b>		La Mirada, CA 90638-0828
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Steve Forster, Public Works Director sforster@cityoflamirada.org
<b>La Puente (4B190184001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	15900 East Marin Street La Puente, CA 91744-4788
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	John DiMario, Director of Development Services jdimario@lapuente.org
<b>La Verne (4B190185001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	3660 "D" Street La Verne, CA 91750-3599
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Daniel Keeseey, Director of Public Works dkeeseey@ci.la-verne.ca.us
<b>Lakewood (4B190186001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 158 Lakewood, CA 90714-0158
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	Konya Vivanti kvivanti@lakewoodcity.org
<b>Lawndale (4B190127002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	14717 Burin Avenue Lawndale, CA 90260
	<b>Facility Contact and Title</b>	Marlene Miyoshi, Senior Administrative Analyst
<b>Lomita (4B190187001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 339 Lomita, CA 90717-0098
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Tom A. Odom, City Administrator d.tomita@lomitacity.com
<b>Los Angeles (4B190188001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1149 S. Broadway, 10 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90015
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Shahram Kharaghani, Program Manager (213) 485-0587
<b>Lynwood (4B190189001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	11330 Bullis Road Lynwood, CA 90262-3693
	<b>Facility Contact and Phone</b>	Josef Kekula (310) 603-0220 ext. 287
<b>Malibu (4B190190001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	23825 Stuart Ranch Road Malibu, CA 90265-4861
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Jennifer Brown, Environmental Program Analyst jbrown@malibucity.org
<b>Manhattan Beach (4B190191001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Email</b>	Brian Wright, Water Supervisor bwright@citymb.info
<b>Maywood (4B190192001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	4319 East Slauson Avenue Maywood, CA 90270-2897
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Andre Dupret, Project Manager (323) 562-5721
<b>Monrovia (4B190193001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	415 South Ivy Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016-2888
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	Heather Maloney hmaloney@ci.monrovia.ca.gov
<b>Montebello (4B190194001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1600 West Beverly Boulevard Montebello, CA 90640-3970
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	Cory Roberts croberts@aaeinc.com
<b>Monterey Park</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	320 West Newmark Avenue

<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
<b>(4B190195001)</b>		Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896
	<b>Facility Contact, Phone, and E-mail</b>	Amy Ho (626) 307-1383 amho@montereypark.ca.gov John Hunter (Consultant) at jhunter@jhla.net
<b>Norwalk (4B190196001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 1030 Norwalk, CA 90651-1030
	<b>Facility Contact and Title</b>	Chino Consunji, City Engineer
<b>Palos Verdes Estates (4B190197001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	340 Palos Verdes Drive West Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Allan Rigg, Director of Public Works arigg@pvestates.org
<b>Paramount (4B190198001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	16400 Colorado Avenue Paramount, CA 90723-5091
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Chris Cash, Utility and Infrastructure Assistant Director ccash@paramountcity.org
<b>Pasadena (4B190199001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 7115 Pasadena, CA 91109-7215
	<b>Facility Contact and E-mail</b>	Stephen Walker swalker@cityofpasadena.net
<b>Pico Rivera (4B190200001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 1016 Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Art Cervantes, Director of Public Works acervantes@pico-rivera.org
<b>Pomona (4B190145003)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 660 Pomona, CA 91769-0660
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Julie Carver, Environmental Programs Coordinator Julie_Carver@ci.pomona.ca.us
<b>Rancho Palos Verdes (4B190201001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	30940 Hawthorne Boulevard Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Ray Holland, Interim Public Works Director clehr@rpv.com
<b>Redondo Beach (4B190143002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 270 Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Mike Shay, Principal Civil Engineer mshay@redondo.org
<b>Rolling Hills (4B190202001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	2 Portuguese Bend Road Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Greg Grammer, Assistant to the City Manager ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov
<b>Rolling Hills Estates (4B190203001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	4045 Palos Verdes Drive North Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Greg Grammer, Assistant to the City Manager ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov
<b>Rosemead (4B190204001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	8838 East Valley Boulevard Rosemead, CA 91770-1787
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Chris Marcarello, Director of PW (626) 569-2118
<b>San Dimas (4B190205001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	245 East Bonita Avenue San Dimas, CA 91773-3002
	<b>Facility Contact, Title,</b>	Latoya Cyrus, Environmental Services Coordinator

<b>Permittee (WDID)</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	
	<b>and E-mail</b>	lcyrus@ci.san-dimas.ca.us
<b>San Fernando (4B190206001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	117 Macneil Street San Fernando, CA 91340
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Ron Ruiz, Director of Public Works rruiz@sfcity.org
<b>San Gabriel (4B190207001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	425 South Mission Drive San Gabriel, CA 91775
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Daren T. Grilley, City Engineer (626) 308-2806 ext. 4631
<b>San Marino (4B190208001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	2200 Huntington Drive San Marino, CA 91108-2691
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Chuck Richie, Director of Parks and Public Works criche@cityofsanmarino.org
<b>Santa Clarita (4B190117001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	23920 West Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300 Santa Clarita, CA 91355
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Travis Lange, Environmental Services Manager (661) 255-4337
<b>Santa Fe Springs (4B190108003)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	P.O. Box 2120 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Sarina Morales-Choate, Civil Engineer Assistant smorales-choate@santafesprings.org
<b>Santa Monica (4B190122002)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1685 Main Street Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail</b>	Neal Shapiro, Urban Runoff Coordinator nshapiro@smgov.net
<b>Sierra Madre (4B190209001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312
	<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	James Carlson, Management Analyst (626) 355-7135 ext. 803
<b>Signal Hill (4B190210001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	2175 Cherry Avenue Signal Hill, CA 90755
	<b>Facility Contact, Phone, and E-mail</b>	John Hunter (562) 802-7880 jhunter@jlha.net
<b>South El Monte (4B190211001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1415 North Santa Anita Avenue South El Monte, CA 91733-3389
	<b>Facility Contact and Phone</b>	Anthony Ybarra, City Manager (626) 579-6540
<b>South Gate (4B190212001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	8650 California Avenue South Gate, CA 90280
	<b>Facility Contact, Phone, and E-mail</b>	John Hunter (562) 802-7880 jhunter@jlha.net
<b>South Pasadena (4B190213001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	1414 Mission Street South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298
	<b>Facility Contact, Phone, and E-mail</b>	John Hunter (562) 802-7880 jhunter@jlha.net
<b>Temple City (4B190214001)</b>	<b>Mailing Address</b>	9701 Las Tunas Drive Temple City, CA 91780-2249
	<b>Facility Contact,</b>	Joe Lambert at (626) 285-2171 or

Permittee (WDID)	Contact Information	
	Phone, and E-mail	
Torrance (4B190215001)	Phone, and E-mail	John Hunter at (562) 802-7880/jhunter@jlha.net
	Mailing Address	3031 Torrance Boulevard Torrance, CA 90503-5059
	Facility Contact and Title	Leslie Cortez, Senior Administrative Assistant
Vernon (4B190216001)	Mailing Address	4305 Santa Fe Avenue Vernon, CA 90058-1786
	Facility Contact and Phone	Claudia Arellano (323) 583-8811
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 682 Walnut, CA 91788
Walnut (4B190217001)	Facility Contact and Title	Jack Yoshino, Senior Management Assistant
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 1440 West Covina, CA 91793-1440
West Covina (4B190218001)	Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail	Samuel Gutierrez, Engineering Technician sam.gutierrez@westcovina.org
	Mailing Address	8300 Santa Monica Boulevard West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314
West Hollywood (4B190219001)	Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail	Sharon Perlstein, City Engineer sperlstein@weho.org
	Mailing Address	31200 Oak Crest Drive Westlake Village, CA 91361
	Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and E-mail	Joe Bellomo, Stormwater Program Manager (805) 279-6856 jbellomo@willdan.com
Whittier (4B190221001)	Mailing Address	13230 Penn Street Whittier, CA 90602-1772
	Facility Contact, Title, and E-mail	David Mochizuki, Director of Public Works dmochizuki@cityofwhittier.org
County of Los Angeles (4B190107099)	Mailing Address	900 South Fremont Avenue Alhambra, CA 91803
	Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and E-mail	Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy Director, Division Engineer (626) 458-4300 ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov
Los Angeles County Flood Control District (4B190107101)	Mailing Address	900 South Fremont Avenue Alhambra, CA 91803
	Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and E-mail	Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy Director, Division Engineer (626) 458-4300 ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov

**Table 3. Discharge Location**

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Receiving Water
All Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System discharge points within Los Angeles County with the exception of the City of Long Beach	Storm Water and Non-Storm Water	Numerous	Numerous	Surface waters identified in Tables 2-1, 2-1a, 2-3, and 2-4, and Appendix 1, Table 1 of the <i>Water Quality Control Plan - Los Angeles Region (Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties)</i> , and other unidentified tributaries to these surface waters within the following Watershed Management Areas: (1) Santa Clara River Watershed; (2) Santa Monica Bay Watershed Management Area, including Malibu Creek Watershed and Ballona Creek Watershed; (3) Los Angeles River Watershed; (4) Dominguez Channel and Greater Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbors Watershed Management Area; (5) Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay Watershed Management Area; (6) San Gabriel River Watershed; and (7) Santa Ana River Watershed. <sup>1</sup>

**Table 4. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region on:	<b>November 8, 2012</b>
This Order becomes effective on:	<b>December 28, 2012</b>
This Order expires on:	<b>December 28, 2017</b>
In accordance with Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 9 of the California Code of Regulations and Title 40, Part 122 of the Code of Federal Regulations, each Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than:	<b>180 days prior to the Order expiration date above</b>

<sup>1</sup> Note that the Santa Ana River Watershed lies primarily within the boundaries of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. However, a portion of the Chino Basin subwatershed lies within the jurisdictions of Pomona and Claremont in Los Angeles County. The primary receiving waters within the Los Angeles County portion of the Chino Basin subwatershed are San Antonio Creek and Chino Creek.

In accordance with section 2235.4 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending issuance of a new permit if all requirements of the federal NPDES regulations on continuation of expired permits are complied with. Accordingly, if a new order is not adopted by the expiration date above, then the Permittees shall continue to implement the requirements of this Order until a new one is adopted.

I, Samuel Unger, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, on November 8, 2012.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Samuel Unger, Executive Officer



## Table of Contents

I.	Facility Information .....	1
II.	Findings.....	13
III.	Discharge Prohibitions.....	27
	A. Prohibitions – Non-Storm Water Discharges .....	27
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications .....	38
	A. Effluent Limitations.....	38
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable.....	38
	C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable.....	38
V.	Receiving Water Limitations .....	38
	A. Receiving Water Limitations .....	38
	B. Ground Water Limitations – Not Applicable .....	39
VI.	Provisions.....	39
	A. Standard Provisions.....	39
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements .....	46
	C. Watershed Management Programs.....	47
	D. Storm Water Management Program Minimum Control Measures .....	67
	E. Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions.....	141

## List of Tables

Table 1.	Discharger Information.....	1
Table 2.	Facility Information.....	1
Table 3.	Discharge Location .....	9
Table 4.	Administrative Information.....	9
Table 5.	List of Permittees .....	16
Table 6.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses .....	21
Table 7.	Ocean Plan Beneficial Uses.....	24
Table 8.	Required Conditions for Conditionally Exempt Non-Storm Water Discharges ...	34
Table 9.	Watershed Management Program Implementation Requirements.....	54
Table 10.	Source Control BMPs at Commercial and Industrial Facilities .....	93
Table 11.	Benchmarks Applicable to New Development Treatment BMPs.....	104
Table 12.	Minimum Set of BMPs for All Construction Sites.....	114
Table 13.	Minimum Set of BMPs for All Construction Sites.....	118
Table 14.	Additional BMPs Applicable to Construction Sites Disturbing 1 Acre or More.	118
Table 15.	Additional Enhanced BMPs for High Risk Sites .....	118
Table 16.	Minimum Required BMPs for Roadway Paving or Repair Operation .....	119
Table 17.	Inspection Frequencies .....	120
Table 18.	BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities.....	127
Table 19.	Discharge Limitations for Dewatering Treatment BMPs.....	134

### List of Attachments

Attachment A – Definitions .....	A-1
Attachment B – Watershed Management Area Maps.....	B-1
Attachment C – MS4 Maps by Watershed Management Area .....	C-1
Attachment D – Standard Provisions.....	D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program .....	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet.....	F-1
Attachment G – Non-Storm Water Action Levels.....	G-1
Attachment H – Bioretention/Biofiltration Design Criteria.....	H-1
Attachment I – Developer Technical Information and Guidelines .....	I-1
Attachment J – Determination of Erosion Potential .....	J-1
Attachment K – Permittees and TMDLs Matrix.....	K-1
Attachment L – TMDL Provisions for Santa Clara River Watershed Management Area .....	L-1
Attachment M – TMDL Provisions for Santa Monica Bay Watershed Management Area (including Malibu Creek, Ballona Creek, and Marina del Rey Subwatersheds).....	M-1
Attachment N – TMDL Provisions for Dominguez Channel and Greater Harbor Waters Watershed Management Area (including Machado Lake Subwatershed) ...	N-1
Attachment O – TMDL Provisions for Los Angeles River Watershed Management Area.....	O-1
Attachment P – TMDL Provisions for San Gabriel River Watershed Management Area.....	P-1
Attachment Q – TMDL Provisions for Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay Watershed Management Area .....	Q-1
Attachment R – TMDL Provisions for Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Management Area .....	R-1

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (hereinafter Regional Water Board) finds:

### A. Nature of Discharges and Sources of Pollutants

Storm water and non-storm water discharges consist of surface runoff generated from various land uses, which are conveyed via the municipal separate storm sewer system and ultimately discharged into surface waters throughout the region. Discharges of storm water and non-storm water from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County convey pollutants to surface waters throughout the Los Angeles Region. In general, the primary pollutants of concern in these discharges identified by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District Integrated Receiving Water Impacts Report (1994-2005) are indicator bacteria, total aluminum, copper, lead, zinc, diazinon, and cyanide. Aquatic toxicity, particularly during wet weather, is also a concern based on a review of Annual Monitoring Reports from 2005-10. Storm water and non-storm water discharges of debris and trash are also a pervasive water quality problem in the Los Angeles Region though significant strides have been made by a number of Permittees in addressing this problem through the implementation of control measures to achieve wasteload allocations established in trash TMDLs.

Pollutants in storm water and non-storm water have damaging effects on both human health and aquatic ecosystems. Water quality assessments conducted by the Regional Water Board have identified impairment of beneficial uses of water bodies in the Los Angeles Region caused or contributed to by pollutant loading from municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges. As a result of these impairments, there are beach postings and closures, fish consumption advisories, local and global ecosystem and aesthetic impacts from trash and debris, reduced habitat for threatened and endangered species, among others. The Regional Water Board and USEPA have established 33 total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) that identify Los Angeles County MS4 discharges as one of the pollutant sources causing or contributing to these water quality impairments.

### B. Permit History

Prior to the issuance of this Order, Regional Water Board Order No. 01-182 served as the NPDES Permit for MS4 storm water and non-storm water discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of the County of Los Angeles. The requirements of Order No. 01-182 applied to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County under County jurisdiction, and 84 Cities within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District with the exception of the City of Long Beach. The first county-wide MS4 permit for the County of Los Angeles and the incorporated areas therein was Order No. 90-079, adopted by the Regional Water Board on June 18, 1990.

Under Order No. 01-182, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District was designated the Principal Permittee, and the County of Los Angeles and 84 incorporated Cities were each designated Permittees. The Principal Permittee coordinated and facilitated activities necessary to comply with the requirements of Order No. 01-182, but was not responsible for ensuring compliance of any of the other Permittees. The designation of a Principal Permittee has not been carried over from Order No. 01-182.

Order No. 01-182 was subsequently amended by the Regional Water Board on September 14, 2006 by Order No. R4-2006-0074 to incorporate provisions consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Dry Weather Bacteria TMDL (SMB Dry Weather Bacteria TMDL) waste load allocations (WLAs). As a result of a legal challenge to Order No. R4-2006-0074, the Los Angeles County Superior Court issued a peremptory writ of mandate on July 23, 2010 requiring the Regional Water Board to void and set aside the amendments adopted through Order No. R4-2006-0074 in Order No. 01-182. The Court concluded that the permit proceeding at which Order No. R4-2006-0074 was adopted was procedurally deficient. The Court did not address the substantive merits of the amendments themselves, and thus made no determination about the substantive validity of Order No. R4-2006-0074. In compliance with the writ of mandate, the Regional Water Board voided and set aside the amendments adopted through Order No. R4-2006-0074 on April 14, 2011. This Order reincorporates requirements equivalent to the 2006 provisions to implement the SMB Dry Weather Bacteria TMDL.

In addition, Order No. 01-182 was amended on August 9, 2007 by Order No. R4-2007-0042 to incorporate provisions consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the Marina del Rey Harbor Mothers' Beach and Back Basins Bacteria TMDL, and was again amended on December 10, 2009 by Order No. R4-2009-0130 to incorporate provisions consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the Los Angeles River Watershed Trash TMDL.

### **C. Permit Application**

On June 12, 2006, prior to the expiration date of Order No. 01-182, all of the Permittees filed Reports of Waste Discharge (ROWD) applying for renewal of their waste discharge requirements that serve as an NPDES permit to discharge storm water and authorized and conditionally exempt non-storm water through their MS4 to surface waters. Specifically, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) submitted an ROWD application on behalf of itself, the County of Los Angeles, and 78 other Permittees. Several Permittees under Order No. 01-182 elected to not be included as part of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's ROWD. On June 12, 2006, the Cities of Downey and Signal Hill each submitted an individual ROWD application requesting a separate MS4 Permit; and the Upper San Gabriel River Watershed Coalition, comprised of the cities of Azusa, Claremont, Glendora, Irwindale, and Whittier also submitted an individual ROWD application requesting a separate MS4 Permit for these cities. In 2010, the LACFCD withdrew from its participation in the 2006 ROWD submitted in conjunction with the County and 78 other co-permittees, and submitted a new ROWD also requesting an individual MS4 permit. The LACFCD also requested that, if an individual MS4 permit was not issued to it, it no longer be designated as the

Principal Permittee and it be relieved of Principal Permittee responsibilities. The Regional Water Board evaluated each of the 2006 ROWDs and notified all of the Permittees that their ROWDs did not satisfy federal storm water regulations contained in the USEPA Interpretive Policy Memorandum on Reapplication Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems; Final Rule, August 9, 1996 (61 *Fed Reg.* 41697). Because each ROWD did not satisfy federal requirements, the Regional Water Board deemed all four 2006 ROWDs incomplete. The Regional Water Board also evaluated the LACFCD's 2010 ROWD and found that it too did not satisfy federal requirements for MS4s.

Though five separate ROWDs were submitted, the Regional Water Board retains discretion as the permitting authority to determine whether to issue permits for discharges from MS4s on a system-wide or jurisdiction-wide basis (Clean Water Act (CWA) § 402(p)(3)(B)(i); 40 CFR section 122.26, subdivisions (a)(1)(v) and (a)(3)(ii)). Because of the complexity and networking of the MS4 within Los Angeles County, which often results in commingled discharges, the Regional Water Board has previously adopted a system-wide approach to permitting MS4 discharges within Los Angeles County.

In evaluating the five separate ROWDs, the Regional Water Board considered the appropriateness of permitting discharges from MS4s within Los Angeles County on a system-wide or jurisdiction-wide basis or a combination of both. Based on that evaluation, the Regional Water Board again determined that, because of the complexity and networking of the MS4 within Los Angeles County, that one system-wide permit is appropriate. In order to provide individual Permittees with more specific requirements, certain provisions of this Order are organized by watershed management area, which is appropriate given the requirements to implement 33 watershed-based TMDLs. The Regional Water Board also determined that because the LACFCD owns and operates large portions of the MS4 infrastructure, including but not limited to catch basins, storm drains, outfalls and open channels, in each coastal watershed management area within Los Angeles County, the LACFCD should remain a Permittee in the single system-wide permit; however, this Order relieves the LACFCD of its role as "Principal Permittee."

#### **D. Permit Coverage and Facility Description**

The Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the County of Los Angeles, and 84 incorporated cities within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District with the exception of the City of Long Beach (see Table 5, List of Permittees), hereinafter referred to separately as Permittees and jointly as the Dischargers, discharge storm water and non-storm water from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), also called storm drain systems. For the purposes of this Order, references to the "Discharger" or "Permittee" in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger, or Permittees herein.

The area covered under this Order encompasses more than 3,000 square miles. This area contains a vast drainage network that serves incorporated and unincorporated areas in every Watershed Management Area within the Los Angeles Region. Maps

depicting the major drainage infrastructure within the area covered under this Order are included in Attachment C of this Order.

**Table 5. List of Permittees**

Agoura Hills	Hawaiian Gardens	Pomona
Alhambra	Hawthorne	Rancho Palos Verdes
Arcadia	Hermosa Beach	Redondo Beach
Artesia	Hidden Hills	Rolling Hills
Azusa	Huntington Park	Rolling Hills Estates
Baldwin Park	Industry	Rosemead
Bell	Inglewood	San Dimas
Bell Gardens	Irwindale	San Fernando
Bellflower	La Canada Flintridge	San Gabriel
Beverly Hills	La Habra Heights	San Marino
Bradbury	La Mirada	Santa Clarita
Burbank	La Puente	Santa Fe Springs
Calabasas	La Verne	Santa Monica
Carson	Lakewood	Sierra Madre
Cerritos	Lawndale	Signal Hill
Claremont	Lomita	South El Monte
Commerce	Los Angeles	South Gate
Compton	Lynwood	South Pasadena
Covina	Malibu	Temple City
Cudahy	Manhattan Beach	Torrance
Culver City	Maywood	Vernon
Diamond Bar	Monrovia	Walnut
Downey	Montebello	West Covina
Duarte	Monterey Park	West Hollywood
El Monte	Norwalk	Westlake Village
El Segundo	Palos Verdes Estates	Whittier
Gardena	Paramount	County of Los Angeles
Glendale	Pasadena	Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Glendora	Pico Rivera	

**E. Los Angeles County Flood Control District**

In 1915, the California Legislature enacted the Los Angeles County Flood Control Act, establishing the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD). The objects and purposes of the Act are to provide for the control and conservation of the flood, storm and other waste waters within the flood control district. Among its other powers, the LACFCD also has the power to preserve, enhance, and add recreational features to lands or interests in lands contiguous to its properties for the protection, preservation, and use of the scenic beauty and natural environment for the properties or the lands. The LACFCD is governed, as a separate entity, by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors.

The LACFCD's system includes the majority of drainage infrastructure within incorporated and unincorporated areas in every watershed, including approximately 500 miles of open channel, 3,500 miles of underground drains, and an estimated 88,000 catch basins, and several dams. Portions of the LACFCD's current system were originally unmodified natural rivers and water courses.

The LACFCD's system conveys both storm and non-storm water throughout the Los Angeles basin. Other Permittees' MS4s connect and discharge to the LACFCD's system.

The waters and pollutants discharged from the LACFCD's system come from various sources. These sources can include storm water and non-storm water from the Permittees under this permit and other NPDES and non-NPDES Permittees discharging into the LACFCD's system, including industrial waste water dischargers, waste water treatment facilities, industrial and construction stormwater Permittees, water suppliers, government entities, CERCLA potentially responsible parties, and Caltrans. Sources can also include discharges from school districts that do not operate large or medium-sized municipal storm sewers and discharges from entities that have waste discharge requirements or waivers of waste discharge requirements.

Unlike other Permittees, including the County of Los Angeles, the LACFCD does not own or operate any municipal sanitary sewer systems, public streets, roads, or highways.

The LACFCD in contrast to the County of Los Angeles has no planning, zoning, development permitting or other land use authority over industrial or commercial facilities, new developments or re-development projects, or development construction sites located in any incorporated or unincorporated areas within its service area. The Permittees that have such land use authority are responsible for implementing a storm water management program to inspect and control pollutants from industrial and commercial facilities, new development and re-development projects, and development construction sites within their jurisdictional boundaries. Nonetheless, as an owner and operator of MS4s, the LACFCD is required by federal regulations to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4, including the ability to control through interagency agreements among co-Permittees and other owners of a MS4 the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the MS4 to another portion of the MS4.

## **F. Permit Scope**

This Order regulates municipal discharges of storm water and non-storm water from the Permittees' MS4s. Section 122.26(b)(8) of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) defines an MS4 as "a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains): (i) [o]wned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to State law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, storm water, or other wastes, including special districts under State law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian

tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under section 208 of the CWA that discharges to waters of the United States; (ii) [d]esignated or used for collecting or conveying storm water; (iii) [w]hich is not a combined sewer; and (iv) [w]hich is not part of a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) as defined at 40 CFR 122.2.”

Storm water discharges consist of those discharges that originate from precipitation events. Federal regulations define “storm water” as “storm water runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.” (40 CFR § 122.26(b)(13).) While “surface runoff and drainage” is not defined in federal law, USEPA’s preamble to its final storm water regulations demonstrates that the term is related to precipitation events such as rain and/or snowmelt. (55 *Fed. Reg.* 47990, 47995-96 (Nov. 16, 1990)).

Non-storm water discharges consist of all discharges through an MS4 that do not originate from precipitation events. Non-storm water discharges through an MS4 are prohibited unless authorized under a separate NPDES permit; authorized by USEPA pursuant to Sections 104(a) or 104(b) of the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA); composed of natural flows; the result of emergency fire fighting activities; or conditionally exempted in this Order.

A permit issued to more than one Permittee for MS4 discharges may contain separate storm water management programs for particular Permittees or groups of Permittees. 40 CFR § 122.26(d)(2)(iv). Given the LACFCD’s limited land use authority, it is appropriate for the LACFCD to have a separate and uniquely-tailored storm water management program. Accordingly, the storm water management program minimum control measures imposed on the LACFCD in Part VI.D of this Order differ in some ways from the minimum control measures imposed on other Permittees. Namely, aside from its own properties and facilities, the LACFCD is not subject to the Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program, the Planning and Land Development Program, and the Development Construction Program. However, as a discharger of storm and non-storm water, the LACFCD remains subject to the Public Information and Participation Program and the Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharges Elimination Program. Further, as the owner and operator of certain properties, facilities and infrastructure, the LACFCD remains subject to requirements of a Public Agency Activities Program.

## **G. Geographic Coverage and Watershed Management Areas**

The municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges flow into receiving waters in the Watershed Management Areas of the Santa Clara River Watershed; Santa Monica Bay Watershed Management Area, including Malibu Creek Watershed and Ballona Creek Watershed; Los Angeles River Watershed; Dominguez Channel and Greater Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbors Watershed Management Area; Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay Watershed Management Area; San Gabriel River Watershed; and Santa Ana River Watershed.



This Order redefines Watershed Management Areas (WMAs) consistent with the delineations used in the Regional Water Board's Watershed Management Initiative. Permittees included in each of the WMAs are listed in Attachment K.

Maps depicting each WMA, its subwatersheds, and the major receiving waters therein are included in Attachment B.

Federal, state, regional or local entities in jurisdictions outside the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and not currently named as Permittee to this Order, may operate MS4 facilities and/or discharge to the MS4 and water bodies covered by this Order. Pursuant to 40 CFR sections 122.26(d)(1)(ii) and 122.26(d)(2)(iv), each Permittee shall maintain the necessary legal authority to control the contribution of pollutants to its MS4 and shall include in its storm water management program a comprehensive planning process that includes intergovernmental coordination, where necessary.

Sources of MS4 discharges into receiving waters in the County of Los Angeles but not covered by this Order include the following:

- About 34 square miles of unincorporated area in Ventura County, which drain into Malibu Creek and then to Santa Monica Bay,
- About 9 square miles of the City of Thousand Oaks, which also drain into Malibu Creek and then to Santa Monica Bay, and
- About 86 square miles of area in Orange County, which drain into Coyote Creek and then into the San Gabriel River.

Specifically, the Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) owns and operates the Los Alamitos Retarding Basin and Pumping Station (Los Alamitos Retarding Basin). The Los Alamitos Retarding Basin is within the San Gabriel River Watershed, and is located adjacent to the Los Angeles and Orange County boundary. The majority of the 30-acre Los Alamitos Retarding Basin is in Orange County; however, the northwest corner of the facility is located in the County of Los Angeles. Storm water and non-storm water discharges, which drain to the Los Alamitos Retarding Basin, are pumped to the San Gabriel River Estuary (SGR Estuary) through pumps and subterranean piping. The pumps and discharge point are located in the County of Los Angeles.

The OCFCD pumps the water within the Los Alamitos Retarding Basin to the San Gabriel River Estuary through four discharge pipes, which are covered by tide gates. The discharge point is located approximately 700 feet downstream from the 2nd Street Bridge in Long Beach. The total pumping capacity of the four pumps is 800 cubic feet per second (cfs). There is also a 5 cfs sump pump that discharges nuisance flow continuously to the Estuary through a smaller diameter uncovered pipe.

The discharge from the Los Alamitos Retarding Basin is covered under the Orange County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit (NPDES Permit No. CAS618030, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Order No. R8-2010-0062), which was issued to the County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District and Incorporated Cities on May 22, 2009. The Orange County MS4 Permit references the San Gabriel River Metals and Selenium TMDL (Metals TMDL). The waste load allocations listed in the

Metals TMDL for Coyote Creek are included in the Orange County MS4 Permit. However, the Orange County MS4 Permit does not contain the dry weather copper waste load allocations assigned to the Estuary.

## H. Legal Authorities

This Order is issued pursuant to CWA section 402 and implementing regulations adopted by the USEPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). This Order serves as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from the Permittees' MS4s to surface waters. This Order also serves as waste discharge requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with Section 13260).

- I. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Requirements.** The 1972 Clean Water Act<sup>2</sup> established the NPDES Program to regulate the discharge of pollutants from point sources to waters of the United States. However, pollution from storm water and dry-weather urban runoff was largely unabated for over a decade. In response to the 1987 Amendments to the Clean Water Act, USEPA developed Phase I of the NPDES Storm Water Permitting Program in 1990, which established a framework for regulating municipal and industrial discharges of storm water and non-storm water. The Phase I program addressed sources of storm water and dry-weather urban runoff that had the greatest potential to negatively impact water quality. In particular, under Phase I, USEPA required NPDES Permit coverage for discharges from medium and large MS4 with populations of 100,000 or more. Operators of MS4s regulated under the Phase I NPDES Storm Water Program were required to obtain permit coverage for municipal discharges of storm water and non-storm water to waters of the United States

Early in the history of this MS4 Permit, the Regional Water Board designated the MS4s owned and/or operated by the incorporated cities and Los Angeles County unincorporated areas within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County as a large MS4 due to the total population of Los Angeles County, including that of unincorporated and incorporated areas, and the interrelationship between the Permittees' MS4s, pursuant to 40 CFR section 122.26(b)(4). The total population of the cities and County unincorporated areas covered by this Order was 9,519,338 in 2000 and has increased by approximately 300,000 to 9,818,605 in 2010, according to the United States Census.

This Order implements the federal Phase I NPDES Storm Water Program requirements. These requirements include three fundamental elements: (i) a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges through the MS4, (ii) requirements to implement controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, and (iii) other provisions the Regional Water Board has determined appropriate for the control of such pollutants.

- J. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the Permittees' applications, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available

---

<sup>2</sup> Federal Water Pollution Control Act; 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq., which, as amended in 1977, is commonly known as the Clean Water Act.

information. In accordance with federal regulations at 40 CFR section 124.8, a Fact Sheet (Attachment F) has been prepared to explain the principal facts and the significant factual, legal, methodological, and policy questions considered in preparing this Order. The Fact Sheet is hereby incorporated into this Order and also constitutes part of the Findings of the Regional Water Board for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through R are also incorporated into this Order.

**K. Water Quality Control Plans.** The Clean Water Act requires the Regional Water Board to establish water quality standards for each water body in its region. Water quality standards include beneficial uses, water quality objectives and criteria that are established at levels sufficient to protect those beneficial uses, and an antidegradation policy to prevent degrading waters. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan - Los Angeles Region* (hereinafter Basin Plan) on June 13, 1994 and has amended it on multiple occasions since 1994. The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters in the Los Angeles Region. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13263(a), the requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan. Beneficial uses applicable to the surface water bodies that receive discharges from the Los Angeles County MS4 generally include those listed below.

**Table 6. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Uses
All Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) discharge points within Los Angeles County coastal watersheds with the exception of the City of Long Beach	Multiple surface water bodies of the Los Angeles Region	Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN); Agricultural Supply (AGR); Industrial Service Supply (IND); Industrial Process Supply (PROC); Ground Water Recharge (GWR); Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH); Navigation (NAV); Hydropower Generation (POW); Water Contact Recreation (REC-1); Limited Contact Recreation (LREC-1); Non-Contact Water Recreation (REC-2); Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM); Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM); Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD); Preservation of Areas of Special Biological Significance (BIOL); Wildlife Habitat (WILD); Preservation of Rare and Endangered Species (RARE); Marine Habitat (MAR); Wetland Habitat (WET); Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR); Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN); Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL)

**1. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)**

Clean Water Act section 303(d)(1) requires each state to identify the waters within its boundaries that do not meet water quality standards. Water bodies that do not meet water quality standards are considered impaired and are placed on the state’s “CWA Section 303(d) List”. For each listed water body, the state is required to establish a TMDL of each pollutant impairing the water quality standards in that water body. A TMDL is a tool for implementing water quality standards and is based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. The

TMDL establishes the allowable pollutant loadings for a water body and thereby provides the basis to establish water quality-based controls. These controls should provide the pollution reduction necessary for a water body to meet water quality standards. A TMDL is the sum of the allowable pollutant loads of a single pollutant from all contributing point sources (the waste load allocations or WLAs) and non-point sources (load allocations or LAs), plus the contribution from background sources and a margin of safety. (40 CFR section 130.2(i).) MS4 discharges are considered point source discharges.

Numerous receiving waters within Los Angeles County do not meet water quality standards or fully support beneficial uses and therefore have been classified as impaired on the State's 303(d) List. The Regional Water Board and USEPA have each established TMDLs to address many of these water quality impairments. Pursuant to CWA section 402(p)(B)(3)(iii) and 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), this Order includes requirements that are consistent with and implement WLAs that are assigned to discharges from the Los Angeles County MS4 from 33 State-adopted and USEPA established TMDLs. This Order requires Permittees to comply with the TMDL Provisions in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R, which are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the TMDL WLAs assigned to discharges from the Los Angeles County MS4. A comprehensive list of TMDLs by watershed management area and the Permittees subject to each TMDL is included in Attachment K.

Waste load allocations in these TMDLs are expressed in several ways depending on the nature of the pollutant and its impacts on receiving waters and beneficial uses. Bacteria WLAs assigned to MS4 discharges are expressed as the number of allowable exceedance days that a water body may exceed the Basin Plan water quality objectives for protection of the REC-1 beneficial use. Since the TMDLs and the WLAs contained therein are expressed as receiving water conditions, receiving water limitations have been included in this Order that are consistent with and implement the allowable exceedance day WLAs. Water quality-based effluent limitations are also included equivalent to the Basin Plan water quality objectives to allow the opportunity for Permittees to individually demonstrate compliance at an outfall or jurisdictional boundary, thus isolating the Permittee's pollutant contributions from those of other Permittees and from other pollutant sources to the receiving water.

WLAs for trash are expressed as progressively decreasing allowable amounts of trash discharges from a Permittee's jurisdictional area within the drainage area to the impaired water body. The Trash TMDLs require each Permittee to make annual reductions of its discharges of trash over a set period, until the numeric target of zero trash discharged from the MS4 is achieved. The Trash TMDLs specify a specific formula for calculating and allocating annual reductions in trash discharges from each jurisdictional area within a watershed. The formula results in specified annual amounts of trash that may be discharged from each jurisdiction into the receiving waters. Translation of the WLAs or compliance points described in the TMDLs into jurisdiction-specific load reductions from the baseline levels, as specified

in the TMDL, logically results in the articulation of an annual limitation on the amount of a pollutant that may be discharged. The specification of allowable annual trash discharge amounts meets the definition of an “effluent limitation”, as that term is defined in subdivision (c) of section 13385.1 of the California Water Code. Specifically, the trash discharge limitations constitute a “numeric restriction ... on the quantity [or] discharge rate ... of a pollutant or pollutants that may be discharged from an authorized location.”

TMDL WLAs for other pollutants (e.g., metals and toxics) are expressed as concentration and/or mass and water quality-based effluent limitations have been specified consistent with the expression of the WLA, including any applicable averaging periods. Some TMDLs specify that, if certain receiving water conditions are achieved, such achievement constitutes attainment of the WLA. In these cases, receiving water limitations and/or provisions outlining these alternate means of demonstrating compliance are included in the TMDL provisions in Part VI.E of this Order.

The inclusion of water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations to implement applicable WLAs provides a clear means of identifying required water quality outcomes within the permit and ensures accountability by Permittees to implement actions necessary to achieve the limitations.

A number of the TMDLs for bacteria, metals, and toxics establish WLAs that are assigned jointly to a group of Permittees whose storm water and/or non-storm water discharges are or may be commingled in the MS4 prior to discharge to the receiving water subject to the TMDL. TMDLs address commingled MS4 discharges by assigning a WLA to a group of MS4 Permittees based on co-location within the same subwatershed. Permittees with co-mingled MS4 discharges are jointly responsible for meeting the water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations assigned to MS4 discharges in this Order. “Joint responsibility” means that the Permittees that have commingled MS4 discharges are responsible for implementing programs in their respective jurisdictions, or within the MS4 for which they are an owner and/or operator, to meet the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations assigned to such commingled MS4 discharges.

In these cases, federal regulations state that co-permittees need only comply with permit conditions relating to discharges from the MS4 for which they are owners or operators (40 CFR § 122.26(a)(3)(vi)). Individual co-permittees are only responsible for their contributions to the commingled MS4 discharge. This Order does not require a Permittee to individually ensure that a commingled MS4 discharge meets the applicable water quality-based effluent limitations included in this Order, unless such Permittee is shown to be solely responsible for an exceedance.

Additionally, this Order allows a Permittee to clarify and distinguish their individual contributions and demonstrate that its MS4 discharge did not cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving

water limitations. If such a demonstration is made, though the Permittee’s discharge may commingle with that of other Permittees, the Permittee would not be held jointly responsible for the exceedance of the water quality-based effluent limitation or receiving water limitation. Individual co-permittees who demonstrate compliance with the water quality-based effluent limitations will not be held responsible for violations by non-compliant co-permittees.

Given the interconnected nature of the Permittees’ MS4s, however, the Regional Water Board expects Permittees to work cooperatively to control the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the MS4 to another portion of the system through inter-agency agreements or other formal arrangements.

**L. Ocean Plan.** In 1972, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) adopted the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California, California Ocean Plan (hereinafter Ocean Plan). The State Water Board adopted the most recent amended Ocean Plan on September 15, 2009. The Office of Administration Law approved it on March 10, 2010. On October 8, 2010, USEPA approved the 2009 Ocean Plan. The Ocean Plan is applicable, in its entirety, to the ocean waters of the State. In order to protect beneficial uses, the Ocean Plan establishes water quality objectives and a program of implementation. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13263(a), the requirements of this Order implement the Ocean Plan. The Ocean Plan identifies beneficial uses of ocean waters of the State to be protected as summarized in the table below.

**Table 7. Ocean Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Uses
All Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) discharge points within Los Angeles County coastal watersheds with the exception of the City of Long Beach	Pacific Ocean	Industrial Water Supply (IND); Water Contact (REC-1) and Non-Contact Recreation (REC-2), including aesthetic enjoyment; Navigation (NAV); Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM); Mariculture; Preservation and Enhancement of Designated Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS); Rare and Endangered Species (RARE); Marine Habitat (MAR); Fish Migration (MIGR); Fish Spawning (SPWN) and Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL)

**M. Antidegradation Policy**

40 CFR section 131.12 requires that state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. The State Water Board established California’s antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 (“Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining the Quality of the Waters of the State”). Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is

justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

- N. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Section 402(o)(2) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 CFR section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous permit.
- O. Endangered Species Act.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2115.5) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A., §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the United States. Permittees are responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
- P. Monitoring and Reporting.** Section 308(a) of the federal Clean Water Act, and 40 CFR sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.41(i), and 122.48, require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Federal regulations applicable to large and medium MS4s also specify additional monitoring and reporting requirements. (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.26(d)(2)(i)(F) & (d)(2)(iii)(D), 122.42(c).) California Water Code section 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement the federal and State laws and/or regulations. This Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.
- Q. Standard and Special Provisions.** Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. Dischargers must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 CFR section 122.42 provided in Attachment D. The Regional Water Board has also included in Part VI of this Order various special provisions applicable to the Dischargers. A rationale for the various special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet (Attachment F).
- R. State Mandates**  
Article XIII B, Section 6(a) of the California Constitution provides that whenever "any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse that local government for the costs of the program or increased level of service." The requirements of this Order do not constitute state mandates that are subject to a

subvention of funds for several reasons as described in detail in the attached Fact Sheet (Attachment F).

- S. California Water Code Section 13241.** The California Supreme Court has ruled that although California Water Code section 13263 requires the State and Regional Water Boards (collectively, Water Boards) to consider the factors set forth in California Water Code section 13241 when issuing an NPDES permit, the Water Boards may not consider the factors to justify imposing pollutant restriction that are less stringent than the applicable federal regulations require. (*City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 613, 618, 626-627). However, when the pollutant restrictions in an NPDES permit are more stringent than federal law requires, California Water Code section 13263 requires that the Water Boards consider the factors described in section 13241 as they apply to those specific restrictions. As noted in the preceding finding, the Regional Water Board finds that the requirements in this permit are not more stringent than the minimum federal requirements. Therefore, a 13241 analysis is not required for permit requirements that implement the effective prohibition on the discharge of non-storm water discharges into the MS4, or for controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable, or other provisions that the Regional Water Board has determined appropriate to control such pollutants, as those requirements are mandated by federal law. Notwithstanding the above, the Regional Water Board has developed an economic analysis of the permit's requirements, consistent with California Water Code section 13241. That analysis is provided in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F of this Order).
- T. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** This action to adopt an NPDES Permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, § 21100, et seq.) pursuant to California Water Code section 13389. (*County of Los Angeles v. Cal. Water Boards* (2006) 143 Cal.App.4th 985.)
- U. Notification of Interested Parties.** In accordance with State and federal laws and regulations, the Regional Water Board has notified the Permittees and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharges authorized by this Order and has provided them with an opportunity to provide written and oral comments. Details of notification, as well as the meetings and workshops held on drafts of the permit, are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.
- V. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all oral and written comments pertaining to the discharges authorized by this Order and the requirements contained herein. The Regional Water Board has prepared written responses to all timely comments, which are incorporated by reference as part of this Order.
- W.** This Order serves as an NPDES permit pursuant to CWA section 402 or amendments thereto, and becomes effective fifty (50) days after the date of its adoption, provided that the Regional Administrator, USEPA, Region IX, expresses no objections.
- X.** This Order supersedes Order No. 01-182 as amended, except for enforcement purposes.



**Y. Review by the State Water Board.** Any person aggrieved by this action of the Regional Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with California Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must *receive* the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the Regional Water Board action, except that if the thirtieth day following the action falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality) or will be provided upon request.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**, that the Dischargers, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13000), and regulations, plans, and policies adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following requirements:

### III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

#### A. Prohibitions – Non-Storm Water Discharges

- 1. Prohibition of Non-Storm Water Discharges.** Each Permittee shall, for the portion of the MS4 for which it is an owner or operator, prohibit non-storm water discharges through the MS4 to receiving waters except where such discharges are either:
  - a. Authorized non-storm water discharges separately regulated by an individual or general NPDES permit;
  - b. Temporary non-storm water discharges authorized by USEPA<sup>3</sup> pursuant to sections 104(a) or 104(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) that either: (i) will comply with water quality standards as applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (“ARARs”) under section 121(d)(2) of CERCLA; or (ii) are subject to either (a) a written waiver of ARARs by USEPA pursuant to section 121(d)(4) of CERCLA or (b) a written determination by USEPA that compliance with ARARs is not practicable considering the exigencies of the situation pursuant to 40 CFR. section 300.415(j);
  - c. Authorized non-storm water discharges from emergency fire fighting activities (i.e., flows necessary for the protection of life or property)<sup>4</sup>;
  - d. Natural flows, including:
    - i. Natural springs;

<sup>3</sup> These typically include short-term, high volume discharges resulting from the development or redevelopment of groundwater extraction wells, or USEPA or State-required compliance testing of potable water treatment plants, as part of a USEPA authorized groundwater remediation action under CERCLA.

<sup>4</sup> Discharges from vehicle washing, building fire suppression system maintenance and testing (e.g., sprinkler line flushing), fire hydrant maintenance and testing, and other routine maintenance activities are not considered emergency fire fighting activities.

- ii. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands;
  - iii. Diverted stream flows, authorized by the State or Regional Water Board;
  - iv. Uncontaminated ground water infiltration<sup>5</sup>;
  - v. Rising ground waters, where ground water seepage is not otherwise covered by a NPDES permit<sup>6</sup>; or
- e. Conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges in accordance with Parts III.A.2 and III.A.3 below.

**2. Conditional Exemptions from Non-Storm Water Discharge Prohibition.** The following categories of non-storm water discharges are conditionally exempt from the non-storm water discharge prohibition, provided they meet all required conditions specified below, or as otherwise approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, in all areas regulated by this Order with the exception of direct discharges to Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) within Los Angeles County. Conditional exemptions from the prohibition on non-storm water discharges through the MS4 to an ASBS are identified in Part III.A.3 below.

