



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Indian Wells
(760) 568-2611
Irvine
(949) 263-2600
Los Angeles
(213) 617-8100
Ontario
(909) 989-8584

655 West Broadway, 15th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 525-1300 | Fax: (619) 233-6118 | www.bbklaw.com

Riverside
(951) 686-1450
Sacramento
(916) 325-4000
Walnut Creek
(925) 977-3300
Washington, DC
(202) 785-0600

J. G. Andre Monette
(619) 525-1374
andre.monette@bbklaw.com
File No. 60093.00021

August 15, 2013

Emel G. Wadhvani
Senior Staff Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: SWRCB/OCC File A-2236(a) Through (kk)

Dear Ms. Wadhvani:

On behalf of the City of Lake Forest (“City” or “Lake Forest”) Best Best & Kriger LLP is pleased to submit these comments on the State Water Resources Control Board’s (“State Board”) receiving water limitations (“RWL”) language and the two questions the State Board has asked about the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit’s (“LA Permit”) RWL approach. The City is happy to see the State Board ask these questions, it looks forward to the early fall State Board workshop on the topic, and it urges the State Board to make meaningful revisions to the current RWL language. Revisions to the current RWL language are particularly important in light of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals’ decision issued August 8, 2013¹, which is more fully discussed below.

I. Why the Current RWL Language is a Concern to Lake Forest

Lake Forest is located in south Orange County. As with many cities across California, Lake Forest has struggled with decreasing revenue sources and increasing demands for services. These fiscal challenges require the City Council to carefully balance its expenditures to make sure that the residents of Lake Forest are receiving the best value for its limited resources, including from its water quality program.

The financial realities still facing the City require it to make difficult spending choices in order to continue to fund all essential governmental services, including, among other things, water quality improvement programs.

The current RWL language, as interpreted by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals,² upsets the City’s careful balancing of its limited resources by forcing the City to chase all pollutants, at all times,

¹ *Natural Resources Defense Council v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. August 8, 2013) ____ F.3d ____ [Dock. No. 10-56017].

² *Natural Resources Defense Council v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 2011), 673 F.3d 880, *rev’d on other grounds* by 133 S.Ct. 710 (2013).
55136.00501\8214722.1



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 2

in all receiving waters, regardless of the relative water quality benefits of such efforts. The City operates a large MS4 system, with thousands of access points. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to control all inputs into the system. The current RWL language is, therefore, not a feasible policy to implement, either from a fiscal or from a water quality perspective.

The State Board's current RWL language and its potential revision are particularly vital issues for Lake Forest because of the Regional MS4 Permit recently adopted by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Regional MS4 Permit contains the State Board's current RWL language, which has been interpreted as requiring strict compliance with water quality standards. At the same time, however, the Regional MS4 Permit includes mandatory water quality improvement plans ("WQIPs"), that require significant expenditure of funds and effort outside of Lake Forest with no corresponding compliance benefits such as those found in the LA Permit. This mandatory WQIP approach, without RWL language reform, is not an appropriate way to approach the issue and will place a significant strain on Lake Forest's municipal budget.³

It is the City's position that BMP-based compliance is a mandatory element of any MS4 permitting scheme. This is because it encourages (allows) the City to the management practices and structural controls necessary to achieve Water Quality Standards. As the State Board has recognized on multiple occasions, attaining Water Quality Standards requires of the community, not just the City. Virtually all pollutants in urban runoff come from activities of home owners, and businesses rather than the City itself. A BMP-based compliance approach gives the City an opportunity to reach the community as a whole and thereby reach the sources of stormwater pollution.

The State Board's own studies show that compliance with RWL prohibitions expressed as numeric limits is not feasible. In 2006, the State Board convened a "Blue Ribbon Panel" of experts to determine whether compliance with numeric effluent limits in stormwater permits was feasible. The panel found that "[m]ost all existing development rely on non-structural control measures, making it difficult, if not impossible to set numeric effluent limits for these areas" and that "[i]t is not feasible at this time to set enforceable numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs and in particular urban discharges." (Storm Water Quality Panel Recommendations to the California State Water Resources Control Board – The Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities, June 19, 2006, pp. 8, 12.)

³ This problem has been made worse by the 9th Circuit's August 8, 2013 decision. That decision appears to suggest that dischargers may be held jointly liable for receiving water exceedances, even without specific evidence that the individual discharger actually discharged the pollutants causing or contributing to the exceedance. To avoid such liability without evidence, dischargers will be compelled to turn inward and focus only on their discharges.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 3

The current RWL approach places the City in a position of possible immediate non-compliance and exposes the City to unwarranted third-party lawsuits. Placing the City in such a position does nothing to further water quality improvements and actually undermines the City's ability to address real problems.

From the City's perspective, therefore, the current RWL language presents real challenges and drives decisions that inhibit the achievement of superior water quality results. Lake Forest therefore urges the State Board to revise the current approach through a precedential order that would apply to, among other things, the Regional MS4 Permit.

II. Why the Receiving Water Limitations Language Can and Should be Revised

The current RWL language thus presents both fiscal and technical quality challenges for the City. Revising the RWL language could alleviate the fiscal challenges by allowing the City to focus its resources on the highest water quality benefits. Of course, the City must still be held accountable through specific, enforceable requirements, and the City is not looking for a free pass. Rather, the State Board should use this opportunity to make meaningful revisions to the RWL language that continue to hold dischargers accountable for their actions but also allow for a broader, more integrated approach to solving water quality problems.

The State Board has the power to make such changes, and should do so through a state-wide precedential order. The legal support for the revisions to the RWL language is briefly set forth below.

A. Initial Development of the RWL Language

The current RWL language was originally developed based what case law has subsequently made clear was a misunderstanding of requirements of the Clean Water Act. In 1991, the State Board concluded that Section 402(p)(3)(B) of the Act required that MS4 permits must contain effluent limitations based on water quality standards in accordance with Section 301 of the Act.⁴ The State Board reasoned that the maximum extent practicable ("MEP") standard in Section 402(p)(3)(B) only modified the technology-based requirements of Section 301, and left in place the water quality-based requirements of Section 301, even if those requirements were more stringent than MEP. The State Board thus concluded that MS4 permits had to contain water quality-based effluent limitations pursuant to Section 301.

Subsequent State Board decisions expressly confirmed that the State Board intended the RWL language to implement the requirement of Section 301(b)(1)(C) to include more stringent

⁴ State Board Order No. WQ 91-03.
55136.00501\8214722.1



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 4

effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards.⁵ Based on this misinterpretation of the Act, the State Board promulgated “the strongest and clearest possible language to protect water quality.” In 1999, the State Board refined its approach and issued the RWL language that currently applies to all MS4 permits.⁶

The confusion about whether Section 301 applied to Section 402(p)(3)(B) was understandable prior to 1999 because no precedential legal decision had yet addressed the question. In 1999, however, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals unequivocally resolved this question.⁷ The 9th Circuit held that Section 402(p)(3)(B) was unambiguous and completely replaced the requirements of Section 301 for MS4 permits. Therefore, neither the technology-based nor water quality-based requirements of Section 301 applied to MS4 permits. Because Section 402(p)(3)(B) was unambiguous, no deference to EPA’s interpretation was required or permitted. Congress had spoken and its decision governed. The 9th Circuit thus held that MS4 permits issued under Section 402(p)(3)(B) did not need to include water quality-based effluent limitations that mandated strict compliance with water quality standards. In other words, the legal premise on which the State Board’s RWL language was based was wrong.

B. Clarification in the State Board’s 2001 BIA Order

In 2001, the State Board had the opportunity to clarify its RWL language in light of the 9th Circuit’s decision in *Browner*.⁸ As the State Board acknowledged, it had not previously addressed the implications of *Browner* and the holding that MS4 permits did not need to require strict compliance with water quality standards. The State Board then properly interpreted its RWL language in a manner consistent with *Browner* and found that the language “does not require strict compliance with water quality standards.” Rather, compliance with water quality standards “is to be achieved over time, through an iterative approach requiring improved BMPs.”

The State Board declined to eliminate, as it could have done under *Browner*, the need to address water quality standards at all in MS4 permits in California. The State Board found that a technology-based standard alone would ignore the impacts urban runoff was having on receiving waters. The State Board thus pursued a middle course in which strict compliance with water quality standards would not generally be required, but where water quality standards would still be addressed through an iterative approach, which seeks compliance over time. This approach, the State Board found, “is protective of water quality, but at the same time considers the

⁵ State Board Order No. WQ 98-01.

⁶ State Board Order No. 99-05.

⁷ *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159.

⁸ State Board Order No. 2001-15.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 5

difficulties of achieving full compliance through BMPs that must be enforced throughout large and medium municipal storm sewer systems.”

The State Board’s 2001 precedential interpretation of the RWL language remains the State Board’s last precedential order on the subject. Had the iterative approach as articulated in the State Board’s 2001 Order been uniformly applied, many of the City’s current concerns would have been ameliorated. Such an iterative approach establishes a high bar—the ultimate achievement of water quality standards—but also recognizes the difficulties faced by MS4s in achieving those standards because of the open nature of MS4 systems, significant variability in rainfall and technical and financial feasibility.

Unfortunately, not all the Regional Boards, nor the courts and third parties applied this language uniformly. Ultimately, the RWL language was interpreted based on the original misapplication of Section 301 to MS4 permits, and was applied to require strict compliance with water quality standard, as most recently reflected in the 9th Circuit’s 2011 and 2013 decisions involving the 2001 LA permit.

C. The NRDC Case

The 9th Circuit in 2011 issued an opinion, subsequently reversed on other grounds, that interprets the State Board’s RWL language to require strict compliance with water quality standards, uncoupled from the iterative process as expressed in the State Board’s 2001 Order.⁹ The 9th Circuit’s opinion appears to turn the State Board’s 2001 precedential decision on its head. Rather than finding the iterative process to be an integral part of the State’s effort to achieve compliance with water quality standards over time through improved BMPs, the 9th Circuit held that strict compliance with water quality standards was required and was subject to independent enforcement separate from the iterative process.

The 9th Circuit’s decision appears rooted in the same misunderstanding of Section 402(p)(3)(B) and Section 301 of the Act that existed at the time of the original development of the RWL language. The 9th Circuit quoted with support from non-MS4 cases that are based on the strict application of water quality standards. For example, the 9th Circuit noted that “[o]nly by enforcing the water-quality standards themselves as the limits could the purpose of the CWA and the NPDES system be effectuated.” The 9th Circuit rejected the notion (which, of course, it previously had supported in *Browner*) that Section 402(p)(3)(B) was a “lesser standard.” The 9th Circuit reasoned that “Defendants’ position that they are subject to a less rigorous or unenforceable regulatory scheme for their storm-water discharges cannot be reconciled with the

⁹ *Natural Resources Defense Council v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 2011), 673 F.3d 880, *rev’d on other grounds* by 133 S.Ct. 710 (2013).
55136.00501\8214722.1



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 6

significant legislative history showing Congress's intent to bring MS4 operators under the NPDES-permitting system."

Although the 9th Circuit's decision was reversed by the United States Supreme Court on other grounds, its interpretation of the RWL language was not addressed by the Supreme Court. The 9th Circuit's decision can thus be interpreted as a fundamental shift away from the State Board's approach in its 2001 precedential order.