- a. Conditionally Exempt Essential Non-Storm Water Discharges: These consist of those discharges that fall within one of the categories below; meet all required best management practices (BMPs) as specified in i. and ii. below, including those enumerated in the referenced BMP manuals; are essential public services discharge activities; and are directly or indirectly required by other state or federal statute and/or regulation:
- i. Discharges from essential *non-emergency* fire fighting activities<sup>7</sup> provided appropriate BMPs are implemented based on the CAL FIRE, Office of the State Fire Marshal's *Water-Based Fire Protection Systems Discharge Best Management Practices Manual* (September 2011) for water-based fire protection system discharges, and based on Riverside County's *Best Management Practices Plan for Urban Runoff Management* (May 1, 2004) or equivalent BMP manual for fire training activities and post-emergency fire fighting activities;
  - ii. Discharges from drinking water supplier distribution systems, where not otherwise regulated by an individual or general NPDES permit<sup>8</sup>, provided

---

<sup>5</sup> Uncontaminated ground water infiltration is water other than waste water that enters the MS4 (including foundation drains) from the ground through such means as defective pipes, pipe joints, connections, or manholes. Infiltration does not include, and is distinguished from, inflow. (See 40 CFR § 35.2005(20).)

<sup>6</sup> A NPDES permit for discharges associated with ground water dewatering is required within the Los Angeles Region.

<sup>7</sup> This includes fire fighting training activities, which simulate emergency responses, and routine maintenance and testing activities necessary for the protection of life and property, including building fire suppression system maintenance and testing (e.g. sprinkler line flushing) and fire hydrant testing and maintenance. Discharges from vehicle washing are not considered essential and as such are not conditionally exempt from the non-storm water discharge prohibition.

<sup>8</sup> Drinking water supplier distribution system releases means sources of flows from drinking water storage, supply and distribution systems (including flows from system failures), pressure releases, system maintenance, distribution line testing, and flushing and dewatering of pipes, reservoirs, and vaults, and minor non-invasive well maintenance activities not involving chemical addition(s) where not otherwise regulated by NPDES Permit No. CAG674001, NPDES Permit No. CAG994005, or another separate NPDES permit.

appropriate BMPs are implemented based on the American Water Works Association (California-Nevada Section) *Guidelines for the Development of Your Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual for Drinking Water System Releases* (2005) or equivalent industry standard BMP manual. Additionally, each Permittee shall work with drinking water suppliers that may discharge to the Permittee's MS4 to ensure for all discharges greater than 100,000 gallons: (1) notification at least 72 hours prior to a planned discharge and as soon as possible after an unplanned discharge; (2) monitoring of any pollutants of concern<sup>9</sup> in the drinking water supplier distribution system release; and (3) record keeping by the drinking water supplier. Permittees shall require that the following information is maintained by the drinking water supplier(s) for all discharges to the MS4 (planned and unplanned) greater than 100,000 gallons: name of discharger, date and time of notification (for planned discharges), method of notification, location of discharge, discharge pathway, receiving water, date of discharge, time of the beginning and end of the discharge, duration of the discharge, flow rate or velocity, total number of gallons discharged, type of dechlorination equipment used, type of dechlorination chemicals used, concentration of residual chlorine, type(s) of sediment controls used, pH of discharge, type(s) of volumetric and velocity controls used, and field and laboratory monitoring data. Records shall be retained for five years and made available upon request by the Permittee or Regional Water Board.

- b.** Those discharges that fall within one of the categories below, provided that the discharge itself is not a source of pollutants and meets all required conditions specified in Table 8 or as otherwise specified or approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer:
- i.** Dewatering of lakes<sup>10</sup>;
  - ii.** Landscape irrigation;
  - iii.** Dechlorinated/debrominated swimming pool/spa discharges<sup>11</sup>, where not otherwise regulated by a separate NPDES permit;
  - iv.** Dewatering of decorative fountains<sup>12</sup>;
  - v.** Non-commercial car washing by residents or by non-profit organizations;

---

<sup>9</sup> Pollutants of concern from drinking water supplier distribution system releases may include trash and debris, including organic matter, total suspended solids (TSS), residual chlorine, pH, and any pollutant for which there is a water quality-based effluent limitation (WQBEL) in Part VI.E applicable to discharges from the MS4 to the receiving water. Determination of the pollutants of concern for a particular discharge shall be based on an evaluation of the potential for the constituent(s) to be present in the discharge at levels that may cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable WQBELs or receiving water limitations.

<sup>10</sup> Dewatering of lakes does not include dewatering of drinking water reservoirs. Dewatering of drinking water reservoirs is addressed in Part III.A.2.a.ii.

<sup>11</sup> Conditionally exempt dechlorinated/debrominated swimming pool/spa discharges do not include swimming pool/spa filter backwash or swimming pool/spa water containing bacteria, detergents, wastes, or algacides, or any other chemicals including salts from pools commonly referred to as "salt water pools" in excess of applicable water quality objectives.

<sup>12</sup> Conditionally exempt discharges from dewatering of decorative fountains do not include fountain water containing bacteria, detergents, wastes, or algacides, or any other chemicals in excess of applicable water quality objectives.

vi. Street/sidewalk wash water<sup>13</sup>.

**3. Conditional Exemptions from Non-Storm Water Discharge Prohibition within an ASBS.** The following non-storm water discharges from the MS4 directly to an ASBS are conditionally exempt pursuant to the California Ocean Plan as specified below, provided that:

- a. The discharges are essential for emergency response purposes, structural stability, slope stability or occur naturally, including the following discharges:
  - i. Discharges associated with emergency fire fighting activities (i.e., flows necessary for the protection of life or property)<sup>14</sup>;
  - ii. Foundation and footing drains;
  - iii. Water from crawl space or basement pumps;
  - iv. Hillside dewatering;
  - v. Naturally occurring ground water seepage via a MS4; and
  - vi. Non-anthropogenic flows from a naturally occurring stream via a culvert or MS4, as long as there are no contributions of anthropogenic runoff.
- b. The discharges fall within one of the conditionally exempt essential non-storm water discharge categories in Part III.A.2.a. above.
- c. Conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges shall not cause or contribute<sup>15</sup> to an exceedance of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations in this Order or the water quality objectives in Chapter II of the Ocean Plan, or alter natural ocean water quality in an ASBS.

**4. Permittee Requirements.** Each Permittee shall:

- a. Develop and implement procedures to ensure that a discharger, if not a named Permittee in this Order, fulfills the following for non-storm water discharges to the Permittee's MS4:
  - i. Notifies the Permittee of the planned discharge in advance, consistent with requirements in Table 8 or recommendations pursuant to the applicable BMP manual;
  - ii. Obtains any local permits required by the MS4 owner(s) and/or operator(s);

---

<sup>13</sup> Conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges of street/sidewalk wash water only include those discharges resulting from use of high pressure, low volume spray washing using only potable water with no cleaning agents at an average usage of 0.006 gallons per square feet of sidewalk area in accordance with Regional Water Board Resolution No. 98-08. Conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges of street/sidewalk wash water do not include hosing of any sidewalk or street with a garden hose with a pressure nozzle.

<sup>14</sup> See note 4.

<sup>15</sup> Based on the water quality characteristics of the conditionally exempt non-storm water discharge itself.



exceedances of applicable water quality-based effluent limitations or action levels, the Permittee shall take further action to determine whether the discharge is causing or contributing to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.

- d.** If the Permittee determines that any of the conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges identified in Part III.A.2.b above is a source of pollutants that causes or contributes to an exceedance of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations, the Permittee(s) shall report its findings to the Regional Water Board in its annual report. Based on this determination, the Permittee(s) shall also either:
  - i.** Effectively prohibit<sup>17</sup> the non-storm water discharge to the MS4; or
  - ii.** Impose conditions in addition to those in Table 8, subject to approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, on the non-storm water discharge such that it will not be a source of pollutants; or
  - iii.** Require diversion of the non-storm water discharge to the sanitary sewer;  
or
  - iv.** Require treatment of the non-storm water discharge prior to discharge to the receiving water.
- e.** If the Permittee determines that any of the authorized or conditionally exempt essential non-storm water discharges identified in Parts III.A.1.a through III.A.1.c, III.A.2.a, or III.A.3 above is a source of pollutants that causes or contributes to an exceedance of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations, the Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board within 30 days if the non-storm water discharge is an authorized discharge with coverage under a separate NPDES permit or authorized by USEPA under CERCLA in the manner provided in Part III.A.1.b above, or a conditionally exempt essential non-storm water discharge or emergency non-storm water discharge.
- f.** If the Permittee prohibits the discharge from the MS4, as per Part III.A.4.d.i, then the Permittee shall implement procedures developed under Part VI.D.9 (Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharges Elimination Program) in order to eliminate the discharge to the MS4.
- 5.** If a Permittee demonstrates that the water quality characteristics of a specific authorized or conditionally exempt essential non-storm water discharge resulted in an exceedance of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations during a specific sampling event, the Permittee shall not be found in violation of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations for that specific sampling event. Such

---

<sup>17</sup> To “effectively prohibit” means to not allow the non-storm water discharge through the MS4 unless the discharger obtains coverage under a separate NPDES permit prior to discharge to the MS4.

demonstration must be based on source specific water quality monitoring data from the authorized or conditionally exempt essential non-storm water discharge or other relevant information documenting the characteristics of the specific non-storm water discharge as identified in Table 8.

6. Notwithstanding the above, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, based on an evaluation of monitoring data and other relevant information for specific categories of non-storm water discharges, may modify a category or remove categories of conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges from Parts III.A.2 and III.A.3 above if the Executive Officer determines that a discharge category is a source of pollutants that causes or contributes to an exceedance of applicable receiving water limitations and/or water quality-based effluent limitations, or may require that a discharger obtain coverage under a separate individual or general State or Regional Water Board permit for a non-storm water discharge.

**Table 8. Required Conditions for Conditionally Exempt Non-Storm Water Discharges**

Discharge Category	General Conditions Under Which Discharge Through the MS4 is Allowed	Conditions/BMPs that are Required to be Implemented Prior to Discharge Through the MS4
All Discharge Categories	See discharge specific conditions below.	<p>Ensure conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges avoid potential sources of pollutants in the flow path to prevent introduction of pollutants to the MS4 and receiving water.</p> <p>Whenever there is a discharge of 100,000 gallons or more into the MS4, Permittees shall require advance notification by the discharger to the potentially affected MS4 Permittees, including at a minimum the LACFCD, if applicable, and the Permittee with jurisdiction over the land area from which the discharge originates.</p>
Dewatering of lakes	Discharge allowed only if all necessary permits/water quality certifications for dredge and fill activities, including water diversions, are obtained prior to discharge.	<p>Ensure procedures for advanced notification by the lake owner / operator to the Permittee(s) no less than 72 hours prior to the planned discharge.</p> <p>Immediately prior to discharge, visible trash on the shoreline or on the surface of the lake shall be removed and disposed of in a legal manner.</p> <p>Immediately prior to discharge, the discharge pathway and the MS4 inlet to which the discharge is directed, shall be inspected and cleaned out.</p> <p>Discharges shall be volumetrically and velocity controlled to minimize resuspension of sediments.</p> <p>Measures shall be taken to stabilize lake bottom sediments.</p> <p>Ensure procedures for water quality monitoring for pollutants of concern<sup>18</sup> in the lake.</p> <p>Ensure record-keeping of lake dewatering by the lake owner / operator.</p>

<sup>18</sup> Pollutants of concern include, at a minimum, trash and debris, including organic matter, TSS, and any pollutant for which there is a water quality-based effluent limitation in Part VI.E for the lake and/or receiving water.



<p>Landscape irrigation using potable water</p>	<p>Discharge allowed if runoff due to potable landscape irrigation is minimized through the implementation of an ordinance specifying water efficient landscaping standards, as well as an outreach and education program focusing on water conservation and landscape water use efficiency.</p>	<p>Implement BMPs to minimize runoff and prevent introduction of pollutants to the MS4 and receiving water.</p> <p>Implement water conservation programs to minimize discharge by using less water.</p>
<p>Landscape irrigation using reclaimed or recycled water</p>	<p>Discharge of reclaimed or recycled water runoff from landscape irrigation is allowed if the discharge is in compliance with the producer and distributor operations and management (O&amp;M) plan, and all relevant portions thereof, including the Irrigation Management Plan.</p>	<p>Discharges must comply with applicable O&amp;M Plans, and all relevant portions thereof, including the Irrigation Management Plan.</p>

<p>Dechlorinated/ debrominated swimming pool/spa discharges</p>	<p>Discharges allowed after implementation of specified BMPs.</p> <p>Pool or spa water containing copper-based algaecides is not allowed to be discharged to the MS4.</p> <p>Discharges of cleaning waste water and filter backwash allowed only if authorized by a separate NPDES permit.</p>	<p>Implement BMPs and ensure discharge avoids potential sources of pollutants in the flow path to prevent introduction of pollutants prior to discharge to the MS4 and receiving water.</p> <p>Swimming pool water must be dechlorinated or debrominated using holding time, aeration, and/or sodium thiosulfate. Chlorine residual in the discharge shall not exceed 0.1 mg/L.</p> <p>Swimming pool water shall not contain any detergents, wastes, or algaecides, or any other chemicals including salts from pools commonly referred to as "salt water pools" in excess of applicable water quality objectives.<sup>19</sup></p> <p>Swimming pool discharges are to be pH adjusted, if necessary, and be within the range of 6.5 and 8.5 standard units.</p> <p>Swimming pool discharges shall be volumetrically and velocity controlled to promote evaporation and/or infiltration.</p> <p>Ensure procedures for advanced notification by the pool owner to the Permittee(s) at least 72 hours prior to planned discharge for discharges of 100,000 gallons or more.</p> <p>For discharges of 100,000 gallons or more, immediately prior to discharge, the discharge pathway and the MS4 inlet to which the discharge is directed, shall be inspected and cleaned out.</p>
<p>Dewatering of decorative fountains</p>	<p>Discharges allowed after implementation of specified BMPs.</p> <p>Fountain water containing copper-based algaecides may not be discharged to the MS4.</p> <p>Fountain water containing dyes may not be discharged to the MS4.</p>	<p>Implement BMPs and ensure discharge avoids potential sources of pollutants in the flow path to prevent introduction of pollutants prior to discharge to the MS4 and receiving water.</p> <p>Fountain water must be dechlorinated or debrominated using holding time, aeration, and/or sodium thiosulfate. Chlorine residual in the discharge shall not exceed 0.1 mg/L.</p> <p>Fountain discharges are to be pH adjusted, if necessary, and be within the range of 6.5 and 8.5 standard units.</p> <p>Fountain discharges shall be volumetrically and velocity controlled to promote evaporation and/or infiltration.</p> <p>Ensure procedures for advanced notification by the fountain owner to the Permittee(s) at least 72 hours prior to planned discharge for discharges of 100,000 gallons or more.</p> <p>For discharges of 100,000 gallons or more, immediately prior to discharge, the discharge pathway and the MS4 inlet to which the discharge is directed, shall be inspected and cleaned out.</p>
<p>Non-commercial car washing by residents or by non-</p>	<p>Discharges allowed after implementation of specified BMPs.</p>	<p>Implement BMPs and ensure discharge avoids potential sources of pollutants in the flow path to prevent introduction of pollutants prior to discharge to the MS4 and receiving water.</p> <p>Minimize the amount of water used by employing water conservation practices such as turning off</p>

<sup>19</sup> Applicable mineral water quality objectives for surface waters are contained in Chapter 3 of the Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

profit organizations		<p>nozzles or kinking the hose when not spraying a car, and using a low volume pressure washer.</p> <p>Encourage use of biodegradable, phosphate free detergents and non-toxic cleaning products.</p> <p>Where possible, wash cars on a permeable surface where wash water can percolate into the ground (e.g. gravel or grassy areas).</p> <p>Empty buckets of soapy or rinse water into the sanitary sewer system (e.g., sinks or toilets).</p>
Street/sidewalk wash water	Discharges allowed after implementation of specified BMPs.	<p>Sweeping should be used as an alternate BMP whenever possible and sweepings should be disposed of in the trash.</p> <p>BMPs shall be in accordance with Regional Water Board Resolution No. 98-08 that requires: 1) removal of trash, debris, and free standing oil/grease spills/leaks (use absorbent material if necessary) from the area before washing and 2) use of high pressure, low volume spray washing using only potable water with no cleaning agents at an average usage of 0.006 gallons per square feet of sidewalk area. In areas of unsanitary conditions (e.g., areas where the congregation of transient populations can reasonably be expected to result in a significant threat to water quality), whenever practicable, Permittees shall collect and divert street and alley wash water from the Permittee's street and sidewalk cleaning public agency activities to the sanitary sewer.</p>

#### **IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS**

##### **A. Effluent Limitations**

- 1. Technology Based Effluent Limitations:** Each Permittee shall reduce pollutants in storm water discharges from the MS4 to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).
- 2. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).** This Order establishes WQBELs consistent with the assumptions and requirements of all available TMDL waste load allocations assigned to discharges from the Permittees' MS4s.
  - a.** Each Permittee shall comply with applicable WQBELs as set forth in Part VI.E of this Order, pursuant to applicable compliance schedules.

##### **B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**

##### **C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable**

#### **V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

##### **A. Receiving Water Limitations**

- 1.** Discharges from the MS4 that cause or contribute to the violation of receiving water limitations are prohibited.
- 2.** Discharges from the MS4 of storm water, or non-storm water, for which a Permittee is responsible<sup>20</sup>, shall not cause or contribute to a condition of nuisance.
- 3.** The Permittees shall comply with Parts V.A.1 and V.A.2 through timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce pollutants in the discharges in accordance with the storm water management program and its components and other requirements of this Order including any modifications. The storm water management program and its components shall be designed to achieve compliance with receiving water limitations. If exceedances of receiving water limitations persist, notwithstanding implementation of the storm water management program and its components and other requirements of this Order, the Permittee shall assure compliance with discharge prohibitions and receiving water limitations by complying with the following procedure:
  - a.** Upon a determination by either the Permittee or the Regional Water Board that discharges from the MS4 are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable Receiving Water Limitation, the Permittee shall promptly notify and thereafter submit an Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report (as described in the Program Reporting Requirements, Part XVIII.A.5 of the Monitoring and Reporting Program) to the Regional Water Board for approval. The Integrated Monitoring Compliance shall describe the BMPs that are currently being

---

<sup>20</sup> Pursuant to 40 CFR § 122.26(a)(3)(vi), a Permittee is only responsible for discharges of storm water and non-storm water from the MS4 for which it is an owner or operator.

implemented by the Permittee and additional BMPs, including modifications to current BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedances of receiving water limitations. The Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report shall include an implementation schedule. This Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report shall be incorporated in the annual Storm Water Report unless the Regional Water Board directs an earlier submittal. The Regional Water Board may require modifications to the Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report.

- b. The Permittee shall submit any modifications to the Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report required by the Regional Water Board within 30 days of notification.
  - c. Within 30 days following the Regional Water Board Executive Officer's approval of the Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report, the Permittee shall revise the storm water management program and its components and monitoring program to incorporate the approved modified BMPs that have been and will be implemented, an implementation schedule, and any additional monitoring required.
  - d. The Permittee shall implement the revised storm water management program and its components and monitoring program according to the approved implementation schedule.
4. So long as the Permittee has complied with the procedures set forth in Part V.A.3. above and is implementing the revised storm water management program and its components, the Permittee does not have to repeat the same procedure for continuing or recurring exceedances of the same receiving water limitations unless directed by the Regional Water Board to modify current BMPs or develop additional BMPs.

## **B. Ground Water Limitations – Not Applicable**

## **VI. PROVISIONS**

### **A. Standard Provisions**

1. **Federal Standard Provisions.** Each Permittee shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order, in accordance with 40 CFR sections 122.41 and 122.42.
2. **Legal Authority**
  - a. Each Permittee must establish and maintain adequate legal authority, within its respective jurisdiction, to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 through ordinance, statute, permit, contract or similar means. This legal authority must, at a minimum, authorize or enable the Permittee to:

- i.** Control the contribution of pollutants to its MS4 from storm water discharges associated with industrial and construction activity and control the quality of storm water discharged from industrial and construction sites. This requirement applies both to industrial and construction sites with coverage under an NPDES permit, as well as to those sites that do not have coverage under an NPDES permit.
- ii.** Prohibit all non-storm water discharges through the MS4 to receiving waters not otherwise authorized or conditionally exempt pursuant to Part III.A;
- iii.** Prohibit and eliminate illicit discharges and illicit connections to the MS4;
- iv.** Control the discharge of spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other than storm water to its MS4;
- v.** Require compliance with conditions in Permittee ordinances, permits, contracts or orders (i.e., hold dischargers to its MS4 accountable for their contributions of pollutants and flows);
- vi.** Utilize enforcement mechanisms to require compliance with applicable ordinances, permits, contracts, or orders;
- vii.** Control the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements among Co-permittees;
- viii.** Control of the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements with other owners of the MS4 such as the State of California Department of Transportation;
- ix.** Carry out all inspections, surveillance, and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with applicable municipal ordinances, permits, contracts and orders, and with the provisions of this Order, including the prohibition of non-storm water discharges into the MS4 and receiving waters. This means the Permittee must have authority to enter, monitor, inspect, take measurements, review and copy records, and require regular reports from entities discharging into its MS4;
- x.** Require the use of control measures to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to achieve water quality standards/receiving water limitations;
- xi.** Require that structural BMPs are properly operated and maintained; and
- xii.** Require documentation on the operation and maintenance of structural BMPs and their effectiveness in reducing the discharge of pollutants to the MS4.

- b.** Each Permittee must submit a statement certified by its chief legal counsel that the Permittee has the legal authority within its jurisdiction to implement and enforce each of the requirements contained in 40 CFR § 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A-F) and this Order. Each Permittee shall submit this certification annually as part of its Annual Report beginning with the first Annual Report required under this Order. These statements must include:
  - i.** Citation of applicable municipal ordinances or other appropriate legal authorities and their relationship to the requirements of 40 CFR § 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A)-(F) and of this Order; and
  - ii.** Identification of the local administrative and legal procedures available to mandate compliance with applicable municipal ordinances identified in subsection (i) above and therefore with the conditions of this Order, and a statement as to whether enforcement actions can be completed administratively or whether they must be commenced and completed in the judicial system.

### **3. Fiscal Resources**

- a.** Each Permittee shall conduct a fiscal analysis of the annual capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to implement the requirements of this Order.
- b.** Each Permittee shall also enumerate and describe in its Annual Report the source(s) of funds used in the past year, and proposed for the coming year, to meet necessary expenditures on the Permittee's storm water management program.

### **4. Responsibilities of the Permittees**

- a.** Each Permittee is required to comply with the requirements of this Order applicable to discharges within its boundaries. Permittees are not responsible for the implementation of the provisions applicable to other Permittees. Each Permittee shall:
  - i.** Comply with the requirements of this Order and any modifications thereto.
  - ii.** Coordinate among its internal departments and agencies, as necessary, to facilitate the implementation of the requirements of this Order applicable to such Permittees in an efficient and cost-effective manner.
  - iii.** Participate in intra-agency coordination (e.g. Planning Department, Fire Department, Building and Safety, Code Enforcement, Public Health, Parks and Recreation, and others) and inter-agency coordination (e.g. co-

Permittees, other NPDES permittees) necessary to successfully implement the provisions of this Order.

## **5. Public Review**

- a. All documents submitted to the Regional Water Board in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Order shall be made available to members of the public pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552 (as amended)) and the Public Records Act (Cal. Government Code § 6250 et seq.).
- b. All documents submitted to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer for approval shall be made available to the public for a 30-day period to allow for public comment.

## **6. Regional Water Board Review**

Any formal determination or approval made by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer pursuant to the provisions of this Order may be reviewed by the Regional Water Board. A Permittee(s) or a member of the public may request such review upon petition within 30 days of the effective date of the notification of such decision to the Permittee(s) and interested parties on file at the Regional Water Board.

## **7. Reopener and Modification**

1. This Order may be modified, revoked, reissued, or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 122.44, 122.62, 122.63, 122.64, 124.5, 125.62, and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to:

Endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity, including information that the discharge(s) regulated by this Order may have the potential to cause or contribute to adverse impacts on water quality and/or beneficial uses;

Acquisition of newly-obtained information that would have justified the application of different conditions if known at the time of Order adoption;

To address changed conditions identified in required reports or other sources deemed significant by the Regional Water Board;

To incorporate provisions as a result of future amendments to the Basin Plan, such as a new or revised water quality objective or the adoption or reconsideration of a TMDL, including the program of implementation. Within 18 months of the effective date of a revised TMDL or as soon as practicable thereafter, where the revisions warrant a change to the provisions of this Order, the Regional Water Board may modify this Order consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the revised WLA(s), including the program of implementation;



To incorporate provisions as a result of new or amended statewide water quality control plans or policies adopted by the State Water Board, or in consideration of any State Water Board action regarding the precedential language of State Water Board Order WQ 99-05;

To incorporate provisions as a result of the promulgation of new or amended federal or state laws or regulations, USEPA guidance concerning regulated activities, or judicial decisions that becomes effective after adoption of this Order.

To incorporate effluent limitations for toxic constituents determined to be present in significant amount in the discharge through a more comprehensive monitoring program included as part of this Order and based on the results of the reasonable potential analysis;

In accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124, to include requirements for the implementation of the watershed management approach or to include new Minimum Levels (MLs); and/or

To include provisions or modifications to WQBELs in Part VI.E and Attachments L-R in this Order prior to the final compliance deadlines, if practicable, that would allow an action-based, BMP compliance demonstration approach with regard to final WQBELs for storm water discharges. Such modifications shall be based on the Regional Water Board's evaluation of whether Watershed Management Programs in Part VI.C. have resulted in attainment of interim WQBELs for storm water and review of relevant research, including but not limited to data and information provided by Permittees and other stakeholders, on storm water quality and the efficacy and reliability of storm water control technologies. Provisions or modifications to WQBELs in Part VI.E. shall only be included in this Order where there is evidence that storm water control technologies can reliably achieve final WQBELs.

2. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:

Violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;

Obtaining this Order by misrepresentation, or failure to disclose all relevant facts;  
or

A change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge.

3. The filing of a request by a Permittee for a modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any condition of this Order.

4. This Order may be modified to make corrections or allowances for changes in the permitted activity, following the procedures at 40 CFR section 122.63, if processed as a minor modification. Minor modifications may only:

Correct typographical errors; or

Require more frequent monitoring or reporting by a Permittee.

8. Any discharge of waste to any point(s) other than specifically described in this Order is prohibited, and constitutes a violation of this Order.
9. A copy of this Order shall be maintained by each Permittee so as to be available during normal business hours to Permittee employees responsible for implementation of the provisions of this Order and members of the public.
10. The discharge of any product registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to any waste stream that may ultimately be released to waters of the United States, is prohibited, unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this Order or another NPDES permit. This requirement is not applicable to products used for lawn and agricultural purposes.
11. Oil or oily material, chemicals, refuse, or other pollutionable materials shall not be stored or deposited in areas where they may be picked up by rainfall and carried off of the property and/or discharged to surface waters. Any such spill of such materials shall be contained and removed immediately.
12. If there is any storage of hazardous or toxic materials or hydrocarbons at a facility owned and/or operated by a Permittee and if the facility is not manned at all times, a 24-hour emergency response telephone number shall be prominently posted where it can easily be read from the outside.

### **13. Enforcement**

- a. Violation of any of the provisions of this Order may subject the violator to any of the penalties described herein or in Attachment D of this Order, or any combination thereof, at the discretion of the prosecuting authority; except that only one kind of penalty may be applied for each kind of violation.
5. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges through the MS4 to receiving waters, may subject a Permittee to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject a Permittee to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
6. The California Water Code provides that any person who violates a waste discharge requirement or a provision of the California Water Code is subject to civil penalties of up to \$5,000 per day, \$10,000 per day, or \$25,000 per day of violation, or when the

violation involves the discharge of pollutants, is subject to civil penalties of up to \$10 per gallon per day or \$25 per gallon per day of violation; or some combination thereof, depending on the violation, or upon the combination of violations.

7. California Water Code section 13385(h)(1) requires the Regional Water Board to assess a mandatory minimum penalty of three-thousand dollars (\$3,000) for each serious violation. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13385(h)(2), a “serious violation” is defined as any waste discharge that violates the effluent limitations contained in the applicable waste discharge requirements for a Group II pollutant by 20 percent or more, or for a Group I pollutant by 40 percent or more. Appendix A of 40 CFR section 123.45 specifies the Group I and II pollutants. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13385.1(a)(1), a “serious violation” is also defined as “a failure to file a discharge monitoring report required pursuant to Section 13383 for each complete period of 30 days following the deadline for submitting the report, if the report is designed to ensure compliance with limitations contained in waste discharge requirements that contain effluent limitations.”
8. California Water Code section 13385(i) requires the Regional Water Board to assess a mandatory minimum penalty of three-thousand dollars (\$3,000) for each violation whenever a person violates a waste discharge requirement effluent limitation in any period of six consecutive months, except that the requirement to assess the mandatory minimum penalty shall not be applicable to the first three violations within that time period.
9. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13385.1(d), for the purposes of section 13385.1 and subdivisions (h), (i), and (j) of section 13385, “effluent limitation” means a numeric restriction or a numerically expressed narrative restriction, on the quantity, discharge rate, concentration, or toxicity units of a pollutant or pollutants that may be discharged from an authorized location. An effluent limitation may be final or interim, and may be expressed as a prohibition. An effluent limitation, for these purposes, does not include a receiving water limitation, a compliance schedule, or a best management practice.
10. Unlike subdivision (c) of California Water Code section 13385, where violations of effluent limitations may be assessed administrative civil liability on a per day basis, the mandatory minimum penalties provisions identified above require the Regional Water Board to assess mandatory minimum penalties for “each violation” of an effluent limitation. Some water quality-based effluent limitations in Attachments L through R of this Order (e.g., trash, as described immediately below) are expressed as annual effluent limitations. Therefore, for such limitations, there can be no more than one violation of each interim or final effluent limitation per year.

#### **11. Trash TMDLs.**

Consistent with the 2009 amendments to Order No. 01-182 to incorporate the Los Angeles River Trash TMDL, the water quality-based effluent limitations in Attachments L through R of this Order for trash are expressed as annual effluent limitations. Therefore, for such limitations, there can be no more than one

violation of each interim or final effluent limitation per year. Trash is considered a Group I pollutant, as specified in Appendix A to 40 CFR section 123.45. Therefore, each annual violation of a trash effluent limitation in Attachments L through R of this Order by forty percent or more would be considered a “serious violation” under California Water Code section 13385(h). With respect to the final effluent limitation of zero trash, any detectable discharge of trash necessarily is a serious violation, in accordance with the State Water Board’s Enforcement Policy. Violations of the effluent limitations in Attachments L through R of this Order would not constitute “chronic” violations that would give rise to mandatory liability under California Water Code section 13385(i) because four or more violations of the effluent limitations subject to a mandatory penalty cannot occur in a period of six consecutive months.

For the purposes of enforcement under California Water Code section 13385, subdivisions (a), (b), and (c), not every storm event may result in trash discharges. In trash TMDLs adopted by the Regional Water Board, the Regional Water Board states that improperly deposited trash is mobilized during storm events of greater than 0.25 inches of precipitation. Therefore, violations of the effluent limitations are limited to the days of a storm event of greater than 0.25 inches. Once a Permittee has violated the annual effluent limitation, any subsequent discharges of trash during any day of a storm event of greater than 0.25 inches during the same storm year constitutes an additional “day in which the violation [of the effluent limitation] occurs”.

14. This Order does not exempt any Permittee from compliance with any other laws, regulations, or ordinances that may be applicable.
15. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provisions of this Order or the application of any provision of this Order to any circumstance is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances and the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.

## **B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

Dischargers shall comply with the MRP and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of this Order or may, in coordination with an approved Watershed Management Program per Part VI.C, implement a customized monitoring program that achieves the five Primary Objectives set forth in Part II.A. of Attachment E and includes the elements set forth in Part II.E. of Attachment E.

## **C. Watershed Management Programs**

### **1. General**

- a.** The purpose of this Part VI.C is to allow Permittees the flexibility to develop Watershed Management Programs to implement the requirements of this Order on a watershed scale through customized strategies, control measures, and BMPs.
- b.** Participation in a Watershed Management Program is voluntary and allows a Permittee to address the highest watershed priorities, including complying with the requirements of Part V.A. (Receiving Water Limitations), Part VI.E (Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions) and Attachments L through R, by customizing the control measures in Parts III.A.4 (Prohibitions – Non-Storm Water Discharges) and VI.D (Minimum Control Measures).
- c.** Customized strategies, control measures, and BMPs shall be implemented on a watershed basis, where applicable, through each Permittee's storm water management program and/or collectively by all participating Permittees through a Watershed Management Program.
- d.** The Watershed Management Programs shall ensure that discharges from the Permittee's MS4: (i) achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R pursuant to the corresponding compliance schedules, (ii) do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Parts V.A and VI.E and Attachments L through R, and (iii) do not include non-storm water discharges that are effectively prohibited pursuant to Part III.A. The programs shall also ensure that controls are implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) pursuant to Part IV.A.1.
- e.** Watershed Management Programs shall be developed either collaboratively or individually using the Regional Water Board's Watershed Management Areas (WMAs). Where appropriate, WMAs may be separated into subwatersheds to focus water quality prioritization and implementation efforts by receiving water.
- f.** Each Watershed Management Program shall be consistent with Part VI.C.5-C.8 and shall:
  - i.** Prioritize water quality issues resulting from storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 to receiving waters within each WMA,
  - ii.** Identify and implement strategies, control measures, and BMPs to achieve the outcomes specified in Part VI.C.1.d,
  - iii.** Execute an integrated monitoring program and assessment program pursuant to Attachment E – MRP, Part IV to determine progress towards achieving applicable limitations and/or action levels in Attachment G, and

- iv.** Modify strategies, control measures, and BMPs as necessary based on analysis of monitoring data collected pursuant to the MRP to ensure that applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations and other milestones set forth in the Watershed Management Program are achieved in the required timeframes.
- v.** Provide appropriate opportunity for meaningful stakeholder input, including but not limited to, a permit-wide watershed management program technical advisory committee (TAC) that will advise and participate in the development of the Watershed Management Programs and enhanced Watershed Management Programs from month 6 through the date of program approval. The composition of the TAC may include at least one Permittee representative from each Watershed Management Area for which a Watershed Management Program will be developed, and must include a minimum of one public representative from a non-governmental organization with public membership, and staff from the Regional Water Board and USEPA Region IX.
- g.** Permittees may elect to develop an enhanced Watershed Management Program (EWMP). An EWMP is one that comprehensively evaluates opportunities, within the participating Permittees' collective jurisdictional area in a Watershed Management Area, for collaboration among Permittees and other partners on multi-benefit regional projects that, wherever feasible, retain (i) all non-storm water runoff and (ii) all storm water runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm event for the drainage areas tributary to the projects, while also achieving other benefits including flood control and water supply, among others. In drainage areas within the EWMP area where retention of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm event is not feasible, the EWMP shall include a Reasonable Assurance Analysis to demonstrate that applicable water quality based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations shall be achieved through implementation of other watershed control measures. An EWMP shall:

  - i.** Be consistent with the provisions in Part VI.C.1.a.-f and VI.C.5-C.8;
  - ii.** Incorporate applicable State agency input on priority setting and other key implementation issues;
  - iii.** Provide for meeting water quality standards and other CWA obligations by utilizing provisions in the CWA and its implementing regulations, policies and guidance;
  - iv.** Include multi-benefit regional projects to ensure that MS4 discharges achieve compliance with all final WQBELs set forth in Part VI.E. and do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A. by retaining through infiltration or capture and reuse the storm water volume from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm for the drainage areas tributary to the multi-benefit regional projects.;

- v. In drainage areas where retention of the storm water volume from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour event is not technically feasible, include other watershed control measures to ensure that MS4 discharges achieve compliance with all interim and final WQBELs set forth in Part VI.E. with compliance deadlines occurring after approval of a EWMP and to ensure that MS4 discharges do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A.;
- vi. Maximize the effectiveness of funds through analysis of alternatives and the selection and sequencing of actions needed to address human health and water quality related challenges and non-compliance;
- vii. Incorporate effective innovative technologies, approaches and practices, including green infrastructure;
- viii. Ensure that existing requirements to comply with technology-based effluent limitations and core requirements (e.g., including elimination of non-storm water discharges of pollutants through the MS4, and controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable) are not delayed;
- ix. Ensure that a financial strategy is in place.

## **2. Compliance with Receiving Water Limitations Not Otherwise Addressed by a TMDL through a WMP or EWMP**

- a. For receiving water limitations in Part V.A. associated with water body-pollutant combinations not addressed through a TMDL, but which a Permittee elects to address through a Watershed Management Program or EWMP as set forth in this Part VI.C., a Permittee shall comply as follows:
  - i. **For pollutants that are in the same class<sup>21</sup> as those addressed in a TMDL for the watershed and for which the water body is identified as impaired on the State's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List as of the effective date of this Order:**

(1) Permittees shall demonstrate that the Watershed Control Measures to achieve the applicable TMDL provisions identified pursuant to Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(3) will also adequately address contributions of the pollutant(s) within the same class from MS4 discharges to receiving waters, consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the corresponding TMDL provisions, including interim and final requirements and deadlines for their achievement, such that the

---

<sup>21</sup> Pollutants are considered in a similar class if they have similar fate and transport mechanisms, can be addressed via the same types of control measures, and within the same timeline already contemplated as part of the Watershed Management Program for the TMDL.

- MS4 discharges of the pollutant(s) will not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A.
- (2) Permittees shall include the water body-pollutant combination(s) in the Reasonable Assurance Analysis in Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(5).
  - (3) Permittees shall identify milestones and dates for their achievement consistent with those in the corresponding TMDL.
- ii. For pollutants that are not in the same class as those addressed in a TMDL for the watershed, but for which the water body is identified as impaired on the State's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List as of the effective date of this Order:**
- (1) Permittees shall assess contributions of the pollutant(s) from MS4 discharges to the receiving waters and sources of the pollutant(s) within the drainage area of the MS4 pursuant to Part VI.C.5.a.iii.
  - (2) Permittees shall identify Watershed Control Measures pursuant to Part VI.C.5.b. that will adequately address contributions of the pollutant(s) from MS4 discharges to receiving waters such that the MS4 discharges of the pollutant(s) will not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A.
  - (3) Permittees shall include the water body-pollutant in the Reasonable Assurance Analysis in Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(5).
  - (4) Permittees shall identify enforceable requirements and milestones and dates for their achievement to control MS4 discharges such that they do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations within a timeframe(s) that is as short as possible, taking into account the technological, operation, and economic factors that affect the design, development, and implementation of the control measures that are necessary. The time between dates shall not exceed one year. Milestones shall relate to a specific water quality endpoint (e.g., x% of the MS4 drainage area is meeting the receiving water limitations) and dates shall relate either to taking a specific action or meeting a milestone.
  - (5) Where the final date(s) in (4) is beyond the term of this Order, the following conditions shall apply:
    - (a) For an EWMP, in drainage areas where retention of (i) all non-storm water runoff and (ii) all storm water runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm event will be achieved, each participating Permittee shall continue to target implementation of watershed control measures in its existing storm water management program, including watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges that are a source of pollutants to receiving waters.
    - (b) For a WMP and in areas of a EWMP where retention of the volume in (a) is technically infeasible and where the Regional



Water Board determines that MS4 discharges cause or contribute to the water quality impairment, participating Permittees may initiate development of a stakeholder-proposed TMDL upon approval of the Watershed Management Program or EWMP. For MS4 discharges from these drainage areas to the receiving waters, any extension of this compliance mechanism beyond the term of this Order shall be consistent with the implementation schedule in a TMDL for the waterbody pollutant combination(s) adopted by the Regional Water Board.

**iii. For pollutants for which there are exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A., but for which the water body is not identified as impaired on the State's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List as of the effective date of this Order:**

- (1) Upon an exceedance of a receiving water limitation, based on data collected pursuant to the MRP and approved IMPs and CIMPs, Permittees shall assess contributions of the pollutant(s) from MS4 discharges to the receiving waters and sources of the pollutant(s) within the drainage area of the MS4 pursuant to Part VI.C.5.a.iii.
- (2) If MS4 discharges are identified as a source of the pollutant(s) that has caused or contributed to, or has the potential to cause or contribute to, the exceedance(s) of receiving water limitations in Part V.A., Permittees shall address contributions of the pollutant(s) from MS4 discharges through modifications to the WMP or EWMP pursuant to Part VI.C.8.a.ii.
  - (a) In a modified WMP or EWMP, Permittees shall identify Watershed Control Measures pursuant to Part VI.C.5.b. that will adequately address contributions of the pollutant(s) from MS4 discharges to receiving waters such that the MS4 discharges of the pollutant(s) will not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A.
  - (b) Permittees shall modify the Reasonable Assurance Analysis pursuant to Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(5) to address the pollutant(s).
  - (c) Permittees shall identify enforceable requirements and milestones and dates for their achievement to control MS4 discharges such that they do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations within a timeframe(s) that is as short as possible, taking into account the technological, operation, and economic factors that affect the design, development, and implementation of the control measures that are necessary. The time between dates shall not exceed one year. Milestones shall relate to a specific water quality endpoint (e.g., x% of the MS4 drainage area is meeting the receiving water limitations) and dates shall relate either to taking a specific action or meeting a milestone.

- (d) Where the final date(s) in (4) is beyond the term of this Order, the following conditions shall apply:
  - (i) For an EWMP, in drainage areas where retention of (i) all non-storm water runoff and (ii) all storm water runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm event will be achieved, each participating Permittee shall continue to target implementation of watershed control measures in its existing storm water management program, including watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges that are a source of pollutants to receiving waters.
  - (ii) For a WMP and in areas of a EWMP where retention of the volume in (a) is technically infeasible, for newly identified exceedances of receiving water limitations, a Permittee may request that the Regional Water Board approve a modification to its WMP or EWMP to include these additional water body-pollutant combinations.
- b.** A Permittee's full compliance with all requirements and dates for their achievement in an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with the receiving water limitations provisions in Part V.A. of this Order for the specific water body-pollutant combinations addressed by an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP.
- c.** If a Permittee fails to meet any requirement or date for its achievement in an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP, the Permittee shall be subject to the provisions of Part V.A. for the waterbody-pollutant combination(s) that were to be addressed by the requirement.
- d.** Upon notification of a Permittee's intent to develop a WMP or EWMP and prior to approval of its WMP or EWMP, a Permittee's full compliance with all of the following requirements shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with the receiving water limitations provisions in Part V.A. not otherwise addressed by a TMDL, if all the following requirements are met:
  - i.** Provides timely notice of its intent to develop a WMP or EWMP,
  - ii.** Meets all interim and final deadlines for development of a WMP or EWMP,
  - iii.** For the area to be covered by the WMP or EWMP, targets implementation of watershed control measures in its existing storm water management program, including watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges of pollutants through the MS4 to receiving waters, to address known contributions of

pollutants from MS4 discharges that cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations, and

- iv. Receives final approval of its WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively.

### **3. Compliance with Receiving Water Limitations Addressed by a TMDL through a WMP or EWMP**

- a. A Permittee's full compliance with all requirements and dates for their achievement in an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with provisions pertaining to applicable interim water quality based effluent limitations and interim receiving water limitations in Part VI.E. and Attachments L-R for the pollutant(s) addressed by the approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP.
- b. Upon notification of a Permittee's intent to develop a WMP or EWMP and prior to approval of its WMP or EWMP, a Permittee's full compliance with all of the following requirements shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with the receiving water limitations provisions in Part V.A., if all the following requirements are met:
  - i. Provides timely notice of its intent to develop a WMP or EWMP,
  - ii. Meets all interim and final deadlines for development of a WMP or EWMP,
  - iii. For the area to be covered by the WMP or EWMP, targets implementation of watershed control measures in its existing storm water management program, including watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges of pollutants through the MS4 to receiving waters, to address known contributions of pollutants from MS4 discharges that cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations, and
  - iv. Receives final approval of its WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively.
- c. Subdivision b. does not apply to receiving water limitations corresponding to final compliance deadlines pursuant to TMDL provisions in Part VI.E. that have passed or will occur prior to approval of a WMP or EWMP.