To make matters worse, the 9th Circuit on August 8, 2013, on remand from the Supreme Court, reconsidered its previous opinion and again held the Los Angeles Flood Control District liable for the quality of the receiving water, even though there was no evidence of a discharge of the standard exceeding pollutants from the Flood Control District's MS4.¹⁰ The 9th Circuit's new decision emphasizes even more the need for RWL reform because it appears to hold permittees liable for the quality of the receiving waters absent any evidence of an individual contribution to the problem. The City acknowledges that some at the State Board and at the various Regional Board may believe that the 9th Circuit's decisions are consistent with the current RWL language and do not reflect a change in approach. However, this position appears hard to reconcile with an objective comparison of the statements in the State Board's 2001 precedential order (in which the State Board stated that its RWL language does not require strict compliance with water quality standards) with the 9th Circuit's decisions (in which the Court held that the RWL language requires strict compliance with water quality standards, apparently even absent evidence of an individual discharge).

D. The Current Situation and the State Board's Authority to Revise the RWL Language

The 9th Circuit's decisions have resulted in significant concerns from municipal dischargers, who have requested that the State Board address the issue through a reconsideration of its current RWL language. The issue has been raised directly with the State Board in connection with the Caltrans Permit and the Phase II Permit. The issue was also the crucial policy issue raised in connection with the LA Permit and the San Diego Regional Permit, both of which are subject to pending petitions to the State Board. Resolution of the RWL language issue by the State Board is the most important pending MS4 policy question.

¹⁰ In its 2011 opinion, the 9th Circuit had rejected the contention that the mass-emissions monitoring station data conclusively established the Flood Control District's liability. The 9th Circuit held that there must be some additional proof of the Flood Control District's individual contribution to the water quality exceedance. However, on August 8, 2013, the reconsidered this argument and held that the monitoring data only established liability, even absent evidence of the District's individual contribution.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 7

Some have asserted that the State Board lacks the legal authority to consider changes to its current RWL language. The City believes that the State Board has discretion on the question and that neither the anti-backsliding nor the anti-degradation provisions of the Act or state law preclude the State Board from addressing the RWL language, as briefly explained below.

1. Anti-Backsliding

Some have asserted that the anti-backsliding provisions of the Act and federal regulations preclude any changes to the RWL language. A careful reading of the Act and the regulations demonstrate otherwise.

Section 402(o) of the Act provides that for specific effluent limitations established on the basis of specific sections of the Act, a permit may not be renewed or reissued that contains effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit. There are several reasons why Section 402(o) has no application to the RWL language.

First, the RWL language is not an “effluent limitation” as defined in the Act. An “effluent limitation” is “any restriction established by a State or the Administrator on quantities, rates, and concentrations of chemical, physical, biological, and other constituents *which are discharged from point sources* into navigable waters, the waters of the contiguous zone, or the ocean, including schedules of compliance.”¹¹ An “effluent limitation” is thus a limit measured at the point of discharge from a point source. In contrast, the RWL language measures compliance in the receiving water.

Second, even if the RWL language could be characterized as an “effluent limitation,” it is not (and could not be) developed in accordance with the specific sections listed in Section 402(o). It is not a technology-based effluent limitation established based on best professional judgment in accordance with Section 402(a)(1)(B). Rather, it derives its legal authority from Section 402(p)(3)(B). Moreover, as *Browner* makes clear, the RWL language is not (and could not be) a technology-based or water-quality based effluent limitation established on the basis of Section 301(b)(1)(c) because Section 301 has no application to MS4 permits. Finally, the RWL language is not an effluent limitation developed under Section 303(d) or (e), which involve the continuing planning process and TMDLs. The RWL language is, at its core, an exercise of discretion under the “such other provisions” language of Section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) and is not subject to Section 402(o).

¹¹ 33 U.S.C. §502(11)(Emphasis added).
55136.00501\8214722.1



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 8

The federal regulations also contain anti-backsliding provisions.¹² These regulations must be addressed in NPDES permits “when applicable.” Due to the unique nature of MS4s and the special standards Congress created in Section 402(p)(3)(B) for such systems, these regulations are not “applicable” to MS4 permits. The regulations provide that “interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions” of renewed or reissued permits must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards or conditions in the previous permit. For the same reasons as discussed above regarding Section 402(o), these regulations do not apply to MS4 permits. It is commonly recognized that these regulations do not govern requirements based on state water quality standards.¹³ Because the RWL language is, at its core, intended to protect state water quality standards, these regulations have no application to the RWL language.

2. Anti-Degradation

EPA’s regulations require that each state develop and adopt a statewide anti-degradation policy and identify the methods for implementing such policy.¹⁴ California adopted its anti-degradation policy in 1968.¹⁵ The State Board has issued guidance on its policy through Administrative Procedures Update (“APU”) 90-004.

As APU 90-004 makes clear, the State’s anti-degradation policy does not apply when a discharge “will not be adverse to the intent and purpose of the state and federal anti-degradation policies.” Likewise, APU 90-004 provides that if there is “no reason to believe that existing water quality will be reduced due to the proposed action, no anti-degradation analysis is required.” As noted above, revisions to the RWL language will allow MS4s through-out the State to better address water quality problems and will lead to better water quality outcomes. Thus, there is no reason to believe that revisions to the RWL language will reduce existing water quality. Therefore, the anti-degradation policy does not apply.

This analysis is consistent with recent case law regarding anti-degradation. In a recent case, the court acknowledged that the anti-degradation policy might not apply if it can be shown that the discharge of waste will not degrade the quality of the receiving water.¹⁶ To support such a conclusion, a water board must ensure that the regulatory action includes sufficient requirements, including an effective monitoring program, to demonstrate that the discharge will not degrade the quality of the receiving water. MS4 permits contain such requirements, including an effective monitoring program. Therefore, the anti-degradation provisions do not apply.

¹² 40 CFR § 122.44(l).

¹³ See, e.g., NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual, page 7-4.

¹⁴ 40 CFR 131.12.

¹⁵ State Board Resolution No. 68-16.

¹⁶ *Asociacion De Gente Unida Por El Agua v. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 1255.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 9

III. Responses to Two Questions

With the above legal framework in mind, the City has the following responses to the two questions posed by the State Board. In the City's view, the RWL language must be amended to include a compliance program option that includes the following key elements: it must be voluntary; it must allow either a watershed or jurisdictional approach; it must permit best management practices; it must allow for prioritization of pollutant-water body combinations; it must permit adaptive management; and it must provide that good faith compliance with the program constitutes compliance with receiving water limitations and discharge prohibitions. The City's answers below are based on these key elements.

A. General Support for Compliance Approach in the LA Permit

The City generally supports the LA Permit's compliance approach as a good first step toward revising the RWL language. The approach is properly an optional one that allows permittees to decide whether the current language or a different approach works best for the City. It also contains sufficient rigor to provide measurable and enforceable requirements that permittees must meet. Most importantly, it provides for two different watershed or jurisdictional compliance paths that all permittees may implement. Although somewhat cumbersome, the City views the LA approach as a good first step and commends the Regional Board for its attempt to address the RWL issue. To fully address the issue, however, additional language rooted in the iterative process is required.

B. Support for CASQA's Improvements to the LA Permit's Approach

Although the City views the LA Permit's approach as a good first step, the City believes that the language requires further refinement. The City supports the RWL language put forward by CASQA in its response to the State Board's two questions as an additional step toward true RWL reform. CASQA's refinements to the LA approach makes the compliance program process more usable and comprehensive.

Moreover, the State Board should additionally consider including in the revised RWL language a mechanism to address those situations where, despite good faith efforts, achievement of water quality standards, including interim and final wasteload allocations/effluent limitations, proves to be currently infeasible. Building such a mechanism into the RWL compliance process now will avoid future disputes and will establish a comprehensive structure through which the State and Regional Boards can work collaboratively with MS4s to achieve water quality standards.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Emel G. Wadhvani
State Water Resources Control Board
August 15, 2013
Page 10

IV. Conclusion

Lake Forest appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments to the State Board and looks forward to the State Board workshop on the topic. It urges the State Board to use this opportunity to make meaningful revisions to the RWL language.

Very truly yours,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'J. G. Andre Monette', written over the typed name and affiliation.

J. G. Andre Monette
for BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

JGM:am

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 13, 2013
Page 10

All Interested Parties

Mr. Samuel Unger [via email only]
Executive Officer
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control
Board
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013
sunger@waterboards.ca.gov

Ms. Deborah Smith [via email only]
Assistant Executive Officer
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control
Board
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013
dsmith@waterboards.ca.gov

Ms. Paula Rasmussen [via email only]
Assistant Executive Officer
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control
Board
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013
prasmussen@waterboards.ca.gov

Ms. Renee Purdy [via email only]
Environmental Program Manager I
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality
Control Board
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013
rpurdy@waterboards.ca.gov

Lori T. Okun, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
lokun@waterboards.ca.gov

Frances L. McChesney, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
FMcChesney@waterboards.ca.gov

Jennifer L. Fordyce, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
ifordyce@waterboards.ca.gov

Nicole L Johnson, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
njohnson@waterboards.ca.gov

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 13, 2013
Page 11

All Interested Parties (cont.)

Mr. Ivar Ridgeway [via email only]
Environmental Scientist
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control
Board
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013
iridgeway@waterboards.ca.gov

Philip G. Wyels, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
pwuels@waterboards.ca.gov

Mr. David W. Smith, Chief [via email only]
Permits Office
U.S. EPA, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
smith.davidw@epa.gov

Michael Lauffer, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
milauffer@waterboards.ca.gov

Bethany A. Pane, Esq. [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
bpane@waterboards.ca.gov

Joanne Griffin [via email only]
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor [95814]
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
jgriffin@waterboards.ca.gov

**SWRCB/OCC FILE NOS. A-2236(a) through (kk)
 PETITIONERS AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD CONTACT LIST
 EXHIBIT A**

<p><u>City of San Marino [A-2236(a)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwqlaw.com clee@rwqlaw.com abrady@rwqlaw.com</p>	<p><u>City of El Monte [A-2236(u)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Ricardo Olivarez, Esq. City Attorney, City of El Monte 11333 Valley Boulevard El Monte, CA 91734-2008 rolvarez@ogplaw.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of San Marino c/o Mr. John Schaefer, City Manager 2200 Huntington Drive San Marino, CA 91108 jschaefer@cityofsanmarino.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of El Monte c/o Mr. Dayle Keller Interim City Manager 11333 Valley Boulevard El Monte, CA 91731 dkeller@ci.el-monte.ca.us</p>
<p><u>City of Rancho Palos Verdes [A-2236(b)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwqlaw.com clee@rwqlaw.com abrady@rwqlaw.com</p>	<p><u>City of Monrovia [A-2236(v)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwqlaw.com clee@rwqlaw.com abrady@rwqlaw.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Rancho Palos Verdes c/o City Manager 30940 Hawthorne Boulevard Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Monrovia c/o City Manager 415 South Ivy Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016 cityhall@ci.monrovia.ca.us</p>

<p><u>City of South El Monte [A-2236(c)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwglaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwglaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwglaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of Agoura Hills [A-2236(w)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwglaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwglaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwglaw.com</u></p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of South El Monte c/o City Manager 1415 N. Santa Anita Avenue South El Monte, CA 91733</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Agoura Hills c/o City Manager 30001 Ladyface Court Agoura Hills, CA 91301</p>
<p><u>City of Norwalk [A-2236(d)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwglaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwglaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwglaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of Pico Rivera [A-2236(x)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Anthony Marinaccio, Esq. Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin 13181 Crossroads Parkway North West Tower, Suite 400 City of Industry, CA 91746 <u>amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com</u></p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Norwalk c/o Mr. Michael J. Egan City Manager 12700 Norwalk Boulevard Norwalk, CA 90650</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Pico Rivera c/o Mr. Ron Bates, City Manager and Mr. Arturo Cervantes, Director of Public Works 6615 Passons Boulevard Pico Rivera, CA 90660 <u>rbates@pico-rivera.org</u> <u>acervantes@pico-rivera.org</u></p>
<p><u>City of Artesia [A-2236 (e)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwglaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwglaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwglaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of Carson [A-2236(y)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] William W. Wynder, Esq. City Attorney Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 475 El Segundo, CA 90245 <u>wwynder@awattorneys.com</u></p>