### **4. Process**

- a. Timelines for Implementation
  - i. Implementation of the following requirements shall occur per the schedule specified in Table 9 below:

**Table 9. Watershed Management Program Implementation Requirements**

Part	Provision	Due Date
VI.C.4.b	Notify Regional Water Board of intent to develop Watershed Management Program or enhanced WMP and request submittal date for draft program plan	6 months after Order effective date
VI.C.4.c	For Permittee(s) that elect not to implement the conditions of Part VI.C.4.c.i or c.ii, submit draft plan to Regional Water Board	1 year after Order effective date
VI.C.4.c	For Permittee(s) that elect to implement the conditions of Part VI.C.4.c.i or c.ii, submit draft plan to Regional Water Board	18 months after Order effective date
VI.C.4.c.iv	For Permittees that elect to collaborate on an enhanced WMP that meets the requirements of Part VI.C.4.c.iv, submit draft plan to Regional Water Board	18 months after Order effective date, provide final work plan for development of enhanced WMP 30 months after Order effective date, submit draft plan
VI.C.4.c	Comments provided to Permittees by Regional Water Board	4 months after submittal of draft plan
VI.C.4.c	Submit final plan to Regional Water Board	3 months after receipt of Regional Water Board comments on draft plan
VI.C.4.c	Approval or denial of final plan by Regional Water Board or by the Executive Officer on behalf of the Regional Water Board	3 months after submittal of final plan
VI.C.6	Begin implementation of Watershed Management Program or EWMP	Upon approval of final plan
VI.C.8	Comprehensive evaluation of Watershed Management	Every two years from date of

Program or EWMP and submittal of modifications to plan	approval
--	----------

- b.** Permittees that elect to develop a Watershed Management Program or EWMP must notify the Regional Water Board no later than six months after the effective date of this Order.
  - i.** Such notification shall specify if the Permittee(s) are requesting a 12-month or 18-month submittal date for the draft Watershed Management Program, per Part VI.C.4.c.i – ii, or if the Permittees are requesting a 18/30-month submittal date for the draft EWMP per Part VI.C.4.c.iv.
  - ii.** As part of their notice of intent to develop a WMP or EWMP, Permittees shall identify all applicable interim and final trash WQBELs and all other final WQBELs and receiving water limitations pursuant to Part VI.E. and the applicable attachment(s) with compliance deadlines occurring prior to approval of a WMP or EWMP. Permittees shall identify watershed control measures, where possible from existing TMDL implementation plans, that will be implemented by participating Permittees concurrently with the development of a Watershed Management Program or EWMP to ensure that MS4 discharges achieve compliance with applicable interim and final trash WQBELs and all other final WQBELs and receiving water limitations set forth in Part VI.E. and the applicable attachment(s) by the applicable compliance deadlines occurring prior to approval of a WMP or EWMP.
  - iii.** As part of their notification, Permittees electing to develop an EWMP shall submit all of the following in addition to the requirements of Part VI.C.4.b.i.-ii.:
    - (1) Plan concept and geographical scope,
    - (2) Cost estimate for plan development,
    - (3) Executed MOU/agreement among participating Permittees to fund plan development, or final draft MOU among participating Permittees along with a signed letter of intent from each participating City Manager or head of agency. If a final draft MOU is submitted, the MOU shall be fully executed by all participating Permittees within 12 months of the effective date of this Order.
    - (4) Interim milestones for plan development and deadlines for their achievement,
    - (5) Identification of, and commitment to fully implement, one structural BMP or a suite of BMPs at a scale that provides meaningful water quality improvement within each watershed covered by the plan within 30 months of the effective date of this Order in addition to

watershed control measures to be implemented pursuant to b.ii. above. The structural BMP or suite of BMPs shall be subject to approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, and

- (6) Demonstration that the requirements in Parts VI.C.4.c.iv.(1) and (2) have been met.
- c.** Permittees that elect to develop a Watershed Management Program shall submit a draft plan to the Regional Water Board as follows:
- i.** For Permittees that elect to collaborate on the development of a Watershed Management Program, Permittees shall submit the draft Watershed Management Program no later than 18 months after the effective date of this Order if the following conditions are met in greater than 50% of the land area covered by the WMP:
    - (1) Demonstrate that there are LID ordinances in place and/or commence development of a Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance(s) meeting the requirements of this Order's Planning and Land Development Program within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft ordinance within 6 months of the effective date of the Order, and
    - (2) Demonstrate that there are green streets policies in place and/or commence development of a policy(ies) that specifies the use of green street strategies for transportation corridors within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft policy within 6 months of the effective date of the Order.
    - (3) Demonstrate in the notification of the intent to develop a Watershed Management Program that Parts VI.C.4.c.i(1) and (2) have been met in greater than 50% of the watershed area.
  - ii.** For a Permittee that elects to develop an individual Watershed Management Program, the Permittee shall submit the draft Watershed Management Program no later than 18 months after the effective date of this Order if the following conditions are met:
    - (1) Demonstrate that there is a LID ordinance in place for the Permittee's jurisdiction and/or commence development of a Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance for the Permittee's jurisdiction meeting the requirements of this Order's Planning and Land Development Program within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft ordinance within 6 months of the effective date of the Order, and
    - (2) Demonstrate that there is a green streets policy in place for the Permittee's jurisdiction and/or commence development of a policy

that specifies the use of green street strategies for transportation corridors within the Permittee's jurisdiction within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft policy within 6 months of the effective date of the Order.

- (3) Demonstrate in the notification of the intent to develop a Watershed Management Program that Parts VI.C.4.c.ii.(1) and (2) have been met.
- iii. For Permittees that elect not to implement the conditions under Part VI.C.4.c.i. or Part VI.C.4.c.ii., Permittees shall submit the draft Watershed Management Program no later than 12 months after the effective date of this Order.
  - iv. For Permittees that elect to collaborate on the development of an EWMP, Permittees shall submit the work plan for development of the EWMP no later than 18 months after the effective date of this Order, and shall submit the draft program no later than 30 months after the effective date of this Order if the following conditions are met in greater than 50% of the land area in the watershed:
    - (1) Demonstrate that there are LID ordinances in place and/or commence development of a Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance(s) meeting the requirements of this Order's Planning and Land Development Program within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft ordinance within 6 months of the effective date of the Order, and
    - (2) Demonstrate that there are green streets policies in place and/or commence development of a policy(ies) that specifies the use of green street strategies for transportation corridors within 60 days of the effective date of the Order and have a draft policy within 6 months of the effective date of the Order.
    - (3) Demonstrate in the notification of the intent to develop an EWMP that Parts VI.C.4.c.iv.(1) and (2) have been met in greater than 50% of the watershed area.
- d. Until the Watershed Management Program or EWMP is approved by the Regional Water Board or by the Executive Officer on behalf of the Regional Water Board, Permittees that elect to develop a Watershed Management Program or EWMP shall:
    - i. Continue to implement watershed control measures in their existing storm water management programs, including actions within each of the six categories of minimum control measures consistent with 40 CFR section 122.26(d)(2)(iv),

- ii. Continue to implement watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges through the MS4 that are a source of pollutants to receiving waters consistent with CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), and
  - iii. Implement watershed control measures, where possible from existing TMDL implementation plans, to ensure that MS4 discharges achieve compliance with interim and final trash WQBELs and all other final WQBELs and receiving water limitations pursuant to Part VI.E. and set forth in Attachments L through R by the applicable compliance deadlines occurring prior to approval of a WMP or EWMP.
- e. Permittees that do not elect to develop a Watershed Management Program or EWMP, or that do not have an approved WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively, of the effective date of this Order, shall be subject to the baseline requirements in Part VI.D and shall demonstrate compliance with receiving water limitations pursuant to Part V.A. and with applicable interim water quality-based effluent limitations in Part VI.E pursuant to subparts VI.E.2.d.i.(1)-(3).
- f. Permittees subject to the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacteria Indicator TMDL shall submit a Comprehensive Bacteria Reduction Plan (CBRP) for dry weather to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer no later than nine months after the effective date of this Order. The CBRP shall describe, in detail, the specific actions that have been taken or will be taken to achieve compliance with the dry weather water quality-based effluent limitations and the receiving water limitations for the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacteria Indicator TMDL by December 31, 2015. The CBRP shall also establish a schedule for developing a CBRP to comply with the water quality-based effluent limitations and the receiving water limitations for the Middle Santa Ana River Bacteria TMDL during wet weather by December 31, 2025. The CBRP may be developed in lieu of the Watershed Management Program for MS4 discharges of bacteria within the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed.

## **5. Program Development**

### **a. Identification of Water Quality Priorities**

Permittees shall identify the water quality priorities within each WMA that will be addressed by the Watershed Management Program. At a minimum, these priorities shall include achieving applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations established pursuant to TMDLs, as set forth in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R of this Order.

- i. **Water Quality Characterization.** Each plan shall include an evaluation of existing water quality conditions, including characterization of storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 and receiving water quality,



to support identification and prioritization/sequencing of management actions.

**ii. Water Body-Pollutant Classification.** On the basis of the evaluation of existing water quality conditions, water body-pollutant combinations shall be classified into one of the following three categories:

- (1) **Category 1 (Highest Priority):** Water body-pollutant combinations for which water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations are established in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R of this Order.
- (2) **Category 2 (High Priority):** Pollutants for which data indicate water quality impairment in the receiving water according to the State's Water Quality Control Policy for Developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List (State Listing Policy) and for which MS4 discharges may be causing or contributing to the impairment.
- (3) **Category 3 (Medium Priority):** Pollutants for which there are insufficient data to indicate water quality impairment in the receiving water according to the State's Listing Policy, but which exceed applicable receiving water limitations contained in this Order and for which MS4 discharges may be causing or contributing to the exceedance.

**iii. Source Assessment.** Utilizing existing information, potential sources within the watershed for the water body-pollutant combinations in Categories 1 - 3 shall be identified.

- (1) Permittees shall identify known and suspected storm water and non-storm water pollutant sources in discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters and any other stressors related to MS4 discharges causing or contributing to the water quality priorities. The identification of known and suspected sources of the highest water quality priorities shall consider the following:
  - (a) Review of available data, including but not limited to:
    - (i) Findings from the Permittees' Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharge Elimination Programs;
    - (ii) Findings from the Permittees' Industrial/Commercial Facilities Programs;
    - (iii) Findings from the Permittees' Development Construction Programs;

- (iv) Findings from the Permittees' Public Agency Activities Programs;
  - (v) TMDL source investigations;
  - (vi) Watershed model results;
  - (vii) Findings from the Permittees' monitoring programs, including but not limited to TMDL compliance monitoring and receiving water monitoring; and
  - (viii) Any other pertinent data, information, or studies related to pollutant sources and conditions that contribute to the highest water quality priorities.
- (b) Locations of the Permittees' MS4s, including, at a minimum, all MS4 major outfalls and major structural controls for storm water and non-storm water that discharge to receiving waters.
  - (c) Other known and suspected sources of pollutants in non-storm water or storm water discharges from the MS4 to receiving waters within the WMA.
- iv. Prioritization.** Based on the findings of the source assessment, the issues within each watershed shall be prioritized and sequenced. Watershed priorities shall include at a minimum:
- (1) TMDLs
    - (a) Controlling pollutants for which there are water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with interim or final compliance deadlines within the permit term, or TMDL compliance deadlines that have already passed and limitations have not been achieved.
    - (b) Controlling pollutants for which there are water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with interim or final compliance deadlines between September 6, 2012 and October 25, 2017.
  - (2) Other Receiving Water Considerations
    - (a) Controlling pollutants for which data indicate impairment or exceedances of receiving water limitations in the receiving water and the findings from the source assessment implicates discharges from the MS4 shall be considered the second highest priority.

**b. Selection of Watershed Control Measures**

- i.** Permittees shall identify strategies, control measures, and BMPs to implement through their individual storm water management programs, and collectively on a watershed scale, with the goal of creating an efficient program to focus individual and collective resources on watershed priorities.
- ii.** The objectives of the Watershed Control Measures shall include:
  - (1) Prevent or eliminate non-storm water discharges to the MS4 that are a source of pollutants from the MS4 to receiving waters.
  - (2) Implement pollutant controls necessary to achieve all applicable interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations pursuant to corresponding compliance schedules.
  - (3) Ensure that discharges from the MS4 do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations.
- iii.** Watershed Control Measures may include:
  - (1) Structural and/or non-structural controls and operation and maintenance procedures that are designed to achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations, receiving water limitations in Part VI.E and/or Attachments L through R;
  - (2) Retrofitting areas of existing development known or suspected to contribute to the highest water quality priorities with regional or sub-regional controls or management measures; and
  - (3) Stream and/or habitat rehabilitation or restoration projects where stream and/or habitat rehabilitation or restoration are necessary for, or will contribute to demonstrable improvements in the physical, chemical, and biological receiving water conditions and restoration and/or protection of water quality standards in receiving waters.
- iv.** The following provisions of this Order shall be incorporated as part of the Watershed Management Program:
  - (1) Minimum Control Measures.
    - (a) Permittees shall assess the minimum control measures (MCMs) as defined in Part VI.D.4 to Part VI.D.10 of this Order to identify opportunities for focusing resources on the high priority issues in each watershed. For each of the following minimum control measures, Permittees shall identify potential modifications that will address watershed priorities:
      - (i) Development Construction Program

- (ii) Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program
  - (iii) Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharges Detection and Elimination Program
  - (iv) Public Agency Activities Program
  - (v) Public Information and Participation Program
- (b) At a minimum, the Watershed Management Program shall include management programs consistent with 40 CFR section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)-(D).
- (c) If the Permittee(s) elects to eliminate a control measure identified in Parts VI.D.4, VI.D.5, VI.D.6 and VI.D.8 to VI.D.10 because that specific control measure is not applicable to the Permittee(s), the Permittee(s) shall provide a justification for its elimination. The Planning and Land Development Program is not eligible for elimination.
- (d) Such customized actions, once approved as part of the Watershed Management Program, shall replace in part or in whole the requirements in Parts VI.D.4, VI.D.5, VI.D.6 and VI.D.8 to VI.D.10 for participating Permittees.
- (2) Non-Storm Water Discharge Measures. Where Permittees identify non-storm water discharges from the MS4 as a source of pollutants that cause or contribute to exceedance of receiving water limitations, the Watershed Control Measures shall include strategies, control measures, and/or BMPs that must be implemented to effectively eliminate the source of pollutants consistent with Parts III.A and VI.D.10. These may include measures to prohibit the non-storm water discharge to the MS4, additional BMPs to reduce pollutants in the non-storm water discharge or conveyed by the non-storm water discharge, diversion to a sanitary sewer for treatment, or strategies to require the non-storm water discharge to be separately regulated under a general NPDES permit.
- (3) TMDL Control Measures. Permittees shall compile control measures that have been identified in TMDLs and corresponding implementation plans. Permittees shall identify those control measures to be modified, if any, to most effectively address TMDL requirements within the watershed. If not sufficiently identified in previous documents, or if implementation plans have not yet been developed (e.g., USEPA established TMDLs), the Permittees shall evaluate and identify control measures to achieve water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations established in this Order pursuant to these TMDLs.

- (a) TMDL control measures shall include where necessary control measures to address both storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4.
  - (b) TMDL control measures may include baseline or customized activities covered under the general MCM categories in Part VI.D as well as BMPs and other control measures covered under the non-storm water discharge provisions of Part III.A of this Order.
  - (c) The WMP shall include, at a minimum, those actions that will be implemented during the permit term to achieve interim and/or final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with compliance deadlines within the permit term.
- (4) Each plan shall include the following components:
- (a) Identification of specific structural controls and non-structural best management practices, including operational source control and pollution prevention, and any other actions or programs to achieve all water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations contained in this Part VI.E and Attachments L through R to which the Permittee(s) is subject;
  - (b) For each structural control and non-structural best management practice, the number, type, and location(s) and/or frequency of implementation;
  - (c) For any pollution prevention measures, the nature, scope, and timing of implementation;
  - (d) For each structural control and non-structural best management practice, interim milestones and dates for achievement to ensure that TMDL compliance deadlines will be met; and
  - (e) The plan shall clearly identify the responsibilities of each participating Permittee for implementation of watershed control measures.
- (5) Permittees shall conduct a Reasonable Assurance Analysis for each water body-pollutant combination addressed by the Watershed Management Program. A Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA) shall be quantitative and performed using a peer-reviewed model in the public domain. Models to be considered for the RAA, without exclusion, are the Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS), Hydrologic Simulation Program-FORTRAN (HSPF), and the Structural BMP Prioritization and Analysis Tool (SBPAT). The RAA shall commence with assembly of all available, relevant subwatershed data collected within the last 10 years, including land use and pollutant loading data, establishment of quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) criteria, QA/QC checks of the data, and identification of the data set meeting the criteria for use in the analysis. Data on

performance of watershed control measures needed as model input shall be drawn only from peer-reviewed sources. These data shall be statistically analyzed to determine the best estimate of performance and the confidence limits on that estimate for the pollutants to be evaluated. The objective of the RAA shall be to demonstrate the ability of Watershed Management Programs and EWMPs to ensure that Permittees' MS4 discharges achieve applicable water quality based effluent limitations and do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations.

- (a) Permittees shall demonstrate using the RAA that the activities and control measures identified in the Watershed Control Measures will achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations in Attachments L through R with compliance deadlines during the permit term.
  - (b) Where the TMDL Provisions in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R do not include interim or final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with compliance deadlines during the permit term, Permittees shall identify interim milestones and dates for their achievement to ensure adequate progress toward achieving interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with deadlines beyond the permit term.
  - (c) For water body-pollutant combinations not addressed by TMDLs, Permittees shall demonstrate using the RAA that the activities and control measures identified in the Watershed Control Measures will achieve applicable receiving water limitations as soon as possible.
- (6) Permittees shall provide documentation that they have the necessary legal authority to implement the Watershed Control Measures identified in the plan, or that other legal authority exists to compel implementation of the Watershed Control Measures.

**c. Compliance Schedules**

Permittees shall incorporate compliance schedules in Attachments L through R into the plan and, where necessary develop interim milestones and dates for their achievement. Compliance schedules and interim milestones and dates for their achievement shall be used to measure progress towards addressing the highest water quality priorities and achieving applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations.

- i. Schedules must be adequate for measuring progress on a watershed scale once every two years.

- ii. Schedules must be developed for both the strategies, control measures and BMPs implemented by each Permittee within its jurisdiction and for those that will be implemented by multiple Permittees on a watershed scale.
- iii. Schedules shall incorporate the following:
  - (1) Compliance deadlines occurring within the permit term for all applicable interim and/or final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R of this Order,
  - (2) Interim milestones and dates for their achievement within the permit term for any applicable final water quality-based effluent limitation and/or receiving water limitation in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R, where deadlines within the permit term are not otherwise specified.
  - (3) For watershed priorities related to addressing exceedances of receiving water limitations in Part V.A and not otherwise addressed by Part VI.E:
    - (a) Milestones based on measureable criteria or indicators, to be achieved in the receiving waters and/or MS4 discharges,
    - (a) A schedule with dates for achieving the milestones, and
    - (b) A final date for achieving the receiving water limitations as soon as possible.
    - (c) The milestones and implementation schedule in (a)-(c) fulfill the requirements in Part V.A.3.a to prepare an Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report.

## **6. Watershed Management Program Implementation**

Each Permittee shall begin implementing the Watershed Management Program or EWMP immediately upon approval of the plan by the Regional Water Board or the Executive Officer on behalf of the Regional Water Board.

- a. Permittees may request an extension of deadlines for achievement of interim milestones established pursuant to Part VI.C.4.c.iii.(3) only. Permittees shall provide requests in writing at least 90 days prior to the deadline and shall include in the request the justification for the extension. Extensions shall be subject to approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

## **7. Integrated Watershed Monitoring and Assessment**

Permittees in each WMA shall develop an integrated monitoring program as set forth in Part IV of the MRP (Attachment E) or implement a customized monitoring

program with the primary objective of allowing for the customization of the outfall monitoring program (Parts VIII and IX) in conjunction with an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP, as defined below. Each monitoring program shall assess progress toward achieving the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations per the compliance schedules, and progress toward addressing the water quality priorities for each WMA. The customized monitoring program shall be submitted as part of the Watershed Management Program, or where Permittees elect to develop an EWMP, shall be submitted within 18 months of the effective date of this Order. If pursuing a customized monitoring program, the Permittee(s) shall provide sufficient justification for each element of the program that differs from the monitoring program requirements as set forth in Attachment E. Monitoring programs shall be subject to approval by the Executive Officer following a public comment period. The customized monitoring program shall be designed to address the Primary Objectives detailed in Attachment E, Part II.A and shall include the following program elements:

- Receiving Water Monitoring
- Storm Water Outfall Monitoring
- Non-Storm Water Outfall Monitoring
- New Development/Re-Development Effectiveness Tracking
- Regional Studies

## **8. Adaptive Management Process**

### **a. Watershed Management Program Adaptive Management Process**

- i. Permittees in each WMA shall implement an adaptive management process, every two years from the date of program approval, adapting the Watershed Management Program or EWMP to become more effective, based on, but not limited to a consideration of the following:
  - (1) Progress toward achieving interim and/or final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R, according to established compliance schedules;
  - (2) Progress toward achieving improved water quality in MS4 discharges and achieving receiving water limitations through implementation of the watershed control measures based on an evaluation of outfall-based monitoring data and receiving water monitoring data;
  - (3) Achievement of interim milestones;



- (4) Re-evaluation of the water quality priorities identified for the WMA based on more recent water quality data for discharges from the MS4 and the receiving water(s) and a reassessment of sources of pollutants in MS4 discharges;
  - (5) Availability of new information and data from sources other than the Permittees' monitoring program(s) within the WMA that informs the effectiveness of the actions implemented by the Permittees;
  - (6) Regional Water Board recommendations; and
  - (7) Recommendations for modifications to the Watershed Management Program solicited through a public participation process.
- ii. Based on the results of the adaptive management process, Permittees shall report any modifications, including where appropriate new compliance deadlines and interim milestones, with the exception of those compliance deadlines established in a TMDL, necessary to improve the effectiveness of the Watershed Management Program or EWMP in the Annual Report, as required pursuant to Part XVIII.A.6 of the MRP (Attachment E), and as part of the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) required pursuant to Part II.B of Attachment D – Standard Provisions.
- (1) The adaptive management process fulfills the requirements in Part V.A.4 to address continuing exceedances of receiving water limitations.
- iii. Permittees shall implement any modifications to the Watershed Management Program or EWMP upon approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer or within 60 days of submittal if the Regional Water Board Executive Officer expresses no objections.

## **D. Storm Water Management Program Minimum Control Measures**

### **1. General Requirements**

- a. Each Permittee shall implement the requirements in Parts VI.D.4 through VI.D.10 below, or may in lieu of the requirements in Parts VI.D.4 through VI.D.10 implement customized actions within each of these general categories of control measures as set forth in an approved Watershed Management Program per Part VI.C. Implementation shall be consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR § 122.26(d)(2)(iv).
- b. Timelines for Implementation
  - i. Unless otherwise noted in Part VI.D, each Permittee that does not elect to develop a Watershed Management Program or EWMP per Part VI.C shall implement the requirements contained in Part VI.D within 6 months after the

effective date of this Order. In the interim, a Permittee shall continue to implement its existing storm water management program, including actions within each of the six categories of minimum control measures consistent with 40 CFR section 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

- ii. Permittees that elect to develop a Watershed Management Program or EWMP shall continue to implement their existing storm water management programs, including actions within each of the six categories of minimum control measures consistent with 40 CFR section 122.26(d)(2)(iv) until the Watershed Management Program or EWMP is approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.

## **2. Progressive Enforcement and Interagency Coordination**

- a. Each Permittee shall develop and implement a Progressive Enforcement Policy to ensure that (1) regulated Industrial/Commercial facilities, (2) construction sites, (3) development and redevelopment sites with post-construction controls, and (4) illicit discharges are each brought into compliance with all storm water and non-storm water requirements within a reasonable time period as specified below.

- i. Follow-up Inspections

In the event that a Permittee determines, based on an inspection or illicit discharge investigation conducted, that a facility or site operator has failed to adequately implement all necessary BMPs, that Permittee shall take progressive enforcement actions which, at a minimum, shall include a follow-up inspection within 4 weeks from the date of the initial inspection and/or investigation.

- ii. Enforcement Action

In the event that a Permittee determines that a facility or site operator has failed to adequately implement BMPs after a follow-up inspection, that Permittee shall take enforcement action as established through authority in its municipal code and ordinances, through the judicial system, or refer the case to the Regional Water Board, per the Interagency Coordination provisions below.

- iii. Records Retention

Each Permittee shall maintain records, per their existing record retention policies, and make them available on request to the Regional Water Board, including inspection reports, warning letters, notices of violations, and other enforcement records, demonstrating a good faith effort to bring facilities into compliance.

- iv. Referral of Violations of Municipal Ordinances and California Water Code § 13260

A Permittee may refer a violation(s) of its municipal storm water ordinances and/or California Water Code section 13260 by Industrial and Commercial facilities and construction site operators to the Regional Water Board

provided that the Permittee has made a good faith effort of applying its Progressive Enforcement Policy to achieve compliance with its own ordinances. At a minimum, a Permittee's good faith effort must be documented with:

- (1) Two follow-up inspections, and
- (2) Two warning letters or notices of violation.

**v. Referral of Violations of the Industrial and Construction General Permits, including Requirements to File a Notice of Intent or No Exposure Certification**

For those facilities or site operators in violation of municipal storm water ordinances and subject to the Industrial and/or Construction General Permits, Permittees may escalate referral of such violations to the Regional Water Board (promptly via telephone or electronically) after one inspection and one written notice of violation (copied to the Regional Water Board) to the facility or site operator regarding the violation. In making such referrals, Permittees shall include, at a minimum, the following documentation:

- (1) Name of the facility or site,
- (2) Operator of the facility or site,
- (3) Owner of the facility or site,
- (4) WDID Number (if applicable),
- (5) Records of communication with the facility/site operator regarding the violation, which shall include at least one inspection report,
- (6) The written notice of violation (copied to the Regional Water Board),
- (7) For industrial sites, the industrial activity being conducted at the facility that is subject to the Industrial General Permit, and
- (8) For construction sites, site acreage and Risk Factor rating.

**b. Investigation of Complaints Transmitted by the Regional Water Board Staff**

Each Permittee shall initiate, within one business day,<sup>22</sup> investigation of complaints from facilities within its jurisdiction. The initial investigation shall include, at a minimum, a limited inspection of the facility to confirm validity of the complaint and to determine if the facility is in compliance with municipal storm water ordinances and, if necessary, to oversee corrective action.

**c. Assistance with Regional Water Board Enforcement Actions**

As directed by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, Permittees shall assist Regional Water Board enforcement actions by:

- i. Assisting in identification of current owners, operators, and lessees of properties and sites.**

---

<sup>22</sup> Permittees may comply with the Permit by taking initial steps (such as logging, prioritizing, and tasking) to "initiate" the investigation within that one business day. However, the Regional Water Board would expect that the initial investigation, including a site visit, to occur within four business days.

- ii. Providing staff, when available, for joint inspections with Regional Water Board inspectors.
- iii. Appearing to testify as witnesses in Regional Water Board enforcement hearings.
- iv. Providing copies of inspection reports and documentation demonstrating application of its Progressive Enforcement Policy.

### **3. Modifications/Revisions**

- a. Each Permittee shall modify its storm water management programs, protocols, practices, and municipal codes to make them consistent with the requirements in this Order.

### **4. Requirements Applicable to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District**

#### **a. Public Information and Participation Program (PIPP)**

##### **i. General**

- (1) The LACFCD shall participate in a regional Public Information and Participation Program (PIPP) or alternatively, shall implement its own PIPP that includes the requirements listed in this part. The LACFCD shall collaborate, as necessary, with other Permittees to implement PIPP requirements. The objectives of the PIPP are as follows:
  - (a) To measurably increase the knowledge of the target audience about the MS4, the adverse impacts of storm water pollution on receiving waters and potential solutions to mitigate the impacts.
  - (b) To measurably change the waste disposal and storm water pollution generation behavior of target audiences by encouraging the implementation of appropriate alternatives by providing information to the public.
  - (c) To involve and engage a diversity of socio-economic groups and ethnic communities in Los Angeles County to participate in mitigating the impacts of stormwater pollution.

##### **ii. PIPP Implementation**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement the PIPP requirements listed in this Part VI.D.5 using one or more of the following approaches:
  - (a) By participating in a collaborative PIPP covering the entire service area of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District,
  - (b) By participating in one or more Watershed Group sponsored PIPPs, and/or
  - (c) Individually within the service area of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

- (2) If the LACFCD participates in a collaborative District-wide or Watershed Group PIPP, the LACFCD shall provide the contact information for their appropriate staff responsible for storm water public education activities to the designated PIPP coordinator and contact information changes no later than 30 days after a change occurs.

### **iii. Public Participation**

- (1) The LACFCD, in collaboration with the County of Los Angeles, shall continue to maintain the countywide hotline (888-CLEAN-LA) for public reporting of clogged catch basin inlets and illicit discharges/dumping, faded or missing catch basin labels, and general storm water management information.
  - (a) The LACFCD shall include the reporting information, updated when necessary, in public information, and the government pages of the telephone book, as they are developed or published.
  - (b) The LACFCD, in collaboration with the County of Los Angeles, shall continue to maintain the [www.888cleanla.com](http://www.888cleanla.com) website.

### **iv. Residential Outreach Program**

- (1) Working in conjunction with a District-wide or Watershed Group sponsored PIPP or individually, the LACFCD shall implement the following activities:
  - (a) Conduct storm water pollution prevention public service announcements and advertising campaigns
  - (b) Facilitate the dissemination of public education materials including, at a minimum, information on the proper handling (i.e., disposal, storage and/or use) of:
    - ( ) Vehicle waste fluids
    - (i) Household waste materials (i.e., trash and household hazardous waste)
    - (ii) Construction waste materials
    - (iii) Pesticides and fertilizers (including integrated pest management practices [IPM] to promote reduced use of pesticides),
    - (iv) Green waste (including lawn clippings and leaves)
    - (v) Animal wastes
  - (c) Facilitate the dissemination of activity-specific storm water pollution prevention public education materials, at a minimum, for the following points of purchase:
    - (i) Automotive parts stores

- (ii) Home improvement centers / lumber yards / hardware stores / paint stores
- (iii) Landscaping / gardening centers
- (iv) Pet shops / feed stores
- (d) Maintain a storm water website, which shall include educational material and opportunities for the public to participate in storm water pollution prevention and clean-up activities listed in Part VI.D.5.
- (e) When implementing activities in (a)-(d), the LACFCD shall use effective strategies to educate and involve ethnic communities in storm water pollution prevention through culturally effective methods.

**b. Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program**

If the LACFCD operates, or has authority over, any facility(ies) identified in Part VI.D.6.b, LACFCD shall comply with the requirements in Part VI.D.6 for those facilities.

**c. Public Agency Activities Program**

**i. General**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement a Public Agency Activities Program to minimize storm water pollution impacts from LACFCD-owned or operated facilities and activities. Requirements for Public Agency Facilities and Activities consist of the following components:
  - (a) Public Construction Activities Management.
  - (b) Public Facility Inventory
  - (c) Public Facility and Activity Management
  - (d) Vehicle and Equipment Washing
  - (e) Landscape and Recreational Facilities Management
  - (f) Storm Drain Operation and Maintenance
  - (g) Parking Facilities Management
  - (h) Emergency Procedures
  - (i) Employee and Contractor Training

## **ii. Public Construction Activities Management**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement and comply with the Planning and Land Development Program requirements in Part VI.D.7 of this Order at LACFCD-owned or operated public construction projects that are categorized under the project types identified in Part VI.D.7 of this Order.
- (2) The LACFCD shall implement and comply with the appropriate Development Construction Program requirements in Part VI.D.8 of this Order at LACFCD-owned or operated construction projects as applicable.
- (3) For LACFCD-owned or operated projects that disturb less than one acre of soil, the LACFCD shall require the implementation of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs from Table 13 (see Construction Development Program).
- (4) The LACFCD shall obtain separate coverage under the Construction General Permit for all LACFCD-owned or operated construction sites that require coverage.

## **iii. Public Facility Inventory**

- (1) The LACFCD shall maintain an updated watershed-based inventory and map of all LACFCD-owned or operated facilities that are potential sources of storm water pollution. The incorporation of facility information into a GIS is recommended. Sources to be tracked include but are not limited to the following:
  - (a) Chemical storage facilities
  - (b) Equipment storage and maintenance facilities (including landscape maintenance-related operations)
  - (c) Fueling or fuel storage facilities
  - (d) Materials storage yards
  - (e) Pesticide storage facilities
  - (f) LACFCD buildings
  - (g) LACFCD vehicle storage and maintenance yards
  - (h) All other LACFCD-owned or operated facilities or activities that the LACFCD determines may contribute a substantial pollutant load to the MS4.
- (2) The LACFCD shall include the following minimum fields of information for each LACFCD-owned or operated facility in its watershed-based inventory and map.
  - (a) Name of facility
  - (b) Name of facility manager and contact information

- (c) Address of facility (physical and mailing)
  - (d) A narrative description of activities performed and principal products used at each facility and status of exposure to storm water.
  - (e) Coverage under the Industrial General Permit or other individual or general NPDES permits or any applicable waiver issued by the Regional or State Water Board pertaining to storm water discharges.
- (3) The LACFCD shall update its inventory and map once during the Permit term. The update shall be accomplished through a collection of new information obtained through field activities.

#### **iv. Public Agency Facility and Activity Management**

- (1) The LACFCD shall obtain separate coverage under the Industrial General Permit for all LACFCD-owned or operated facilities where industrial activities are conducted that require coverage under the Industrial General Permit.
- (2) The LACFCD shall implement the following measures for flood management projects:
  - (a) Develop procedures to assess the impacts of flood management projects on the water quality of receiving waterbodies; and
  - (b) Evaluate existing structural flood control facilities during the planning phases of major maintenance or rehabilitation projects to determine if retrofitting the facility to provide additional pollutant removal from storm water is feasible.



- (3) The LACFCD shall implement and maintain the general and activity-specific BMPs listed in Table 18 (BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities) or an equivalent set of BMPs when such activities occur at LACFCD-owned or operated facilities and field activities (e.g., project sites) including but not limited to the facility types listed in Part VI.D.9.c above, and at any area that includes the activities described in Table 18, or that have the potential to discharge pollutants in storm water.
- (4) Any contractors hired by the LACFCD to conduct Public Agency Activities shall be contractually required to implement and maintain the general and activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 or an equivalent set of BMPs. The LACFCD shall conduct oversight of contractor activities to ensure these BMPs are implemented and maintained.
- (5) Effective source control BMPs for the activities listed in Table 18 shall be implemented at LACFCD-owned or operated facilities, unless the pollutant generating activity does not occur. The LACFCD shall require implementation of additional BMPs where storm water from the MS4 discharges to a significant ecological area (SEA, see Attachment A for definition), a water body subject to TMDL Provisions in Part VI.E, or a CWA section 303(d) listed water body (see Part VI.E below). Likewise, for those BMPs that are not adequately protective of water quality standards, the LACFCD shall implement additional site-specific controls.

**v. Vehicle and Equipment Washing**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 (BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities) or an equivalent set of BMPs for all fixed vehicle and equipment washing areas;
- (2) The LACFCD shall prevent discharges of wash waters from vehicle and equipment washing to the MS4 by implementing any of the following measures at existing facilities with vehicle or equipment wash areas:
  - (a) Self-contain, and haul off for disposal; or
  - (b) Equip with a clarifier or an alternative pre-treatment device and plumb to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations

- (3) The LACFCD shall ensure that any LACFCD facilities constructed, redeveloped, or replaced shall not discharge wastewater from vehicle and equipment wash areas to the MS4 by plumbing all areas to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations, or self-containing all waste water/ wash water and hauling to a point of legal disposal.

#### **vi. Landscape and Recreational Facilities Management**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 (BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities) or an equivalent set of BMPs for all its public right-of-ways, flood control facilities and open channels and reservoirs, and landscape and recreational facilities and activities.
- (2) The LACFCD shall implement an IPM program that includes the following:
  - (a) Pesticides are used only if monitoring indicates they are needed, and pesticides are applied according to applicable permits and established guidelines.
  - (b) Treatments are made with the goal of removing only the target organism.
  - (c) Pest controls are selected and applied in a manner that minimizes risks to human health, beneficial non-target organisms, and the environment.
  - (d) The use of pesticides, including Organophosphates and Pyrethroids, does not threaten water quality.
  - (e) Partner, as appropriate, with other agencies and organizations to encourage the use of IPM.
  - (f) Adopt and verifiably implement policies, procedures, and/ or ordinances requiring the minimization of pesticide use and encouraging the use of IPM techniques (including beneficial insects) for Public Agency Facilities and Activities.
  - (g) Policies, procedures, and ordinances shall include a schedule to reduce the use of pesticides that cause impairment of surface waters by implementing the following procedures:
    - (i) Prepare and annually update an inventory of pesticides used by all internal departments, divisions, and other operational units.
    - (ii) Quantify pesticide use by staff and hired contractors.
    - (iii) Demonstrate implementation of IPM alternatives where feasible to reduce pesticide use.

- (3) The LACFCD shall implement the following requirements:
  - (a) Use a standardized protocol for the routine and non-routine application of pesticides (including pre-emergents), and fertilizers.
  - (b) Ensure there is no application of pesticides or fertilizers (1) when two or more consecutive days with greater than 50% chance of rainfall are predicted by NOAA, (2) within 48 hours of a 1/2-inch rain event, or (3) when water is flowing off the area where the application is to occur. This requirement does not apply to the application of aquatic pesticides or pesticides which require water for activation.
  - (c) Ensure that no banned or unregistered pesticides are stored or applied.
  - (d) Ensure that all staff applying pesticides are certified in the appropriate category by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, or are under the direct supervision of a pesticide applicator certified in the appropriate category.
  - (e) Implement procedures to encourage the retention and planting of native vegetation to reduce water, pesticide and fertilizer needs; and
  - (f) Store pesticides and fertilizers indoors or under cover on paved surfaces, or use secondary containment.
    - (i) Reduce the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials to reduce the potential for spills.
    - (ii) Regularly inspect storage areas.

#### **vii. Storm Drain Operation and Management**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 or equivalent set of BMPs for storm drain operation and maintenance.
- (2) Ensure that all the material removed from the MS4 does not reenter the system. Solid material shall be dewatered in a contained area and liquid material shall be disposed in accordance with any of the following measures:
  - (a) Self-contain, and haul off for legal disposal; or
  - (b) Equip with a clarifier or an alternative pre-treatment device; and plumb to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations.
- (3) Catch Basin Cleaning
  - (a) In areas that are not subject to a trash TMDL, the LACFCD shall determine priority areas and shall update its map or list of catch basins with their GPS coordinates and priority:

Priority A: Catch basins that are designated as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris.

Priority B: Catch basins that are designated as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris.

Priority C: Catch basins that are designated as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris.

The map or list shall contain the rationale or data to support priority designations.

- (b) In areas not subject to a trash TMDL, the LACFCD shall inspect its catch basins according to the following schedule:

Priority A: A minimum of 3 times during the wet season (October 1 through April 15) and once during the dry season every year.

Priority B: A minimum of once during the wet season and once during the dry season every year.

Priority C: A minimum of once per year.

Catch basins shall be cleaned as necessary on the basis of inspections. At a minimum, LACFCD shall ensure that any catch basin that is determined to be at least 25% full of trash shall be cleaned out. LACFCD shall maintain inspection and cleaning records for Regional Water Board review.

- (c) In areas that are subject to a trash TMDL, the subject Permittees shall implement the applicable provisions in Part VI.E.

(4) Catch Basin Labels and Open Channel Signage

(a) LACFCD shall label all catch basin inlets that they own with a legible “no dumping” message.

(b) The LACFCD shall inspect the legibility of the catch basin stencil or label nearest the inlet prior to the wet season every year.

(c) The LACFCD shall record all catch basins with illegible stencils and re-stencil or re-label within 180 days of inspection.

(d) The LACFCD shall post signs, referencing local code(s) that prohibit littering and illegal dumping, at designated public access points to open channels, creeks, urban lakes, and other relevant waterbodies.

(5) Open Channel Maintenance

The LACFCD shall implement a program for Open Channel Maintenance that includes the following:

- (a) Visual monitoring of LACFCD owned open channels and other drainage structures for trash and debris at least annually;
  - (b) Removal of trash and debris from open channels a minimum of once per year before the wet season;
  - (c) Elimination of the discharge of contaminants produced by storm drain maintenance and clean outs; and
  - (d) Proper disposal of debris and trash removed during open channel maintenance.
- (6) Infiltration from Sanitary Sewer to MS4/Preventive Maintenance
- (a) The LACFCD shall implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate infiltration of seepage from sanitary sewers to its MS4 thorough routine preventive maintenance of its MS4.
  - (b) The LACFCD shall implement controls to limit infiltration of seepage from sanitary sewers to its MS4 where necessary. Such controls must include:
    - (i) Adequate plan checking for construction and new development;
    - (ii) Incident response training for its employees that identify sanitary sewer spills;
    - (iii) Code enforcement inspections;
    - (iv) MS4 maintenance and inspections;
    - (v) Interagency coordination with sewer agencies; and
    - (vi) Proper education of its staff and contractors conducting field operations on its MS4.
- (7) LACFCD-Owned Treatment Control BMPs
- (a) The LACFCD shall implement an inspection and maintenance program for all LACFCD-owned treatment control BMPs, including post-construction treatment control BMPs.
  - (b) The LACFCD shall ensure proper operation of all its treatment control BMPs and maintain them as necessary for proper operation, including all post-construction treatment control BMPs.
  - (c) Any residual water produced by a treatment control BMP and not being internal to the BMP performance when being maintained shall be:
    - (i) Hauled away and legally disposed of; or
    - (ii) Applied to the land without runoff; or
    - (iii) Discharged to the sanitary sewer system (with permits or authorization); or

- (iv) Treated or filtered to remove bacteria, sediments, nutrients, and meet the limitations set in Table 19 (Discharge Limitations for Dewatering Treatment BMPs), prior to discharge to the MS4.

#### **viii. Parking Facilities Management**

LACFCD-owned parking lots exposed to storm water shall be kept clear of debris and excessive oil buildup and cleaned no less than 2 times per month and/or inspected no less than 2 times per month to determine if cleaning is necessary. In no case shall a LACFCD-owned parking lot be cleaned less than once a month.

#### **ix. Emergency Procedures**

The LACFCD may conduct repairs and rehabilitation of essential public service systems and infrastructure in emergency situations with a self-waiver of the provisions of this Order as follows:

- (1) The LACFCD shall abide by all other regulatory requirements, including notification to other agencies as appropriate.
- (2) Where the self-waiver has been invoked, the LACFCD shall notify the Regional Water Board Executive Officer of the occurrence of the emergency no later than 30 business days after the situation of emergency has passed.
- (3) Minor repairs of essential public service systems and infrastructure in emergency situations (that can be completed in less than one week) are not subject to the notification provisions. Appropriate BMPs to reduce the threat to water quality shall be implemented.

#### **x. Employee and Contractor Training**

- (1) The LACFCD shall, no later than one year after Order adoption and annually thereafter before June 30, train all of their employees and contractors in targeted positions (whose interactions, jobs, and activities affect storm water quality) on the requirements of the overall storm water management program to:
  - (a) Promote a clear understanding of the potential for activities to pollute storm water.
  - (b) Identify opportunities to require, implement, and maintain appropriate BMPs in their line of work.

- (2) The LACFCD shall, no later than one year after Order adoption and annually thereafter before June 30, train all of their employees and contractors who use or have the potential to use pesticides or fertilizers (whether or not they normally apply these as part of their work). Outside contractors can self-certify, providing they certify they have received all applicable training required in the Order and have documentation to that effect. Training programs shall address:
  - (a) The potential for pesticide-related surface water toxicity.
  - (b) Proper use, handling, and disposal of pesticides.
  - (c) Least toxic methods of pest prevention and control, including IPM.
  - (d) Reduction of pesticide use.
- (3) The LACFCD shall require appropriate training of contractor employees in targeted positions as described above.

#### **d. Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharge Elimination Program**

##### **i. General**

- (1) The LACFCD shall continue to implement an Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharge (IC/ID) Program to detect, investigate, and eliminate IC/IDs to its MS4. The IC/ID Program must be implemented in accordance with the requirements and performance measures specified in the following subsections.
- (2) As stated in Part VI.A.2 of this Order, each Permittee must have adequate legal authority to prohibit IC/IDs to the MS4 and enable enforcement capabilities to eliminate the source of IC/IDs.
- (3) The LACFCD's IC/ID Program shall consist of at least the following major program components:
  - (a) An up-to-date map of LACFCD's MS4
  - (b) Procedures for conducting source investigations for IC/IDs
  - (c) Procedures for eliminating the source of IC/IDs
  - (d) Procedures for public reporting of illicit discharges
  - (e) Spill response plan
  - (f) IC/IDs education and training for LACFCD staff

## ii. MS4 Mapping

- (1) The LACFCD shall maintain an up-to-date and accurate electronic map of its MS4. If possible, the map should be maintained within a GIS. The map must show the following, at a minimum:
  - (a) Within one year of Permit adoption, the location of outfalls owned and maintained by the LACFCD. Each outfall shall be given an alphanumeric identifier, which must be noted on the map. Each mapped outfall shall be located using a geographic positioning system (GPS). Photographs of the major outfalls shall be taken to provide baseline information to track operation and maintenance needs over time.
  - (b) The location and length of open channels and underground storm drain pipes with a diameter of 36 inches or greater that are owned and operated by the LACFCD.
  - (c) The location and name of all waterbodies receiving discharges from those MS4 major outfalls identified in (a).
  - (d) All LACFCD's dry weather diversions installed within the MS4 to direct flows from the MS4 to the sanitary sewer system, including the owner and operator of each diversion.
  - (e) By the end of the Permit term, map all known permitted and documented connections to its MS4 system.
- (2) The MS4 map shall be updated as necessary.

## iii. Illicit Discharge Source Investigation and Elimination

- (1) The LACFCD shall develop written procedures for conducting investigations to prioritize and identify the source of all illicit discharges to its MS4, including procedures to eliminate the discharge once the source is located.
- (2) At a minimum, the LACFCD shall initiate<sup>23</sup> an investigation(s) to identify and locate the source within one business day of becoming aware of the illicit discharge.
- (3) When conducting investigations, the LACFCD shall comply with the following:
  - (a) Illicit discharges suspected of being sanitary sewage and/or significantly contaminated shall be investigated first.
  - (b) The LACFCD shall track all investigations to document, at a minimum, the date(s) the illicit discharge was observed; the results

---

<sup>23</sup> Permittees may comply with the Permit by taking initial steps (such as logging, prioritizing, and tasking) to "initiate" the investigation within one business day. However, the Regional Water Board would expect that the initial investigation, including a site visit, occur within two business days of becoming aware of the illicit discharge.