<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Artesia c/o Interim City Manager 18747 Clarkdale Avenue Artesia, CA 90701</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel Wesley A. Millband, Esq., Special Counsel Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 dboyer@awattorneys.com wmillband@awattorneys.com</p>
<p><u>City of Torrance [A-2236(f)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clea@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Carson c/o Mr. David C. Biggs City Manager 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745 dbiggs@carson.ca.us</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Torrance c/o Mr. LeRoy J. Jackson, City Manager 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Third Floor Torrance, CA 90503 ljackson@torranceca.gov</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Carson c/o Mr. Farrokh Abolfathi P.E. Principal Civil Engineer 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745 fabolfathi@carson.ca.us</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Torrance c/o Mr. Robert J. Beste Public Works Director 20500 Madrona Avenue Torrance, CA 90503 rbeste@torranceca.gov</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Carson c/o Ms. Patricia Elkins Storm Water Quality Programs Manager 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745 pelkins@carson.ca.us</p>
<p><u>City of Beverly Hills [A-2236 (g)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clea@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>	<p><u>City of Lawndale [A-2236 (z)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Tiffany J. Israel, Esq. City Attorney, City of Lawndale Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 tisrael@awattorneys.com</p>

<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Beverly Hills c/o City Manager 455 N. Rexford Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210 lkolin@beverlyhills.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel Wesley A. Millband, Esq., Special Counsel Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 dboyer@awattorneys.com wmillband@awattorneys.com</p>
<p>City of Hidden Hills [A-2236(h)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clee@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Lawndale c/o Mr. Stephen Mandoki, City Manager 14717 Burin Avenue Lawndale, CA 90260 smandoki@lawndalecity.org</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Hidden Hills c/o City Manager 6165 Spring Valley Road Hidden Hills, CA 91302 staff@hiddenhillscity.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Lawndale c/o Mr. Nasser Abbaszadeh Director of Public Works 14717 Burin Avenue Lawndale, CA 90260 nabbaszadeh@lawndalecity.org</p>
<p>City of Claremont [A-2236 (i)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Shawn Hagerty, Esq. J.G. Andre Monette, Esq. Rebecca Andrews, Esq. Best Best & Krieger, LLP 655 West Boardway, 15th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 andre.monette@bbklaw.com</p>	<p>City of Commerce [A-2236(aa)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clee@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Claremont c/o Mr. Brian Desatnik Director of Community Development 207 Harvard Avenue Claremont, CA 91711 bdesatnik@ci.claremont.ca.us</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Commerce c/o Mr. Jorge Rifa City Administrator 2535 Commerce Way Commerce, CA 90040 jorger@ci.commerce.ca.us</p>

<p><u>City of Arcadia [A-2236(j)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Shawn Hagerty, Esq. J.G. Andre Monette, Esq. Rebecca Andrews, Esq. Best Best & Krieger, LLP 655 West Broadway, 15th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 andre.monette@bbkllaw.com</p>	<p><u>City of Pomona [A-2236(bb)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Andrew L. Jared, Esq. Anthony Marinaccio, Esq. Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin 13181 Crossroads Parkway North West Tower, Suite 400 City of Industry, CA 91746 andrew@agclawfirm.com amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Arcadia, City Manager c/o Mr. Dominic Lazzaretto 240 West Huntington Drive P.O. Box 60021 Arcadia, CA 91066 dlazzaretto@ci.arcadia.ca.us</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Pomona c/o Ms. Linda Lowry, City Manager and Ms. Julie Carver, Environmental Programs Coordinator P.O. Box 660 505 S. Garay Avenue Pomona, CA 91766</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Arcadia c/o Mr. Tom Tait Director of Public Works Services 240 West Huntington Drive P.O. Box 60021 Arcadia, CA 91066 ttait@ci.arcadia.ca.us</p>	<p><u>City of Sierra Madre [A-2236(cc)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Teresa L. Highsmith, Esq., City Attorney Holly O. Whatley, Esq. Colantuono & Levin, PC 300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2700 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3137 highsmith@claw.us hwhatley@claw.us</p>
<p><u>Cities of Duarte and Huntington Beach [A-2236(k)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Richard Montevideo, Esq. Joseph Larsen, Esq. Rutan & Tucker, LLP 611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400 Costa Mesa, CA 92626 rmontevideo@rutan.com</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Sierra Madre c/o Ms. Elaine Aguilar, City Manager 232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard Sierra Madre, CA 91024</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Duarte c/o Mr. Darrell George City Manager 1600 Huntington Drive Duarte, CA 91010 georged@accessduarte.com</p>	<p><u>City of Downey [A-2236(dd)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwqlaw.com clee@rwqlaw.com abrady@rwqlaw.com</p>

<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Huntington Park c/o Mr. René Bobadilla City Manager 6550 Miles Avenue Huntington Park, CA 90255</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Downey c/o Yvette M. Ablch Garcia, Esq. City Attorney 11111 Brookshire Avenue Downey, CA 90241 ygarcia@downeyca.org</p>
<p><u>City of Glendora [A-2236(l)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] D. Wayne Leech, Esq. City Attorney, City of Glendora Leech & Associates 11001 E. Valley Mall #200 El Monte, CA 91731 wayne@leechlaw.com</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Downey c/o Mr. Jason Wen, Ph.D., P.E. Utilities Superintendent 9252 Stewart and Gray Road Downey, CA 90241 jwen@downeyca.org</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Glendora c/o Mr. Chris Jeffers, City Manager, and Mr. Dave Davies, Director of Public Works 116 East Foothill Boulevard Glendora, CA 91741-3380 city_manager@ci.glendora.ca.us ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us</p>	<p><u>City of Inglewood [A-2236(ee)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwqlaw.com clea@rwqlaw.com abrady@rwqlaw.com</p>
<p><u>NRDC, Heal the Bay and Los Angeles Waterkeeper [A-2236(m)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Steve Fielschil, Esq. Noah Garrison, Esq. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. 1314 Second Street Santa Monica, CA 90401 sfielschil@nrdc.org ngarrison@nrdc.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Inglewood c/o City Manager One Manchester Boulevard Inglewood, CA 90301 lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org bral@cityofinglewood.org latwell@cityofinglewood.org jalewis@cityofinglewood.org csaunders@cityofinglewood.org afields@cityofinglewood.org</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Liz Crosson, Esq. Tatiana Gaur, Esq. Los Angeles Waterkeeper 120 Broadway, Suite 105 Santa Monica, CA 90401 liz@lawaterkeeper.org tgaur@lawaterkeeper.org</p>	<p><u>City of Lynwood [A-2236(ff)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Fred Galante, Esq., City Attorney David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel Wesley A. Millband, Esq., Special Counsel Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 dboyer@awattorneys.com wmillband@awattorneys.com fgalante@awattorneys.com</p>

<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Kirsten James, Esq. Heal the Bay 1444 9th Street Santa Monica, CA 90401 kiames@healthebay.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Lynwood c/o Mr. Josef Kekula and Mr. Elias Salkaly Public Works Department 11330 Bullis Road Lynwood, CA 90262 ikekula@lynwood.ca.us esalkaly@lynwood.ca.us</p>
<p>City of Gardena [A-2236(n)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Cary S. Reisman, Esq. Assistant City Attorney, City of Gardena Wallin, Kress, Reisman & Kranitz, LLP 2800 28th Street, Suite 315 Santa Monica, CA 90405 cary@wkrklaw.com</p>	<p>City of Irwindale [A-2236(qq)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Fred Galante, Esq., City Attorney David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel Wesley A. Milliband, Esq., Special Counsel Aleshire & Wynder, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 dboyer@awattorneys.com wmilliband@awattorneys.com fgalante@awattorneys.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Gardena c/o Mr. Mitch Lansdell, City Manager 1700 West 162nd Street Gardena, CA 90247 mlansdell@ci.gardena.ca.us</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Irwindale c/o Mr. Kwok Tam, City Engineer Public Works Department 5050 North Irwindale Avenue Irwindale, CA 91706 ktam@ci.irwindale.ca.us</p>
<p>City of Bradbury [A-2236(o)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Cary S. Reisman, Esq. City Attorney, City of Bradbury Wallin, Kress, Reisman & Kranitz, LLP 2800 28th Street, Suite 315 Santa Monica, CA 90405 cary@wkrklaw.com</p>	<p>City of Culver City [A-2236(hh)]:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clee@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Bradbury c/o Ms. Michelle Keith City Manager 600 Winston Avenue Bradbury, CA 91008 mkelth@cityofbradbury.org</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Culver City c/o Mr. John Nachbar, City Manager 9770 Culver Boulevard Culver City, CA 90232 john.nachbar@culvercity.org</p>

<p><u>City of Westlake Village (A-2236(p)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwqlaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of Signal Hill (A-2236(ii)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] David J. Aleshire, Esq., City Attorney David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel Wesley A. Milliband, Esq., Special Counsel Aleshire & Wyrider, LLP 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 <u>daleshire@awattorneys.com</u> <u>dboyer@awattorneys.com</u> <u>wmilliband@awattorneys.com</u></p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Westlake Village c/o City Manager 31200 Oak Crest Drive Westlake Village, CA 91361 <u>ray@wlv.org</u> <u>beth@wlv.org</u></p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Signal Hill c/o Mr. Kenneth Farfsing City Manager 2175 Cherry Avenue Signal Hill, CA 90755 <u>kfarfsing@cityofsignalhill.org</u></p>
<p><u>City of La Mirada (A-2236 (g)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwqlaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of Redondo Beach (A-2236(ii)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwqlaw.com</u></p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of La Mirada c/o City Manager 13700 La Mirada Boulevard La Mirada, CA 90638 <u>citycontact@cityoflamirada.org</u></p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail only] City of Redondo Beach c/o Mr. Bill Workman, City Manager 415 Diamond Street Redondo Beach, CA 90277</p>
<p><u>City of Manhattan Beach (A-2236(r)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 <u>lbond@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>clee@rwqlaw.com</u> <u>abrady@rwqlaw.com</u></p>	<p><u>City of West Covina (A-2236(kk)):</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Anthony Marinaccio, Esq. Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin 13181 Crossroads Parkway North West Tower, Suite 400 City of Industry, CA 91746 <u>amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com</u></p>

<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Manhattan Beach c/o City Manager 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 cm@citymb.info</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of West Covina c/o Mr. Andrew Pasmant, City Manager 1444 West Garvey Avenue, Room 305 West Covina, CA 91790 andrew.pasmant@westcovina.org</p>
<p><u>City of Covina [A-2236 (s)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clee@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>	<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of West Covina c/o Ms. Shannon Yauchzee Director of Public Works 1444 West Garvey Avenue West Covina, CA 91790 shannon.yauchzee@westcovina.org</p>
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Covina c/o City Manager 125 East College Street Covina, CA 91273 ycaastro@covinaca.gov</p>	<p>Additional Interested Party By Request:</p> <p>[via U.S. Mail only] Andrew R. Henderson, Esq. General Counsel Building Industry Legal Defense Foundation 17744 Sky Park Circle, Suite 170 Irvine, CA 92614 ahenderson@blasc.org</p>
<p><u>City of Vernon [A-2236(f)]:</u></p> <p>[via U.S. Mail and email] Lisa Bond, Esq. Candice K. Lee, Esq. Andrew J. Brady, Esq. Richards, Watson & Gershon 355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 lbond@rwglaw.com clee@rwglaw.com abrady@rwglaw.com</p>	
<p>[via U.S. Mail and email] City of Vernon c/o City Manager 4305 South Santa Fe Avenue Vernon, CA 90058 carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us</p>	