- of the investigation; any follow-up of the investigation; and the date the investigation was closed.
- (c) The LACFCD shall prioritize and investigate the source of all observed illicit discharges to its MS4.
  - (d) If the source of the illicit discharge is found to be a discharge authorized under an NPDES permit, the LACFCD shall document the source and report to the Regional Water Board within 30 days of determination. No further action is required.
  - (e) If the source of the illicit discharge has been determined to originate from within the jurisdiction of other Permittee(s) with land use authority over the suspected responsible party/parties, the LACFCD shall immediately alert the appropriate Permittee(s) of the problem for further action by the Permittee(s).
- (4) When taking corrective action to eliminate illicit discharges, the LACFCD shall comply with the following:
- (a) If the source of the illicit discharge has been determined or suspected by the LACFCD to originate within an upstream jurisdiction(s), the LACFCD shall immediately notify the upstream jurisdiction(s), and notify the Regional Water Board within 30 days of such determination and provide all the information collected and efforts taken.
  - (b) Once the Permittee with land use authority over the suspected responsible party/parties has been alerted, the LACFCD may continue to work in cooperation with the Permittee(s) to notify the responsible party/parties of the problem, and require the responsible party/parties to immediately initiate necessary corrective actions to eliminate the illicit discharge. Upon being notified that the discharge has been eliminated, the LACFCD may, in conjunction with the Permittee(s) conduct a follow-up investigation to verify that the discharge has been eliminated and cleaned up to the satisfaction of the LACFCD. The LACFCD shall document its follow-up investigation. The LACFCD may seek recovery and remediation costs from responsible parties or require compensation for the cost of all inspection and investigation activities. Resulting enforcement actions shall follow the program's Progressive Enforcement Policy.
  - (c) If the source of the illicit discharge cannot be traced to a suspected responsible party, the LACFCD, in conjunction with other affected Permittees, shall continue implementing the illicit discharge/spill response plan.

- (5) In the event the LACFCD and/or other Permittees are unable to eliminate an ongoing illicit discharge following full execution of its legal authority and in accordance with its Progressive Enforcement Policy, including the inability to find the responsible party/parties, or other circumstances prevent the full elimination of an ongoing illicit discharge, the LACFCD and/or other Permittees shall notify the Regional Water Board within 30 days of such determination and provide available information to the Regional Water Board.

#### **iv. Identification and Response to Illicit Connections**

- (1) Investigation

The LACFCD, upon discovery or upon receiving a report of a suspected illicit connection, shall initiate an investigation within 21 days, to determine the following: (1) source of the connection, (2) nature and volume of discharge through the connection, and (3) responsible party for the connection.

- (2) Elimination

The LACFCD, upon confirmation of an illicit connection to its MS4, shall ensure that the connection is:

- (a) Permitted or documented, provided the connection will only discharge storm water and non-storm water allowable under this Order or other individual or general NPDES Permits/WDRs, or
- (b) Eliminated within 180 days of completion of the investigation, using its formal enforcement authority, if necessary, to eliminate the illicit connection.

- (3) Documentation

Formal records must be maintained for all illicit connection investigations and the formal enforcement taken to eliminate illicit connections.

**v. Public Reporting of Non-Stormwater Discharges and Spills**

- (1) The LACFCD shall, in collaboration with the County, continue to maintain the 888-CLEAN-LA hotline and corresponding internet site at [www.888cleanla.org](http://www.888cleanla.org) to promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges into or from MS4s.
- (2) The LACFCD shall include information regarding public reporting of illicit discharges or improper disposal on the signage adjacent to open channels as required in Part VI.D.9.h.vi.(4).
- (3) The LACFCD shall develop and maintain written procedures that document how complaint calls and internet submissions are received, documented, and tracked to ensure that all complaints are adequately addressed. The procedures shall be evaluated annually to determine whether changes or updates are needed to ensure that the procedures accurately document the methods employed by the LACFCD. Any identified changes shall be made to the procedures subsequent to the annual evaluation.
- (4) The LACFCD shall maintain documentation of the complaint calls and internet submissions and record the location of the reported spill or IC/ID and the actions undertaken, including referrals to other agencies, in response to all IC/ID complaints.

**vi. Illicit Discharge and Spill Response Plan**

- (1) The LACFCD shall implement an ID and spill response plan for all spills that may discharge into its system. The ID and spill response plan shall clearly identify agencies responsible for ID and spill response and cleanup, contact information, and shall contain at a minimum the following requirements:
  - (a) Coordination with spill response teams throughout all appropriate departments, programs and agencies so that maximum water quality protection is provided.
  - (b) Initiation of investigation of all public and employee ID and spill complaints within one business day of receiving the complaint to assess validity.
  - (c) Response to ID and spills within 4 hours of becoming aware of the ID or spill, except where such IDs or spills occur on private property, in which case the response should be within 2 hours of gaining legal access to the property.
  - (d) IDs or spills that may endanger health or the environment shall be reported to appropriate public health agencies and the Office of Emergency Services (OES).

### **vii. Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharge Education and Training**

- (1) The LACFCD must continue to implement a training program regarding the identification of IC/IDs for all LACFCD field staff, who, as part of their normal job responsibilities (e.g., storm drain inspection and maintenance), may come into contact with or otherwise observe an illicit discharge or illicit connection to its MS4. Contact information, including the procedure for reporting an illicit discharge, must be included in the LACFCD's fleet vehicles that are used by field staff. Training program documents must be available for review by the Regional Water Board.
- (2) The LACFCD's training program should address, at a minimum, the following:
  - (a) IC/ID identification, including definitions and examples,
  - (b) investigation,
  - (c) elimination,
  - (d) cleanup,
  - (e) reporting, and
  - (f) documentation.
- (3) The LACFCD must create a list of applicable positions which require IC/ID training and ensure that training is provided at least twice during the term of this Order. The LACFCD must maintain documentation of the training activities.
- (4) New LACFCD staff members must be provided with IC/ID training within 180 days of starting employment.
- (5) The LACFCD shall require its contractors to train their employees in targeted positions as described above.

## **5. Public Information and Participation Program**

### **a. General**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement a Public Information and Participation Program (PIPP) that includes the requirements listed in this Part VI.D.5. Each Permittee shall be responsible for developing and implementing the PIPP and implementing specific PIPP requirements. The objectives of the PIPP are as follows:
  - (1) To measurably increase the knowledge of the target audiences about the MS4, the adverse impacts of storm water pollution on receiving waters and potential solutions to mitigate the impacts.
  - (2) To measurably change the waste disposal and storm water pollution generation behavior of target audiences by developing and encouraging the implementation of appropriate alternatives.

- (3) To involve and engage a diversity of socio-economic groups and ethnic communities in Los Angeles County to participate in mitigating the impacts of storm water pollution.

**b. PIPP Implementation**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement the PIPP requirements listed in this Part VI.D.4 using one or more of the following approaches:
  - (1) By participating in a County-wide PIPP,
  - (2) By participating in one or more Watershed Group sponsored PIPPs, and/or
  - (3) Or individually within its jurisdiction.
- ii. If a Permittee participates in a County-wide or Watershed Group PIPP, the Permittee shall provide the contact information for their appropriate staff responsible for storm water public education activities to the designated PIPP coordinator and contact information changes no later than 30 days after a change occurs.

**c. Public Participation**

- i. Each Permittee, whether participating in a County-wide or Watershed Group sponsored PIPP, or acting individually, shall provide a means for public reporting of clogged catch basin inlets and illicit discharges/dumping, faded or missing catch basin labels, and general storm water and non-storm water pollution prevention information.
  - (1) Permittees may elect to use the 888-CLEAN-LA hotline as the general public reporting contact or each Permittee or Watershed Group may establish its own hotline, if preferred.
  - (2) Each Permittee shall include the reporting information, updated when necessary, in public information, and the government pages of the telephone book, as they are developed or published.
  - (3) Each Permittee shall identify staff or departments who will serve as the contact person(s) and shall make this information available on its website.
  - (4) Each Permittee is responsible for providing current, updated hotline contact information to the general public within its jurisdiction.
- ii. Organize events targeted to residents and population subgroups to educate and involve the community in storm water and non-storm water pollution prevention and clean-up (e.g., education seminars, clean-ups, and community catch basin stenciling).

**d. Residential Outreach Program**

- i. Working in conjunction with a County-wide or Watershed Group sponsored PIPP or individually, each Permittee shall implement the following activities:

- (1) Conduct storm water pollution prevention public service announcements and advertising campaigns
- (2) Public education materials shall include but are not limited to information on the proper handling (i.e., disposal, storage and/or use) of:
  - (a) Vehicle waste fluids
  - (b) Household waste materials (i.e., trash and household hazardous waste, including personal care products and pharmaceuticals)
  - (c) Construction waste materials
  - (d) Pesticides and fertilizers (including integrated pest management practices [IPM] to promote reduced use of pesticides)
  - (e) Green waste (including lawn clippings and leaves)
  - (f) Animal wastes
- (3) Distribute activity specific storm water pollution prevention public education materials at, but not limited to, the following points of purchase:
  - (a) Automotive parts stores
  - (b) Home improvement centers / lumber yards / hardware stores/paint stores
  - (c) Landscaping / gardening centers
  - (d) Pet shops / feed stores
- (4) Maintain storm water websites or provide links to storm water websites via the Permittee's website, which shall include educational material and opportunities for the public to participate in storm water pollution prevention and clean-up activities listed in Part VI.D.4.
- (5) Provide independent, parochial, and public schools within in each Permittee's jurisdiction with materials to educate school children (K-12) on storm water pollution. Material may include videos, live presentations, and other information. Permittees are encouraged to work with, or leverage, materials produced by other statewide agencies and associations such as the State Water Board's "Erase the Waste" educational program and the California Environmental Education Interagency Network (CEEIN) to implement this requirement.
- (6) When implementing activities in subsections (1)-(5), Permittees shall use effective strategies to educate and involve ethnic communities in storm water pollution prevention through culturally effective methods.

## **6. Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program**

### **a. General**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement an Industrial / Commercial Facilities Program that meets the requirements of this Part VI.D.6. The Industrial / Commercial

Facilities Program shall be designed to prevent illicit discharges into the MS4 and receiving waters, reduce industrial / commercial discharges of storm water to the maximum extent practicable, and prevent industrial / commercial discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of receiving water limitations. At a minimum, the Industrial / Commercial Facilities Program shall be implemented in accordance with the requirements listed in this Part VI.D.6, or as approved in a Watershed Management Program per Part VI.C. Minimum program components shall include the following components:

- (1) Track
- (2) Educate
- (3) Inspect
- (4) Ensure compliance with municipal ordinances at industrial and commercial facilities that are critical sources of pollutants in storm water

**b. Track Critical Industrial / Commercial Sources**

i. Each Permittee shall maintain an updated watershed-based inventory or database containing the latitude / longitude coordinates of all industrial and commercial facilities within its jurisdiction that are critical sources of storm water pollution. The inventory or database shall be maintained in electronic format and incorporation of facility information into a Geographical Information System (GIS) is recommended. Critical Sources to be tracked are summarized below:

- (1) Commercial Facilities
  - (a) Restaurants
  - (b) Automotive service facilities (including those located at automotive dealerships)
  - (c) Retail Gasoline Outlets
  - (d) Nurseries and Nursery Centers (Merchant Wholesalers, Nondurable Goods, and Retail Trade)
- (2) USEPA "Phase I" Facilities [as specified in 40 CFR §122.26(b)(14)(i)-(xi)]
- (3) Other federally-mandated facilities [as specified in 40 CFR §122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C)]
  - (a) Municipal landfills
  - (b) Hazardous waste treatment, disposal, and recovery facilities
  - (c) Industrial facilities subject to section 313 "Toxic Release Inventory" reporting requirements of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA) [42 U.S.C. § 11023]
- (4) All other commercial or industrial facilities that the Permittee determines may contribute a substantial pollutant load to the MS4.

- ii. Each Permittee shall include the following minimum fields of information for each critical source industrial and commercial facility identified in its watershed-based inventory or database:
  - (1) Name of facility
  - (2) Name of owner/ operator and contact information
  - (3) Address of facility (physical and mailing)
  - (4) North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code
  - (5) Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code
  - (6) A narrative description of the activities performed and/or principal products produced
  - (7) Status of exposure of materials to storm water
  - (8) Name of receiving water
  - (9) Identification of whether the facility is tributary to a CWA § 303(d) listed water body segment or water body segment subject to a TMDL, where the facility generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired.
  - (10) Ability to denote if the facility is known to maintain coverage under the State Water Board's General NPDES Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activities (Industrial General Permit) or other individual or general NPDES permits or any applicable waiver issued by the Regional or State Water Board pertaining to storm water discharges.
  - (11) Ability to denote if the facility has filed a No Exposure Certification with the State Water Board.
- iii. Each Permittee shall update its inventory of critical sources at least annually. The update shall be accomplished through collection of new information obtained through field activities or through other readily available inter- and intra-agency informational databases (e.g., business licenses, pretreatment permits, sanitary sewer connection permits, and similar information).

**c. Educate Industrial / Commercial Sources**

- i. At least once during the five-year period of this Order, each Permittee shall notify the owner/operator of each of its inventoried commercial and industrial sites identified in Part VI.D.6.b of the BMP requirements applicable to the site/source.
- ii. Business Assistance Program
  - (1) Each Permittee shall implement a Business Assistance Program to provide technical information to businesses to facilitate their efforts to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water. Assistance shall be targeted to select business sectors or small businesses upon a determination that their activities may be contributing substantial pollutant



loads to the MS4 or receiving water. Assistance may include technical guidance and provision of educational materials. The Program may include:

- (a) On-site technical assistance, telephone, or e-mail consultation regarding the responsibilities of business to reduce the discharge of pollutants, procedural requirements, and available guidance documents.
- (b) Distribution of storm water pollution prevention educational materials to operators of auto repair shops; car wash facilities; restaurants and mobile sources including automobile/equipment repair, washing, or detailing; power washing services; mobile carpet, drape, or upholstery cleaning services; swimming pool, water softener, and spa services; portable sanitary services; and commercial applicators and distributors of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, if present.

**d. Inspect Critical Commercial Sources**

**i. Frequency of Mandatory Commercial Facility Inspections**

Each Permittee shall inspect all commercial facilities identified in Part VI.D.6.b twice during the 5-year term of the Order, provided that the first mandatory compliance inspection occurs no later than 2 years after the effective date of this Order. A minimum interval of 6 months between the first and the second mandatory compliance inspection is required. In addition, each Permittee shall implement the activities outlined in the following subparts.

**ii. Scope of Mandatory Commercial Facility Inspections**

Each Permittee shall inspect all commercial facilities to confirm that storm water and non-storm water BMPs are being effectively implemented in compliance with municipal ordinances. At each facility, inspectors shall verify that the operator is implementing effective source control BMPs for each corresponding activity. Each Permittee shall require implementation of additional BMPs where storm water from the MS4 discharges to a significant ecological area (SEA), a water body subject to TMDL provisions in Part VI.E, or a CWA § 303(d) listed impaired water body. Likewise, for those BMPs that are not adequately protective of water quality standards, a Permittee may require additional site-specific controls.

**e. Inspect Critical Industrial Sources**

Each Permittee shall conduct industrial facility compliance inspections as specified below.

**i. Frequency of Mandatory Industrial Facility Compliance Inspections**

**(1) Minimum Inspection Frequency**

Each Permittee shall perform an initial mandatory compliance inspection at all industrial facilities identified in Part VI.D.6.b no later than 2 years after the effective date of this Order. After the initial inspection, all

facilities that have not filed a No Exposure Certification with the State Water Board are subject to a second mandatory compliance inspection. A minimum interval of 6 months between the first and the second mandatory compliance inspection is required. A facility need not be inspected more than twice during the term of the Order unless subject to an enforcement action as specified in Part VI.D.6.h below.

(2) Exclusion of Facilities Previously Inspected by the Regional Water Board

Each Permittee shall review the State Water Board's Storm Water Multiple Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS) database<sup>24</sup> at defined intervals to determine if an industrial facility has recently been inspected by the Regional Water Board. The first interval shall occur approximately 2 years after the effective date of the Order. The Permittee does not need to inspect the facility if it is determined that the Regional Water Board conducted an inspection of the facility within the prior 24 month period. The second interval shall occur approximately 4 years after the effective date of the Order. Likewise, the Permittee does not need to inspect the facility if it is determined that the Regional Water Board conducted an inspection of the facility within the prior 24 month period.

(3) No Exposure Verification

As a component of the first mandatory inspection, each Permittee shall identify those facilities that have filed a No Exposure Certification with the State Water Board. Approximately 3 to 4 years after the effective date of the Order, each Permittee shall evaluate its inventory of industrial facilities and perform a second mandatory compliance inspection at a minimum of 25% of the facilities identified to have filed a No Exposure Certification. The purpose of this inspection is to verify the continuity of the no exposure status.

(4) Exclusion Based on Watershed Management Program

A Permittee is exempt from the mandatory inspection frequencies listed above if it is implementing industrial inspections in accordance with an approved Watershed Management Program per Part VI.C.

ii. Scope of Mandatory Industrial Facility Inspections

Each Permittee shall confirm that each industrial facility:

- (1) Has a current Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number for coverage under the Industrial General Permit, and that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is available on-site; *or*
- (2) Has applied for, and has received a current No Exposure Certification for facilities subject to this requirement;
- (3) Is effectively implementing BMPs in compliance with municipal ordinances. Facilities must implement the source control BMPs identified

---

<sup>24</sup> SMARTS is accessible at <https://smarts.waterboards.ca.gov/smarts/faces/SwSmartsLogin.jsp>

in Table 10, unless the pollutant generating activity does not occur. The Permittees shall require implementation of additional BMPs where storm water from the MS4 discharges to a water body subject to TMDL Provisions in Part VI.E, or a CWA § 303(d) listed impaired water body. Likewise, if the specified BMPs are not adequately protective of water quality standards, a Permittee may require additional site-specific controls. For critical sources that discharge to MS4s that discharge to SEAs, each Permittee shall require operators to implement additional pollutant-specific controls to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff that are causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality standards.

- (4) Applicable industrial facilities identified as not having either a current WDID or No Exposure Certification shall be notified that they must obtain coverage under the Industrial General Permit and shall be referred to the Regional Water Board per the Progressive Enforcement Policy procedures identified in Part VI.D.2.

**f. Source Control BMPs for Commercial and Industrial Facilities**

Effective source control BMPs for the activities listed in Table 10 shall be implemented at commercial and industrial facilities, unless the pollutant generating activity does not occur:

**Table 10. Source Control BMPs at Commercial and Industrial Facilities**

<b>Pollutant-Generating Activity</b>	<b>BMP Narrative Description</b>
Unauthorized Non-Storm water Discharges	Effective elimination of non-storm water discharges
Accidental Spills/ Leaks	Implementation of effective spills/ leaks prevention and response procedures
Vehicle/ Equipment Fueling	Implementation of effective fueling source control devices and practices
Vehicle/ Equipment Cleaning	Implementation of effective equipment/ vehicle cleaning practices and appropriate wash water management practices
Vehicle/ Equipment Repair	Implementation of effective vehicle/ equipment repair practices and source control devices
Outdoor Liquid Storage	Implementation of effective outdoor liquid storage source controls and practices
Outdoor Equipment Operations	Implementation of effective outdoor equipment source control devices and practices
Outdoor Storage of Raw Materials	Implementation of effective source control practices and structural devices
Storage and Handling of Solid Waste	Implementation of effective solid waste storage/ handling practices and appropriate control measures
Building and Grounds Maintenance	Implementation of effective facility maintenance practices

<b>Pollutant-Generating Activity</b>	<b>BMP Narrative Description</b>
Parking/ Storage Area Maintenance	Implementation of effective parking/ storage area designs and housekeeping/ maintenance practices
Storm water Conveyance System Maintenance Practices	Implementation of proper conveyance system operation and maintenance protocols
<b>Pollutant-Generating Activity</b>	<b>BMP Narrative Description from Regional Water Board Resolution No. 98-08</b>
Sidewalk Washing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove trash, debris, and free standing oil/grease spills/leaks (use absorbent material, if necessary) from the area before washing; and</li> <li>2. Use high pressure, low volume spray washing using only potable water with no cleaning agents at an average usage of 0.006 gallons per square feet of sidewalk area.</li> </ol>
Street Washing	Collect and divert wash water to the sanitary sewer – publically owned treatment works (POTW). Note: POTW approval may be needed.

**g. Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs)**

See VI.D.6.e.ii.3.

**h. Progressive Enforcement**

Each Permittee shall implement its Progressive Enforcement Policy to ensure that Industrial / Commercial facilities are brought into compliance with all storm water requirements within a reasonable time period. See Part VI.D.2 for requirements for the development and implementation of a Progressive Enforcement Policy.

**7. Planning and Land Development Program**

**a. Purpose**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement a Planning and Land Development Program pursuant to Part VI.D.7.b for all New Development and Redevelopment projects subject to this Order to:
  - (1) Lessen the water quality impacts of development by using smart growth practices such as compact development, directing development towards existing communities via infill or redevelopment, and safeguarding of environmentally sensitive areas.
  - (2) Minimize the adverse impacts from storm water runoff on the biological integrity of Natural Drainage Systems and the beneficial uses of water

bodies in accordance with requirements under CEQA (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.).

- (3) Minimize the percentage of impervious surfaces on land developments by minimizing soil compaction during construction, designing projects to minimize the impervious area footprint, and employing Low Impact Development (LID) design principles to mimic predevelopment hydrology through infiltration, evapotranspiration and rainfall harvest and use.
- (4) Maintain existing riparian buffers and enhance riparian buffers when possible.
- (5) Minimize pollutant loadings from impervious surfaces such as roof tops, parking lots, and roadways through the use of properly designed, technically appropriate BMPs (including Source Control BMPs such as good housekeeping practices), LID Strategies, and Treatment Control BMPs.
- (6) Properly select, design and maintain LID and Hydromodification Control BMPs to address pollutants that are likely to be generated, reduce changes to pre-development hydrology, assure long-term function, and avoid the breeding of vectors<sup>25</sup>.
- (7) Prioritize the selection of BMPs to remove storm water pollutants, reduce storm water runoff volume, and beneficially use storm water to support an integrated approach to protecting water quality and managing water resources in the following order of preference:
  - (a) On-site infiltration, bioretention and/or rainfall harvest and use.
  - (b) On-site biofiltration, off-site ground water replenishment, and/or off-site retrofit.

## **b. Applicability**

### **i. New Development Projects**

- (1) Development projects subject to Permittee conditioning and approval for the design and implementation of post-construction controls to mitigate storm water pollution, prior to completion of the project(s), are:
  - (a) All development projects equal to 1 acre or greater of disturbed area and adding more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area
  - (b) Industrial parks 10,000 square feet or more of surface area
  - (c) Commercial malls 10,000 square feet or more surface area
  - (d) Retail gasoline outlets 5,000 square feet or more of surface area
  - (e) Restaurants (SIC 5812) 5,000 square feet or more of surface area

---

<sup>25</sup> Treatment BMPs when designed to drain within 96 hours of the end of rainfall minimize the potential for the breeding of vectors. See California Department of Public Health *Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California* (2012) at <http://www.westnile.ca.gov/resources.php>

- (f) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area, or with 25 or more parking spaces
- (g) Street and road construction of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area shall follow USEPA guidance regarding Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets<sup>26</sup> (December 2008 EPA-833-F-08-009) to the maximum extent practicable. Street and road construction applies to standalone streets, roads, highways, and freeway projects, and also applies to streets within larger projects.
- (h) Automotive service facilities (SIC 5013, 5014, 5511, 5541, 7532-7534 and 7536-7539) 5,000 square feet or more of surface area
- (i) Redevelopment projects in subject categories that meet Redevelopment thresholds identified in Part VI.D.6.b.ii (Redevelopment Projects) below
- (j) Projects located in or directly adjacent to, or discharging directly to a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), where the development will:
  - (i) Discharge storm water runoff that is likely to impact a sensitive biological species or habitat; and
  - (ii) Create 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface area
- (k) Single-family hillside homes. To the extent that a Permittee may lawfully impose conditions, mitigation measures or other requirements on the development or construction of a single-family home in a hillside area as defined in the applicable Permittee's Code and Ordinances, each Permittee shall require that during the construction of a single-family hillside home, the following measures are implemented:
  - (i) Conserve natural areas
  - (ii) Protect slopes and channels
  - (iii) Provide storm drain system stenciling and signage
  - (iv) Divert roof runoff to vegetated areas before discharge unless the diversion would result in slope instability
  - (v) Direct surface flow to vegetated areas before discharge unless the diversion would result in slope instability.

## ii. Redevelopment Projects

- (1) Redevelopment projects subject to Permittee conditioning and approval for the design and implementation of post-construction controls to mitigate storm water pollution, prior to completion of the project(s), are:
  - (a) Land-disturbing activity that results in the creation or addition or replacement of 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://water.epa.gov/infrastructure/greeninfrastructure/index.cfm>

on an already developed site on development categories identified in Part VI.D.6.c. (New Development/Redevelopment Performance Criteria).

- (b) Where Redevelopment results in an alteration to more than fifty percent of impervious surfaces of a previously existing development, and the existing development was not subject to post-construction storm water quality control requirements, the entire project must be mitigated.
- (c) Where Redevelopment results in an alteration of less than fifty percent of impervious surfaces of a previously existing development, and the existing development was not subject to post-construction storm water quality control requirements, only the alteration must be mitigated, and not the entire development.
  - (i) Redevelopment does not include routine maintenance activities that are conducted to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, original purpose of facility or emergency redevelopment activity required to protect public health and safety. Impervious surface replacement, such as the reconstruction of parking lots and roadways which does not disturb additional area and maintains the original grade and alignment, is considered a routine maintenance activity. Redevelopment does not include the repaving of existing roads to maintain original line and grade.
  - (ii) Existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures are exempt from the Redevelopment requirements unless such projects create, add, or replace 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area.
- (d) In this section, Existing Development or Redevelopment projects shall mean all discretionary permit projects or project phases that have not been deemed complete for processing, or discretionary permit projects without vesting tentative maps that have not requested and received an extension of previously granted approvals within 90 days of adoption of the Order. Projects that have been deemed complete within 90 days of adoption of the Order are not subject to the requirements Section 7.c. For Permittee's projects the effective date shall be the date the governing body or their designee approves initiation of the project design.
- (e) Specifically, the Newhall Ranch Project Phases I and II (a.k.a. the Landmark and Mission Village projects) are deemed to be an existing development that will at a minimum, be designed to comply with the Specific LID Performance Standards attached to the Waste Discharge Requirements (Order No. R4-2012-0139). All subsequent phases of the Newhall Ranch Project constructed during the term of this Order shall be subject to the requirements of this Order.

**c. New Development/ Redevelopment Project Performance Criteria**

**i. Integrated Water Quality/Flow Reduction/Resources Management Criteria**

- (1) Each Permittee shall require all New Development and Redevelopment projects (referred to hereinafter as “new projects”) identified in Part VI.D.7.b to control pollutants, pollutant loads, and runoff volume emanating from the project site by: (1) minimizing the impervious surface area and (2) controlling runoff from impervious surfaces through infiltration, bioretention and/or rainfall harvest and use.
- (2) Except as provided in Part VI.D.7.c.ii. (Technical Infeasibility or Opportunity for Regional Ground Water Replenishment), Part VI.D.7.d.i (Local Ordinance Equivalence), or Part VI.D.7.c.v (Hydromodification), below, each Permittee shall require the project to retain on-site the Stormwater Quality Design Volume (SWQDv) defined as the runoff from:
  - (a) The 0.75-inch, 24-hour rain event or
  - (b) The 85th percentile, 24-hour rain event, as determined from the Los Angeles County 85th percentile precipitation isohyetal map, *whichever is greater*.
- (3) Bioretention and biofiltration systems shall meet the design specifications provided in Attachment H to this Order unless otherwise approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.
- (4) When evaluating the potential for on-site retention, each Permittee shall consider the maximum potential for evapotranspiration from green roofs and rainfall harvest and use.

**ii. Alternative Compliance for Technical Infeasibility or Opportunity for Regional Ground Water Replenishment**

- (1) In instances of technical infeasibility or where a project has been determined to provide an opportunity to replenish regional ground water supplies at an offsite location, each Permittee may allow projects to comply with this Order through the alternative compliance measures as described in Part VI.D.7.c.iii.
- (2) To demonstrate technical infeasibility, the project applicant must demonstrate that the project cannot reliably retain 100 percent of the SWQDv on-site, even with the maximum application of green roofs and rainwater harvest and use, and that compliance with the applicable post-construction requirements would be technically infeasible by submitting a site-specific hydrologic and/or design analysis conducted and endorsed by a registered professional engineer, geologist, architect, and/or landscape architect. Technical infeasibility may result from conditions including the following:
  - (a) The infiltration rate of saturated in-situ soils is less than 0.3 inch per hour and it is not technically feasible to amend the in-situ soils to attain an infiltration rate necessary to achieve reliable performance of infiltration or bioretention BMPs in retaining the SWQDv on-site.



- (b) Locations where seasonal high ground water is within 5 to 10 feet of the surface,
  - (c) Locations within 100 feet of a ground water well used for drinking water,
  - (d) Brownfield development sites where infiltration poses a risk of causing pollutant mobilization,
  - (e) Other locations where pollutant mobilization is a documented concern<sup>27</sup>,
  - (f) Locations with potential geotechnical hazards, or
  - (g) Smart growth and infill or redevelopment locations where the density and/ or nature of the project would create significant difficulty for compliance with the on-site volume retention requirement.
- (3) To utilize alternative compliance measures to replenish ground water at an offsite location, the project applicant shall demonstrate (i) why it is not advantageous to replenish ground water at the project site, (ii) that ground water can be used for beneficial purposes at the offsite location, and (iii) that the alternative measures shall also provide equal or greater water quality benefits to the receiving surface water than the Water Quality/Flow Reduction/Resource Management Criteria in Part VI.7.D.c.i.

**iii. Alternative Compliance Measures**

When a Permittee determines a project applicant has demonstrated that it is technically infeasible to retain 100 percent of the SWQDv on-site, or is proposing an alternative offsite project to replenish regional ground water supplies, the Permittee shall require one of the following mitigation options:

(1) On-site Biofiltration

- (a) If using biofiltration due to demonstrated technical infeasibility, then the new project must biofiltrate 1.5 times the portion of the SWQDv that is not reliably retained on-site, as calculated by Equation 1 below.

Equation 1:

$$B_v = 1.5 * [SWQD_v - R_v]$$

Where:

B<sub>v</sub> = biofiltration volume

---

<sup>27</sup> Pollutant mobilization is considered a documented concern at or near properties that are contaminated or store hazardous substances underground.

SWQDv = the storm water runoff from a 0.75 inch, 24-hour storm or the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm, *whichever is greater*.

Rv = volume reliably retained on-site

(b) Conditions for On-site Biofiltration

- (i) Biofiltration systems shall meet the design specifications provided in Attachment H to this Order unless otherwise approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.
- (ii) Biofiltration systems discharging to a receiving water that is included on the Clean Water Act section 303(d) list of impaired water quality-limited water bodies due to nitrogen compounds or related effects shall be designed and maintained to achieve enhanced nitrogen removal capability. See Attachment H for design criteria for underdrain placement to achieve enhanced nitrogen removal.

(2) Offsite Infiltration

- (a) Use infiltration or bioretention BMPs to intercept a volume of storm water runoff equal to the SWQDv, less the volume of storm water runoff reliably retained on-site, at an approved offsite project, and
- (b) Provide pollutant reduction (treatment) of the storm water runoff discharged from the project site in accordance with the Water Quality Mitigation Criteria provided in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.
- (c) The required offsite mitigation volume shall be calculated by Equation 2 below and equal to:

Equation 2:

$$Mv = 1.0 * [SWQDv - Rv]$$

Where:

Mv = mitigation volume

SWQDv = runoff from the 0.75 inch, 24-hour storm event or the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm, *whichever is greater*

Rv = the volume of storm water runoff reliably retained on-site.

(3) Ground Water Replenishment Projects

Permittees may propose, in their Watershed Management Program or EWMP, regional projects to replenish regional ground water supplies at offsite locations, provided the groundwater supply has a designated beneficial use in the Basin Plan.

- (a) Regional groundwater replenishment projects must use infiltration, ground water replenishment, or bioretention BMPs to intercept a volume of storm water runoff equal to the SWQDv for new development and redevelopment projects, subject to Permittee conditioning and approval for the design and implementation of post-construction controls, within the approved project area, and
- (b) Provide pollutant reduction (treatment) of the storm water runoff discharged from development projects, within the project area, subject to Permittee conditioning and approval for the design and implementation of post-construction controls to mitigate storm water pollution in accordance with the Water Quality Mitigation Criteria provided in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.
- (c) Permittees implementing a regional ground water replenishment project in lieu of onsite controls shall ensure the volume of runoff captured by the project shall be equal to:

Equation 2:

$$Mv = 1.0 * [SWQDv - Rv]$$

Where:

Mv = mitigation volume

SWQDv = runoff from the 0.75 inch, 24-hour storm event or the 85th percentile storm, whichever is greater

Rv = the volume of storm water runoff reliably retained on-site.

- (d) Regional groundwater replenishment projects shall be located in the same sub-watershed (defined as draining to the same HUC-12 hydrologic area in the Basin Plan) as the new development or redevelopment projects which did not implement on site retention BMPs . Each Permittee may consider locations outside of the HUC-12 but within the HUC-10 subwatershed area if there are no opportunities within the HUC-12 subwatershed or if greater pollutant reductions and/or ground water replenishment can be achieved at a location within the expanded HUC-10 subwatershed. The use of a mitigation, ground water replenishment, or retrofit project outside of the HUC-12 subwatershed is subject to the approval of the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board.

#### (4) Offsite Project - Retrofit Existing Development

Use infiltration, bioretention, rainfall harvest and use and/or biofiltration BMPs to retrofit an existing development, with similar land uses as the new development or land uses associated with comparable or higher storm water runoff event mean concentrations (EMCs) than the new development.

Comparison of EMCs for different land uses shall be based on published data from studies performed in southern California. The retrofit plan shall be designed and constructed to:

- (a) Intercept a volume of storm water runoff equal to the mitigation volume ( $M_v$ ) as described above in Equation 2, except biofiltration BMPs shall be designed to meet the biofiltration volume as described in Equation 1 and
- (b) Provide pollutant reduction (treatment) of the storm water runoff from the project site as described in the Water Quality Mitigation Criteria provided in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.

(5) Conditions for Offsite Projects

- (a) Project applicants seeking to utilize these alternative compliance provisions may propose other offsite projects, which the Permittees may approve if they meet the requirements of this subpart.
- (b) Location of offsite projects. Offsite projects shall be located in the same sub-watershed (defined as draining to the same HUC-12 hydrologic area in the Basin Plan) as the new development or redevelopment project. Each Permittee may consider locations outside of the HUC-12 but within the HUC-10 subwatershed area if there are no opportunities within the HUC-12 subwatershed or if greater pollutant reductions and/or ground water replenishment can be achieved at a location within the expanded HUC-10 subwatershed. The use of a mitigation, ground water replenishment, or retrofit project outside of the HUC-12 subwatershed is subject to the approval of the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board.
- (c) Project applicant must demonstrate that equal benefits to ground water recharge cannot be met on the project site.
- (d) Each Permittee shall develop a prioritized list of offsite mitigation, ground water replenishment and/or retrofit projects, and when feasible, the mitigation must be directed to the highest priority project within the same HUC-12 or if approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, the HUC-10 drainage area, as the new development project.
- (e) Infiltration/bioretenion shall be the preferred LID BMP for offsite mitigation or ground water replenishment projects. Offsite retrofit projects may include green streets, parking lot retrofits, green roofs, and rainfall harvest and use. Biofiltration BMPs may be considered for retrofit projects when infiltration, bioretention or rainfall harvest and use is technically infeasible.
- (f) Each Permittee shall develop a schedule for the completion of offsite projects, including milestone dates to identify, fund, design, and construct the projects. Offsite projects shall be completed as soon as possible, and at the latest, within 4 years of the certificate of occupancy for the first project that contributed funds toward the

construction of the offsite project, unless a longer period is otherwise authorized by the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board. For public offsite projects, each Permittee must provide in their annual reports a summary of total offsite project funds raised to date and a description (including location, general design concept, volume of water expected to be retained, and total estimated budget) of all pending public offsite projects. Funding sufficient to address the offsite volume must be transferred to the Permittee (for public offsite mitigation projects) or to an escrow account (for private offsite mitigation projects) within one year of the initiation of construction.

- (g) Offsite projects must be approved by the Permittee and may be subject to approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, if a third-party petitions the Executive Officer to review the project. Offsite projects will be publicly noticed on the Regional Water Board's website for 30 days prior to approval.
- (h) The project applicant must perform the offsite projects as approved by either the Permittee or the Regional Water Board Executive Officer or provide sufficient funding for public or private offsite projects to achieve the equivalent mitigation storm water volume.

#### (6) Regional Storm Water Mitigation Program

A Permittee or Permittee group may apply to the Regional Water Board for approval of a regional or sub-regional storm water mitigation program to substitute in part or wholly for New and Redevelopment requirements for the area covered by the regional or sub-regional storm water mitigation program. Upon review and a determination by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer that the proposal is technically valid and appropriate, the Regional Water Board may consider for approval such a program if its implementation meets all of the following requirements:

- (a) Retains the runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour rain event or the 0.75 inch, 24-hour rain event, whichever is greater;
- (b) Results in improved storm water quality;
- (c) Protects stream habitat;
- (d) Promotes cooperative problem solving by diverse interests;
- (e) Is fiscally sustainable and has secure funding; and
- (f) Is completed in five years including the construction and start-up of treatment facilities.
- (g) Nothing in this provision shall be construed as to delay the implementation of requirements for new and redevelopment, as approved in this Order.

#### (7) Water Quality Mitigation Criteria

- (a) Each Permittee shall require all New Development and Redevelopment projects that have been approved for offsite mitigation or ground water replenishment projects as defined in Part VI.D.7.c.ii-iii to also provide treatment of storm water runoff from the project site. Each Permittee shall require these projects to design and implement post-construction storm water BMPs and control measures to reduce pollutant loading as necessary to:
  - (i) Meet the pollutant specific benchmarks listed in Table 11 at the treatment systems outlet or prior to the discharge to the MS4, and
  - (ii) Ensure that the discharge does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards at the Permittee’s downstream MS4 outfall.
- (b) Each Permittee may allow the project proponent to install flow-through modular treatment systems including sand filters, or other proprietary BMP treatment systems with a demonstrated efficiency at least equivalent to a sand filter. The sizing of the flow through treatment device shall be based on a rainfall intensity of:
  - (i) 0.2 inches per hour, or
  - (ii) The one year, one-hour rainfall intensity as determined from the most recent Los Angeles County isohyetal map, *whichever is greater*.

**Table 11. Benchmarks Applicable to New Development Treatment BMPs<sup>28</sup>**

Conventional Pollutants

Pollutant	Suspended Solids mg/L	Total P mg/L	Total N mg/L		TKN mg/L	
Effluent Concentration	14	0.13	1.28		1.09	

Metals

Pollutant	Total Cd µg/L	Total Cu µg/L	Total Cr µg/L	Total Pb µg/L	Total Zn µg/L
Effluent Concentration	0.3	6	2.8	2.5	23

<sup>28</sup> The treatment control BMP performance benchmarks were developed from the median effluent water quality values of the six highest performing BMPs, per pollutant, in the storm water BMP database (<http://www.bmpdatabase.org/>, last visited September 25, 2012).

- (c) In addition to the requirements for controlling pollutant discharges as described in Part VI.D.7.c.iii. and the treatment benchmarks described above, each Permittee shall ensure that the new development or redevelopment will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality-based effluent limitations established in Part VI.E pursuant to Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).

**iv. Hydromodification (Flow/ Volume/ Duration) Control Criteria**

Each Permittee shall require all New Development and Redevelopment projects located within natural drainage systems as described in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.(1)(a)(iii) to implement hydrologic control measures, to prevent accelerated downstream erosion and to protect stream habitat in natural drainage systems. The purpose of the hydrologic controls is to minimize changes in post-development hydrologic storm water runoff discharge rates, velocities, and duration. This shall be achieved by maintaining the project's pre-project storm water runoff flow rates and durations.

**(1) Description**

- (a) Hydromodification control in natural drainage systems shall be achieved by maintaining the Erosion Potential (Ep) in streams at a value of 1, unless an alternative value can be shown to be protective of the natural drainage systems from erosion, incision, and sedimentation that can occur as a result of flow increases from impervious surfaces and prevent damage to stream habitat in natural drainage system tributaries (see Attachment J - Determination of Erosion Potential).
- (ii) Hydromodification control may include one, or a combination of on-site, regional or sub-regional hydromodification control BMPs, LID strategies, or stream and riparian buffer restoration measures. Any in-stream restoration measure shall not adversely affect the beneficial uses of the natural drainage systems.
- (iii) Natural drainage systems that are subject to the hydromodification assessments and controls as described in this Part of the Order, include all drainages that have not been improved (e.g., channelized or armored with concrete, shotcrete, or rip-rap) or drainage systems that are tributary to a natural drainage system, except as provided in Part VI.D.7c.iv.(1)(b)--Exemptions to Hydromodification Controls [see below]. The clearing or dredging of a natural drainage system does not constitute an "improvement."
- (iv) Until the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board adopts a final Hydromodification Policy or criteria, Permittees shall implement the Hydromodification Control Criteria described in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.(1)(c) to control the potential adverse impacts of changes in hydrology that may result from new development and

redevelopment projects located within natural drainage systems as described in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.(1)(a)(iii).

- (b) Exemptions to Hydromodification Controls. Permittees may exempt the following New Development and Redevelopment projects from implementation of hydromodification controls where assessments of downstream channel conditions and proposed discharge hydrology indicate that adverse hydromodification effects to beneficial uses of Natural Drainage Systems are unlikely:
- (i) Projects that are replacement, maintenance or repair of a Permittee's existing flood control facility, storm drain, or transportation network.
  - (ii) Redevelopment Projects in the Urban Core that do not increase the effective impervious area or decrease the infiltration capacity of pervious areas compared to the pre-project conditions.
  - (iii) Projects that have any increased discharge directly or via a storm drain to a sump, lake, area under tidal influence, into a waterway that has a 100-year peak flow (Q100) of 25,000 cfs or more, or other receiving water that is not susceptible to hydromodification impacts.
  - (iv) Projects that discharge directly or via a storm drain into concrete or otherwise engineered (not natural) channels (e.g., channelized or armored with rip rap, shotcrete, etc.), which, in turn, discharge into receiving water that is not susceptible to hydromodification impacts (as in Parts VI.D.7.c.iv.(1)(b)(i)-(iii) above).
  - (v) LID BMPs implemented on single family homes are sufficient to comply with Hydromodification criteria.
- (c) Hydromodification Control Criteria. The Hydromodification Control Criteria to protect natural drainage systems are as follows:
- (i) Except as provided for in Part VI.D.7.c.iv.(1)(b), projects disturbing an area greater than 1 acre but less than 50 acres within natural drainage systems will be presumed to meet pre-development hydrology if one of the following demonstrations is made:
    1. The project is designed to retain on-site, through infiltration, evapotranspiration, and/or harvest and use, the storm water volume from the runoff of the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm, or
    2. The runoff flow rate, volume, velocity, and duration for the post-development condition do not exceed the pre-development condition for the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall event. This condition may be substantiated by simple screening models, including those described in *Hydromodification Effects on Flow Peaks*



*and Durations in Southern California Urbanizing Watersheds* (Hawley et al., 2011) or other models acceptable to the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board, or

3. The Erosion Potential ( $E_p$ ) in the receiving water channel will approximate 1, as determined by a Hydromodification Analysis Study and the equation presented in Attachment J. Alternatively, Permittees can opt to use other work equations to calculate Erosion Potential with Executive Officer approval.
- (ii) Projects disturbing 50 acres or more within natural drainage systems will be presumed to meet pre-development hydrology based on the successful demonstration of one of the following conditions:
1. The site infiltrates on-site at least the runoff from a 2-year, 24-hour storm event, or
  2. The runoff flow rate, volume, velocity, and duration for the post-development condition does not exceed the pre-development condition for the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall events. These conditions must be substantiated by hydrologic modeling acceptable to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, or
  3. The Erosion Potential ( $E_p$ ) in the receiving water channel will approximate 1, as determined by a Hydromodification Analysis Study and the equation presented in Attachment J.

(c) Alternative Hydromodification Criteria

- (i) Permittees may satisfy the requirement for Hydromodification Controls by implementing the hydromodification requirements in the County of Los Angeles Low Impact Development Manual (2009) for all projects disturbing an area greater than 1 acre within natural drainage systems.
- (ii) Each Permittee may alternatively develop and implement watershed specific Hydromodification Control Plans (HCPs). Such plans shall be developed no later than one year after the effective date of this Order.
- (iii) The HCP shall identify:
  1. Stream classifications
  2. Flow rate and duration control methods
  3. Sub-watershed mitigation strategies
  4. Stream and/or riparian buffer restoration measures, which will maintain the stream and tributary Erosion Potential at 1 unless

an alternative value can be shown to be protective of the natural drainage systems from erosion, incision, and sedimentation that can occur as a result of flow increases from impervious surfaces and prevent damage to stream habitat in natural drainage system tributaries.

(iv) The HCP shall contain the following elements:

1. Hydromodification Management Standards
2. Natural Drainage Areas and Hydromodification Management Control Areas
3. New Development and Redevelopment Projects subject to the HCP
4. Description of authorized Hydromodification Management Control BMPs
5. Hydromodification Management Control BMP Design Criteria
6. For flow duration control methods, the range of flows to control for, and goodness of fit criteria
7. Allowable low critical flow,  $Q_c$ , which initiates sediment transport
8. Description of the approved Hydromodification Model
9. Any alternate Hydromodification Management Model and Design
10. Stream Restoration Measures Design Criteria
11. Monitoring and Effectiveness Assessment
12. Record Keeping
13. The HCP shall be deemed in effect upon Executive Officer approval.

**v. Watershed Equivalence.**

Regardless of the methods through which Permittees allow project applicants to implement alternative compliance measures, the subwatershed-wide (defined as draining to the same HUC-12 hydrologic area in the Basin Plan) result of all development must be at least the same level of water quality protection as would have been achieved if all projects utilizing these alternative compliance provisions had complied with Part VI.D.7.c.i (Integrated Water Quality/Flow Reduction/Resource Management Criteria).

**vi. Annual Report**

Each Permittee shall provide in their annual report to the Regional Water Board a list of mitigation project descriptions and estimated pollutant and flow reduction analyses (compiled from design specifications submitted by project

applicants and approved by the Permittee(s)). Within 4 years of Order adoption, Permittees must submit in their Annual Report, a comparison of the expected aggregate results of alternative compliance projects to the results that would otherwise have been achieved by retaining on site the SWQDv.

#### **d. Implementation**

##### **i. Local Ordinance Equivalence**

A Permittee that has adopted a local LID ordinance prior to the adoption of this Order, and which includes a retention requirement numerically equal to the 0.75-inch, 24-hour rain event or the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour rain event, whichever is greater, may submit documentation to the Regional Water Board that the alternative requirements in the local ordinance will provide equal or greater reduction in storm water discharge pollutant loading and volume as would have been obtained through strict conformance with Part VI.D.7.c.i. (Integrated Water Quality/Flow Reduction Resources Management Criteria) or Part VI.D.7.c.ii. (Alternative Compliance Measures for Technical Infeasibility or Opportunity for Regional Ground water Replenishment) of this Order and, if applicable, Part VI.D.7.c.iv. (Hydromodification (Flow/Volume Duration) Control Criteria).

- (1) Documentation shall be submitted within 180 days after the effective date of this Order.
- (2) The Regional Water Board shall provide public notice of the proposed equivalency determination and a minimum 30-day period for public comment. After review and consideration of public comments, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer will determine whether implementation of the local ordinance provides equivalent pollutant control to the applicable provisions of this Order. Local ordinances that do not strictly conform to the provisions of this Order must be approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer as being “equivalent” in effect to the applicable provisions of this Order in order to substitute for the requirements in Parts VI.D.7.c.i and, where applicable, VI.D.7.c.iv.
- (3) Where the Regional Water Board Executive Officer determines that a Permittee’s local LID ordinance does not provide equivalent pollutant control, the Permittee shall either
  - (a) Require conformance with Parts VI.D.7.c.i and, where applicable, VI.D.7.c.iv, or
  - (b) Update its local ordinance to conform to the requirements herein within two years of the effective date of this Order.

##### **ii. Project Coordination**

- (1) Each Permittee shall facilitate a process for effective approval of post-construction storm water control measures. The process shall include:
  - (a) Detailed LID site design and BMP review including BMP sizing calculations, BMP pollutant removal performance, and municipal approval; and

- (b) An established structure for communication and delineated authority between and among municipal departments that have jurisdiction over project review, plan approval, and project construction through memoranda of understanding or an equivalent agreement.

**iii. Maintenance Agreement and Transfer**

- (1) Prior to issuing approval for final occupancy, each Permittee shall require that all new development and redevelopment projects subject to post-construction BMP requirements, with the exception of simple LID BMPs implemented on single family residences, provide an operation and maintenance plan, monitoring plan, where required, and verification of ongoing maintenance provisions for LID practices, Treatment Control BMPs, and Hydromodification Control BMPs including but not limited to: final map conditions, legal agreements, covenants, conditions or restrictions, CEQA mitigation requirements, conditional use permits, and/or other legally binding maintenance agreements. Permittees shall require maintenance records be kept on site for treatment BMPs implemented on single family residences.
  - (a) Verification at a minimum shall include the developer's signed statement accepting responsibility for maintenance until the responsibility is legally transferred; and either:
    - (i) A signed statement from the public entity assuming responsibility for BMP maintenance; or
    - (ii) Written conditions in the sales or lease agreement, which require the property owner or tenant to assume responsibility for BMP maintenance and conduct a maintenance inspection at least once a year; or
    - (iii) Written text in project covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CCRs) for residential properties assigning BMP maintenance responsibilities to the Home Owners Association; or
    - (iv) Any other legally enforceable agreement or mechanism that assigns responsibility for the maintenance of BMPs.
  - (b) Each Permittee shall require all development projects subject to post-construction BMP requirements to provide a plan for the operation and maintenance of all structural and treatment controls. The plan shall be submitted for examination of relevance to keeping the BMPs in proper working order. Where BMPs are transferred to Permittee for ownership and maintenance, the plan shall also include all relevant costs for upkeep of BMPs in the transfer. Operation and Maintenance plans for private BMPs shall be kept on-site for periodic review by Permittee inspectors.

**iv. Tracking, Inspection, and Enforcement of Post-Construction BMPs**

- (1) Each Permittee shall implement a tracking system and an inspection and enforcement program for new development and redevelopment post-construction storm water no later than 60 days after Order adoption date.
  - (a) Implement a GIS or other electronic system for tracking projects that have been conditioned for post-construction BMPs. The electronic system, at a minimum, should contain the following information:
    - (i) Municipal Project ID
    - (ii) State WDID No.
    - (iii) Project Acreage
    - (iv) BMP Type and Description
    - (v) BMP Location (coordinates)
    - (vi) Date of Acceptance
    - (vii) Date of Maintenance Agreement
    - (viii) Maintenance Records
    - (ix) Inspection Date and Summary
    - (x) Corrective Action
    - (xi) Date Certificate of Occupancy Issued
    - (xii) Replacement or Repair Date
  - (b) Inspect all development sites upon completion of construction and prior to the issuance of occupancy certificates to ensure proper installation of LID measures, structural BMPs, treatment control BMPs and hydromodification control BMPs. The inspection may be combined with other inspections provided it is conducted by trained personnel.
  - (c) Verify proper maintenance and operation of post-construction BMPs previously approved for new development and redevelopment and operated by the Permittee. The post-construction BMP maintenance inspection program shall incorporate the following elements:
    - (i) The development of a Post-construction BMP Maintenance Inspection checklist
    - (ii) Inspection at least once every 2 years after project completion, of post-construction BMPs to assess operation conditions with particular attention to criteria and procedures for post-construction

treatment control and hydromodification control BMP repair, replacement, or re-vegetation.

- (d) For post-construction BMPs operated and maintained by parties other than the Permittee, the Permittee shall require the other parties to document proper maintenance and operations.
- (e) Undertake enforcement action per the established Progressive Enforcement Policy as appropriate based on the results of the inspection. See Part VI.D.2 for requirements for the development and implementation of a Progressive Enforcement Policy.

## **8. Development Construction Program**

- a.** Each Permittee shall develop, implement, and enforce a construction program that:
  - i.** Prevents illicit construction-related discharges of pollutants into the MS4 and receiving waters.
  - ii.** Implements and maintains structural and non-structural BMPs to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff from construction sites.
  - iii.** Reduces construction site discharges of pollutants to the MS4 to the MEP.
  - iv.** Prevents construction site discharges to the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.
- b.** Each Permittee shall establish for its jurisdiction an enforceable erosion and sediment control ordinance for all construction sites that disturb soil.

### **c. Applicability**

The provisions contained in Part VI.D.8.d below apply exclusively to construction sites less than 1 acre. Provisions contained in Part VI.D.8.e – j, apply exclusively to construction sites 1 acre or greater. The requirements contained in this part apply to all activities involving soil disturbance with the exception of agricultural activities. Activities covered by this permit include but are not limited to grading, vegetation clearing, soil compaction, paving, re-paving and linear underground/overhead projects (LUPs).

### **d. Requirements for Construction Sites Less than One Acre**

- i.** For construction sites less than 1 acre, each Permittee shall:
  - (1) Through the use of the Permittee's erosion and sediment control ordinance or and/or building permit, require the implementation of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs from Table 12 to prevent erosion and sediment loss, and the discharge of construction wastes.

**Table 12. Applicable Set of BMPs for All Construction Sites**

<b>Erosion Controls</b>	Scheduling
	Preservation of Existing Vegetation
<b>Sediment Controls</b>	Silt Fence
	Sand Bag Barrier
	Stabilized Construction Site Entrance/Exit
<b>Non-Storm Water Management</b>	Water Conservation Practices
	Dewatering Operations
<b>Waste Management</b>	Material Delivery and Storage
	Stockpile Management
	Spill Prevention and Control
	Solid Waste Management
	Concrete Waste Management
	Sanitary/Septic Waste Management

- (2) Possess the ability to identify all construction sites with soil disturbing activities that require a permit, regardless of size, and shall be able to provide a list of permitted sites upon request of the Regional Water Board. Permittees may use existing permit databases or other tracking systems to comply with these requirements.
  - (3) Inspect construction sites on as needed based on the evaluation of the factors that are a threat to water quality. In evaluating the threat to water quality, the following factors shall be considered: soil erosion potential; site slope; project size and type; sensitivity of receiving water bodies; proximity to receiving water bodies; non-storm water discharges; past record of non-compliance by the operators of the construction site; and any water quality issues relevant to the particular MS4.
  - (4) Implement the Permittee’s Progressive Enforcement Policy to ensure that construction sites are brought into compliance with the erosion and sediment control ordinance within a reasonable time period. See Part VI.D.2 for requirements for the development and implementation of a Progressive Enforcement Policy.
- e. Each Permittee shall require operators of public and private construction sites within its jurisdiction to select, install, implement, and maintain BMPs that comply with its erosion and sediment control ordinance.
  - f. The requirements contained in this part apply to all activities involving soil disturbance with the exception of agricultural activities. Activities covered by this permit include but are not limited to grading, vegetation clearing, soil compaction, paving, re-paving and linear underground/overhead projects (LUPs).
  - g. Construction Site Inventory / Electronic Tracking System**



- i. Each Permittee shall use an electronic system to inventory grading permits, encroachment permits, demolition permits, building permits, or construction permits (and any other municipal authorization to move soil and/ or construct or destruct that involves land disturbance) issued by the Permittee. To satisfy this requirement, the use of a database or GIS system is recommended.
- ii. Each Permittee shall complete an inventory and continuously update as new sites are permitted and sites are completed. The inventory / tracking system shall contain, at a minimum:
  - (1) Relevant contact information for each project (e.g., name, address, phone, email, etc. for the owner and contractor.
  - (2) The basic site information including location, status, size of the project and area of disturbance.
  - (3) The proximity all water bodies, water bodies listed as impaired by sediment-related pollutants, and water bodies for which a sediment-related TMDL has been adopted and approved by USEPA.
  - (4) Significant threat to water quality status, based on consideration of factors listed in Appendix 1 to the Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit).
  - (5) Current construction phase where feasible.
  - (6) The required inspection frequency.
  - (7) The project start date and anticipated completion date.
  - (8) Whether the project has submitted a Notice of Intent and obtained coverage under the Construction General Permit.
  - (9) The date the Permittee approved the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP).
  - (10) Post-Construction Structural BMPs subject to Operation and Maintenance Requirements.

#### **h. Construction Plan Review and Approval Procedures**

- i. Each Permittee shall develop procedures to review and approve relevant construction plan documents.
- ii. The review procedures shall be developed and implemented such that the following minimum requirements are met:
  - (1) Prior to issuing a grading or building permit, each Permittee shall require each operator of a construction activity within its jurisdiction to prepare and submit an ESCP prior to the disturbance of land for the Permittee's review and written approval. The construction site operator shall be prohibited from commencing construction activity prior to receipt of written approval by the Permittee. Each Permittee shall not approve any ESCP unless it contains appropriate site-specific construction site BMPs that

meet the minimum requirements of a Permittee's erosion and sediment control ordinance.

- (2) ESCPs must include the elements of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). SWPPPs prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit can be accepted as ESCPs.
- (3) At a minimum, the ESCP must address the following elements:
  - (a) Methods to minimize the footprint of the disturbed area and to prevent soil compaction outside of the disturbed area.
  - (b) Methods used to protect native vegetation and trees.
  - (c) Sediment/Erosion Control.
  - (d) Controls to prevent tracking on and off the site.
  - (e) Non-storm water controls (e.g., vehicle washing, dewatering, etc.).
  - (f) Materials Management (delivery and storage).
  - (g) Spill Prevention and Control.
  - (h) Waste Management (e.g., concrete washout/waste management; sanitary waste management).
  - (i) Identification of site Risk Level as identified per the requirements in Appendix 1 of the Construction General Permit.
- (4) The ESCP must include the rationale for the selection and design of the proposed BMPs, including quantifying the expected soil loss from different BMPs.
- (5) Each Permittee shall require that the ESCP is developed and certified by a Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD).
- (6) Each Permittee shall require that all structural BMPs be designed by a licensed California Engineer.
- (7) Each Permittee shall require that for all sites, the landowner or the landowner's agent sign a statement on the ESCP as follows:
  - (a) "I certify that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to ensure 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, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information submitted is true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that submitting false and/ or inaccurate information, failing to update the ESCP to reflect current conditions, or failing to properly and/ or adequately implement the ESCP may result in revocation of grading and/ or other permits or other sanctions provided by law."
- (8) Prior to issuing a grading or building permit, each Permittee must verify that the construction site operators have existing coverage under

applicable permits, including, but not limited to the State Water Board's Construction General Permit, and State Water Board 401 Water Quality Certification.

- (9) Each Permittee shall develop and implement a checklist to be used to conduct and document review of each ESCP.

**i. BMP Implementation Level**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement technical standards for the selection, installation and maintenance of construction BMPs for all construction sites within its jurisdiction.
- ii. The BMP technical standards shall require:
- (1) The use of BMPs that are tailored to the risks posed by the project. Sites are to be ranked from Low Risk (Risk 1) to High Risk (Risk 3). Project risks are to be calculated based on the potential for erosion from the site and the sensitivity of the receiving water body. Receiving water bodies that are listed on the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) list for sediment or siltation are considered High Risk. Likewise, water bodies with designated beneficial uses of SPWN, COLD, and MIGR are also considered to be High Risk. The combined (sediment/receiving water) site risk shall be calculated using the methods provided in Appendix 1 of the Construction General Permit. At a minimum, the BMP technical standards shall include requirements for High Risk sites as defined in Table 15.
  - (2) The use of BMPs for all construction sites, sites equal or greater to 1 acre, and for paving projects per Tables 14 and 16 of this Order.
  - (3) Detailed installation designs and cut sheets for use within ESCPs.
  - (4) Maintenance expectations for each BMP, or category of BMPs, as appropriate.
- iii. Permittees are encouraged to adopt respective BMPs from latest versions of the *California BMP Handbook, Construction* or *Caltrans Stormwater Quality Handbooks, Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual* and addenda. Alternatively, Permittees are authorized to develop or adopt equivalent BMP standards consistent for Southern California and for the range of activities presented below in Tables 13 through 16.
- iv. The local BMP technical standards shall be readily available to the development community and shall be clearly referenced within each Permittee's storm water or development services website, ordinance, permit approval process and/or ESCP review forms. The local BMP technical standards shall also be readily available to the Regional Water Board upon request.
- v. Local BMP technical standards shall be available for the following:

**Table 13. Minimum Set of BMPs for All Construction Sites**

<b>Erosion Controls</b>	Scheduling
	Preservation of Existing Vegetation
<b>Sediment Controls</b>	Silt Fence
	Sand Bag Barrier
	Stabilized Construction Site Entrance/Exit
<b>Non-Storm Management</b>	<b>water</b> Water Conservation Practices
	Dewatering Operations
<b>Waste Management</b>	Material Delivery and Storage
	Stockpile Management
	Spill Prevention and Control
	Solid Waste Management
	Concrete Waste Management
	Sanitary/Septic Waste Management

**Table 14. Additional BMPs Applicable to Construction Sites Disturbing 1 Acre or More**

<b>Erosion Controls</b>	Hydraulic Mulch
	Hydroseeding
	Soil Binders
	Straw Mulch
	Geotextiles and Mats
	Wood Mulching
<b>Sediment Controls</b>	Fiber Rolls
	Gravel Bag Berm
	Street Sweeping and/ or Vacuum
	Storm Drain Inlet Protection
	Scheduling
	Check Dam
<b>Additional Controls</b>	Wind Erosion Controls
	Stabilized Construction Entrance/ Exit
	Stabilized Construction Roadway
	Entrance/ Exit Tire Wash
<b>Non-Storm Management</b>	<b>water</b> Vehicle and Equipment Washing
	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
	Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
<b>Waste Management</b>	Material Delivery and Storage
	Spill Prevention and Control

**Table 15. Additional Enhanced BMPs for High Risk Sites**

<b>Erosion Controls</b>	Hydraulic Mulch
	Hydroseeding
	Soil Binders
	Straw Mulch

	Geotextiles and Mats
	Wood Mulching
	Slope Drains
<b>Sediment Controls</b>	Silt Fence
	Fiber Rolls
	Sediment Basin
	Check Dam
	Gravel Bag Berm
	Street Sweeping and/or Vacuum
	Sand Bag Barrier
	Storm Drain Inlet Protection
<b>Additional Controls</b>	Wind Erosion Controls
	Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit
	Stabilized Construction Roadway
	Entrance/Exit Tire Wash
	Advanced Treatment Systems*
<b>Non-Storm water Management</b>	Water Conservation Practices
	Dewatering Operations (Ground water dewatering only under NPDES Permit No. CAG994004)
	Vehicle and Equipment Washing
	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
	Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
<b>Waste Management</b>	Material Delivery and Storage
	Stockpile Management
	Spill Prevention and Control
	Solid Waste Management

\* Applies to public roadway projects.

**Table 16. Minimum Required BMPs for Roadway Paving or Repair Operation (For Private or Public Projects)**

1.	Restrict paving and repaving activity to exclude periods of rainfall or predicted rainfall unless required by emergency conditions.
2.	Install gravel bags and filter fabric or other equivalent inlet protection at all susceptible storm drain inlets and at manholes to prevent spills of paving products and tack coat.
3.	Prevent the discharge of release agents including soybean oil, other oils, or diesel to the storm water drainage system or receiving waters.
4.	Minimize non storm water runoff from water use for the roller and for evaporative cooling of the asphalt.
5.	Clean equipment over absorbent pads, drip pans, plastic sheeting or other material to capture all spillage and dispose of properly.
6.	Collect liquid waste in a container, with a secure lid, for transport to a maintenance facility to be reused, recycled or disposed of properly.
7.	Collect solid waste by vacuuming or sweeping and securing in an

	appropriate container for transport to a maintenance facility to be reused, recycled or disposed of properly.
8.	Cover the “cold-mix” asphalt (i.e., pre-mixed aggregate and asphalt binder) with protective sheeting during a rainstorm.
9.	Cover loads with tarp before haul-off to a storage site, and do not overload trucks.
10.	Minimize airborne dust by using water spray or other approved dust suppressant during grinding.
11.	Avoid stockpiling soil, sand, sediment, asphalt material and asphalt grindings materials or rubble in or near storm water drainage system or receiving waters.
12.	Protect stockpiles with a cover or sediment barriers during a rain.

**j. Construction Site Inspection**

- i. Each Permittee shall use its legal authority to implement procedures for inspecting public and private construction sites.
- ii. The inspection procedures shall be implemented as follows:
  - (1) Inspect the public and private construction sites as specified in Table 17 below:

**Table 17. Inspection Frequencies for Sites One Acre or Greater**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Inspection Frequency Shall Occur</b>
a. All sites 1 acre or larger that discharge to a tributary listed by the state as an impaired water for sediment or turbidity under the CWA § 303(d)	(1) when two or more consecutive days with greater than 50% chance of rainfall are predicted by NOAA <sup>29</sup> , (2) within 48 hours of a 1/2-inch rain event and at (3) least once every two weeks
b. Other sites 1 acre or more determined to be a significant threat to water quality <sup>30</sup>	
c. All other construction sites with 1 acre or more of soil disturbance not meeting the criteria above	At least monthly

- (2) Each Permittee shall inspect all phases of construction as follows:

(a) Prior to Land Disturbance

Prior to allowing an operator to commence land disturbance, each Permittee shall perform an inspection to ensure all necessary erosion

<sup>29</sup> www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast

<sup>30</sup> In evaluating the threat to water quality, the following factors shall be considered: soil erosion potential; site slope; project size and type; sensitivity of receiving water bodies; proximity to receiving water bodies; non-storm water discharges; past record of non-compliance by the operators of the construction site; and any water quality issues relevant to the particular MS4.

and sediment structural and non-structural BMP materials and procedures are available per the erosion and sediment control plan.

- (b) During Active Construction, including Land Development<sup>31</sup> and Vertical Construction<sup>32</sup>

In accordance with the frequencies specified in Part VI.D.8.j and Table 17 of this Order, each Permittee shall perform an inspection to ensure all necessary erosion and sediment structural and non-structural BMP materials and procedures are available per the erosion and sediment control plan throughout the construction process.

- (c) Final Landscaping / Site Stabilization<sup>33</sup>

At the conclusion of the project and as a condition of approving and/or issuing a Certificate of Occupancy, each Permittee shall inspect the constructed site to ensure that all graded areas have reached final stabilization and that all trash, debris, and construction materials, and temporary erosion and sediment BMPs are removed.

- (3) Based on the required frequencies above, each construction project shall be inspected a minimum of three times.

- (4) Inspection Standard Operating Procedures

Each Permittee shall develop, implement, and revise as necessary, standard operating procedures that identify the inspection procedures each Permittee will follow. Inspections of construction sites, and the standard operating procedures, shall include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Verification of active coverage under the Construction General Permit for sites disturbing 1 acre or more, or that are part of a planned development that will disturb 1 acre or more and a process for referring non-filers to the Regional Water Board.
- (b) Review of the applicable ESCP and inspection of the construction site to determine whether all BMPs have been selected, installed, implemented, and maintained according to the approved plan and subsequent approved revisions.
- (c) Assessment of the appropriateness of the planned and installed BMPs and their effectiveness.
- (d) Visual observation and record keeping of non-storm water discharges, potential illicit discharges and connections, and potential discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff.
- (e) Development of a written or electronic inspection report generated from an inspection checklist used in the field.

---

<sup>31</sup> Activities include cuts and fills, rough and finished grading; alluvium removals; canyon cleanouts; rock undercuts; keyway excavations; stockpiling of select material for capping operations; and excavation and street paving, lot grading, curbs, gutters and sidewalks, public utilities, public water facilities including fire hydrants, public sanitary sewer systems, storm sewer system and/or other drainage improvement.

<sup>32</sup> The build out of structures from foundations to roofing, including rough landscaping.

<sup>33</sup> All soil disturbing activities at each individual parcel within the site have been completed.

- (f) Tracking of the number of inspections for the inventoried construction sites throughout the reporting period to verify that the sites are inspected at the minimum frequencies required in Table 17 of this Order.

**k. Enforcement**

Each Permittee shall implement its Progressive Enforcement Policy to ensure that construction sites are brought into compliance with all storm water requirements within a reasonable time period. See Part VI.D.2 for requirements for the development and implementation of a Progressive Enforcement Policy.

**I. Permittee Staff Training**

- i. Each Permittee shall ensure that all staff whose primary job duties are related to implementing the construction storm water program are adequately trained.
- ii. Each Permittee may conduct in-house training or contract with consultants. Training shall be provided to the following staff positions of the MS4:

(1) Plan Reviewers and Permitting Staff

Ensure staff and consultants are trained as qualified individuals, knowledgeable in the technical review of local erosion and sediment control ordinance, local BMP technical standards, ESCP requirements, and the key objectives of the State Water Board QSD program. Permittees may provide internal training to staff or require staff to obtain QSD certification.

(2) Erosion Sediment Control/Storm Water Inspectors

Each Permittee shall ensure that its inspectors are knowledgeable in inspection procedures consistent with the State Water Board sponsored program QSD or a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) or that a designated person on staff who has been trained in the key objectives of the QSD/QSP programs supervises inspection operations. Each Permittee may provide internal training to staff or require staff to obtain QSD/QSP certification. Each inspector must be knowledgeable of the local BMP technical standards and ESCP requirements.

(3) Third-Party Plan Reviewers, Permitting Staff, and Inspectors

If the Permittee utilizes outside parties to conduct inspections and/or review plans, each Permittee shall ensure these staff are trained per the requirements listed above. Outside contractors can self-certify, providing they certify they have received all applicable training required in the Permit and have documentation to that effect.

**9. Public Agency Activities Program**

- a. Each Permittee shall implement a Public Agency Activities Program to minimize storm water pollution impacts from Permittee-owned or operated facilities and activities and to identify opportunities to reduce storm water pollution impacts



from areas of existing development. Requirements for Public Agency Facilities and Activities consist of the following components:

- i. Public Construction Activities Management
- ii. Public Facility Inventory
- iii. Inventory of Existing Development for Retrofitting Opportunities
- iv. Public Facility and Activity Management
- v. Vehicle and Equipment Wash Areas
- vi. Landscape, Park, and Recreational Facilities Management
- vii. Storm Drain Operation and Maintenance
- viii. Streets, Roads, and Parking Facilities Maintenance
- ix. Emergency Procedures
- x. Municipal Employee and Contractor Training

**b. Public Construction Activities Management**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement and comply with the Planning and Land Development Program requirements in Part VI.D.7 of this Order at Permittee-owned or operated (i.e., public or Permittee sponsored) construction projects that are categorized under the project types identified in Part VI.D.7.b of this Order.
- ii. Each Permittee shall implement and comply with the appropriate Development Construction Program requirements in Part VI.D.8 of this Order at Permittee-owned or operated construction projects as applicable.
- iii. For Permittee-owned or operated projects (including those under a capital improvement project plan) that disturb less than one acre of soil, each Permittee shall require an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs from Table 13 (see Construction Development Program, minimum BMPs).
- iv. Each Permittee shall obtain separate coverage under the Construction General Permit for all Permittee-owned or operated construction sites that require coverage.

**c. Public Facility Inventory**

- i. Each Permittee shall maintain an updated inventory of all Permittee-owned or operated (i.e., public) facilities within its jurisdiction that are potential sources of storm water pollution. The incorporation of facility information into a GIS is recommended. Sources to be tracked include but are not limited to the following:
  - (1) Animal control facilities
  - (2) Chemical storage facilities

- (3) Composting facilities
  - (4) Equipment storage and maintenance facilities (including landscape maintenance-related operations)
  - (5) Fueling or fuel storage facilities (including municipal airports)
  - (6) Hazardous waste disposal facilities
  - (7) Hazardous waste handling and transfer facilities
  - (8) Incinerators
  - (9) Landfills
  - (10) Materials storage yards
  - (11) Pesticide storage facilities
  - (12) Fire stations
  - (13) Public restrooms
  - (14) Public parking lots
  - (15) Public golf courses
  - (16) Public swimming pools
  - (17) Public parks
  - (18) Public works yards
  - (19) Public marinas
  - (20) Recycling facilities
  - (21) Solid waste handling and transfer facilities
  - (22) Vehicle storage and maintenance yards
  - (23) Storm water management facilities (e.g., detention basins)
  - (24) All other Permittee-owned or operated facilities or activities that each Permittee determines may contribute a substantial pollutant load to the MS4.
- ii. Each Permittee shall include the following minimum fields of information for each Permittee-owned or operated facility in its inventory.
- (1) Name of facility
  - (2) Name of facility manager and contact information
  - (3) Address of facility (physical and mailing)
  - (4) A narrative description of activities performed and potential pollution sources.
  - (5) Coverage under the Industrial General Permit or other individual or general NPDES permits or any applicable waiver issued by the Regional or State Water Board pertaining to storm water discharges.

- iii. Each Permittee shall update its inventory at least once during the 5-year term of the Order. The update shall be accomplished through collection of new information obtained through field activities or through other readily available inter and intra-agency informational databases (e.g., property management, land-use approvals, accounting and depreciation ledger account, and similar information).

**d. Inventory of Existing Development for Retrofitting Opportunities**

- i. Each Permittee shall develop an inventory of retrofitting opportunities that meets the requirements of this Part VI.9.d. Retrofit opportunities shall be identified within the public right-of-way or in coordination with a TMDL implementation plan(s). The goals of the existing development retrofitting inventory are to address the impacts of existing development through regional or sub-regional retrofit projects that reduce the discharges of storm water pollutants into the MS4 and prevent discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards as defined in Part V.A, Receiving Water Limitations.
- ii. Each Permittee shall screen existing areas of development to identify candidate areas for retrofitting using watershed models or other screening level tools.
- iii. Each Permittee shall evaluate and rank the areas of existing development identified in the screening to prioritize retrofitting candidates. Criteria for evaluation may include but are not limited to:
  - (1) Feasibility, including general private and public land availability;
  - (2) Cost effectiveness;
  - (3) Pollutant removal effectiveness;
  - (4) Tributary area potentially treated;
  - (5) Maintenance requirements;
  - (6) Landowner cooperation;
  - (7) Neighborhood acceptance;
  - (8) Aesthetic qualities;
  - (9) Efficacy at addressing concern; and
  - (10) Potential improvements to public health and safety.
- iv. Each Permittee shall consider the results of the evaluation in the following programs:
  - (1) The Permittee's storm water management program: Highly feasible projects expected to benefit water quality should be given a high priority to implement source control and treatment control BMPs in a Permittee's SWMP.

- (2) Off-site mitigation for New Development and Redevelopment: Each Permittee shall consider high priority retrofit projects as candidates for off-site mitigation projects per Part VI.D.7.c.iii.(4).(d).
  - (3) Where feasible, at the discretion of the Permittee, the existing development retrofitting program may be coordinated with flood control projects and other infrastructure improvement programs per Part VI.D.9.e.ii.(2) below.
- v. Each Permittee shall cooperate with private landowners to encourage site specific retrofitting projects. Each Permittee shall consider the following practices in cooperating with private landowners to retrofit existing development:
- (1) Demonstration retrofit projects;
  - (2) Retrofits on public land and easements that treat runoff from private developments;
  - (3) Education and outreach;
  - (4) Subsidies for retrofit projects;
  - (5) Requiring retrofit projects as enforcement, mitigation or ordinance compliance;
  - (6) Public and private partnerships;
  - (7) Fees for existing discharges to the MS4 and reduction of fees for retrofit implementation.

**e. Public Agency Facility and Activity Management**

- i. Each Permittee shall obtain separate coverage under the Industrial General Permit for all Permittee-owned or operated facilities where industrial activities are conducted that require coverage under the Industrial General Permit.
- ii. Each Permittee shall implement the following measures for Permittee- owned and operated flood management projects:
  - (1) Develop procedures to assess the impacts of flood management projects on the water quality of receiving water bodies; and
  - (2) Evaluate existing structural flood control facilities to determine if retrofitting the facility to provide additional pollutant removal from storm water is feasible.
- iii. Each Permittee shall ensure the implementation and maintenance of activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 (BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities) or an equivalent set of BMPs when such activities occur at Permittee-owned or operated facilities and field activities (e.g., project sites) including but not limited to the facility types listed in Part VI.D.9.c above, and at any area that includes the activities described in Table 18, or that have the potential to discharge pollutants in storm water.

- iv. Any contractors hired by the Permittee to conduct Public Agency Activities including, but not limited to, storm and/or sanitary sewer system inspection and repair, street sweeping, trash pick-up and disposal, and street and right-of-way construction and repair shall be contractually required to implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18. Each Permittee shall conduct oversight of contractor activities to ensure these BMPs are implemented and maintained.
- v. Permittee-owned or operated facilities that have obtained coverage under the Industrial General Permit shall implement and maintain BMPs consistent with the associated SWPPP and are therefore not required to implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18.
- vi. Effective source control BMPs for the activities listed in Table 18 shall be implemented at Permittee-owned or operated facilities, unless the pollutant generating activity does not occur. Each Permittee shall require implementation of additional BMPs where storm water from the MS4 discharges to a significant ecological area (SEA, see Attachment A for definition), a water body subject to TMDL provisions in Part VI.E., or a CWA § 303(d) listed water body (see Part VI.E below). Likewise, for those BMPs that are not adequately protective of water quality standards, a Permittee may require additional site-specific controls.

**Table 18. BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities**

<b>General and Activity Specific BMPs</b>		
<b>General BMPs</b>	Scheduling and Planning	
	Spill Prevention and Control	
	Sanitary/Septic Waste Management	
	Material Use	
	Safer Alternative Products	
	Vehicle/Equipment Cleaning, Fueling and Maintenance	
	Illicit Connection Detection, Reporting and Removal	
	Illegal Spill Discharge Control	
	Maintenance Facility Housekeeping Practices	
<b>Flexible Pavement</b>	Asphalt Cement Crack and Joint Grinding/ Sealing	
	Asphalt Paving	
	Structural Pavement Failure (Digouts) Pavement Grinding and Paving	
	Emergency Pothole Repairs	
	Sealing Operations	
<b>Rigid Pavement</b>	Portland Cement Crack and Joint Sealing	
	Mudjacking and Drilling	
	Concrete Slab and Spall Repair	
<b>Slope/ Vegetation</b>	<b>Drains/</b>	Shoulder Grading
		Nonlandscaped Chemical Vegetation Control
		Nonlandscaped Mechanical Vegetation Control/

<b>General and Activity Specific BMPs</b>	
	Mowing
	Nonlandscaped Tree and Shrub Pruning, Brush Chipping, Tree and Shrub Removal
	Fence Repair
	Drainage Ditch and Channel Maintenance
	Drain and Culvert Maintenance
	Curb and Sidewalk Repair
<b>Litter/ Debris/ Graffiti</b>	Sweeping Operations
	Litter and Debris Removal
	Emergency Response and Cleanup Practices
	Graffiti Removal
<b>Landscaping</b>	Chemical Vegetation Control
	Manual Vegetation Control
	Landscaped Mechanical Vegetation Control/ Mowing
	Landscaped Tree and Shrub Pruning, Brush Chipping, Tree and Shrub Removal
	Irrigation Line Repairs
	Irrigation (Watering), Potable and Nonpotable
<b>Environmental</b>	Storm Drain Stenciling
	Roadside Slope Inspection
	Roadside Stabilization
	Stormwater Treatment Devices
	Traction Sand Trap Devices
<b>Bridges</b>	Welding and Grinding
	Sandblasting, Wet Blast with Sand Injection and Hydroblasting
	Painting
	Bridge Repairs
<b>Other Structures</b>	Pump Station Cleaning
	Tube and Tunnel Maintenance and Repair
	Tow Truck Operations
	Toll Booth Lane Scrubbing Operations
<b>Electrical</b>	Sawcutting for Loop Installation
<b>Traffic Guidance</b>	Thermoplastic Striping and Marking
	Paint Striping and Marking
	Raised/ Recessed Pavement Marker Application and Removal
	Sign Repair and Maintenance
	Median Barrier and Guard Rail Repair
	Emergency Vehicle Energy Attenuation Repair
<b>Storm Maintenance</b>	Minor Slides and Slipouts Cleanup/ Repair
<b>Management and Support</b>	Building and Grounds Maintenance
	Storage of Hazardous Materials (Working Stock)
	Material Storage Control (Hazardous Waste)

<b>General and Activity Specific BMPs</b>	
	Outdoor Storage of Raw Materials
	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
	Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
	Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance and Repair
	Aboveground and Underground Tank Leak and Spill Control

**f. Vehicle and Equipment Washing**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 (BMPs for Public Agency Facilities and Activities) for all fixed vehicle and equipment washing; including fire fighting and emergency response vehicles.
- ii. Each Permittee shall prevent discharges of wash waters from vehicle and equipment washing to the MS4 by implementing any of the following measures at existing facilities with vehicle or equipment wash areas:
  - (1) Self-contain, and haul off for disposal; or
  - (2) Equip with a clarifier or an alternative pre-treatment device and plumb to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations.
- iii. Each Permittee shall ensure that any municipal facilities constructed, redeveloped, or replaced shall not discharge wastewater from vehicle and equipment wash areas to the MS4 by plumbing all areas to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations, or self-containing all waste water/ wash water and hauling to a point of legal disposal.

**g. Landscape, Park, and Recreational Facilities Management**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 for all public right-of-ways, flood control facilities and open channels, lakes and reservoirs, and landscape, park, and recreational facilities and activities.
- ii. Each Permittee shall implement an IPM program that includes the following:
  - (1) Pesticides are used only if monitoring indicates they are needed, and pesticides are applied according to applicable permits and established guidelines.
  - (2) Treatments are made with the goal of removing only the target organism.
  - (3) Pest controls are selected and applied in a manner that minimizes risks to human health, beneficial non-target organisms, and the environment.
  - (4) The use of pesticides, including Organophosphates and Pyrethroids, does not threaten water quality.

- (5) Partner with other agencies and organizations to encourage the use of IPM.
- (6) Adopt and verifiably implement policies, procedures, and/ or ordinances requiring the minimization of pesticide use and encouraging the use of IPM techniques (including beneficial insects) for Public Agency Facilities and Activities.
- (7) Policies, procedures, and ordinances shall include commitments and a schedule to reduce the use of pesticides that cause impairment of surface waters by implementing the following procedures:
  - (a) Prepare and annually update an inventory of pesticides used by all internal departments, divisions, and other operational units.
  - (b) Quantify pesticide use by staff and hired contractors.
  - (c) Demonstrate implementation of IPM alternatives where feasible to reduce pesticide use.

**iii.** Each Permittee shall implement the following requirements:

- (1) Use a standardized protocol for the routine and non-routine application of pesticides (including pre-emergents), and fertilizers.
- (2) Ensure there is no application of pesticides or fertilizers (1) when two or more consecutive days with greater than 50% chance of rainfall are predicted by NOAA<sup>34</sup>, (2) within 48 hours of a 1/2-inch rain event, or (3) when water is flowing off the area where the application is to occur. This requirement does not apply to the application of aquatic pesticides described in Part VI.D.9.g.iii.(1) above or pesticides which require water for activation.
- (3) Ensure that no banned or unregistered pesticides are stored or applied.
- (4) Ensure that all staff applying pesticides are certified in the appropriate category by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, or are under the direct supervision of a pesticide applicator certified in the appropriate category.
- (5) Implement procedures to encourage the retention and planting of native vegetation to reduce water, pesticide and fertilizer needs; and
- (6) Store pesticides and fertilizers indoors or under cover on paved surfaces, or use secondary containment.
  - (a) Reduce the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials to reduce the potential for spills.
  - (b) Regularly inspect storage areas.

**h. Storm Drain Operation and Maintenance**

---

<sup>34</sup> [www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast](http://www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast)



- i. Each Permittee shall implement and maintain the activity specific BMPs listed in Table 18 for storm drain operation and maintenance.
- ii. Ensure that all material removed from the MS4 does not reenter the system. Solid material shall be dewatered in a contained area and liquid material shall be disposed in accordance with any of the following measures:
  - (1) Self-contain, and haul off for legal disposal; or
  - (2) Applied to the land without runoff; or
  - (3) Equip with a clarifier or an alternative pre-treatment device; and plumb to the sanitary sewer in accordance with applicable waste water provider regulations.

**iii. Catch Basin Cleaning**

- (1) In areas that are not subject to a trash TMDL, each Permittee shall determine priority areas and shall update its map or list of Catch Basins with their GPS coordinates and priority:

Priority A: Catch basins that are designated as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris.

Priority B: Catch basins that are designated as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris.

Priority C: Catch basins that are designated as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris.

The map or list shall contain the rationale or data to support priority designations.

- (2) In areas that are not subject to a trash TMDL, each Permittee shall inspect catch basins according to the following schedule:

Priority A: A minimum of 3 times during the wet season (October 1 through April 15) and once during the dry season every year.

Priority B: A minimum of once during the wet season and once during the dry season every year.

Priority C: A minimum of once per year.

Catch basins shall be cleaned as necessary on the basis of inspections. At a minimum, Permittees shall ensure that any catch basin that is determined to be at least 25% full of trash shall be cleaned out. Permittees shall maintain inspection and cleaning records for Regional Water Board review.

- (3) In areas that are subject to a trash TMDL, the subject Permittees shall implement the applicable provisions in Part VI.E.

**iv. Trash Management at Public Events**

- (1) Each Permittee shall require the following measures for any event in the public right of way or wherever it is foreseeable that substantial quantities

of trash and litter may be generated, including events located in areas that are subject to a trash TMDL:

- (a) Proper management of trash and litter generated; and
- (b) Arrangement for temporary screens to be placed on catch basins; or
- (c) Provide clean out of catch basins, trash receptacles, and grounds in the event area within one business day subsequent to the event.

**v. Trash Receptacles**

- (1) Each Permittee shall ensure trash receptacles, or equivalent trash capturing devices, are covered in areas newly identified as high trash generation areas within its jurisdiction.
- (2) Each Permittee shall ensure that all trash receptacles are cleaned out and maintained as necessary to prevent trash overflow.

**vi. Catch Basin Labels and Open Channel Signage**

- (1) Each Permittee shall label all storm drain inlets that they own with a legible “no dumping” message.
- (2) Each Permittee shall inspect the legibility of the stencil or label nearest each inlet prior to the wet season every year.
- (3) Each Permittee shall record all catch basins with illegible stencils and re-stencil or re-label within 180 days of inspection.
- (4) Each Permittee shall post signs, referencing local code(s) that prohibit littering and illegal dumping, at designated public access points to open channels, creeks, urban lakes, and other relevant water bodies.

**vii. Additional Trash Management Practices**

- (1) In areas that are not subject to a trash TMDL, each Permittee shall install trash excluders, or equivalent devices, on or in catch basins or outfalls to prevent the discharge of trash to the MS4 or receiving water no later than four years after the effective date of this Order in areas defined as Priority A (Part VI.D.9.h.iii.(1)) except at sites where the application of such BMP(s) alone will cause flooding. Lack of maintenance that causes flooding is not an acceptable exception to the requirement to install BMPs. Alternatively, each Permittee may implement alternative or enhanced BMPs beyond the provisions of this Order (such as but not limited to increased street sweeping, adding trash cans near trash generation sites, prompt enforcement of trash accumulation, increased trash collection on public property, increased litter prevention messages or trash nets within the MS4) that provide substantially equivalent removal of trash. Each Permittee shall demonstrate that BMPs, which substituted for trash excluders, provide equivalent trash removal performance as excluders. When outfall trash capture is provided, revision of the schedule for inspection and cleanout of catch basins in Part VI.D.9.h.iii.(2) shall be reported in the next year’s annual report.

**viii. Storm Drain Maintenance**

Each Permittee shall implement a program for Storm Drain Maintenance that includes the following:

- (1) Visual monitoring of Permittee-owned open channels and other drainage structures for trash and debris at least annually.
- (2) Removal of trash and debris from open channels a minimum of once per year before the wet season.
- (3) Elimination of the discharge of contaminants during MS4 maintenance and clean outs.
- (4) Proper disposal of debris and trash removed during storm drain maintenance.

**ix. Infiltration from Sanitary Sewer to MS4/Preventive Maintenance**

- (1) Each Permittee shall implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate infiltration of seepage from sanitary sewers to MS4s through thorough, routine preventive maintenance of the MS4.
- (2) Each Permittee that operates both a municipal sanitary sewer system and a MS4 must implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate infiltration of seepage from the sanitary sewers to the MS4s that must include overall sanitary sewer and MS4 surveys and thorough, routine preventive maintenance of both. Implementation of a Sewer System Management Plan in accordance with the Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, may be used to fulfill this requirement.
- (3) Each Permittee shall implement controls to limit infiltration of seepage from sanitary sewers to the MS4 where necessary. Such controls must include:
  - (a) Adequate plan checking for construction and new development;
  - (b) Incident response training for its municipal employees that identify sanitary sewer spills;
  - (c) Code enforcement inspections;
  - (d) MS4 maintenance and inspections;
  - (e) Interagency coordination with sewer agencies; and
  - (f) Proper education of its municipal staff and contractors conducting field operations on the MS4 or its municipal sanitary sewer (if applicable).

**x. Permittee Owned Treatment Control BMPs**

- (1) Each Permittee shall implement an inspection and maintenance program for all Permittee owned treatment control BMPs, including post-construction treatment control BMPs.

- (2) Each Permittee shall ensure proper operation of all treatment control BMPs and maintain them as necessary for proper operation, including all post-construction treatment control BMPs.
- (3) Any residual water<sup>35</sup> produced by a treatment control BMP and not being internal to the BMP performance when being maintained shall be:
  - (a) Hauled away and legally disposed of; or
  - (b) Applied to the land without runoff; or
  - (c) Discharged to the sanitary sewer system (with permits or authorization); or
  - (d) Treated or filtered to remove bacteria, sediments, nutrients, and meet the limitations set in Table 19 (Discharge Limitations for Dewatering Treatment BMPs), prior to discharge to the MS4.

**Table 19. Discharge Limitations for Dewatering Treatment BMPs<sup>36</sup>**

Parameter	Units	Limitation
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	100
Turbidity	NTU	50
Oil and Grease	mg/L	10

**i. Streets, Roads, and Parking Facilities Maintenance**

- i. Each Permittee shall designate streets and/or street segments within its jurisdiction as one of the following:
  - Priority A: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris.
  - Priority B: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris.
  - Priority C: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris.
- ii. Each Permittee shall perform street sweeping of curbed streets according to the following schedule:
  - Priority A: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as Priority A shall be swept at least two times per month.
  - Priority B: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as Priority B shall be swept at least once per month.
  - Priority C: Streets and/or street segments that are designated as Priority C shall be swept as necessary but in no case less than once per year.

<sup>35</sup> See Attachment A.

<sup>36</sup> Technology based effluent limitations.

### **iii. Road Reconstruction**

Each Permittee shall require that for any project that includes roadbed or street paving, repaving, patching, digouts, or resurfacing roadbed surfaces, that the following BMPs be implemented for each project.

- (1) Restrict paving and repaving activity to exclude periods of rainfall or predicted rainfall<sup>37</sup> unless required by emergency conditions.
- (2) Install sand bags or gravel bags and filter fabric at all susceptible storm drain inlets and at manholes to prevent spills of paving products and tack coat;
- (3) Prevent the discharge of release agents including soybean oil, other oils, or diesel into the MS4 or receiving waters.
- (4) Prevent non-storm water runoff from water use for the roller and for evaporative cooling of the asphalt.
- (5) Clean equipment over absorbent pads, drip pans, plastic sheeting or other material to capture all spillage and dispose of properly.
- (6) Collect liquid waste in a container, with a secure lid, for transport to a maintenance facility to be reused, recycled or disposed of properly.
- (7) Collect solid waste by vacuuming or sweeping and securing in an appropriate container for transport to a maintenance facility to be reused, recycled or disposed of properly.
- (8) Cover the “cold-mix” asphalt (i.e., pre-mixed aggregate and asphalt binder) with protective sheeting during a rainstorm.
- (9) Cover loads with tarp before haul-off to a storage site, and do not overload trucks.
- (10) Minimize airborne dust by using water spray during grinding.
- (11) Avoid stockpiling soil, sand, sediment, asphalt material and asphalt grindings materials or rubble in or near MS4 or receiving waters.
- (12) Protect stockpiles with a cover or sediment barriers during a rain.

### **iv. Parking Facilities Maintenance**

- (1) Permittee-owned parking lots exposed to storm water shall be kept clear of debris and excessive oil buildup and cleaned no less than 2 times per month and/or inspected no less than 2 times per month to determine if cleaning is necessary. In no case shall a Permittee-owned parking lot be cleaned less than once a month.

## **j. Emergency Procedures**

- i.** Each Permittee may conduct repairs of essential public service systems and infrastructure in emergency situations with a self-waiver of the provisions of this Order as follows:

---

<sup>37</sup> A probability of precipitation (POP) of 50% is required.

- (1) The Permittee shall abide by all other regulatory requirements, including notification to other agencies as appropriate.
- (2) Where the self-waiver has been invoked, the Permittee shall submit to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer a statement of the occurrence of the emergency, an explanation of the circumstances, and the measures that were implemented to reduce the threat to water quality, no later than 30 business days after the situation of emergency has passed.
- (3) Minor repairs of essential public service systems and infrastructure in emergency situations (that can be completed in less than one week) are not subject to the notification provisions. Appropriate BMPs to reduce the threat to water quality shall be implemented.

**k. Municipal Employee and Contractor Training**

i. Each Permittee shall, no later than 1 year after Order adoption and annually thereafter before June 30, train all of their employees in targeted positions (whose interactions, jobs, and activities affect storm water quality) on the requirements of the overall storm water management program, or shall ensure contractors performing privatized/contracted municipal services are appropriately trained to:

- (1) Promote a clear understanding of the potential for activities to pollute storm water.
- (2) Identify opportunities to require, implement, and maintain appropriate BMPs in their line of work.

Outside contractors can self-certify, providing they certify they have received all applicable training required in the Permit and have documentation to that effect.

ii. Each Permittee shall, no later than 1 year after Order adoption and annually thereafter before June 30, train all of their employees and contractors who use or have the potential to use pesticides or fertilizers (whether or not they normally apply these as part of their work). Training programs shall address:

- (1) The potential for pesticide-related surface water toxicity.
- (2) Proper use, handling, and disposal of pesticides.
- (3) Least toxic methods of pest prevention and control, including IPM.
- (4) Reduction of pesticide use.

iii. Outside contractors can self-certify, providing they certify they have received all applicable training required in the Permit and have documentation to that effect.

## **10. Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharges Elimination Program**

### **a. General**

- i.** Each Permittee shall continue to implement an Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharge Elimination (IC/ID) Program to detect, investigate, and eliminate IC/IDs to the MS4. The IC/ID Program must be implemented in accordance with the requirements and performance measures specified in this Order.
- ii.** As stated in Part VI.A.2 of this Order, each Permittee must have adequate legal authority to prohibit IC/IDs to the MS4 and enable enforcement capabilities to eliminate the source of IC/IDs.
- iii.** Each Permittee's IC/ID Program shall consist of at least the following major program components:
  - (1) Procedures for conducting source investigations for IC/IDs
  - (2) Procedures for eliminating the source of IC/IDs
  - (3) Procedures for public reporting of illicit discharges
  - (4) Spill response plan
  - (5) IC/IDs education and training for Permittee staff

### **b. Illicit Discharge Source Investigation and Elimination**

- i.** Each Permittee shall develop written procedures for conducting investigations to identify the source of all suspected illicit discharges, including procedures to eliminate the discharge once the source is located.
- ii.** At a minimum, each Permittee shall initiate an investigation(s) to identify and locate the source within 72 hours of becoming aware of the illicit discharge.
- iii.** When conducting investigations, each Permittee shall comply with the following:
  - (1) Illicit discharges suspected of being sanitary sewage and/or significantly contaminated shall be investigated first.
  - (2) Each Permittee shall track all investigations to document at a minimum the date(s) the illicit discharge was observed; the results of the investigation; any follow-up of the investigation; and the date the investigation was closed.
  - (3) Each Permittee shall investigate the source of all observed illicit discharges.
- iv.** When taking corrective action to eliminate illicit discharges, each Permittee shall comply with the following:
  - (1) If the source of the illicit discharge has been determined to originate within the Permittee's jurisdiction, the Permittee shall immediately notify the responsible party/parties of the problem, and require the responsible party to initiate all necessary corrective actions to eliminate the illicit discharge.

Upon being notified that the discharge has been eliminated, the Permittee shall conduct a follow-up investigation to verify that the discharge has been eliminated and cleaned-up to the satisfaction of the Permittee(s). Each Permittee shall document its follow-up investigation. Each Permittee may seek recovery and remediation costs from responsible parties or require compensation for the cost of all inspection, investigation, cleanup and oversight activities. Resulting enforcement actions shall follow the program's Progressive Enforcement Policy, per Part VI.D.2.

- (2) If the source of the illicit discharge has been determined to originate within an upstream jurisdiction, the Permittee shall notify the upstream jurisdiction and the Regional Water Board within 30 days of such determination and provide all of the information collected regarding efforts to identify its source. Each Permittee may seek recovery and remediation costs from responsible parties or require compensation for the cost of all inspection, investigation, cleanup and oversight activities. Resulting enforcement actions shall follow the program's Progressive Enforcement Policy, per Part VI.D.2.
  - (3) If the source of the illicit discharge cannot be traced to a suspected responsible party, affected Permittees shall implement its spill response plan and then initiate a permanent solution as described in section 10.b.v below.
- v. In the event the Permittee is unable to eliminate an ongoing illicit discharge following full execution of its legal authority and in accordance with its Progressive Enforcement Policy, or other circumstances prevent the full elimination of an ongoing illicit discharge, including the inability to find the responsible party/parties, the Permittee shall provide for diversion of the entire flow to the sanitary sewer or provide treatment. In either instance, the Permittee shall notify the Regional Water Board in writing within 30 days of such determination and shall provide a written plan for review and comment that describes the efforts that have been undertaken to eliminate the illicit discharge, a description of the actions to be undertaken, anticipated costs, and a schedule for completion.

### **c. Identification and Response to Illicit Connections**

#### **i. Investigation**

Each Permittee, upon discovery or upon receiving a report of a suspected illicit connection, shall initiate an investigation within 21 days, to determine the following: (1) source of the connection, (2) nature and volume of discharge through the connection, and (3) responsible party for the connection.

#### **ii. Elimination**

Each Permittee, upon confirmation of an illicit MS4 connection, shall ensure that the connection is:



- (1) Permitted or documented, provided the connection will only discharge storm water and non-storm water allowed under this Order or other individual or general NPDES Permits/WDRs, or
- (2) Eliminated within 180 days of completion of the investigation, using its formal enforcement authority, if necessary, to eliminate the illicit connection.

**iii. Documentation**

Formal records must be maintained for all illicit connection investigations and the formal enforcement taken to eliminate illicit connections.

**d. Public Reporting of Non-Storm Water Discharges and Spills**

- i. Each Permittee shall promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges into or from MS4s through a central contact point, including phone numbers and an internet site for complaints and spill reporting. Each Permittee shall also provide the reporting hotline to Permittee staff to leverage the field staff that has direct contact with the MS4 in detecting and eliminating illicit discharges.
- ii. Each Permittee shall implement the central point of contact and reporting hotline requirements listed in this part in one or more of the following methods:
  - (1) By participating in a County-wide sponsored hotline
  - (2) By participating in one or more Watershed Group sponsored hotlines
  - (3) Or individually within its own jurisdiction
  - (4) The LACFCD shall, in collaboration with the County, continue to maintain the 888-CLEAN-LA hotline and internet site to promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges into or from MS4s.
- iii. Each Permittee shall ensure that signage adjacent to open channels, as required in Part F.8.h.vi, include information regarding dumping prohibitions and public reporting of illicit discharges.
- iv. Each Permittee shall develop and maintain written procedures that document how complaint calls are received, documented, and tracked to ensure that all complaints are adequately addressed. The procedures shall be evaluated to determine whether changes or updates are needed to ensure that the procedures accurately document the methods employed by the Permittee. Any identified changes shall be made to the procedures subsequent to the evaluation.
- v. Each Permittee shall maintain documentation of the complaint calls and record the location of the reported spill or IC/ ID and the actions undertaken in response to all IC/ID complaints, including referrals to other agencies.

**e. Spill Response Plan**

- i. Each Permittee shall implement a spill response plan for all sewage and other spills that may discharge into its MS4. The spill response plan shall clearly identify agencies responsible for spill response and cleanup, telephone numbers and e-mail address for contacts, and shall contain at a minimum the following requirements:
  - (1) Coordination with spill response teams throughout all appropriate departments, programs and agencies so that maximum water quality protection is provided.
  - (2) Initiate investigation of all public and employee spill complaints within one business day of receiving the complaint to assess validity.
  - (3) Response to spills for containment within 4 hours of becoming aware of the spill, except where such spills occur on private property, in which case the response should be within 2 hours of gaining legal access to the property.
  - (4) Spills that may endanger health or the environment shall be reported to appropriate public health agencies and the Office of Emergency Services (OES).

**f. Illicit Connection and Illicit Discharge Education and Training**

- i. Each Permittee must continue to implement a training program regarding the identification of IC/IDs for all municipal field staff, who, as part of their normal job responsibilities (e.g., street sweeping, storm drain maintenance, collection system maintenance, road maintenance), may come into contact with or otherwise observe an illicit discharge or illicit connection to the MS4. Contact information, including the procedure for reporting an illicit discharge, must be readily available to field staff. Training program documents must be available for review by the permitting authority.
  - ii. Each Permittee shall ensure contractors performing privatized/contracted municipal services such as, but not limited to, storm and/or sanitary sewer system inspection and repair, street sweeping, trash pick-up and disposal, and street and right-of-way construction and repair are trained regarding IC/ID identification and reporting. Permittees may provide training or include contractual requirements for IC/ID identification and reporting training. Outside contractors can self-certify, providing they certify they have received all applicable training required in the Permit and have documentation to that effect.
- iii. Each Permittee's training program should address, at a minimum, the following:
  - (1) IC/ID identification, including definitions and examples,
  - (2) investigation,
  - (3) elimination,
  - (4) cleanup,

- (5) reporting, and
- (6) documentation.
- iv. Each Permittee must create a list of applicable positions and contractors which require IC/ID training and ensure that training is provided at least twice during the term of the Order. Each Permittee must maintain documentation of the training activities.
- v. New Permittee staff members must be provided with IC/ID training within 180 days of starting employment.

## **E. Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions**

1. The provisions of this Part VI.E. implement and are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of all waste load allocations (WLAs) established in TMDLs for which some or all of the Permittees in this Order are responsible.
  - a. Part VI.E of this Order includes provisions that are designed to assure that Permittees achieve WLAs and meet other requirements of TMDLs covering receiving waters impacted by the Permittees' MS4 discharges. TMDL provisions are grouped by WMA (WMA) in Attachments L through R.
  - b. The Permittees subject to each TMDL are identified in Attachment K.
  - c. The Permittees shall comply with the applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations contained in Attachments L through R, consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the WLAs established in the TMDLs, including implementation plans and schedules, where provided for in the State adoption and approval of the TMDL (40 CFR §122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B); Cal. Wat. Code §13263(a)).
  - d. A Permittee may comply with water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations in Attachments L through R using any lawful means.

## **2. Compliance Determination**

### **a. General**

- i. A Permittee shall demonstrate compliance at compliance monitoring points established in each TMDL or, if not specified in the TMDL, at locations identified in an approved TMDL monitoring plan or in accordance with an approved integrated monitoring program per Attachment E, Part VI.C.5 (Integrated Watershed Monitoring and Assessment).
- ii. Compliance with water quality-based effluent limitations shall be determined as described in Parts VI.E.2.d and VI.E.2.e, or for trash water quality-based effluent limitations as described in Part VI.E.5.b, or as otherwise set forth in TMDL specific provisions in Attachments L through R.

- iii. Pursuant to Part VI.C, a Permittee may, individually or as part of a watershed-based group, develop and submit for approval by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer a Watershed Management Program that addresses all water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations to which the Permittee is subject pursuant to established TMDLs.

**b. Commingled Discharges**

- i. A number of the TMDLs establish WLAs that are assigned jointly to a group of Permittees whose storm water and/or non-storm water discharges are or may be commingled in the MS4 prior to discharge to the receiving water subject to the TMDL.
- ii. In these cases, pursuant to 40 CFR section 122.26(a)(3)(vi), each Permittee is only responsible for discharges from the MS4 for which they are owners and/or operators.
- iii. Where Permittees have commingled discharges to the receiving water, compliance at the outfall to the receiving water or in the receiving water shall be determined for the group of Permittees as a whole unless an individual Permittee demonstrates that its discharge did not cause or contribute to the exceedance, pursuant to subpart v. below.
- iv. For purposes of compliance determination, each Permittee is responsible for demonstrating that its discharge did not cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable water quality-based effluent limitation(s) at the outfall or receiving water limitation(s) in the target receiving water.
- v. A Permittee may demonstrate that its discharge did not cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable water quality-based effluent limitation or receiving water limitation in any of the following ways:
  - (1) Demonstrate that there is no discharge from the Permittee's MS4 into the applicable receiving water during the time period subject to the water quality-based effluent limitation and/or receiving water limitation; or
  - (2) Demonstrate that the discharge from the Permittee's MS4 is controlled to a level that does not exceed the applicable water quality-based effluent limitation; or
  - (3) For exceedances of bacteria receiving water limitations or water quality-based effluent limitations, demonstrate through a source investigation pursuant to protocols established under California Water Code section 13178 or for exceedances of other receiving water limitations or water quality-based effluent limitations, demonstrate using other accepted source identification protocols, that pollutant sources within the jurisdiction of the Permittee or the Permittee's MS4 have not caused or contributed to the exceedance of the Receiving Water Limitation(s).

**c. Receiving Water Limitations Addressed by a TMDL**

- i. For receiving water limitations in Part V.A. associated with water body-pollutant combinations addressed in a TMDL, Permittees shall achieve compliance with the receiving water limitations in Part V.A. as outlined in this Part VI.E. and Attachments L through R of this Order.
- ii. A Permittee's full compliance with the applicable TMDL requirement(s), including compliance schedules, of this Part VI.E. and Attachments L through R constitutes compliance with Part V.A. of this Order for the specific pollutant addressed in the TMDL.
- iii. As long as a Permittee is in compliance with the applicable TMDL requirements in a time schedule order (TSO) issued by the Regional Water Board pursuant to California Water Code sections 13300 and 13385(j)(3), it is not the Regional Water Board's intention to take an enforcement action for violations of Part V.A. of this Order for the specific pollutant(s) addressed in the TSO.

**d. Interim Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations and Receiving Water Limitations**

- i. A Permittee shall be considered in compliance with an applicable interim water quality-based effluent limitation and interim receiving water limitation for a pollutant associated with a specific TMDL if any of the following is demonstrated:
  - (1) There are no violations of the interim water quality-based effluent limitation for the pollutant associated with a specific TMDL at the Permittee's applicable MS4 outfall(s),<sup>38</sup> including an outfall to the receiving water that collects discharges from multiple Permittees' jurisdictions;
  - (2) There are no exceedances of the applicable receiving water limitation for the pollutant associated with a specific TMDL in the receiving water(s) at, or downstream of, the Permittee's outfall(s);
  - (3) There is no direct or indirect discharge from the Permittee's MS4 to the receiving water during the time period subject to the water quality-based effluent limitation and/or receiving water limitation for the pollutant associated with a specific TMDL; or
  - (4) The Permittee has submitted and is fully implementing an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP pursuant to Part VI.C.
    - (a) To be considered fully implementing an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP, a Permittee must be implementing

---

<sup>38</sup> An outfall may include a manhole or other point of access to the MS4 at the Permittee's jurisdictional boundary.

all actions consistent with the approved program and applicable compliance schedules, including structural BMPs.

- (b) Structural storm water BMPs or systems of BMPs should be designed and maintained to treat storm water runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm, where feasible and necessary to achieve applicable WQBELs and receiving water limitations, and maintenance records must be up-to-date and available for inspection by the Regional Water Board.
- (c) A Permittee that does not implement the Watershed Management Program in accordance with the milestones and compliance schedules shall demonstrate compliance with its interim water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations pursuant to Part VI.E.2.d.i.(1)-(3), above.
- (d) Upon notification of a Permittee's intent to develop a WMP or EWMP and prior to approval of its WMP or EWMP, a Permittee's full compliance with all of the following requirements shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with provisions pertaining to interim WQBELs with compliance deadlines occurring prior to approval of a WMP or EWMP. This subdivision (d) shall not apply to interim trash WQBELs.
  - (1) Provides timely notice of its intent to develop a WMP or EWMP,
  - (2) Meets all interim and final deadlines for development of a WMP or EWMP,
  - (3) For the area to be covered by the WMP or EWMP, targets implementation of watershed control measures in its existing storm water management program, including watershed control measures to eliminate non-storm water discharges of pollutants through the MS4 to receiving waters, to address known contributions of pollutants from MS4 discharges that cause or contribute to the impairment(s) addressed by the TMDL(s), and
  - (4) Receives final approval of its WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively.

**e. Final Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations and/or Receiving Water Limitations**

- i. A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with an applicable final water quality-based effluent limitation and final receiving water limitation for the pollutant(s) associated with a specific TMDL if any of the following is demonstrated:

- (1) There are no violations of the final water quality-based effluent limitation for the specific pollutant at the Permittee's applicable MS4 outfall(s)<sup>39</sup>;
- (2) There are no exceedances of applicable receiving water limitation for the specific pollutant in the receiving water(s) at, or downstream of, the Permittee's outfall(s);
- (3) There is no direct or indirect discharge from the Permittee's MS4 to the receiving water during the time period subject to the water quality-based effluent limitation and/or receiving water limitation for the pollutant(s) associated with a specific TMDL; or
- (4) In drainage areas where Permittees are implementing an EWMP, (i) all non-storm water and (ii) all storm water runoff up to and including the volume equivalent to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour event is retained for the drainage area tributary to the applicable receiving water. This provision (4) shall not apply to final trash WQBELs.

### **3. USEPA Established TMDLs**

TMDLs established by the USEPA, to which Permittees are subject, do not contain an implementation plan adopted pursuant to California Water Code section 13242. However, USEPA has included implementation recommendations as part of these TMDLs. In lieu of inclusion of numeric water quality based effluent limitations at this time, this Order requires Permittees subject to WLAs in USEPA established TMDLs to propose and implement best management practices (BMPs) that will be effective in achieving compliance with USEPA established numeric WLAs. The Regional Water Board may, at its discretion, revisit this decision within the term of this Order or in a future permit, as more information is developed to support the inclusion of numeric water quality based effluent limitations.

- a. Each Permittee shall propose BMPs to achieve the WLAs contained in the applicable USEPA established TMDL(s), and a schedule for implementing the BMPs that is as short as possible, in a Watershed Management Program or EWMP.
- b. Each Permittee may either individually submit a Watershed Management Program, or may jointly submit a WMP or EWMP with other Permittees subject to the WLAs contained in the USEPA established TMDL.
- c. At a minimum, each Permittee shall include the following information in its Watershed Management Program or EWMP, relevant to each applicable USEPA established TMDL:
  - i. Available data demonstrating the current quality of the Permittee's MS4 discharge(s) in terms of concentration and/or load of the target pollutant(s) to the receiving waters subject to the TMDL;

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

- ii. A detailed description of BMPs that have been implemented, and/or are currently being implemented by the Permittee to achieve the WLA(s), if any;
  - iii. A detailed time schedule of specific actions the Permittee will take in order to achieve compliance with the applicable WLA(s);
  - iv. A demonstration that the time schedule requested is as short as possible, taking into account the time since USEPA establishment of the TMDL, and technological, operation, and economic factors that affect the design, development, and implementation of the control measures that are necessary to comply with the WLA(s);
    - (1) For the Malibu Creek Nutrient TMDL established by USEPA in 2003, in no case shall the time schedule to achieve the final numeric WLAs exceed five years from the effective date of this Order; and
  - v. If the requested time schedule exceeds one year, the proposed schedule shall include interim requirements and numeric milestones and the date(s) for their achievement.
- d. Each Permittee subject to a WLA in a TMDL established by USEPA shall submit a draft of a Watershed Management Program or EWMP to the Regional Water Board Executive Officer for approval per the schedule Part VI.C.4.
  - e. If a Permittee does not submit a Watershed Management Program, or the plan is determined to be inadequate by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer and the Permittee does not make the necessary revisions within 90 days of written notification that plan is inadequate, the Permittee shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the numeric WLAs immediately based on monitoring data collected under the MRP (Attachment E) for this Order.

#### **4. State Adopted TMDLs where Final Compliance Deadlines have Passed**

- a. Permittees shall comply immediately with water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations to implement WLAs in state-adopted TMDLs for which final compliance deadlines have passed pursuant to the TMDL implementation schedule.
- b. Where a Permittee believes that additional time to comply with the final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations is necessary, a Permittee may within 45 days of Order adoption request a time schedule order pursuant to California Water Code section 13300 for the Regional Water Board's consideration.
- c. Permittees may either individually request a TSO, or may jointly request a TSO with all Permittees subject to the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations, to implement the WLAs in the state-adopted TMDL.



- d. At a minimum, a request for a time schedule order shall include the following:
- i. Data demonstrating the current quality of the MS4 discharge(s) in terms of concentration and/or load of the target pollutant(s) to the receiving waters subject to the TMDL;
  - ii. A detailed description and chronology of structural controls and source control efforts, since the effective date of the TMDL, to reduce the pollutant load in the MS4 discharges to the receiving waters subject to the TMDL;
  - iii. Justification of the need for additional time to achieve the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations;
  - iv. A detailed time schedule of specific actions the Permittee will take in order to achieve the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations;
  - v. A demonstration that the time schedule requested is as short as possible, taking into account the technological, operation, and economic factors that affect the design, development, and implementation of the control measures that are necessary to comply with the effluent limitation(s); and
  - vi. If the requested time schedule exceeds one year, the proposed schedule shall include interim requirements and the date(s) for their achievement. The interim requirements shall include both of the following:
    - (1) Effluent limitation(s) for the pollutant(s) of concern; and
    - (2) Actions and milestones leading to compliance with the effluent limitation(s).

## 5. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations for Trash

Permittees assigned a Waste Load Allocation in a trash TMDL shall comply as set forth below.

- a. **Effluent Limitations:** Permittees shall comply with the interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations for trash set forth in Attachments L through R for the following Trash TMDLs:
- i. Lake Elizabeth Trash TMDL (Attachment L)
  - ii. Santa Monica Bay Nearshore and Offshore Debris TMDL (Attachment M)
  - iii. Malibu Creek Watershed Trash TMDL (Attachment M)
  - iv. Ballona Creek Trash TMDL (Attachment M)
  - v. Machado Lake Trash TMDL (Attachment N)
  - vi. Los Angeles River Trash TMDL (Attachment O)

- vii. Peck Road Park Lake Trash TMDL (Attachment O)
- viii. Echo Park Lake Trash TMDL (Attachment O)
- ix. Legg Lake Trash TMDL (Attachment O)

**b. Compliance**

- i. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13360(a), Permittees may comply with the trash effluent limitations using any lawful means. Such compliance options are broadly classified as *full capture*, *partial capture*, *institutional controls*, or *minimum frequency of assessment and collection*, as described below, and any combination of these may be employed to achieve compliance:

(1) Full Capture Systems:

- (a) The Basin Plan authorizes the Regional Water Board Executive Officer to certify *full capture systems*, which are systems that meet the operating and performance requirements as described in this Order, and the procedures identified in “Procedures and Requirements for Certification of a Best Management Practice for Trash Control as a Full Capture System.”<sup>40</sup>
- (b) Permittees are authorized to comply with their effluent limitations through certified *full capture systems* provided the requirements of paragraph (c), immediately below, and any conditions in the certification, continue to be met.
- (c) Permittees may comply with their effluent limitations through progressive installation of *full capture systems* throughout their jurisdictional areas until all areas draining to Lake Elizabeth, Santa Monica Bay, Malibu Creek, Ballona Creek, Machado Lake, the Los Angeles River system, Legg Lake, Peck Road Park Lake, and/or Echo Park Lake are addressed. For purposes of this Order, attainment of the effluent limitations shall be conclusively presumed for any drainage area to Lake Elizabeth, Santa Monica Bay, Malibu Creek (and its tributaries), Ballona Creek (and its tributaries), Machado Lake, the Los Angeles River (and its tributaries), Legg Lake, Peck Road Park Lake, and/or Echo Park Lake where certified *full capture systems* treat all drainage from the area, provided that the *full capture systems* are adequately sized and maintained, and that maintenance records are up-to-date and available for inspection by the Regional Water Board.

---

<sup>40</sup> The Regional Water Board currently recognizes eight *full capture systems*. These are: Vortex Separation Systems (VSS) and seven other Executive Officer certified *full capture systems*, including specific types or designs of trash nets; two gross solids removal devices (GSRDs); catch basin brush inserts and mesh screens; vertical and horizontal trash capture screen inserts; and a connector pipe screen device. See August 3, 2004 Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Memorandum titled “Procedures and Requirements for Certification of a Best Management Practice for Trash Control as a Full Capture System.”

- (i) A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with its final effluent limitation if it demonstrates that all drainage areas under its jurisdiction and/or authority are serviced by appropriate certified *full capture systems* as described in paragraph (1)(c).
  - (ii) A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with its interim effluent limitations, where applicable:
    - 1. By demonstrating that *full capture systems* treat the percentage of drainage areas in the watershed that corresponds to the required trash abatement.
    - 2. Alternatively, a Permittee may propose a schedule for installation of *full capture systems* in areas under its jurisdiction and/or authority within a given watershed, targeting first the areas of greatest trash generation, for the Executive Officer's approval. The Executive Officer shall not approve any such schedule that does not result in timely compliance with the final effluent limitations, consistent with the established TMDL implementation schedule and applicable State policies. A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with its interim effluent limitations provided it is fully in compliance with any such approved schedule.
- (2) Partial Capture Devices and Institutional Controls: Permittees may comply with their interim and final effluent limitations through the installation of *partial capture devices* and the application of *institutional controls*.<sup>41</sup>
- (a) Trash discharges from areas serviced solely by *partial capture devices* may be estimated based on demonstrated performance of the device(s) in the implementing area.<sup>42</sup> That is, trash reduction is equivalent to the *partial capture devices'* trash removal efficiency multiplied by the percentage of drainage area serviced by the devices.
  - (b) Except as provided in subdivision (c), immediately below, trash discharges from areas addressed by *institutional controls* and/or *partial capture devices* (where site-specific performance data is not available) shall be calculated using a mass balance approach, based on the daily generation rate (DGR) for a representative area.<sup>43</sup> The DGR shall be determined from direct measurement of trash deposited in the drainage area during any thirty-day period between June 22<sup>nd</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup> exclusive of rain events<sup>44</sup>, and shall be re-calculated every year thereafter unless a less frequent period for recalculation is approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. The DGR

<sup>41</sup> While interim effluent limitations may be complied with using *partial capture devices*, compliance with final effluent limitations cannot be achieved with the exclusive use of *partial capture devices*.

<sup>42</sup> Performance shall be demonstrated under different conditions (e.g. low to high trash loading).

<sup>43</sup> The area(s) should be representative of the land uses and activities within the Permittees' authority and shall be approved by the Executive Officer prior to the 30-day collection period.

<sup>44</sup> Provided no special events are scheduled that may affect the representative nature of that collection period.

shall be calculated as the total amount of trash collected during this period divided by the length of the collection period.

$$\text{DGR} = (\text{Amount of trash collected during a 30-day collection period})^{45} / (30 \text{ days})$$

The DGR for the applicable area under the Permittees' jurisdiction and/or authority shall be extrapolated from that of the representative drainage area(s). A mass balance equation shall be used to estimate the amount of trash discharged during a storm event.<sup>46</sup> The *Storm Event Trash Discharge* for a given rain event in the Permittee's drainage area shall be calculated by multiplying the number of days since the last street sweeping by the DGR and subtracting the amount of any trash recovered in the catch basins.<sup>47</sup> For each day of a storm event that generates precipitation greater than 0.25 inch, the Permittee shall calculate a *Storm Event Trash Discharge*.

$$\text{Storm Event Trash Discharge} = [(\text{Days since last street sweeping} * \text{DGR})] - [\text{Amount of trash recovered from catch basins}]^{48}$$

The sum of the *Storm Event Trash Discharges* for the storm year shall be the Permittee's calculated annual trash discharge.

$$\text{Total Storm Year Trash Discharge} = \sum \text{Storm Event Trash Discharges from Drainage Area}$$

- (c) The Executive Officer may approve alternative compliance monitoring approaches for calculating total storm year trash discharge, upon finding that the program will provide a scientifically-based estimate of the amount of trash discharged from the Permittee's MS4.

(3) Combined Compliance Approaches:

Permittees may comply with their interim and final effluent limitations through a combination of *full capture systems*, *partial capture devices*, and *institutional controls*. Where a Permittee relies on a combination of approaches, it shall demonstrate compliance with the interim and final effluent limitations as specified in (1)(c) in areas where *full capture systems* are installed and as specified in (2)(a) or (2)(b), as appropriate, in areas where *partial capture devices* and *institutional controls* are applied.

(4) Minimum Frequency of Assessment and Collection Approach:

If allowed in a trash TMDL and approved by the Executive Officer, a Permittee may alternatively comply with its final effluent limitations by

<sup>45</sup> Between June 22<sup>nd</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Amount of trash shall refer to the uncompressed volume (in gallons) or drip-dry weight (in pounds) of trash collected.

<sup>47</sup> Any negative values shall be considered to represent a zero discharge.

<sup>48</sup> When more than one storm event occurs prior to the next street sweeping the discharge shall be calculated from the date of the last assessment.

implementing a program for *minimum frequency of assessment and collection* (MFAC) in conjunction with BMPs. To the satisfaction of the Executive Officer, the MFAC/BMP program must meet the following criteria:

- (a) The MFAC/BMP Program includes an initial minimum frequency of trash assessment and collection and suite of structural and/or nonstructural BMPs. The MFAC/BMP program shall include collection and disposal of all trash found in the receiving water and shoreline. Permittees shall implement an initial suite of BMPs based on current trash management practices in land areas that are found to be sources of trash to the water body. The initial minimum frequency of trash assessment and collection shall be set as specified in the following TMDLs:
  - (i) Malibu Creek Watershed Trash TMDL
  - (ii) Machado Lake Trash TMDL
  - (iii) Legg Lake Trash TMDL
- (b) The MFAC/BMP Program includes reasonable assurances that it will be implemented by the responsible Permittees.
- (c) MFAC protocols may be based on SWAMP protocols for rapid trash assessment, or alternative protocols proposed by Permittees and approved by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer.
- (d) Implementation of the MFAC/BMP program should include a Health and Safety Program to protect personnel. The MFAC/BMP program shall not require Permittees to access and collect trash from areas where personnel are prohibited.
- (e) The Regional Water Board Executive Officer may approve or require a revised assessment and collection frequency and definition of the critical conditions under the MFAC:
  - (i) To prevent trash from accumulating in deleterious amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses between collections;
  - (ii) To reflect the results of trash assessment and collection;
  - (iii) If the amount of trash collected does not show a decreasing trend, where necessary, such that a shorter interval between collections is warranted; or
  - (iv) If the amount of trash collected is decreasing such that a longer interval between collections is warranted.
- (f) At the end of the implementation period, a revised MFAC/BMP program may be required if the Regional Water Board Executive Officer determines that the amount of trash accumulating between

collections is causing nuisance or otherwise adversely affecting beneficial uses.

(g) With regard to (4)(e)(i), (4)(e)(ii), or (4)(e)(iii), above, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer is authorized to allow responsible Permittees to implement additional structural or non-structural BMPs in lieu of modifying the monitoring frequency.

ii. If a Permittee is not in compliance with its applicable interim and/or final effluent limitation as identified in Attachments L through R, then it shall be in violation of this Order.

(1) A Permittee relying on *partial capture devices* and/or *institutional controls* that has violated its interim and/or final effluent limitation(s) shall be presumed to have violated the applicable limitation for each day of each storm event that generated precipitation greater than 0.25 inch during the applicable storm year, except those storm days on which it establishes that its cumulative Storm Event Trash Discharges has not exceeded the applicable effluent limitation.

(2) If a Permittee relying on *full capture systems* has failed to demonstrate that the *full capture systems* for any drainage area are adequately sized and maintained, and that maintenance records are up-to-date and available for inspection by the Regional Water Board, and that it is in compliance with any conditions of its certification, shall be presumed to have discharged trash in an amount that corresponds to the percentage of the baseline waste load allocation represented by the drainage area in question.

(a) A Permittee may overcome this presumption by demonstrating (using any of the methods authorized in Part VI.E.5.b) that the actual or calculated discharge for that drainage area is in compliance with the applicable interim or final effluent limitation.

iii. Each Permittee shall be held liable for violations of the effluent limitations assigned to their area. If a Permittee's compliance strategy includes *full* or *partial capture devices* and it chooses to install a full or partial capture device in the MS4 physical infrastructure of another public entity, it is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits to do so. If a Permittee believes it is unable to obtain the permits needed to install a full capture or partial capture device within another Permittee's MS4 physical infrastructure, either Permittee may request the Executive Officer to hold a conference with the Permittees. Nothing in this Order shall affect the right of that public entity or a Permittee to seek indemnity or other recourse from the other as they deem appropriate. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as relieving a Permittee of any liability that the Permittee would otherwise have under this Order.

**c. Monitoring and Reporting Requirements (pursuant to California Water Code section 13383)**

- i. Each Permittee shall submit a TMDL Compliance Report as part of its Annual Report detailing compliance with the applicable interim and/or final effluent limitations. Reporting shall include the information specified below. The report shall be submitted on the reporting form specified by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer. The report shall be signed under penalty of perjury by the Permittee's principal executive officer or ranking elected official or duly authorized representative of the officer, consistent with Part V.B of Attachment D (Standard Provisions), who is responsible for ensuring compliance with this Order. Each Permittee shall be charged with and shall demonstrate compliance with its applicable effluent limitations beginning with its December 15, 2013, TMDL Compliance Report.
  - (1) Reporting Compliance based on Full Capture Systems: Permittees shall provide information on the number and location of full capture installations, the sizing of each full capture installation, the drainage areas addressed by these installations, and compliance with the applicable interim or final effluent limitation, in its TMDL Compliance Report. The Los Angeles Water Board will periodically audit sizing, performance, and other data to validate that a system satisfies the criteria established for a *full capture system* and any conditions established by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer in the certification.
  - (2) Reporting Compliance based on Partial Capture Systems and/or Institutional Controls:
    - (a) Using Performance Data Specific to the Permittee's Area: In its TMDL Compliance Report, a Permittee shall provide: (i) site-specific performance data for the applicable device(s); (ii) information on the number and location of such installations, and the drainage areas addressed by these installations; and (iii) calculated compliance with the applicable effluent limitations.
    - (b) Using Direct Measurement of Trash Discharge: Permittees shall provide an accounting of DGR and trash removal via street sweeping, catch basin clean outs, etc., in a database to facilitate the calculation of discharge for each rain event. The database shall be maintained and provided to the Regional Water Board for inspection upon request. In its TMDL Compliance Report, a Permittee shall provide information on its annual DGR, calculated storm year discharge, and compliance with the applicable effluent limitation.
  - (3) Reporting Compliance based on Combined Compliance Approaches:

Permittees shall provide the information specified in Part VI.E.5.c.i(1) for areas where *full capture systems* are installed and that are specified in Part VI.E.5.c.i(2)(a) or (b), as appropriate, for areas where *partial capture devices* and *institutional controls* are applied. In its TMDL Compliance Report, a Permittee shall also provide information on compliance with the applicable effluent limitation based on the combined compliance approaches.

(4) Reporting Compliance based on an MFAC/BMP Approach:

The MFAC/BMP Program includes a Trash Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and a requirement that the responsible Permittees will self-report any non-compliance with its provisions. The results and report of the Trash Monitoring and Reporting Plan must be submitted to Regional Water Board with the Permittee's Annual Report.

- ii. Violation of the reporting requirements of this Part shall be punishable pursuant to, inter alia, California Water Code section 13385, subdivisions (a)(3) and (h)(1), and/or section 13385.1.



1 STEVE FLEISCHLI, Bar No. 175174  
NOAH J. GARRISON, Bar No. 252154  
2 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
1314 Second Street  
3 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
(310) 434-2300

4 Attorneys for NATURAL  
5 RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
AND HEAL THE BAY

6 LIZ CROSSON, Bar No. 262178  
7 TATIANA GAUR, Bar No. 246227  
LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
8 120 Broadway, Suite 105  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
9 (310) 394-6162

10 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES  
WATERKEEPER  
11 AND HEAL THE BAY

12 DANIEL COOPER, Bar No. 153576  
LAWYERS FOR CLEAN WATER, INC.  
13 1004A O'Reilly Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94129  
14 (415) 440-6520

15 Attorney for LOS ANGELES  
WATERKEEPER

16  
17  
18 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD  
19

20  
21 In the Matter of the Petition of NRDC, Los )  
Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, for )  
22 Review of Action by the California Regional )  
Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles )  
23 Region, in Adopting the Los Angeles County )  
Municipal Separate Stormwater National )  
24 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System )  
25 (NPDES) Permit; Order No. R4-2012-0175; )  
26 NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 )  
27 )  
28

) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
) AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
) PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS  
) ANGELES REGIONAL WATER  
) QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
) ACTION OF ADOPTING ORDER  
) NO. R4-2012-0175

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This petition seeks review of a pollution discharge permit that is both unlawful and  
3 inadequate to protect the region’s waters or the public health. The Los Angeles Regional Water  
4 Quality Control Board’s (“Regional Board” or “Board”) permit for Los Angeles County municipal  
5 separate storm sewer systems (“MS4s”)<sup>1</sup> is the unfortunate result of six years of delay in renewing  
6 the previous permit, and of largely ignoring the crucial need to address the region’s ongoing legacy  
7 of water pollution. The 2012 Permit, and the process the Regional Board followed in adopting it,  
8 were both deeply flawed, and impermissibly weaken or “backslide” from the requirements of the  
9 previous, 2001 MS4 permit.<sup>2</sup> The critical—but by no means only—flaw of the 2012 Permit is that  
10 it often abandons requirements to comply with both narrative and numeric water quality standards  
11 in receiving waters as a means of protecting water quality. For the reasons discussed below,  
12 Petitioners respectfully request that the State Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”)  
13 overturn these unlawful provisions of the 2012 Permit, or remand the matter to the Regional Board  
14 with specific direction to remedy the provisions of the 2012 Permit that violate state and federal  
15 law.

16 The 2012 Permit is unlawful due to its inclusion of safe harbors from provisions, required  
17 by the 2001 Permit, that require that discharges comply with Water Quality Standards. The safe  
18 harbors—provisions that excuse compliance with Water Quality Standards in the Permit’s  
19 Receiving Water Limitations section, are illegal for four principal reasons: 1) the safe harbors  
20 violate federal anti-backsliding requirements; 2) the safe harbors violate state and federal  
21 antidegradation requirements; 3) the safe harbors violate requirements for incorporation of TMDLs  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> Regional Board, Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System  
25 (MS4) Discharges Within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, Except Those  
26 Discharges Originating From the City of Long Beach, Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES Permit  
27 No CAS004001 (Nov. 8, 2012) (“2012 Permit” or “Permit”).

28 <sup>2</sup> Regional Board, Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer and Urban  
Runoff Discharges Within the County of Los Angeles, and the Incorporated Cities Therein, Except  
the City of Long Beach, Order No. 01-182, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 (Dec. 13, 2001)  
 (“2001 Permit”).

1 into National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits; and, 4) the Regional Board failed to  
2 make sufficient findings or provide evidence in the record to support the inclusion of the safe  
3 harbors in the 2012 Permit.

4 These violations of law present compelling reasons for the State Board to exercise its  
5 statutory duty to correct the unlawful actions of the Regional Board. These corrections are  
6 seriously needed to protect the waters of Los Angeles County and the public health.

7 **A. Factual Background**

8 **1. Monitoring Demonstrates That the Los Angeles County MS4s Discharge**  
9 **Pollution to Receiving Waters**

10 The stormwater systems regulated by the 2012 Permit discharge bacteria, metals, and other  
11 pollutants at unsafe levels to rivers, lakes, and beaches in Los Angeles County. This pollution  
12 causes increased rates of human illness, harm to the environment, and an economic loss of tens to  
13 hundreds of millions of dollars every year from public health impacts alone. As the Regional  
14 Board itself acknowledges:

15 Discharges of storm water and non-storm water from the . . . Los Angeles County  
16 [MS4s] convey pollutants to surface waters throughout the Los Angeles Region. . . .  
17 the primary pollutants of concern in these discharges . . . are indicator bacteria, total  
18 aluminum, copper, lead, zinc, diazanon, and cyanide. Aquatic toxicity, particularly  
during wet weather, is also a concern. . .

19 Pollutants in storm water and non-storm water have damaging effects on both  
20 human health and aquatic ecosystems. Water quality assessments conducted by the  
21 Regional Water Board have identified impairment of beneficial uses of water  
22 bodies in the Los Angeles Region caused or contributed to by pollutant loading  
from municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges.

23 (2012 Permit, at p. 13, Finding A.)<sup>3,4</sup>

24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>3</sup> This comports with the findings of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), which  
27 considers urban runoff to be “one of the most significant reasons that water quality standards are  
28 not being met nationwide.” (U.S. General Accounting Office (June 2001) Water Quality: Better  
Data and Evaluation of Urban Runoff Programs Needed to Assess Effectiveness, Report No.  
GAO-01-679, at 37.)

1 The pollutants that impair the region's waters come in large part from the MS4s subject to  
2 the permit at issue. Monitoring data from mass emission stations in area streams and rivers  
3 demonstrate that the MS4s persistently contribute to violations of Water Quality Standards and  
4 cleanup targets (total maximum daily loads or "TMDLs") in Los Angeles area water bodies.  
5 Monitoring revealed 1,105 violations since 2003 of water quality limits for fecal bacteria, various  
6 heavy metals, ammonia, pH, and cyanide, among other constituents, in Ballona Creek, Malibu  
7 Creek, the Los Angeles River, Santa Clara River, Dominguez Channel, and Coyote Creek.<sup>5</sup>

8 Monitoring conducted by non-profit organizations confirms that MS4s in Los Angeles  
9 County pollute in the region. Data collected by these organizations show:

- 10 • Malibu Creek routinely exceeded limits for nitrogen, ammonia, phosphate, E.coli,  
11 and enterococcus bacteria during wet and dry weather.<sup>6</sup>
- 12 • Compton Creek commonly exceeded applicable pollution limits; the highest  
13 magnitude of exceedances occurred during storm events at storm drain outfalls.<sup>7</sup>
- 14 • 13 of 22 sites sampled in the Los Angeles River watershed during 2005 received an  
15 F grade for failing water quality standards for PH, temperature, dissolved solids,  
16 nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity.<sup>8</sup>
- 17 • Dry weather discharges from 18 storm drains flowing into Ballona Creek, which is  
18 impaired by fecal bacteria, had consistently high levels of bacteria.<sup>9</sup>

19 <sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references to documents in this brief are to documents that were  
20 timely submitted to the Regional Board and are part of the record in this matter. We include  
21 documents originally submitted by Petitioners here for the convenience of the State Water  
22 Resources Control Board ("State Board").

23 <sup>5</sup> Los Angeles County, Dept. of Public Works, Stormwater Monitoring Reports for 2003-2004  
(Aug. 15, 2004), 2005-2006 (Aug. 22, 2006), 2006-2007 (Sept. 4, 2007), 2007-2008 (Aug. 20,  
2008), 2008-2009 (Aug. 25, 2009), 2009-2010 (Aug. 12, 2010), 2010-2011 (Aug. 11, 2011),  
(selected data tables attached and full documents available at  
[http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd/NPDES/report\\_directory.cfm](http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd/NPDES/report_directory.cfm), last visited July 19, 2012).

24 <sup>6</sup> See Exhibit A1: Heal the Bay, Water Quality in Malibu Creek Watershed and Surrounding  
25 Reference Sites; Exhibit A2: Heal the Bay, Malibu Watershed Exceedances, Raw Data (1998-  
2010).

26 <sup>7</sup> See Exhibit B1: Heal the Bay, Monitoring Plan for Compton Creek; Exhibit B2: Heal the Bay,  
27 Sediment Data Analysis – Compton Creek (2006-2011); Exhibit B3: Heal the Bay, Water Data  
28 Analysis – Compton Creek (2006-2011).

<sup>8</sup> Friends of the Los Angeles River (2005) The First State of the Los Angeles River Report, at 3.

<sup>9</sup> See Exhibit C: Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Ballona Creek Data (2011-2012).

1 Receiving water sampling conducted in Ballona Creek, together with dry weather storm drain  
2 sampling, as well as monitoring from the City of Malibu, demonstrate a link between polluted  
3 storm drain discharges and exceedances of water quality standards, and that the MS4 system is a  
4 significant source of this pollution to receiving waters.<sup>10</sup>

5 Finally, California Ocean Plan standards and fecal bacteria TMDL limits established to  
6 protect the health of beachgoers have been exceeded on thousands of occasions. Monitoring  
7 identified 3,369 exceedances of beach bacteria TMDL limits at 65 Los Angeles County beach  
8 monitoring locations during the April – October dry weather season from 2006 through 2011,  
9 exposing the public to various well-documented health risks associated with recreating in polluted  
10 water.<sup>11</sup>

## 11 **2. Stormwater Pollution Threatens Public Health**

12 Polluted urban runoff increases bacteria levels and illness rates among swimmers.<sup>12</sup>  
13 Contact with waters contaminated by stormwater runoff can lead to fever, chills, ear infections and  
14 discharge, coughing and respiratory ailments, vomiting, diarrhea and other gastrointestinal illness,  
15 and skin rashes.<sup>13</sup> Scientists reviewing 22 epidemiological studies found that 19 of them showed  
16 that adverse health effects were significantly related to fecal indicator bacteria or bacterial  
17 pathogens.<sup>14</sup> One local analysis investigated health risks of people exposed to storm drain runoff  
18

---

19 <sup>10</sup> *Id.*; Exhibit D: Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Malibu 2011-2012 Storm Water Monitoring.

20 <sup>11</sup> See, Exhibit F: Heal the Bay, Santa Monica Bay Bacteria TMDL Tally; see also Exhibit G: Los  
21 Angeles Waterkeeper, Area of Special Biological Significance [ASBS] Malibu Data Revised  
22 March 27, 2012; Exhibit H: Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Non-ASBS and Malibu Creek Data  
Revised March 27, 2012.

23 <sup>12</sup> Curriero et al. (August 2001) *The Association Between Extreme Precipitation and Waterborne*  
24 *Disease Outbreaks in the United States, 1949-1994*, American Journal of Public Health, 91:8  
1194-1199. See also, Letter from Dr. Jennifer Jay to Mr. Sam Unger, Executive Officer and  
Members of the Board, Regional Board re: MS4 Permit for Los Angeles County, July 23, 2012.

25 <sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Haile, et al. (1999) *The Health Effects of Swimming in Ocean Water Contaminated by*  
26 *Storm Drain Runoff*, Epidemiology 10(4): 355-63; Haile, R. W. et al (1996) *An Epidemiological*  
27 *Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay*, Santa Monica Bay  
Restoration Project, 70 pp.

28 <sup>14</sup> Pruss, A. (1998) *Review of epidemiological studies on health effects from exposure to*  
*recreational waters*, International Journal of Epidemiology 27:1-9.

1 while swimming in Santa Monica Bay and found that swimmers exposed directly in front of a  
2 storm drain experienced increased health risks of approximately 50-100 percent compared with  
3 people swimming more than 400 yards away from the drain.<sup>15</sup>

4 The Regional Board itself has acknowledged that the harm to the public from exceeding  
5 bacteria standards “is dramatic both in terms of health impacts to exposed beachgoers, and the  
6 economic cost to the region associated with related illnesses.” (2001 Permit (as amended by Order  
7 R4-2009-0130), at p. 16, Finding E.32.) These health impacts come at tremendous cost—one  
8 study demonstrated that swimming at polluted beaches in Los Angeles County caused between  
9 427,800 and 993,000 excess cases of gastroenteritis per year, resulting in annual health costs of  
10 between \$14 and \$35 million, or \$120 and \$278 million per year (depending on whether only  
11 market costs or both market and non-market costs, such as willingness-to-pay not to get sick, were  
12 considered).<sup>16</sup>

### 13 **3. Controlling stormwater pollution provides numerous economic benefits, 14 while stormwater pollution creates many economic harms**

15 Controlling pollution from MS4 systems has far-reaching economic and social benefits for  
16 the region. According to a report to California’s Resources Agency, “California has the largest  
17 Ocean Economy in the United States, ranking number one overall for both employment and gross  
18 state product. . . .”<sup>17</sup> One study estimated that local beach goers in California spend as much as  
19 \$9.5 billion annually and the non-market values associated with beach going in California may be  
20 as high as \$5.8 billion annually.<sup>18</sup>

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 <sup>15</sup> Haile, R. W. et al (1996) *An Epidemiological Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of*  
23 *Swimming in Santa Monica Bay*, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project, at 54; see also, Haile, et  
24 al. (1999) *The Health Effects of Swimming in Ocean Water Contaminated by Storm Drain Runoff*,  
25 *Epidemiology* 10(4): 355-63.

26 <sup>16</sup> Given, S., et al. (2006) *Regional Public Health Cost Estimates of Contaminated Coastal Waters:*  
27 *A Case Study of Gastroenteritis at Southern California Beaches*, *Environmental Science &*  
28 *Technology* 40(16): 4851-4858, at 4856.

<sup>17</sup> Kildow, J. and Colgan, C.S. (2005) National Ocean Economics Program, California’s Ocean  
Economy: A Report to the Resources Agency, State of California, at 1.

<sup>18</sup> Pendleton, L. (July 2004) *Harvesting Ocean Observing Technologies to Improve Beach*  
*Management: Estimating the Regional Economic Benefits of Improvements in the California*

1           Unfortunately, stormwater runoff in Los Angeles County’s coastal waters causes or  
2 contributes to an enormous number of beach closures or advisories each year.<sup>19</sup> Beach closures  
3 and advisories result in direct and indirect negative effects on the coastal economy, such as lost  
4 revenue.<sup>20</sup> One study estimated that a hypothetical beach closure of Huntington Beach for one day  
5 would result in a loss of 1200 beach visits and associated economic losses of \$100,000.<sup>21</sup>  
6 Conversely, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association found that improving water  
7 quality in Long Beach from a C grade to the healthier standards of Huntington City Beach (a B  
8 grade) would create \$8.8 million in economic benefits over a 10-year period.<sup>22</sup>

9           Moreover, the economic and social benefits of stormwater regulation, such as those  
10 achievable through this Permit, far outweigh the costs of implementation. For example, the staff  
11 report for the Metals TMDL for the Los Angeles River and its tributaries found that removing  
12 metals from the waterways would have benefits of as much as \$18 billion (if structural systems  
13 were used), in comparison to costs of between \$5.7 and \$7.4 billion.<sup>23</sup> This would be in addition  
14 to “[u]nquantifiable health benefits” associated with implementation.<sup>24</sup>

---

16 *Coastal Ocean Observing System* Arlington, VA: Ocean. Unnumbered Report. July; see also,  
17 Chapman, D. and Hanemann, M. (2001) *Environmental Damages in Court: the American Trader*  
18 *Case*, in *The Law and Economics of the Environment*, (Heyes, edit.), pp. 319-367 (estimating a  
19 “consumer surplus” of \$8.16 to \$60.79 per visit for each beachgoer).

20 <sup>19</sup> NRDC (2012) *Testing the Waters: A Guide to Water Quality at Vacation Beaches*, at California  
21 Chapter Summary. Los Angeles County reported 2,430 total closing or advisory days in 2011  
22 from all sources. Reported closing or advisory days are for events lasting six consecutive weeks or  
23 less. Available at <http://www.nrdc.org/water/oceans/ttw/ca.asp>.

24 <sup>20</sup> See, Leeworthy, V.R. and Wiley, P.C. (2000) *Southern California Beach Valuation Project:*  
25 *Economic Value and Impact of Water Quality Change for Long Beach in Southern California*,  
26 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, at 4.

27 <sup>21</sup> Hanemann, M., et al. (November 2005) *Welfare Estimates for Five Scenarios of Water Quality*  
28 *Change in Southern California: A Report from the Southern California Beach Valuation Project*, at  
7-8.

<sup>22</sup> Leeworthy, V.R. and Wiley, P.C. (2000) *Southern California Beach Valuation Project:*  
*Economic Value and Impact of Water Quality Change for Long Beach in Southern California*,  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, at 9, 15.

<sup>23</sup> Regional Board and U.S. EPA Region 9 (June 2, 2005) *Total Maximum Daily Loads for Metals*  
Los Angeles River and Tributaries, at 77.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*; See 2012 Permit, Attachment F (“Fact Sheet”), at 76-77.

1           **B. Legal Background**

2           In 1972, Congress enacted the Clean Water Act (“CWA”) to “restore and maintain the  
3 chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.” (33 U.S.C. § 1251(a); see  
4 also, *NRDC v. U.S.E.P.A.*, 859 F.2d 156, 198 (D.C. Cir. 1988); *NRDC v. Costle*, 568 F.2d 1369,  
5 1373 (D.C. Cir. 1977); *American Frozen Foods Inst. v. Train*, 539 F. 2d 107, 124 (D.C. Cir.  
6 1976).) The Act sought to eliminate the discharge of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985, and  
7 to achieve fishable and swimmable conditions, wherever possible, by 1983. (33 U.S.C. §  
8 1251(a)(1)-(2).) Courts have consistently recognized that the CWA is a tough law—“strong  
9 medicine.” (*Texas Municipal Power Agency v. U.S. EPA* (5th Cir. 1988) 836 F.2d 1482, 1488.)<sup>25</sup>

10           Overall, the Act prohibits the discharge of any pollutant from a point source into a water of  
11 the United States except as in compliance with the Act. (33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a), 1342.) “Point  
12 source” is defined to mean any discrete “conveyance,” such as a pipe or channel, (33 U.S.C. §  
13 1362(14)), and thus includes MS4s, which are elaborate networks of such conveyances. (33  
14 U.S.C. §§ 1342(p), 1362(14).)<sup>26</sup> A point source, such as an MS4, can comply with the CWA by  
15 obtaining a discharge permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System  
16 (“NPDES”) program. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(b), (p).)

17           The CWA requires each state to adopt Water Quality Standards (“WQSs”) for all waters  
18 within its boundaries and submit them to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) for  
19 approval. (33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(b)(1)(C), 1313.) WQSs include maximum permissible pollutant  
20 levels that must be sufficiently stringent to protect public health and enhance water quality,  
21 consistent with the uses for which the water bodies have been designated. (33 U.S.C. §

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 <sup>25</sup> “The [Clean Water Act] is strong medicine. . . . Congress explicitly recognized that reduction of  
24 the amount of effluents—not merely their dilution or dispersion—is the goal of the [Act].” (*Texas*  
*Municipal Power Agency*, 836 F.2d at 1488.)

25 <sup>26</sup> The discharge of pollutants from an MS4, often called “polluted runoff” or “urban runoff,” is a  
26 two-part problem. It includes what is often referred to as non-stormwater discharges—typically,  
27 landscape irrigation flows, washwater, and other flows not related to precipitation carrying  
28 herbicides, bacteria, metals, used motor oil, and other pollutants. And it includes urban  
stormwater—which is basically what it sounds like—storm flows that contain pollutants from the  
urban environment. (*See* 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B)(ii)-(iii).)



1 1313(c)(2)(A.) WQSs provide the reference point “to prevent water quality from falling below  
2 acceptable levels.” (*PUD No. 1 of Jefferson County v. Washington Dep’t of Ecology* (1994) 511  
3 U.S. 700, 704 [quotation omitted].) States also must identify as impaired any water bodies that fail  
4 to meet water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. § 1313(d).)

5 For impaired waters, states must establish TMDLs, which set a daily limit on the discharge  
6 of each pollutant necessary to achieve water quality standards. (*Id.* § 1313(d)(1).) The TMDL  
7 “assigns a **waste load allocation (WLA)** to each point source, which is that portion of the TMDL’s  
8 total pollutant load, which is allocated to a point source for which a NPDES permit is required.”  
9 (*Communities for a Better Env’t v. State Water Res. Control Bd.* (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 1313,  
10 1321 (emphasis in original).) Critically, federal law requires that “once a TMDL is developed,  
11 effluent limitations in NPDES permits must be consistent with the WLA’s in the TMDL.” (*Id.*, at  
12 1322 (citing 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).) According to EPA, which oversees  
13 implementation of the CWA, “[w]here the TMDL includes WLAs for stormwater sources that  
14 provide numeric pollutant load . . . the WLA should, where feasible, be translated into numeric  
15 [water quality-based effluent limitations] in the applicable stormwater permits.”<sup>27</sup>

16 Like other NPDES permits, MS4 permits must ensure that discharges from storm sewers do  
17 not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. § 1311(a); 1313;  
18 1341(a); 1342(p).)<sup>28</sup> Renewal permits—like the 2012 Permit, at issue—may not contain weaker

---

20 <sup>27</sup> Memorandum from James A. Hanlon and Denise Keehner, U.S. EPA, to Water Management  
21 Division Directors, Regions 1 – 10, re: Revisions to the November 22, 2002 Memorandum  
22 "Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm  
23 Water Sources and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on Those WLAs, November 12, 2010,  
24 ("EPA Hanlon Memo") at 3. (Attached as Request for Notice ("RN") "Exhibit A".)

25 <sup>28</sup> See, e.g., State Board Order No. WQ 99-05, *Own Motion to Review the Petition of*  
26 *Environmental Health Coalition to Review Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-03*; In  
27 addition, permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers “shall require controls to reduce the  
28 discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable . . . and such other provisions as the  
Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants. (33 U.S.C.  
§ 1342(p)(3)(B)(iii).) This language in section 1342(p) has been held by California courts to grant  
“the EPA (and/or a state approved to issue the NPDES permit) . . . the discretion to impose  
‘appropriate’ water pollution controls in addition to those that come within the definition of  
‘maximum extent practicable.’” (*Building Industry Ass’n of San Diego County v. State Water*

1 standards than those contained in the previous permit, except under limited circumstances. (33  
2 U.S.C. § 1342(o); 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l).) Federal and state law additionally require  
3 implementation of an antidegradation policy, that mandates that existing water quality in navigable  
4 waters be maintained unless degradation is justified by specific findings. (See, 40 C.F.R. §  
5 131.12(a)(1).)

### 6 **1. The 2001 Los Angeles County MS4 Permit**

7 In 2001, the Regional Board adopted an NPDES permit for MS4s in Los Angeles County,<sup>29</sup>  
8 which was intended to address the harm caused by pollutants conveyed via storm drains to surface  
9 waters in the Los Angeles area. The permit regulated Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles  
10 County Flood Control District, and 84 incorporated cities within the County.

11 Importantly, the 2001 Permit contained Receiving Water Limitations (“RWLs”), which  
12 required that “discharges from the MS4 that cause or contribute to the violation of Water Quality  
13 Standards or water quality objectives are prohibited.” (2001 Permit, at Part 2.1.)<sup>30</sup> The Permittees  
14 were directed to begin remedial measures immediately if discharges violate water quality  
15 standards. (*Id.*, at Part 2.3.) If exceedances of water quality standards persisted, notwithstanding  
16 control measures, the Permittees “shall assure compliance” by preparing a compliance report that  
17 identifies the violations and adopting more stringent pollution control measures to correct them.  
18 (*Id.*)

19 Complying with the 2001 Permit’s iterative process assisted Permittees in meeting water  
20 quality goals, but did not excuse violations of water quality standards. An earlier MS4 permit for  
21 Orange County, approved by the State Board, had included language stating “the permittees will  
22  
23

---

24 *Resources Control Bd.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 883 (citing *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*  
25 (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159, at 1165–1167).)

26 <sup>29</sup> This was the third such permit issued by the Regional Board to Los Angeles County and local  
27 municipalities. Prior permits were adopted in 1990 and 1996. (2001 Permit, p. 1, Finding A.)

28 <sup>30</sup> “Water Quality Standards and Water Quality Objectives” are defined in the 2001 Permit to mean  
“water quality criteria contained in the Basin Plan, the California Ocean Plan, . . . the California  
Toxics Rule, and other state or federally approved surface water quality plans.” (2001 Permit, at  
Part 5, p. 70.)

1 not be in violation of [receiving water limitations] so long as they are in compliance with [the  
2 iterative process set forth in the permit].”<sup>31</sup> EPA objected to that provision, (which MS4 permits  
3 for Vallejo and Riverside County had additionally adopted), as a “safe harbor,” meaning the  
4 provision deemed the permittees in compliance with the permit regardless of whether Water  
5 Quality Standards were then met. In response, the State Board directed the Regional Boards to  
6 include receiving water limitations language devised by EPA, without a safe harbor provision, into  
7 all future MS4 permits.<sup>32</sup>

8 The Regional Board followed this clear directive in the 2001 Permit. Indeed, when the  
9 County and 43 cities challenged the permit in state court, the court ruled that the Regional Board  
10 “included Parts 2.1 and 2.2 in the Permit without a ‘safe harbor.’” (*Id.*)<sup>33</sup> The Regional Board  
11 supports this interpretation: “the plain meaning of these provisions is clear: they prohibit  
12 discharges that cause or contribute to a ‘violation of Water Quality Standards’ [or water quality  
13 objectives] or to a condition of nuisance.” Put simply, “[t]he Regional Board’s position . . . is that  
14 the Permit cannot be read to excuse exceedances of water quality standards.”<sup>34</sup> Finally, the Ninth  
15 Circuit confirmed the state court’s interpretation of the 2001 Permit’s Receiving Water  
16 Limitations, holding that “no such ‘safe harbor’ is present in this Permit. . . . [there is] no textual  
17  
18  
19

---

20  
21 <sup>31</sup> See, State Board Order No. WQ 98-01, *Own Motion to Review the Petition of Environmental  
Health Coalition to Review Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-03*, at 6-7.

22 <sup>32</sup> See, State Board WQ Order 99-05.

23 <sup>33</sup> See, *In re L.A. County Mun. Storm Water Permit Litigation.*, No. BS 080548 at 4-7 (L.A. Super.  
24 Ct. Mar. 24, 2005) (“*L.A. County Mun. Stormwater*”). The court noted that, “the Regional Board  
acted within its authority when it included Parts 2.1 and 2.2 in the Permit without a ‘safe harbor,’  
25 whether or not compliance therewith requires efforts that exceed the ‘MEP’ standard.” (*In re L.A.  
County Mun. Stormwater*, at 7.) But regardless of this authority, as described above, the Court  
26 found that “the terms of the Permit taken, as a whole, constitute the Regional Board’s definition of  
MEP, including, but not limited to, the challenged Permit Provisions.” (*Id.* at 7-8.)

27 <sup>34</sup> Brief of Amicus Curiae California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region,  
28 in *Santa Monica Baykeeper v. City of Malibu* No. CV 08-1465-AHM (PLAx) (C.D. Cal.) (filed  
Feb. 5, 2010), at 9; *see also, id.* at 4.

1 support for the proposition that compliance with certain provisions shall forgive non-compliance  
2 with the discharge prohibitions.”<sup>35</sup>

### 3 **2. The 2012 Permit**

4 On November 8, 2012, the Regional Board adopted a new MS4 permit for Los Angeles  
5 County. Like the prior 2001 Permit, the 2012 Permit states that, “Discharges from the MS4 that  
6 cause or contribute to the violation of receiving water limitations are prohibited.” (2012 Permit, at  
7 Part V.A.1.)<sup>36</sup> Rather than maintaining the 2001 Permit’s strict prohibition against discharges that  
8 cause or contribute to an exceedance of Water Quality Standards, however, the Permit instead  
9 incorporates several safe harbors that create broad exemptions to the RWLs section, rendering the  
10 limitations inoperative in certain circumstances.

11 Under the 2012 Permit, Permittees have several different compliance options, two of which  
12 trigger application of a safe harbor. In particular, dischargers may elect to develop or participate in  
13 a Watershed Management Program (“WMP”), or Enhanced Watershed Management Program  
14 (“EWMP”). (2012 Permit, at Part VI.C.) These programs in many aspects allow a permittee to  
15 draft their own permit requirements, conditions, and schedules for compliance. Under a WMP, a  
16 permittee is required to identify water quality priorities (*id.* at VI.C.5.a), select watershed control  
17 measures to be implemented, (*id.* at VI.C.5.b), and establish compliance schedules for addressing  
18 water quality priorities. (*Id.* at VI.C.5.c.) For an EWMP, a permittee must, where feasible within  
19 a given watershed, retain all storm water runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm event for  
20 the drainage areas tributary to the projects. (*Id.* at VI.C.1.g.) Under both options, Permittees must  
21 conduct a “reasonable assurance” analysis to assess whether the programs will result in discharges  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>35</sup> *Natural Resources Defense Council v. County of Los Angeles* (2011) 673 F.3d 880, 897. This  
25 portion of the 9th Circuit Court’s Opinion is not subject to further review.

26 <sup>36</sup> The Permit defines “Receiving Water Limitation” as: “Any applicable numeric or narrative  
27 water quality objective or criterion, or limitation to implement the applicable water quality  
28 objective or criterion, for the receiving water as contained in Chapter 3 or 7 of the Water Quality  
Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region (Basin Plan), water quality control plans or policies  
adopted by the State Water Board, or federal regulations, including but not limited to, 40 CFR §  
131.38.” (Permit, at Attachment A, A-17.)

1 that achieve water quality based effluent limitations and RWLs in the 2012 Permit. (*Id.* at  
2 VI.C.1.g; VI.C.5.b.iv(5).)

3 Although it is a goal of these programs to ensure that stormwater discharges do not cause  
4 or contribute to exceedances of RWLs, (see, e.g., *id.* at VI.C.5.b.ii), and that TMDL WLAs are  
5 achieved, it is not a requirement that the programs achieve these results in fact. Permittees are  
6 instead given a safe harbor from the prohibition on violations of RWLs, or, in some cases of  
7 TMDL limits, if they participate in a WMP or an EWMP. The safe harbors include relief from  
8 RWL compliance: 1) during the development of a WMP or an EWMP, before the plan is  
9 approved; 2) after a plan is submitted to and approved by the Regional Board; and, 3) when the  
10 specific RWL (or combination of water quality standard and waterbody) at issue is already  
11 addressed by a TMDL.<sup>37</sup>

12 More specifically, in the first instance, a safe harbor applies to discharges by a permittee  
13 upon notification of its intent to develop a WMP or an EWMP to the Regional Board. During the  
14 period of plan development and review (up to 28 months from the 2012 Permit adoption date for a  
15 WMP or 40 months from the 2012 Permit adoption date for an EWMP before it may be approved  
16 (*Id.* at VI.C.4.a.)), the permittee is excused for violations of the Permit's RWLs:

- 17 • “Upon notification of a Permittee’s intent to develop a WMP or EWMP and prior  
18 to approval of its WMP or EWMP, a Permittee’s full compliance with all of the  
19 following requirements shall constitute a Permittee’s compliance with the receiving  
water limitations provisions in Part V.A. not otherwise addressed by a TMDL  
.....<sup>38</sup>

20 (2012 Permit, at Part VI.C.2.d.)<sup>39</sup> Second, after approval of a Permittee’s WMP or EWMP  
21 by the Regional Board or the Board’s Executive Officer, a safe harbor removes liability for  
22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>37</sup> In this last case, in some circumstances the 2012 Permit provides a safe harbor for compliance  
with either interim or final TMDL limits, or both.

25 <sup>38</sup> We note that the Regional Board lacks authority to exempt state law requirements prohibiting  
the causation of a condition of nuisance under Part V.A.2.

26 <sup>39</sup> The Permittee is required to: “i. Provide[] timely notice of its intent to develop a WMP or  
27 EWMP, ii. Meet[] all interim and final deadlines for development of a WMP or EWMP, iii. For  
the area to be covered by the WMP or EWMP, target[] implementation of watershed control  
28 measures in its existing storm water management program . . . and iv. Receive[] final approval of

1 a violation of all RWLs if the WMP or EWMP addresses that pollutant/waterbody  
2 combination, regardless of whether or not compliance with the RWL is actually achieved:

- 3 • “A Permittee’s full compliance with all requirements and dates for their  
4 achievement in an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP shall  
5 constitute a Permittee’s compliance with the receiving water limitations provisions  
6 in Part V.A. of this Order for the specific water body-pollutant combinations  
7 addressed by an approved Watershed Management Program or EWMP.”

8 (*Id.* at VI.C.2.b.) Third, the 2012 Permit provides a safe harbor from certain TMDL  
9 requirements. Specifically, the 2012 Permit provides a safe harbor for interim TMDL  
10 WLAs for permittees indicating their intent to develop a WMP or an EWMP:

- 11 • “Upon notification of a Permittee’s intent to develop a WMP or EWMP and prior to  
12 approval of its WMP or EWMP, a Permittee’s full compliance with all of the following  
13 requirements<sup>40</sup> shall constitute a Permittee’s compliance with provisions pertaining to  
14 interim WQBELs with compliance deadlines occurring prior to approval of a WMP or  
15 EWMP.”

16 (*Id.* at VI.E.2.d.i(4)(d).) And, for permittees implementing an EWMP, the 2012 Permit provides a  
17 safe harbor for all TMDL final limits other than for Trash TMDLs:

- 18 • “A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with an applicable final water quality-based  
19 effluent limitation and final receiving water limitation for the pollutant(s) associated with a  
20 specific TMDL if. . . . In drainage areas where Permittees are implementing an EWMP, (i)  
21 all non-storm water and (ii) all storm water runoff up to and including the volume  
22 equivalent to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour event is retained for the drainage area tributary to  
23 the applicable receiving water.”

24 (*Id.* at VI.E.2.e.i(4).) By allowing these safe harbors, the 2012 Permit excuses compliance with  
25 TMDL WLAs, and with its RWLs where the 2001 Permit mandated compliance.

26 its WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively.” (Permit, at Part VI.C.3.b.i-iv.) The  
27 safe harbor does not apply to interim Trash TMDL limits.

28 <sup>40</sup> The Permittee is required to to: “i. Provide[] timely notice of its intent to develop a WMP or  
EWMP, ii. Meet[] all interim and final deadlines for development of a WMP or EWMP, iii. For  
the area to be covered by the WMP or EWMP, target[] implementation of watershed control  
measures in its existing storm water management program . . . and iv. Receive[] final approval of  
its WMP or EWMP within 28 or 40 months, respectively.” (2012 Permit, at Parts  
VI.E.2.d.i(4)(d)(1)-(4).)

1 **II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

2 The State Board must exercise its independent judgment as to whether a Regional Board  
3 action is reasonable. (See, *Stinnes-Western Chemical Corp.*, State Board WQ Order No. 86-16  
4 (1986).) Specifically, the State Board’s review is equivalent to the standard a reviewing court  
5 would apply under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, (*id.*), which states “[a]buse  
6 of discretion is established if the respondent has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the  
7 order or decision is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the  
8 evidence.” (Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1094.5(b); see also, *Zuniga v. Los Angeles County Civil Serv.*  
9 *Comm’n* (2006) 137 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1258 (applying same statutory standard).) “Where it is  
10 claimed that the findings are not supported by the evidence, . . . abuse of discretion is established if  
11 the court determines that the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence.” (Cal. Civ.  
12 Proc. Code § 1094.5(c).)

13 The administrative decision must be accompanied by findings that allow the court  
14 reviewing the order or decision to “bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and ultimate  
15 decision or order.” (*Topanga Ass’n for a Scenic Cmty. v. County of Los Angeles* (1974) 11 Cal.3d  
16 506, 515.) This requirement “serves to conduce the administrative body to draw legally relevant  
17 sub-conclusions supportive of its ultimate decision . . . to facilitate orderly analysis and minimize  
18 the likelihood that the agency will randomly leap from evidence to conclusions.” (*Id.* at 516.)  
19 “Absent such roadsigns, a reviewing court would be forced into unguided and resource-consuming  
20 explorations; it would have to grope through the record to determine whether some combination of  
21 credible evidentiary items which supported some line of factual and legal conclusions supported  
22 the ultimate order or decision of the agency.” (*Id.* at 516, n.15.)

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 **A. The Permit Creates Illegal Safe Harbors in Violation of Federal Anti-Backsliding and**  
3 **Antidegradation Requirements**

4 **1. The 2012 Permit Creates Safe Harbors that Exempt Compliance with**  
5 **Receiving Water Limitations in Some Circumstances**

6 Rather than maintaining the 2001 Permit’s prohibition against discharges that cause or  
7 contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, the 2012 Permit creates safe harbors that  
8 exempt compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations for Permittees that elect to participate in  
9 a WMP or an EWMP. These safe harbor provisions violate multiple provisions of the CWA and  
10 other federal and state regulations, and render the 2012 Permit unlawful.

11 The 2012 Permit creates safe harbors by deeming a Permittee to be in compliance with the  
12 Permit’s RWLs (which was required by the 2001 Permit), both once a WMP or an EWMP has  
13 been approved by the Regional Board and during plan development.<sup>41</sup> The Ninth Circuit defined a  
14 “safe harbor” as “the proposition that compliance with certain provisions shall forgive non-  
15 compliance with the discharge prohibitions.” (*Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. County*  
16 *of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 2011) 673 F.3d 880, 897 (cert. granted on other grounds).) Unfortunately,  
17 the new Permit establishes just such a program. If a Permittee meets the program requirements for  
18 a WMP or an EWMP, it *legally* complies with the 2012 Permit’s RWLs, regardless of whether the  
19 RWLs are *actually* achieved.

20 During the 2012 Permit adoption hearing,<sup>42</sup> the Regional Board’s Executive Officer  
21 admitted that these provisions provide a safe harbor from liability for RWL violations. While  
22 attempting to define each provision as only a “compliance mechanism,” Mr. Sam Unger stated, “at  
23 best, it’s a conditional safe harbor.”<sup>43</sup> Similarly, Mr. Unger stated: “Permittees have to be in

---

24 <sup>41</sup> We note that the 2012 Permit’s approach is nonsensical in this regard, as it creates a safe harbor  
25 from compliance with Receiving Water Limitations (and for interim TMDL limits) prior to  
26 approval of a WMP or an EWMP, while the safe harbor is ultimately expressly conditioned on the  
27 approval of the TMDL.

28 <sup>42</sup> Regional Board, In the Matter of the Regional Board Public Meeting/Hearing, Thursday,  
November 8, 2012. (“November 8 Hearing.”)

<sup>43</sup> Mr. Sam Unger, Executive Officer, Regional Board, November 8 Hearing, at 346:25.



1 compliance with the milestones and the activities set out in developing the plan for the watershed  
2 management program. And if they're not, then the operative part of the permit that would take  
3 place is these receiving water limitation[s].”<sup>44</sup> Precisely—the effect of this scheme is that if a  
4 Permittee is in compliance with the requirements of a WMP or an EWMP, the Receiving Water  
5 Limitations are *not* operative. There is simply no defensible argument that these provisions  
6 constitute anything other than safe harbors, which violate federal and state law.

7 **2. The 2012 Permit’s Safe Harbors Violate Federal Anti-Backsliding**  
8 **Requirements**

9 Clean Water Act and federal regulations prohibit backsliding, or weakening of permit  
10 terms, from the previous permit. Section 402(o)(1) of the Clean Water Act requires that, for  
11 effluent limitations based on a state standard, “a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified  
12 to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in  
13 the previous permit,” except in circumstances not present here. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(1).)  
14 Similarly, federal regulations require that “when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent  
15 limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations,  
16 standards, or conditions in the previous permit. . . .” (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l)(1).) By providing a  
17 safe harbor waiving requirements to meet Water Quality Standards, the 2012 Permit flatly violates  
18 these federal requirements.

19 **a. The Safe Harbors Render the RWLs Less Stringent Than in the Previous**  
20 **Permit**

21 The Permit allows a Permittee participating in a WMP or an EWMP to comply with  
22 Receiving Water Limitations, even if a Permittee’s discharges actually cause or contribute to an  
23 exceedance of the Receiving Water Limitations, including violations of Water Quality Standards.  
24 By contrast, the 2001 Permit required compliance with WQSS. Thus, the 2012 Permit excuses  
25 discharges of pollution and violations of WQSS that the previous permit prohibited.

26  
27  
28 <sup>44</sup> Mr. Sam Unger, Executive Officer, Regional Board, November 8 Hearing, at 324:8-12.

1                                   **b. The Receiving Water Limitations Cannot be Weakened Unless Consistent**  
2                                   **With 1313(d)(4) or 402(o)**

3                   Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)), generally prohibits  
4 relaxation of, among other things, an effluent limitation “necessary to meet water quality standards  
5 . . . schedules of compliance, established pursuant to any State law or regulations . . . or any other  
6 Federal law or regulation, or required to implement any applicable water quality standard  
7 established pursuant to” the CWA. (See, 33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(1); 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C).)<sup>45</sup>  
8 Although a permit may contain less stringent requirements if the change is consistent with the  
9 requirements of 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(4) or the enumerated exceptions in section 402(o)(2).<sup>46</sup> The  
10 safe harbors in the 2012 Permit satisfy none of these conditions.

11                                   **i. The Receiving Water Limitations Are Covered by Anti-**  
12                                   **Backsliding Requirements as “Effluent Limitations” and**  
13                                   **“Standards or Conditions” of the 2001 Permit**

14                   The Clean Water Act defines the term “effluent limitation” broadly, as “any restriction  
15 established by a State or the Administrator on quantities, rates, and concentrations of chemical,  
16 physical, biological, and other constituents which are discharged from point sources. . . .” (33  
17 U.S.C. § 1362(11).) By prohibiting the “discharge” of any pollutant in quantities sufficient to  
18 cause or contribute to an exceedance of Receiving Water Limitations, the RWLs easily fit within  
19 this sweeping definition. (*See also, NRDC v. U.S.E.P.A.* (D.C. Cir. 1981) 656 F.2d 768, 775-76  
20 (as a practical matter the limitation restricted the discharge of pollution and consequently was an  
21 effluent limitation), *NRDC v. U.S.E.P.A.* (D.C. Cir. 1982) 673 F.2d 400, 403 (33 U.S.C. §  
22 502(11) “defines ‘effluent limitation’ as ‘any restriction’, not just numeric limitations”).)

23 <sup>45</sup> We note that EPA has recognized that providing additional time for compliance for a provision  
24 required by the previous permit violates anti-backsliding requirements. (Letter from Jon M.  
25 Capacasa, Director Water Protection Division, EPA Region III to Jay Sakai, Maryland Department  
26 of the Environment, re: Specific Objection to Prince George’s County Phase I Municipal Separate  
27 Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit MD0068284, at 3 (Attached as RN “Exhibit B”).) The  
28 additional time allotted by the new Permit to achieve compliance with RWLs, required in the 2001  
Permit, for Permittees developing a WMP or an EWMP constitutes a less stringent limitation.

<sup>46</sup> See also, U.S. EPA (September 2010) NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual (“NPDES Manual”), at 7-  
1 to 7-3. (Attached as RN “Exhibit C”).

1 In addition, the RWLs constitute “standards” or “conditions” protected by anti-backsliding  
2 requirements under 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l). Board staff have attempted to avoid the plain  
3 implications of section 402(o) by saying that the CWA “talks about [anti-backsliding] in terms of  
4 effluent limits. And we’re talking about receiving water limitations.”<sup>47</sup> Yet, even if this were the  
5 case, the safe harbors would still be unlawful. EPA’s anti-backsliding regulations require that  
6 “effluent limitations, *standards or conditions* must be at least as stringent as the final effluent  
7 limitations, *standards, or conditions* in the previous permit. . . .” (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l)(1)  
8 (emphasis added).) Thus these requirements “apply to questions regarding non-water quality-  
9 based effluent limits,” including “backsliding questions regarding permit conditions, (rather than  
10 permit limitations) even where the conditions in question are based on water quality  
11 considerations.”<sup>48</sup> Regional Board staff confirmed at the November 8 Hearing that, at a minimum,  
12 the “receiving water limits would be considered a condition[] [of the] permit.”<sup>49</sup> As a result, even  
13 if section 402(o) were inapplicable, which it is not, the prohibition on anti-backsliding contained in  
14 40 CFR 122.44(l) applies to the RWLs as conditions. Because in either case the 2012 Permit  
15 weakens the Receiving Water Limitations as compared with the 2001 Permit, it violates anti-

---

16  
17  
18 <sup>47</sup> Ms. Deborah Smith, Regional Board, November 8 Hearing at 313:5-7.

19 <sup>48</sup> EPA (1989) Memorandum on Interim Guidance on Implementation of Section 402(o) Anti-  
20 Backsliding Rules For Water Quality-Based Permits, from James R. Elder, Director, Office of  
21 Water Enforcement and Permits to Water Management Division Directors, Regions I-X, NPDES  
22 State Directors, at 2. (Attached as RN “Exhibit D”). (“Section 402(o) is silent on the issue of  
23 permit conditions, and only addresses backsliding from permit limitations”); See also, EPA (Sept.  
24 2010) NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual, EPA 833-K-10-001, at 7-4. (“NPDES Manual”)

25 <sup>49</sup> Ms. Deborah Smith, Regional Board, November 8 Hearing, at 314:6-7. Earlier draft versions of  
26 the Permit had previously acknowledged the application of anti-backsliding requirements in this  
27 context, but, inexplicably, staff edited the October 18, 2012 draft of the 2012 Permit to remove  
28 reference to “conditions” in its explanation of anti-backsliding requirements. Referring to 40  
C.F.R. § 122.44(l), the sentence “anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations or other  
conditions in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit,” was revised to  
read “anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent  
as those in the previous permit. . . .” (2012 Permit, at p. 25, Finding N.) Thus, the Permit only  
incompletely states the requirements of federal anti-backsliding regulations it then proceeds to  
violate.

1 backsliding requirements. In addition, as discussed below, the exemptions to anti-backsliding do  
2 not apply here.

3 **ii. The Safe Harbors do not Qualify Under Section 1313(d)(4) as**  
4 **Exceptions to the Anti-Backsliding Rule**

5 Section 1313(d)(4) restricts what effluent limitations may be revised in a renewal permit.  
6 First, where water quality standards are not being attained (see 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(4)(A)), a less  
7 stringent effluent limitation based on a TMDL or other WLA is allowed in a renewal permit only if  
8 “the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limitations based on such total maximum daily  
9 load or waste load allocation will assure the attainment of such water quality standard,” or if the  
10 designated use is removed. (33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(4)(A).)<sup>50</sup> Second, for waters that are meeting  
11 applicable water quality standards, (under 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(4)(B)), a limitation based on a  
12 TMDL or Water Quality Standard may only be weakened if it is consistent with the applicable  
13 state antidegradation policy. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(1).)<sup>51</sup>

14 Neither of these conditions has been met. First, for waters that are failing to meet WQSs,  
15 the 2012 Permit fails to demonstrate that the revised standards will assure WQSs will be attained.  
16 Second, where waters are currently attaining WQSs, the Permit fails to provide required analysis  
17 consistent with the state’s antidegradation policy. These allowances violate the anti-backsliding  
18 requirements both during WMP or EWMP development, before the plan is approved by the  
19 Regional Board, and after WMP or EWMP approval, during the plan’s implementation.

20 **iii. The Safe Harbors do not Qualify Under Section 402(o)(2) as**  
21 **Exceptions to the Anti-Backsliding Rule**

22 Although section 402(o)(2) lists a series of exceptions to the otherwise applicable anti-  
23 backsliding requirements, none applies to this permit. The law’s exemptions include:  
24  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>50</sup> See also, EPA, NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, at 7-3.

28 <sup>51</sup> See also, EPA, NPDES Manual, at 7-2; Exhibit 7-2. For further discussion of antidegradation  
issues raised by the 2012 Permit, see section III.A.3, below.

1 (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility  
2 occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent  
3 effluent limitation; (B)(i) information is available which was not available at the  
4 time of permit issuance . . . and which would have justified the application of a less  
5 stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator  
6 determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in  
7 issuing the permit under section (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent  
8 effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no  
control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy; (D) the permittee  
has received a permit modification under [various other sections] of this title; or (E)  
the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent  
limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the  
facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent  
limitations. . .

9 (33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(2).) None of these exceptions apply to the adoption of the 2012 Permit.

10 Other than an unsupported and insufficient statement by Board counsel at the November 8 Hearing  
11 that “Had in 2001 there been 33 [new] TMDLs [incorporated into the Permit] it’s possible the  
12 Board might have done something very different than what they did” in adopting the 2001 Permit,  
13 the Regional Board offered no evidence that these exceptions apply.<sup>52</sup> As a result, the anti-  
14 backsliding requirements of section 402(o) prohibit the adoption of safe harbors in the 2012  
15 Permit.

16 **iv. The Safe Harbors Violate Section 402(o)(3)’s Prohibition**  
17 **Against Changes that Would Result in a Violation of**  
18 **Applicable Water Quality Standards**

19 Even if the 2012 Permit’s safe harbors complied with the above anti-backsliding  
20 requirements, which they do not, they would still be unlawful under section 402(o)(3), which  
21 serves as a “*safety clause* that provides an absolute limitation on backsliding.”<sup>53</sup> Section 402(o)(3)  
22 requires that in no event shall a permit “be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less  
23 stringent effluent limitation if the implementation of such limitation would result in a violation of a  
24 water quality standard” under 33 U.S.C. § 1313. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(3).) Thus, as EPA  
25 explains, “even if one or more of the backsliding exceptions outlined in the statute is applicable  
26 and met, CWA section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor and restricts the extent to which effluent

27 <sup>52</sup> Ms. Jennifer Fordyce, Regional Board Counsel, November 8 Hearing at 317:11-13.

28 <sup>53</sup> See EPA, NPDES Manual at 7-4.

1 limitations may be relaxed.”<sup>54</sup> The 2012 Permit, by explicitly excusing violations of Receiving  
2 Water Limitations which prohibit discharges that cause or contribute to a violation of WQSs, fails  
3 to meet this federally mandated minimum level of protection.

### 4 **3. The 2012 Permit’s Safe Harbor Provisions Violate State and Federal** 5 **Antidegradation Requirements**

6 The overall goal of the Clean Water Act is the complete elimination of the discharge of  
7 pollutants into waters of the United States. (33 U.S.C. § 1251(a)(1).) To help meet this goal,  
8 states must implement an antidegradation policy. As discussed below, the permit does not comply  
9 with applicable antidegradation requirements.

#### 10 **a. The Safe Harbors Violate Antidegradation Requirements that Prohibit** 11 **Actions that Would Lead to Lower Water Quality**

12 The federal antidegradation policy contains a three “Tier” test for determining when  
13 increases in pollutant loadings or adverse changes to water quality may be allowed. (40 C.F.R. §  
14 131.12.) While Tier II and Tier III apply only to high quality waters and “outstanding National  
15 resource waters,” respectively, Tier I antidegradation analysis applies to *all* waters of the United  
16 States, including waters that do not exceed the CWA section 101(a) goals.<sup>55</sup> “Tier One  
17 classification applies a minimum level of protection to all waters, which protects even seriously  
18 degraded water bodies, by prohibiting any additional pollution that would affect existing uses.”<sup>56</sup>

19 California has established a state antidegradation policy, which incorporates the federal  
20 antidegradation policy and establishes additional requirements.<sup>57</sup> NPDES permit renewals or  
21 modifications such as the 2001 and 2012 Los Angeles County MS4 Permits are subject to both  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>54</sup> See EPA, NPDES Manual at 7-4.

25 <sup>55</sup> (64 Fed. Reg. 46058, 46063, *Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System*  
26 *Program and Federal Antidegradation Policy in Support of Revisions to the Water Quality*  
27 *Planning and Management Regulation.*

28 <sup>56</sup> Brawer, J.M., “Antidegradation Policy and Outstanding Natural Resource Waters in the  
Northern Rocky Mountain States,” 20 Pub. Land & Resources L. Rev. 13, 18 (1999).

<sup>57</sup> See, State Board Resolution 68-16; *see also In the Matter of the Petition of Rimmon C. Fay*,  
State Board Order No. WQ 86-17 at 16-19 (November 20, 1986).

1 state and federal antidegradation requirements.<sup>58</sup> The State antidegradation policy specifically  
2 addresses only “high quality” waters, or waters of better quality than required by water quality  
3 standards for a particular beneficial use (or conversely, those waters not designated as “impaired”).  
4 However, the State policy applies to all waters, including surface and groundwater, to changes in  
5 water quality since 1968, and to all uses, including existing and potential uses.<sup>59</sup>

6 Together, state and federal anti-degradation requirements mandate that existing water  
7 quality in navigable waters be maintained, unless degradation is justified based on specific  
8 findings. In no case may water quality be lowered to a level that would interfere with existing or  
9 designated uses. Thus any action by a Regional Board, including permit issuance, that would result  
10 in lower water quality—either in high quality or impaired waters—must be analyzed to ensure  
11 consistency with state and federal antidegradation policy. Further, because a receiving water can  
12 be considered high quality for one beneficial use, and impaired for others, the analysis must be  
13 conducted pollutant by pollutant, and beneficial use by beneficial use. (*See, Asociacion de Gente*  
14 *Unida for El Agua v. Central Valley Regional Board* (2012) (210 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1255) [149  
15 Cal.Rptr.3d 132, 142; 144] (citing “St. Water Res. Control Bd., Guidance Memorandum (Feb. 16,  
16 1995); 40 CFR 131.12(a)(1).)

17 Accordingly, the Regional Board was required to conduct a Tier I analysis for all waters  
18 impacted by the Los Angeles County MS4 systems, and a Tier II analysis for higher quality Los  
19 Angeles waters (taking account of water quality for specific pollutant and beneficial use  
20 considerations). In past instances when the Regional Board has failed to provide adequate findings  
21 to verify that beneficial uses or high-quality waters will be maintained, the State Board has  
22 remanded the orders to the Regional Board for further proceedings.<sup>60</sup> The same should be done  
23 here.

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>58</sup> *See*, SWRCB Order No. WQ 86-17; EPA, Region IX, *Guidance on Implementing the*  
26 *Antidegradation Provisions of 40 C.F.R. § 131.12*, at 2-4 (June 3, 1987) (“EPA Antidegradation  
27 *Guidance*”). (Attached as RN “Exhibit E”.)

28 <sup>59</sup> State Board Resolution 68-16.

<sup>60</sup> *See e.g.*, State Board Order WQ 86-17, at 28 (State Board remanded Regional Board order due  
to the Regional Board’s failure to make appropriate findings as to whether an increase in

1                                   **b. The Regional Board did not Conduct Any Required Antidegradation**  
2                                   **Analysis**

3                   As noted in section III.A.1. above, the safe harbor provisions in the 2012 Permit weaken  
4 the Receiving Water Limitations compared with the 2001 Permit requirements.<sup>61</sup> However,  
5 despite the 2012 Permit’s explicit weakening of the prior permit’s limits, and the resulting  
6 continued degradation of receiving waters, the Regional Board conducted *no* antidegradation  
7 analysis. The 2012 Permit’s reference to antidegradation is limited to a cursory summary of the  
8 legal requirements, and a conclusion that “[t]he permitted discharge is consistent with the anti-  
9 degradation provision of [40 CFR] section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.”  
10 (2012 Permit, at p. 25, Finding J.) Simply claiming that no degradation will occur does not satisfy  
11 the requirements of the Clean Water Act. (*Asociacion de Gente Unida*, 149 Cal.Rptr., at 136.; see  
12 also, *American Funeral Concepts-American Cremation Soc’y v. Board of Funeral Directors and*  
13 *Embalmers* (1982) 136 Cal.App.3d 303, 309.)

14                   Even assuming, as the Regional Board claims, that the new Receiving Water Limitations  
15 are as stringent as those in the previous Permit, allowing a permit regime that degrades receiving  
16 waters to continue triggers antidegradation analysis. At a minimum, the 2012 Permit maintains the  
17 existing failed program implementation for 18 or 30 months during WMP or EWMP development  
18 and a potentially additional 10 months during Regional Board review of the plans. Such an  
19 approach is inconsistent with antidegradation requirements. As the Third Appellate District  
20

---

21 suspended solids and bacteria would violate antidegradation requirements in an area used for  
22 body-contact sports.); see also, *Topanga Ass’n for a Scenic Cmty.*, 11 Cal.3d at 515

23 <sup>61</sup> Board counsel indicated that anti-degradation is not a concern during the planning phase for  
24 either WMP or EWMPs, before the plans are either approved or adopted, because “they still have  
25 to implement their existing MS4 program. So they’re going to keep doing what they’re doing right  
26 now . . . the water quality is not going to get worse.” (Ms. Jennifer Fordyce, Regional Board  
27 counsel, November 8 Hearing, at 318:3-7; see also Ms. Renee Purdy, Regional Board, November 8  
28 Hearing, at 318:12-18.) Yet as discussed earlier, under the existing program, monitoring shows  
persistent violations of water quality standards, including in waters not yet listed as impaired under  
CWA section 303(d).



1 pointedly stated in rejecting the Regional Board’s argument that because a new dairy permit was  
2 no worse than the last:

3 Our problem with the Regional Board’s reliance on the assertion that no  
4 groundwater degradation is allowed is twofold. First, as the order itself recognizes,  
5 the groundwater quality has degraded, and dairy operations are partly responsible.  
6 To the extent that the Order allows historic practices to continue without change,  
7 degradation will continue.

8 (*Asociacion de Gente Unida*, 149 Cal.Rptr., at 145.)

9 There is no meaningful debate that urban runoff continues to degrade receiving waters in  
10 the Los Angeles area, and that the stormwater programs implemented under the prior permit failed  
11 to control that degradation. Therefore, because an antidegradation analysis is required, and the  
12 2012 Permit fails to conduct that analysis, the 2012 Permit violates State and Federal Law.

13 **B. The Permit Unlawfully Fails to Incorporate Waste-Load Allocations Consistent With  
14 Applicable TMDLs**

15 The Clean Water Act relies on TMDLs to restore water bodies that fail to meet water  
16 quality standards. TMDLs establish a clear and scientifically-driven pathway towards protecting  
17 beneficial issues for public health and aquatic life. The CWA and its implementing regulations  
18 require that NPDES permits are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of TMDL  
19 WLAs. (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)<sup>62</sup>

20 Consistent with EPA regulations, the MS4-related WLAs for TMDLs adopted in the Los  
21 Angeles Region must be properly reflected in the MS4 Permit. The Permit itself states:

22 The Permittees shall comply with the applicable water quality-based effluent  
23 limitations and/or receiving water limitations contained in Attachments L through  
24 R, consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the WLAs established in  
25 the TMDLs, including implementation plans and schedules, where provided for in  
26 the State adoption and approval of the TMDL (40 CFR §122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B);  
27 Cal.Wat. Code §13263(a)).

28 (2012 Permit, at Part VI.E.1.c.) However, the Permit fails to properly incorporate the very  
29 limitations it acknowledges are necessary. During this renewal, 33 TMDLs were newly  
30 incorporated into the 2012 Permit. In violation of the federal requirements, the 2012 Permit fails

---

<sup>62</sup> See, EPA Hanlon Memo.

1 to ensure compliance with all interim and final WLAs for these TMDLs and incorporates illegal  
2 compliance schedules as permit terms.

3 **1. The 2012 Permit Illegally Exempts Dischargers from Complying with**  
4 **Interim and Final Numeric Waste Load Allocations Established in TMDLs**

5 Although all permit terms must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of  
6 WLAs established in TMDLs, (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)), the 2012 Permit inexplicably  
7 excuses compliance with interim WLAs<sup>63</sup> and eliminates final WLAs in at least two instances.

8 First, the 2012 Permit specifies that where a Permittee is implementing an EWMP and  
9 runoff is retained up to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm, the Permittee is deemed in compliance with final  
10 TMDL WLAs. (2012 Permit, at Part VI.E.2.e.i(4).) The Permit states:

11 A Permittee shall be deemed in compliance with an applicable final water quality-  
12 based effluent limitation and final receiving water limitation for the pollutant(s)  
13 associated with a specific TMDL if... (4)In drainage areas where Permittees are  
14 implementing an EWMP, (i) all non-storm water and (ii) all storm water runoff up  
to and including the volume equivalent to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour event is  
retained for the drainage area tributary to the applicable receiving water.

15 (*Id.* at Part VI.E.2.e.i.) By providing this alternative means of demonstrating compliance, the  
16 Regional Board thus creates a safe harbor from final TMDL requirements and incorporates a  
17 provision that is inconsistent with the WLAs. Under this regime, there is no assurance that actual  
18 final TMDL limits, established to achieve WQSs and protect beneficial uses, will ever be met in  
19 waterbodies throughout Los Angeles County.<sup>64</sup>

20 Second, for EPA-approved TMDLs, the 2012 Permit removes compliance obligations,  
21 again excusing Permittees from complying with final WLAs. Section VI.E.3 provides:

---

25 <sup>63</sup> Where a Permittee engages in either type of watershed management program, the Permit  
26 unlawfully eliminates the need to comply with interim WQBELs and RWLs. Indeed, the Permit  
27 includes a safe harbor for violations of interim limits that occur during and after WMP or EWMP  
development rather than actually achieving the interim limits defined in the TMDL. (2012 Permit,  
at Parts VI.C.3.a, VI.E.2.d.i(4), (4)(d); see also, Section I.B.2., above.)

28 <sup>64</sup> See discussion on evidence in the record in section III.C., below.

1 TMDLs established by the USEPA, to which Permittees are subject, do not contain  
2 an implementation plan adopted pursuant to California Water code section 13424.  
3 However, USEPA has included implementation *recommendations* as part of these  
4 TMDLs. *In lieu of* inclusion of numeric water quality based effluent limitations at  
5 (2012 Permit, at Part VI.E.3 (emphasis added).) This provision is not consistent with existing,  
6 applicable WLAs. (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).) Because TMDLs established by EPA  
7 include numeric WLAs, the 2012 Permit must include numeric WQBELs consistent with those  
8 WLAs.<sup>65</sup> For example, the San Gabriel River Metals and Selenium TMDL, which has been in  
9 effect since 2007, sets numeric WLAs based on the California Toxics Rule (“CTR”) (40 C.F.R.  
10 131.36(d)(10)) criteria. The MS4 Permit must incorporate the numeric WLAs set forth in the EPA  
11 San Gabriel River Metals and Selenium TMDL and other EPA TMDLs to comply with the Clean  
12 Water Act. Yet, the safe harbor provisions do not require compliance with these numeric limits, in  
13 violation of federal requirements.

14 **2. The Permit Incorporates Illegal Compliance Schedules In Violation of 40**  
15 **C.F.R. § 122.47**

16 NPDES permits may only include schedules for achieving compliance with permit limits as  
17 permit terms when schedules for achieving compliance are authorized, appropriate, and satisfy  
18 specific requirements. (*See In the Matter of Star-Kist Caribe, Inc.* (E.A.B. 1989) 1989 EPA App.  
19 LEXIS 38, at \*7; 33 U.S.C. § 1313(e)(3)(F); 40 C.F.R. § 122.47.)

20 Any compliance schedules incorporated into the MS4 Permit must lead to compliance “as  
21 soon as possible,” (40 C.F.R. § 122.47(a)(1)), and must comply with specific requirements  
22 including:

- 23 1) if the compliance schedule exceeds one year, it must include interim compliance  
24 deadlines; 2) interim deadlines must be no more than one year apart; and, 3) if the  
25 time necessary for completion of any interim requirement is more than one year and  
26 is not readily divisible into stages for completion, the permit shall specify interim  
27 dates for the submission of reports of progress toward completion of the interim  
28 requirements and indicate a projected completion date.

---

28 <sup>65</sup> EPA Hanlon Memo

1 (40 C.F.R. § 122.47(a)(3).) Further, WLAs and compliance schedules in the 2012 Permit must  
2 also be consistent with other state water quality control plans and statutory deadlines; a compliance  
3 schedule may only be included in an NPDES permit as a permit term when such compliance  
4 schedules are authorized. (See *In the Matter of Star-Kist Caribe, Inc.*, 1989 EPA App. LEXIS, at  
5 \*7; 33 U.S.C. § 1313(e)(3)(F).)

6 Section IV.A.2.a. of the 2012 Permit does not comply with these federal regulations. It  
7 provides that “[e]ach Permittee shall comply with applicable WQBELs as set forth in Part VI.E  
8 [TMDL section] of this Order, *pursuant to applicable compliance schedules.*” (Emphasis added).  
9 The 2012 Permit also references TMDL implementation schedules in several other sections.<sup>66</sup>  
10 However, the implementation schedules set out in several of the applicable TMDLs do not satisfy  
11 federal laws governing NPDES permit compliance schedules, and therefore cannot be incorporated  
12 into the 2012 Permit.

13 Specifically, any implementation schedule set forth in an applicable TMDL that allows for  
14 more than one year to achieve compliance, but lacks interim deadlines, cannot be incorporated into  
15 the 2012 Permit as an NPDES compliance schedule. Because the implementation schedules set  
16 out in the Malibu Creek Bacteria TMDL, the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria TMDLs, and the  
17 Los Angeles River Indicator Bacteria TMDL do not have such deadlines, the 2012 Permit may not  
18 incorporate them without a detailed schedule. The Permit contains no such schedule.

19 Moreover, WLAs in metals TMDLs in Los Angeles are based on the CTR criteria, and  
20 compliance schedules for CTR-based limits are authorized through the Inland Surface Water Plan  
21 (“ISWP”). But the ISWP only authorized compliance schedules for a maximum of 10 years from  
22 the time CTR criteria were first promulgated and states that no discharger can be given a  
23 compliance schedule to meet CTR criteria after May 18, 2010.<sup>67</sup> As a result, any compliance  
24 schedules set out in TMDLs implementing the CTR are not authorized.

---

25  
26 <sup>66</sup> See, e.g., Permit, at Parts VI.C.3.c.; VI.E.1.; VI.E.c.ii.; and, VI.e.2.d.i.

27 <sup>67</sup> State Board Resolution No. 2000-15, *Policy for the Implementation of Toxics Standards for*  
28 *Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California*, at 19; see also October 23,  
2006 EPA Letter re: California SIP, Compliance Schedule Provisions; State Board Memo dated

1           **C. The Decision to Adopt the 2012 Permit, Including its Safe Harbor Provisions, is not**  
2           **Supported by the Findings or the Evidence in the Administrative Record**

3           The Regional Board’s approval of the 2012 Permit violates long-established requirements  
4 for agency decision-making. The Regional Board’s findings fail to show the Board’s mode of  
5 analysis to “bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and [the] ultimate decision or  
6 order.” (See, *Topanga Ass’n for a Scenic Cmty*, 11 Cal.3d at 515.) Moreover, in critical aspects  
7 the Regional Board’s final decision lacks evidentiary support in the record. The absence of  
8 adequate findings or evidence renders the Regional Board’s decision unlawful. (See, Cal. Civ.  
9 Proc. Code § 1094.5(b); see also, *Zuniga*, 137 Cal. App. 4th at 1258.)

10           The 2012 Permit’s discussion of anti-backsliding requirements exemplifies the Regional  
11 Board’s lack of sufficient analysis.<sup>68</sup> Environmental Groups raised significant legal and factual  
12 argument before the Regional Board to demonstrate that the safe harbors incorporated in the 2012  
13 Permit violate federal anti-backsliding requirements.<sup>69</sup> In response, the 2012 Permit merely  
14 repeats (incompletely) the legal requirements for anti-backsliding, then leaps to the conclusory  
15 statement that, “All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent  
16 limitations in the previous permit.” (2012 Permit, at p. 25, Finding N.) However, bare  
17 conclusions are impermissible. (See, *American Funeral Concepts-American Cremation Soc’y*, 136  
18 Cal.App.3d at 309 (“administrative findings set forth solely in the language of the applicable  
19 legislation are insufficient”).)

20           Similarly, there is insufficient evidence to support the Regional Board’s decision to adopt  
21 the safe harbor provisions allowed for Permittees under an EWMP. Participation in an EWMP  
22

---

23 September 15, 2006 Re: CTR Compliance Schedules; State Board Resolution No. 2008-0025 at 4;  
24 Final Staff Report, State Board Resolution No. 2008-0025 at 10; Final Response to Written  
25 Comments, State Board Resolution No. 2008-0025 at 6, 9, 10, 18-19, 26.

26 <sup>68</sup> As is discussed in section III.A.3.b., the 2012 Permit’s discussion of antidegradation  
27 requirements is another stark example of the lack of sufficient findings and evidentiary support.

28 <sup>69</sup> See Letter from NRDC, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay to Regional Board re:  
Comments on Tentative Order R4-2012-XXXX, Los Angeles County MS4 Permit, June 6, 2012  
Draft, July 23, 2012; NRDC, Los Angeles Waterkeeper and Heal the Bay also presented on this  
issue at the October 4-5 and November 8 Regional Board Hearings on the 2012 Permit.

1 requires retention of runoff from the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24-hour storm in exchange for safe harbors.  
2 (Permit, at Part VI.E.2.e.i.(4).) Yet there is no evidence in the record for the 2012 Permit’s  
3 adoption to demonstrate that retention of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm event will, in fact, achieve  
4 compliance with either Water Quality Standards required under the Receiving Water Limitations,  
5 or with the numerous TMDL WLAs required to be met in the 2012 Permit. At the November 8,  
6 2012 Hearing, EPA specifically questioned the adequacy of the record on this point:

7 [T]he EPA guidance on incorporating TMDLs into . . . MS4 permits that has been  
8 around since 2002 talks about when you come up with a BMP-based approach for  
9 incorporating a TMDL into a permit—so basically this is a BMP-based approach.  
10 You would be retaining the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm—you have to have in the record  
11 for the permit the justification for how that gets to those specific wasteload  
12 allocations. . . .<sup>70</sup>

13 We’ve been very involved with the county’s modeling and . . . we don’t have that  
14 rigorous analysis that’s been—that’s required by the EPA guidance for saying and  
15 showing that that specific retention is going to achieve the numeric wasteload  
16 allocation. . . . I haven’t seen the support in the administrative record, the fact sheet  
17 or otherwise.<sup>71</sup>

18 Following EPA’s observation, the Regional Board Chair asked staff directly if the evidence  
19 requested by EPA was in the record.<sup>72</sup> The Board’s Executive Officer, Mr. Unger replied:

20 Yes. Yes. It was discussed when the county first presented at the last hearing, the  
21 enhanced management approach, they discussed their—the watershed modeling  
22 system that they would be using to demonstrate a reasonable assurance.<sup>73</sup>

23 However, the record, including watershed modeling discussed by Los Angeles County, does not  
24 anywhere demonstrate that retention of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm will protect water quality  
25 standards or achieve TMDL WLAs as required by the Clean Water Act or EPA guidance.

26 In fact, the County’s presentation demonstrates only that, in its view, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile  
27 storm represents a cost-effective or “appropriate design storm [size] for use in BMP planning and  
28 design” for treatment of stormwater runoff,<sup>74</sup> not, as Regional Board staff appear to indicate, that

<sup>70</sup> Mr. John Kemmerer, EPA, November 8 Hearing, at 365:24-25 to 366:1-7.

<sup>71</sup> Mr. John Kemmerer, EPA, November 8 Hearing, at 366:10-18; 367:6-8.

<sup>72</sup> See, Ms. Maria Mehranian, Regional Board Chair, November 8 Hearing, at 368:13-14 (stating  
“So—I’m sorry . . . it is in the record?”).

<sup>73</sup> Mr. Sam Unger, at 368:15-19.

<sup>74</sup> Mr. Gary Hildebrand, November 8 Hearing, at 220: 18-19.

1 retention of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm will achieve required WLAs for all TMDLs in all watersheds  
2 covered by the permit. At both the October 4-5 Hearing and November 8 Hearing, the County  
3 discussed the decision to select the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm and acknowledged it was based on cost  
4 and treatment considerations:

5 This concept involves the identification of a storm of specific size, the intensity,  
6 and/or duration for use in design stormwater controls to achieve water quality  
standards that balances cost with pollutant removal efficiency. . . .<sup>75</sup>

7 The [projected] graph plots the total cost of BMPs needed throughout LA County to  
8 comply with all the TMDLs expected in the new permit against various size storm  
9 events. As can be seen, the most optimum storm size is the 85th percentile storm  
event.<sup>76</sup>

10 Thus, the County’s explanation does not demonstrate a discernible relationship between the  
11 85<sup>th</sup> percentile retention approach and full achievement of TMDL WLAs—just that the 85<sup>th</sup>  
12 percentile storm is a cost-effective cut-off point for pollution control measures.<sup>77</sup> Nor do  
13 the County or the Regional Board provide data, analysis, or in the Regional Board’s case,  
14 findings to support that this BMP-based approach will achieve applicable WLAs<sup>78</sup> or  
15 demonstrate the validity of the County’s model.<sup>79</sup> Accordingly, the Regional Board’s

---

17  
18 <sup>75</sup> Mr. Gary Hildebrand, November 8 Hearing, at 220: 20-24. Regional Board Staff also  
19 indicated their understanding that selection of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm was a cost  
20 consideration, not an independent assessment of the storm size required to be retained to  
21 meet applicable TMDL WLAs. See, Mr. Sam Unger, November 8 Hearing, at 360:14-17  
22 (“when you look at that curve, sort of a dollars versus precipitation event occurred, right  
23 about that 85<sup>th</sup> percentile—right at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, the curve trends up very markedly.”).

24 <sup>76</sup> Mr. Gary Hildebrand, October 4 Hearing, at 308:7-12.

25 <sup>77</sup> The same concern rises for compliance with the Permit’s Receiving Water Limitations—  
26 retention of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm represents only, in the County’s view, a cost effective upper  
27 limit for a design storm. This does not stand for the proposition that retention will then achieve  
28 water quality standards for all receiving waters in all conditions.

<sup>78</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B); see also, EPA Hanlon Memo.

<sup>79</sup> We note that to the extent the Regional Board may have relied on additional information  
submitted by the County related to selection of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile storm submitted after July 23,  
this evidence is not part of the record. In the agenda for the October 4-5 and the November 8  
Hearings, the Regional Board stated unequivocally that “No new written materials may be  
submitted on the Tentative Order . . . Written comments were due by noon on July 23, 2012.”  
(October 4-5 Agenda, at, 2; see also, Notice of Opportunity for Comment, October 18, at 2.

1 decision to include the EWMP safe harbors in the 2012 Permit was arbitrary and  
2 capricious.

3  
4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 For all the foregoing reasons, the instant Petition for Review should be GRANTED.

6  
7 Respectfully submitted,

8 Dated: December 10, 2012

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.

9  
10 

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Noah Garrison  
13 Steve Fleischli  
14 Attorneys for NATURAL RESOURCES  
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. & HEAL THE BAY

15 Dated: December 10, 2012

LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER

16 

17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 Elizabeth Crosson  
19 Tatiana Gaur  
20 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
& HEAL THE BAY



1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18  
3 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 1314 Second Street, Santa Monica,  
4 California 90401.

5 On December 10, 2012 I served the within document described as MEMORANDUM OF  
6 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS  
7 ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD ACTION OF ADOPTING  
8 ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 on the following interested parties in said action by placing a true  
9 copy thereof in the United States mail enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage prepaid,  
10 addressed as follows:

11 Ken Berkman  
12 City Engineer  
13 30001 Ladyface Court  
14 Agoura Hills, CA 91301

11 Terri Rodrigue  
12 City Engineer  
13 6330 Pine Avenue  
14 Bell, CA 90201-1291

15 David Dolphin  
16 111 South First Street  
17 Alhambra, CA 91801-3796

15 John Oropeza  
16 Director of Public Works  
17 7100 South Garfield Avenue  
18 Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293

19 Susannah Turney  
20 Environmental Services Officer  
21 P.O. Box 60021  
22 Arcadia, CA 91066-6021

19 Bernie Iniguez  
20 Environmental Services Manager  
21 16600 Civic Center Drive  
22 Bellflower, CA 90706-5494

23 Maria Dadian  
24 Director of Public Works  
25 18747 Clarkdale Avenue  
26 Artesia, CA 90701-5899

23 Vincent Chee  
24 Project Civil Engineer  
25 455 North Rexford Drive  
26 Beverly Hills, CA 90210

27 Carl Hassel  
28 City Engineer  
213 East Foothill Boulevard  
Azusa, CA 91702

27 Elroy Kiepke  
28 City Engineer  
600 Winston Avenue  
Bradbury, CA 91010-1199

29 David Lopez  
30 Associate Engineer  
31 14403 East Pacific Avenue  
32 Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297

29 Bonnie Teaford  
30 Public Works Director  
31 P.O. Box 6459  
32 Burbank, CA 91510

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Alex Farassati  
ESM  
100 Civic Center Way  
Calabasas, CA 91302-3172

Mike O'Grady  
Environmental Services  
P.O. Box 3130  
Cerritos, CA 90703-3130

Gina Nila  
2535 Commerce Way  
Commerce, CA 90040-1487

Vivian Castro, Environmental Services  
Manager  
125 East College Street  
Covina, CA 91723-2199

Damian Skinner  
Manager  
9770 Culver Boulevard  
Culver City, CA 90232-0507

Yvonne Blumberg  
P.O. Box 7016  
Downey, CA 90241-7016

James A Enriquez  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 6008  
El Monte, CA 91731

Ron Jackson  
Building Maintenance Supervisor  
P.O. Box 47003  
Gardena, CA 90247-3778

Dave Davies  
Deputy Director of Public Works  
116 East Foothill Boulevard  
Glendora, CA 91741

Patricia Elkins  
Building Construction Manager  
P.O. Box 6234  
Carson, CA 90745

Craig Bradshaw  
City Engineer  
207 Harvard Avenue  
Claremont, CA 91711-4719

Hien Nguyen  
Assistant City Engineer  
205 South Willowbrook Avenue  
Compton, CA 90220-3190

Hector Rodriguez  
City Manager  
P.O. Box 1007  
Cudahy, CA 90201-6097

David Liu  
Director of Public Works  
21825 East Copley Drive  
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177

Steve Esbenshades  
Engineering Division Manager  
1600 Huntington Drive  
Duarte, CA 91010-2592

Stephanie Katsouleas  
Public Works Director  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245-3895

Maurice Oillataguerre  
Senior Environmental Program Scientist  
Engineering Section  
633 East Broadway, Room 209  
Glendale, CA 91206-4308

Joseph Colombo  
Director of Community Development  
21815 Pioneer Boulevard  
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Arnold Shadbehr  
Chief General Service and Public Works  
4455 West 126th Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482

Kimberly Colberts  
Environmental Coordinator  
6165 Spring Valley Road  
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

Mike Nagaoka  
Director of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 3366  
Industry, CA 91744-3995

Kwok Tam  
Director of Public Works  
5050 North Irwindale Avenue  
Irwindale, CA 91706

Shauna Clark  
City Manager  
1245 North Hacienda Boulevard  
La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570

John DiMario  
Director of Development Services  
15900 East Marin Street  
La Puente, CA 91744-4788

Konya Vivanti  
P.O. Box 158  
Lakewood, CA 90714-0158

Tom A. Odom  
City Administrator  
P.O. Box 339  
Lomita, CA 90717-0098

Josef Kekula  
11330 Bullis Road  
Lynwood, CA 90262-3693

Homayoun Behboodi  
Associate Engineer  
1315 Valley Drive  
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884

Craig Melich  
City Engineer and City Official  
6550 Miles Avenue  
Huntington Park, CA 90255

Lauren Amimoto  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
1 W. Manchester Blvd, 3rd Floor  
Inglewood, CA 90301-1750

Edward G. Hitti  
Director of Public Works  
1327 Foothill Boulevard  
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137

Steve Forster  
Public Works Director  
13700 La Mirada Boulevard  
La Mirada, CA 90638-0828

Daniel Keesey  
Director of Public Works  
3660 "D" Street  
La Verne, CA 91750-3599

Marlene Miyoshi  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
14717 Burin Avenue  
Lawndale, CA 90260

Shahram Kharaghani  
Program Manager  
1149 S. Broadway, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Jennifer Brown  
Environmental Program Analyst  
23825 Stuart Ranch Road  
Malibu, CA 90265-4861

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Brian Wright  
Water Supervisor  
1400 Highland Avenue  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795

Heather Maloney  
415 South Ivy Avenue  
Monrovia, CA 91016-2888

Amy Ho  
John Hunter (Consultant)  
320 West Newmark Avenue  
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896

Allan Rigg  
Director of Public Works  
340 Palos Verdes Drive West  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Stephen Walker  
P.O. Box 7115  
Pasadena, CA 91109-7215

Julie Carver  
Environmental Programs Coordinator  
P.O. Box 660  
Pomona, CA 91769-0660

Mike Shay  
Principal Civil Engineer  
P.O. Box 270  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

Latoya Cyrus  
Environmental Services Coordinator  
245 East Bonita Avenue  
San Dimas, CA 91773-3002

Andre Dupret  
Project Manager  
4319 East Slauson Avenue  
Maywood, CA 90270-2897

Cory Roberts  
1600 West Beverly Boulevard  
Montebello, CA 90640-3970

Chino Consunji  
City Engineer  
P.O. Box 1030  
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030

Chris Cash  
Utility and Infrastructure Assistant Director  
16400 Colorado Avenue  
Paramount, CA 90723-5091

Art Cervantes  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 1016  
Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016  
Ray Holland  
Interim Public Works Director  
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
2 Portuguese Bend Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199

Chris Marcarello  
Director of PW  
8838 East Valley Boulevard  
Rosemead, CA 91770-1787

Ron Ruiz  
Director of Public Works  
117 Macneil Street  
San Fernando, CA 91340

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Daren T. Grilley  
City Engineer  
425 South Mission Drive  
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Travis Lange  
Environmental Services Manager  
23920 West Valencia Blvd, Suite 300  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Neal Shapiro  
Urban Runoff Coordinator  
1685 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295

John Hunter  
2175 Cherry Avenue  
Signal Hill, CA 90755

John Hunter  
8650 California Avenue  
South Gate, CA 90280

Leslie Cortez  
Senior Administrative Assistant  
3031 Torrance Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90503-5059

Jack Yoshino  
Senior Management Assistant  
P.O. Box 682  
Walnut, CA 91788

Sharon Perlstein  
City Engineer  
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard  
West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314

David Mochizuki  
Director of Public Works  
13230 Penn Street  
Whittier, CA 90602-1772

Chuck Richie  
Director of Parks and Public Works  
2200 Huntington Drive  
San Marino, CA 91108-2691

Sarina Morales-Choate  
Civil Engineer Assistant  
P.O. Box 2120  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120

James Carlson  
Management Analyst  
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard  
Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312

John Hunter  
1414 Mission Street  
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298

Joe Lambert  
John Hunter  
9701 Las Tunas Drive  
Temple City, CA 91780-2249

Claudia Arellano  
4305 Santa Fe Avenue  
Vernon, CA 90058-1786

Samuel Gutierrez  
Engineering Technician  
P.O. Box 1440  
West Covina, CA 91793-1440

Roxanne Hughes  
Stormwater Program Coordinator  
31200 Oak Crest Drive  
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Gary Hildebrand  
Assistant Deputy Director, Division Engineer  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803

1 I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing  
2 correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day in the  
3 ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed  
4 invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for  
5 mailing in affidavit.

6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
7 foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed on December 10, 2012, at Santa Monica, California.

9 

10 

---

**Anna Kheyfets**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 STEVE FLEISCHLI, Bar No. 175174  
2 NOAH J. GARRISON, Bar No. 252154  
3 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
4 1314 Second Street  
5 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
6 (310) 434-2300

7 Attorneys for NATURAL  
8 RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.  
9 AND HEAL THE BAY

10 LIZ CROSSON, Bar No. 262178  
11 TATIANA GAUR, Bar No. 246227  
12 LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
13 120 Broadway, Suite 105  
14 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
15 (310) 394-6162

16 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES  
17 WATERKEEPER  
18 AND HEAL THE BAY

19 DANIEL COOPER, Bar No. 153576  
20 LAWYERS FOR CLEAN WATER, INC.  
21 1004A O'Reilly Avenue  
22 San Francisco, CA 94129  
23 (415) 440-6520

24 Attorney for LOS ANGELES  
25 WATERKEEPER  
26

27 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
28 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

29 In the Matter of the Petition of NRDC, Los )  
30 Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, for )  
31 Review of Action by the California Regional )  
32 Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles )  
33 Region, in Adopting the Los Angeles County )  
34 Municipal Separate Stormwater National )  
35 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System )  
36 (NPDES) Permit; Order No. R4-2012-0175; )  
37 NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 )  
38

39 REQUEST FOR OFFICIAL NOTICE  
40 RE: PETITION FOR REVIEW OF  
41 LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER  
42 QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
43 ACTION OF ADOPTING ORDER  
44 NO. R4-2012-0175

1 The Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”), Los Angeles Waterkeeper  
2 (“Waterkeeper”), and Heal the Bay (collectively, “Petitioners”), in conjunction with our Petition  
3 for Review In the Matter of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles  
4 Region, in Adopting the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Stormwater National Pollutant  
5 Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit; Order No. R4-2012-0175; NPDES Permit No.  
6 CAS004001, hereby request that the State Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”) take  
7 official notice of the following documents, pursuant to California Government  
8 Code § 11515 and California Code of Regulations § 2050.6:

9 1. Attached as “Exhibit A” is a true and correct copy of a memorandum from  
10 James A. Hanlon, Director, Office of Wastewater Management, U.S. EPA and Denise  
11 Keehner, Director, Office of Wetlands, Ocean and Watersheds, U.S. EPA, to Water  
12 Management Division Directors, Regions 1-10, (November 12, 2010). Evidence Code  
13 section 452(c) allows the Board to take official notice of “[o]fficial acts of the  
14 legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the United States. . . .” Courts have  
15 found that “Official acts” under Evidence Code section 452(c) “include records, reports  
16 and orders of administrative agencies.” (*Rodas v. Spiegel* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 513,  
17 518.) A letter or memo from an agency concerning the interpretation of its own  
18 regulations is an “official act” and therefore a proper subject of notice. (*In re Social*  
19 *Services Payment Cases* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1249, 1271-72 (agency letters  
20 interpreting statute were proper subject of judicial notice as “official acts” of agency);  
21 *People v. French* (1978) 77 Cal.App.3d 511, 521 n.12 (taking judicial notice of  
22 Department of Health memorandum concerning interpretation of agency regulations).)

23 2. Attached as “Exhibit B” is a true and correct copy of a letter from Jon M.  
24 Capacasa, Director, Water Protection Division, U.S. EPA, to Mr. Jay Sakai, Director,  
25 Water Management Administration, Maryland Department of the Environment (August  
26 8, 2012). Evidence Code section 452(c) allows the Board to take official notice of  
27 “[o]fficial acts of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the United  
28 States. . . .” Courts have found that “Official acts” under Evidence Code section 452(c)



1 “include records, reports and orders of administrative agencies.” (*Rodas v. Spiegel*, 87  
2 Cal.App.4th at 518.) A letter or memo from an agency concerning the interpretation of  
3 its own regulations is an “official act” and therefore a proper subject of notice. (*In re*  
4 *Social Services Payment Cases*, 166 Cal.App.4th at 1271-72 (agency letters interpreting  
5 statute were proper subject of judicial notice as “official acts” of agency); see also,  
6 *People v. French*, 77 Cal.App.3d at 521 n.12.)

7 3. Attached as “Exhibit C” is a true and correct copy of Chapter 7 from U.S.  
8 EPA’s NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, EPA 833-K-10-001 (September 2010).  
9 Chapter 7 is called “Final Effluent Limitations and Anti-backsliding.” Evidence Code  
10 section 452(c) allows the Board to take official notice of “[o]fficial acts of the  
11 legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the United States. . . .” Courts have  
12 found that “Official acts” under Evidence Code section 452(c) “include records, reports  
13 and orders of administrative agencies.” (*Rodas v. Spiegel*, 87 Cal.App.4th at 518.) A  
14 manual or handbook of an administrative agency, especially when requested for the  
15 purpose of showing the agency’s interpretation of its own regulations, is a proper  
16 subject of notice. (*People v. Goodloe* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 485, 492-93 (taking  
17 judicial notice of administrative bulletin issued by Department of Corrections regarding  
18 its interpretation of criminal statute); *Cicairos v. Summit Logistics, Inc.* (2005) 133  
19 Cal.App.4th 949, 956, fn. 1 (granting judicial notice of Division of Labor Standards  
20 Enforcement Manual).)

21 4. Attached as “Exhibit D” is a true and correct copy of a memorandum from  
22 James R. Elder, Office of Water Enforcement and Permits, U.S. EPA, to Water  
23 Management Division Directors, Regions I-X, and NPDES State Directors (1989).  
24 Evidence Code section 452(c) allows the Board to take official notice of “[o]fficial acts  
25 of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the United States. . . .” Courts  
26 have found that “Official acts” under Evidence Code section 452(c) “include records,  
27 reports and orders of administrative agencies.” (*Rodas v. Spiegel*, 87 Cal.App.4th at  
28 518.) A letter or memo from an agency concerning the interpretation of its own

1 regulations is an “official act” and therefore a proper subject of notice. (*In re Social*  
2 *Services Payment Cases*, 166 Cal.App.4th at 1271-72 (agency letters interpreting  
3 statute were proper subject of judicial notice as “official acts” of agency); see also,  
4 *People v. French*, 77 Cal.App.3d at 521 n.12.)

5 5. Attached as “Exhibit E” is a true and correct copy of a document from U.S.  
6 EPA, Region 9 called “Guidance on Implementing the Antidegradation Provisions of  
7 40 C.F.R. 131.12,” (June 3, 1987). Evidence Code section 452(c) allows the Board to  
8 take official notice of “[o]fficial acts of the legislative, executive, and judicial  
9 departments of the United States. . . .” Courts have found that “Official acts” under  
10 Evidence Code section 452(c) “include records, reports and orders of administrative  
11 agencies.” (*Rodas v. Spiegel*, 87 Cal.App.4th at 518.) A manual or handbook of an  
12 administrative agency, especially when requested for the purpose of showing the  
13 agency’s interpretation of its own regulations, is a proper subject of notice. (*People v.*  
14 *Goodloe*, 37 Cal.App.4th at 492-93 (taking judicial notice of administrative bulletin  
15 issued by Department of Corrections regarding its interpretation of criminal statute);  
16 see also, *Cicairos v. Summit Logistics, Inc.*, 133 Cal.App.4th at 956, fn. 1.)

17 ///  
18 ///  
19 ///  
20 ///  
21 ///  
22 ///  
23 ///  
24 ///  
25 ///  
26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

1 For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the State Board take official  
2 notice of these documents.

3  
4 Dated: December 10, 2012

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.

5  
6 

7  
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Noah Garrison  
10 Steve Fleischli  
11 Attorneys for NATURAL RESOURCES  
12 DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. & HEAL THE BAY

13  
14 Dated: December 10, 2012

LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER

15  
16 

17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Elizabeth Crosson  
20 Tatiana Gaur  
21 Attorneys for LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
22 & HEAL THE BAY  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18  
3 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 1314 Second Street, Santa Monica,  
4 California 90401.

5 On December 10, 2012 I served the within document described as REQUEST FOR OFFICIAL  
6 NOTICE RE: PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY  
7 CONTROL BOARD ACTION OF ADOPTING ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 on the following  
8 interested parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof in the United States mail enclosed in  
9 a sealed envelope with postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

10 Ken Berkman  
11 City Engineer  
12 30001 Ladyface Court  
13 Agoura Hills, CA 91301

14 Terri Rodrigue  
15 City Engineer  
16 6330 Pine Avenue  
17 Bell, CA 90201-1291

18 David Dolphin  
19 111 South First Street  
20 Alhambra, CA 91801-3796

21 John Oropeza  
22 Director of Public Works  
23 7100 South Garfield Avenue  
24 Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293

25 Susannah Turney  
26 Environmental Services Officer  
27 P.O. Box 60021  
28 Arcadia, CA 91066-6021

Bernie Iniguez  
Environmental Services Manager  
16600 Civic Center Drive  
Bellflower, CA 90706-5494

Maria Dadian  
Director of Public Works  
18747 Clarkdale Avenue  
Artesia, CA 90701-5899

Vincent Chee  
Project Civil Engineer  
455 North Rexford Drive  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Carl Hassel  
City Engineer  
213 East Foothill Boulevard  
Azusa, CA 91702

Elroy Kiepke  
City Engineer  
600 Winston Avenue  
Bradbury, CA 91010-1199

David Lopez  
Associate Engineer  
14403 East Pacific Avenue  
Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297

Bonnie Teaford  
Public Works Director  
P.O. Box 6459  
Burbank, CA 91510

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Alex Farassati  
ESM  
100 Civic Center Way  
Calabasas, CA 91302-3172

Mike O'Grady  
Environmental Services  
P.O. Box 3130  
Cerritos, CA 90703-3130

Gina Nila  
2535 Commerce Way  
Commerce, CA 90040-1487

Vivian Castro, Environmental Services  
Manager  
125 East College Street  
Covina, CA 91723-2199

Damian Skinner  
Manager  
9770 Culver Boulevard  
Culver City, CA 90232-0507

Yvonne Blumberg  
P.O. Box 7016  
Downey, CA 90241-7016

James A Enriquez  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 6008  
El Monte, CA 91731

Ron Jackson  
Building Maintenance Supervisor  
P.O. Box 47003  
Gardena, CA 90247-3778

Dave Davies  
Deputy Director of Public Works  
116 East Foothill Boulevard  
Glendora, CA 91741

Patricia Elkins  
Building Construction Manager  
P.O. Box 6234  
Carson, CA 90745

Craig Bradshaw  
City Engineer  
207 Harvard Avenue  
Claremont, CA 91711-4719

Hien Nguyen  
Assistant City Engineer  
205 South Willowbrook Avenue  
Compton, CA 90220-3190

Hector Rodriguez  
City Manager  
P.O. Box 1007  
Cudahy, CA 90201-6097

David Liu  
Director of Public Works  
21825 East Copley Drive  
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177

Steve Esbenshades  
Engineering Division Manager  
1600 Huntington Drive  
Duarte, CA 91010-2592

Stephanie Katsouleas  
Public Works Director  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245-3895

Maurice Oillataguerre  
Senior Environmental Program Scientist  
Engineering Section  
633 East Broadway, Room 209  
Glendale, CA 91206-4308

Joseph Colombo  
Director of Community Development  
21815 Pioneer Boulevard  
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Arnold Shadbeh  
Chief General Service and Public Works  
4455 West 126th Street  
Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482

Kimberly Colberts  
Environmental Coordinator  
6165 Spring Valley Road  
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

Mike Nagaoka  
Director of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 3366  
Industry, CA 91744-3995

Kwok Tam  
Director of Public Works  
5050 North Irwindale Avenue  
Irwindale, CA 91706

Shauna Clark  
City Manager  
1245 North Hacienda Boulevard  
La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570

John DiMario  
Director of Development Services  
15900 East Marin Street  
La Puente, CA 91744-4788

Konya Vivanti  
P.O. Box 158  
Lakewood, CA 90714-0158

Tom A. Odom  
City Administrator  
P.O. Box 339  
Lomita, CA 90717-0098

Josef Kekula  
11330 Bullis Road  
Lynwood, CA 90262-3693

Homayoun Behboodi  
Associate Engineer  
1315 Valley Drive  
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884

Craig Melich  
City Engineer and City Official  
6550 Miles Avenue  
Huntington Park, CA 90255

Lauren Amimoto  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
1 W. Manchester Blvd, 3rd Floor  
Inglewood, CA 90301-1750

Edward G. Hitti  
Director of Public Works  
1327 Foothill Boulevard  
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137

Steve Forster  
Public Works Director  
13700 La Mirada Boulevard  
La Mirada, CA 90638-0828

Daniel Keesey  
Director of Public Works  
3660 "D" Street  
La Verne, CA 91750-3599

Marlene Miyoshi  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
14717 Burin Avenue  
Lawndale, CA 90260

Shahram Kharaghani  
Program Manager  
1149 S. Broadway, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Jennifer Brown  
Environmental Program Analyst  
23825 Stuart Ranch Road  
Malibu, CA 90265-4861

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Brian Wright  
Water Supervisor  
1400 Highland Avenue  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795

Heather Maloney  
415 South Ivy Avenue  
Monrovia, CA 91016-2888

Amy Ho  
John Hunter (Consultant)  
320 West Newmark Avenue  
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896

Allan Rigg  
Director of Public Works  
340 Palos Verdes Drive West  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Stephen Walker  
P.O. Box 7115  
Pasadena, CA 91109-7215

Julie Carver  
Environmental Programs Coordinator  
P.O. Box 660  
Pomona, CA 91769-0660

Mike Shay  
Principal Civil Engineer  
P.O. Box 270  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

Latoya Cyrus  
Environmental Services Coordinator  
245 East Bonita Avenue  
San Dimas, CA 91773-3002

Andre Dupret  
Project Manager  
4319 East Slauson Avenue  
Maywood, CA 90270-2897

Cory Roberts  
1600 West Beverly Boulevard  
Montebello, CA 90640-3970

Chino Consunji  
City Engineer  
P.O. Box 1030  
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030

Chris Cash  
Utility and Infrastructure Assistant Director  
16400 Colorado Avenue  
Paramount, CA 90723-5091

Art Cervantes  
Director of Public Works  
P.O. Box 1016  
Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016  
Ray Holland  
Interim Public Works Director  
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Greg Grammer  
Assistant to the City Manager  
2 Portuguese Bend Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199

Chris Marcarello  
Director of PW  
8838 East Valley Boulevard  
Rosemead, CA 91770-1787

Ron Ruiz  
Director of Public Works  
117 Macneil Street  
San Fernando, CA 91340

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Daren T. Grilley  
City Engineer  
425 South Mission Drive  
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Travis Lange  
Environmental Services Manager  
23920 West Valencia Blvd, Suite 300  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Neal Shapiro  
Urban Runoff Coordinator  
1685 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295

John Hunter  
2175 Cherry Avenue  
Signal Hill, CA 90755

John Hunter  
8650 California Avenue  
South Gate, CA 90280

Leslie Cortez  
Senior Administrative Assistant  
3031 Torrance Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90503-5059

Jack Yoshino  
Senior Management Assistant  
P.O. Box 682  
Walnut, CA 91788

Sharon Perlstein  
City Engineer  
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard  
West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314

David Mochizuki  
Director of Public Works  
13230 Penn Street  
Whittier, CA 90602-1772

Chuck Richie  
Director of Parks and Public Works  
2200 Huntington Drive  
San Marino, CA 91108-2691

Sarina Morales-Choate  
Civil Engineer Assistant  
P.O. Box 2120  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120

James Carlson  
Management Analyst  
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard  
Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312

John Hunter  
1414 Mission Street  
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298

Joe Lambert  
John Hunter  
9701 Las Tunas Drive  
Temple City, CA 91780-2249

Claudia Arellano  
4305 Santa Fe Avenue  
Vernon, CA 90058-1786

Samuel Gutierrez  
Engineering Technician  
P.O. Box 1440  
West Covina, CA 91793-1440

Roxanne Hughes  
Stormwater Program Coordinator  
31200 Oak Crest Drive  
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Gary Hildebrand  
Assistant Deputy Director, Division Engineer  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803



1 I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing  
2 correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day in the  
3 ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed  
4 invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for  
5 mailing in affidavit.

6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
7 foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed on December 10, 2012, at Santa Monica, California.

9 

10 

---

**Anna Kheyfets**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28