EXHIBIT B
MS4 DISCHARGERS
MAILING LIST

City of Agoura Hills
c/o Ken Berkman, City Engineer
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
kberkman@agoura-hills.ca.us

City of Alhambra
c/o David Dolphin
111 South First Street
Alhambra, CA 91801-3796
ddolphin@cityofalhambra.org

City of Arcadia
c/o Vanessa Hevener
Environmental Services Officer
11800 Goldring Road
Arcadia, CA 91006-5879
vhevener@ci.arcadia.ca.us

City of Artesia
c/o Maria Dadian
Director of Public Works
18747 Clarkdale Avenue
Artesia, CA 90701-5899
mdadian@cityofartesia.ci.us

City of Azusa
c/o Carl Hassel, City Engineer
213 East Foothill Boulevard
Azusa, CA 91702
chassel@ci.azusa.ca.us

City of Baldwin Park
c/o David Lopez, Associate Engineer
14403 East Pacific Avenue
Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297
dlopez@baldwinpark.com

City of Bell
c/o Terry Rodrigue, City Engineer
6330 Pine Avenue
Bell, CA 90201-1291
trodrigue@cityofbell.org

City of Bell Gardens
c/o John Oropeza, Director of Public Works
7100 South Garfield Avenue
Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293

City of Bellflower
c/o Bernie Iniguez
Environmental Services Manager
16600 Civic Center Drive
Bellflower, CA 90706-5494
biniguez@bellflower.org

City of Beverly Hills
c/o Vincent Chee, Project Civil Engineer
455 North Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
kgettler@beverlyhills.org

City of Bradbury
c/o Elroy Kiepke, City Engineer
600 Winston Avenue
Bradbury, CA 91010-1199
mkeith@cityofbradbury.org

City of Burbank
c/o Bonnie Teaford, Public Works Director
P.O. Box 6459
Burbank, CA 91510
bteaford@ci.burbank.ca.us

City of Calabasas
c/o Alex Farassati, ESM
100 Civic Center Way
Calabasas, CA 91302-3172
afarassati@cityofcalabasas.com

City of Carson
c/o Patricia Elkins
Building Construction Manager
P.O. Box 6234
Carson, CA 90745
pelkins@carson.ca.us

City of Cerritos
c/o Mike O'Grady, Environmental Services
P.O. Box 3130
Cerritos, CA 90703-3130
mogradyc@cerritos.us

City of Claremont
c/o Brian Desatnik
Director of Community Development
207 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-4719
bdesatnik@ci.claremont.ca.us

City of Commerce
c/o Gina Nila
2535 Commerce Way
Commerce, CA 90040-1487
gnila@ci.commerce.ca.us

City of Compton
c/o Hien Nguyen, Assistant City Engineer
25 South Willowbrook Avenue
Compton, CA 90220-3190

City of Covina
c/o Vivian Castro
Environmental Services Manager
125 East College Street
Covina, CA 91723-2199
vastro@covinaca.gov

City of Cudahy
c/o Hector Rodriguez, City Manager
P.O. Box 1007
Cudahy, CA 90201-6097
hrodriguez@cityofcudahy.ca.us

City of Culver City
c/o Damian Skinner, Manager
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232-0507

City of Diamond Bar
c/o David Liu, Director of Public Works
21825 East Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177
dliu@diamondbarca.gov

City of Downey
c/o Jason Wen, Ph.D., P.E.
Utilities Superintendent
9252 Stewart and Gray Road
Downey, CA 90241
jwen@downeyca.org

City of Duarte
c/o Steve Esbenshades
Engineering Division Manager
1600 Huntington Drive
Duarte, CA 91010-2592

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

City of El Segundo
c/o Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245-3895
skatsouleas@elsegundo.org

City of Gardena
c/o Ron Jackson
Building Maintenance Supervisor
P.O. Box 47003
Gardena, CA 90247-3778
ifelix@ci.gardena.ca.us

City of Glendale
c/o Maurice Oillataguerre
Senior Environmental Program Scientist
Eng. Section, 633 East Broadway, Rm. 209
Glendale, CA 91206-4308
moillataguerre@ci.glendale.ca.us

City of Glendora
c/o Dave Davies
Deputy Director of Public Works
116 East Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741
ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us

City of Hawaiian Gardens
c/o Joseph Colombo
Director of Community Development
21815 Pioneer Boulevard
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716
jcolombo@qhcity.org

City of Hawthorne
c/o Arnold Shadbeh
Chief General Service and Public Works
4455 West 126th Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482
ashadbeh@cityofhawthorne.org

City of Hermosa Beach
c/o Homayoun Behboodi
Associate Engineer
1315 Valley Drive
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884
hbehboodi@hermosabch.org

City of Hidden Hills
c/o Kimberly Colberts
Environmental Coordinator
6165 Spring Valley Road
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

City of Huntington Park
c/o Craig Melich
City Engineer and City Official
6550 Miles Avenue
Huntington Park, CA 90255

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

City of Inglewood
c/o Lauren Amimoto
Senior Administrative Analyst
1 W. Manchester Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Inglewood, CA 90301-1750
lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org

City of Irwindale
c/o Kwok Tam
Director of Public Works
5050 North Irwindale Avenue
Irwindale, CA 91706
ktam@ci.irwindale.ca.us

City of La Canada Flintridge
c/o Edward G. Hitti
Director of Public Works
1327 Foothill Boulevard
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137
ehitti@lcf.ca.gov

City of La Habra Heights
c/o Shauna Clark, City Manager
1245 North Hacienda Boulevard
La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570
shaunac@lhhcity.org

City of La Mirada
c/o Steve Forster
Public Works Director
13700 La Mirada Boulevard
La Mirada, CA 90638-0828
sforster@cityoflamirada.org

City of La Puente
c/o John DiMario
Director of Development Services
15900 East Marin Street
La Puente, CA 91744-4788
jdimario@lapuente.org

City of La Verne
c/o Daniel Keeseey
Director of Public Works
3660 "D" Street
La Verne, CA 91750-3599
dkeeseey@ci.la-verne.ca.us

City of Lakewood
c/o Konya Vivanti
P.O. Box 158
Lakewood, CA 90714-0158
kvivanti@lakewoodcity.org

City of Lawndale
c/o Marlene Miyoshi
Senior Administrative Analyst
14717 Burin Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260

City of Lomita
c/o Tom A. Odom, City Administrator
P.O. Box 339
Lomita, CA 90717-0098
d.tomita@lomitacity.com

City of Los Angeles
c/o Shahram Kharanghani
Program Manager
1149 S. Broadway, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90015

City of Lynwood
c/o Josef Kekula
11330 Bullis Road
Lynwood, CA 90262-3693

City of Malibu
c/o Jennifer Brown
Environmental Program Analyst
23825 Stuart Ranch Road
Malibu, CA 90265-4861
jbrown@malibucity.org

City of Manhattan Beach
c/o Brian Wright, Water Supervisor
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795
bwright@citymb.info

City of Maywood
c/o Andre Dupret, Project Manager
4319 East Slauson Avenue
Maywood, CA 90270-2897

City of Monrovia
c/o Heather Maloney
415 South Ivy Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016-2888
hmaloney@ci.monrovia.ca.gov

City of Montebello
c/o Cory Roberts
1600 West Beverly Boulevard
Montebello, CA 90640-3970
croberts@aaeinc.com

City of Monterey Park
c/o Amy Ho or John Hunter, Consultant
320 West Newmark Avenue
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896
amho@montereypark.ca.gov
jhunter@jhla.net

City of Norwalk
c/o Daniel R. Garcia, City Engineer
P.O. Box 1030
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030
dgarcia@norwalkca.gov

City of Palos Verdes Estates
c/o Allan Rigg, Director of Public Works
340 Palos Verdes Drive West
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
arigg@pvestates.org

City of Paramount
c/o Christopher S. Cash
Director of Public Works
16400 Colorado Avenue
Paramount, CA 90723-5091
ccash@paramountcity.com

City of Pasadena
c/o Stephen Walker
P.O. Box 7115
Pasadena, CA 91109-7215
swalker@cityofpasadena.net

City of Pico Rivera
c/o Art Cervantes
Director of Public Works
P.O. Box 1016
Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016
acervantes@pico-rivera.org

City of Pomona
c/o Julie Carver
Environmental Programs Coordinator
P.O. Box 660
Pomona, CA 91769-0660
julie_carver@ci.pomona.ca.us

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
c/o Ray Holland
Interim Public Works Director
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
clehr@rpv.com

City of Redondo Beach
c/o Mike Shay
Principal Civil Engineer
P.O. Box 270
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270
mshay@redondo.org

City of Rolling Hills
c/o Greg Grammer
Assistant to the City Manager
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199
ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov

City of Rolling Hills Estates
c/o Greg Grammer
Assistant to the City Manager
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov

City of Rosemead
c/o Chris Marcarello
Director of Public Works
8838 East Valley Boulevard
Rosemead, CA 91770-1787

City of San Dimas
c/o Latoya Cyrus
Environmental Services Coordinator
245 East Bonita Avenue
San Dimas, CA 91773-3002
lcyrus@ci.san-dimas.ca.us

City of San Fernando
c/o Ron Ruiz
Director of Public Works
117 Macneil Street
San Fernando, CA 91340
r Ruiz@sfcity.org

City of San Gabriel
c/o Daren T. Grilley, City Engineer
425 South Mission Drive
San Gabriel, CA 91775

City of San Marino
c/o Chuck Richie
Director of Parks and Public Works
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108-2691
criche@cityofsanmarino.org

City of Santa Clarita
c/o Travis Lange
Environmental Services Manager
23920 West Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

City of Santa Fe Springs
c/o Sarina Morales-Choate
Civil Engineer Assistant
P.O. Box 2120
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120
smorales-choate@santafesprings.org

City of Santa Monica
c/o Neal Shapiro
Urban Runoff Coordinator
1685 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295
nshapiro@smgov.net

City of Sierra Madre
c/o James Carlson, Management Analyst
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard
Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312

City of Signal Hill
c/o John Hunter
2175 Cherry Avenue
Signal Hill, CA 90755
ihunter@ilha.net

City of South El Monte
c/o Anthony Ybarra, City Manager
1415 North Santa Anita Avenue
South El Monte, CA 91733-3389

City of South Gate
c/o John Hunter
8650 California Avenue
South Gate, CA 90280
ihunter@ilha.net

City of South Pasadena
c/o John Hunter
1414 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298
ihunter@ilha.net

City of Temple City
c/o Joe Lambert or John Hunter
9701 Las Tunas Drive
Temple City, CA 91780-2249
jhunter@ilha.net

City of Torrance
c/o Leslie Cortez
Senior Administrative Assistant
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503-5059

City of Vernon
c/o Claudia Arellano
4305 Santa Fe Avenue
Vernon, CA 90058-1786

City of Walnut
c/o Jack Yoshino
Senior Management Assistant
P.O. Box 682
Walnut, CA 91788

City of West Covina
c/o Samuel Gutierrez
Engineering Technician
P.O. Box 1440
West Covina, CA 91793-1440
sam.gutierrez@westcovina.org

City of West Hollywood
c/o Sharon Perlstein, City Engineer
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314
sperlstein@weho.org

City of Westlake Village
c/o Joe Bellomo
Stormwater Program Manager
31200 Oak Crest Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361
jbello@willdan.com

City of Whittier
c/o David Mochizuki
Director of Public Works
13230 Penn Street
Whittier, CA 90602-1772
dmoichizuki@cityofwhittier.org

County of Los Angeles
c/o Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy
Director, Division Engineer
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803
ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov

Los Angeles County Flood Control District
c/o Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy
Director, Division Engineer
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803
ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov