



## CITY OF CLAREMONT

8/4/09 Bd Mtg. Item 10  
A-1780-County of LA  
Deadline: 7/31/09 by 12 noon

City Hall  
207 Harvard Avenue  
P.O. Box 880  
Claremont, CA 91711-0880  
Fax: (909) 399-5492  
Website: www.ci.claremont.ca.us  
Email: contact@ci.claremont.ca.us

City Council • (909) 399-5444  
Corey Calaycay  
Linda Eiderkin  
Sam Pedroza  
Larry Schroeder  
Peter Yao

July 21, 2009



Ms. Jeanine Townsend  
Clerk to the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Townsend:

### Comments on Draft Order, SWRCB/OCC File A-1780

The City of Claremont wishes to submit comments regarding the draft State Water Resources Control Board Order in the Matter of the Petition of County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District, SWRCB/OCC File A-1780 ("Petition"). The City is a permittee under the municipal storm water permit at issue in the Petition and will become subject to TMDLs as they are incorporated into the permit. The City of Claremont requests that the following comments in support of the Petition be placed in the record of this action and also be forwarded to the chair and members of the State Board prior to the hearing date.

The issues discussed in the Petition are of critical importance to the City because of the complex, evolving and expensive technologies that are required to address the pollutants covered by TMDLs. The requirements to implement TMDLs, including developing compliance and monitoring plans, conducting monitoring, and BMP design and installation, are proving to be the single most expensive element of storm water compliance. The pollutants covered by the TMDLs are generated by a number of sources, most of them beyond the direct control of municipalities. In this era of shrinking government budgets, the State and local governments need to work together to achieve clean water goals using ever-limited public funds.

The City wishes to emphasize four issues raised by the Petition that are of critical importance:

Ms. Jeanine Townsend

July 21, 2009

Page 2 of 2

First, the City strongly objects to the incorporation of TMDLs into municipal storm water permits. Such an approach could place municipalities in immediate jeopardy of civil penalties under federal and state law and would ignore the difficult task of identifying and addressing exceedances of pollutants in storm water and urban runoff. This approach was expressly rejected by the State Board's panel of experts formed to consider numeric effluent limits in storm water permits.

Second, any amendment of a municipal storm water permit to incorporate a TMDL should adopt an iterative approach. Use of an iterative approach is extremely important because in many cases, the sources of pollutants are not under the permittees' control, and reliable technologies are not always available. Municipalities should not be burdened with the threat of civil penalty actions or citizens' suits if initial attempts to meet the TMDL waste load allocations are unsuccessful. A better approach is an iterative one employing BMPs and monitoring to demonstrate compliance.


Third, the City urges the Board to require that, before a Regional Board incorporates a TMDL into a municipal storm water permit, the Regional Board make a finding that the amendment is consistent with the "maximum extent practicable" ("MEP") standard. This finding is legally required and is especially important because MEP is not considered when a TMDL is adopted. A TMDL's consistency with the MEP standard must be considered prior to its incorporation into a municipal storm water permit.

Fourth, the City asks the Board to reject the joint liability provision found in the permit amendment before the Board in this Petition. It is fundamentally unfair to hold one city responsible for discharges from other jurisdictions over which it has no control. In addition, this provision violates both the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act and the Clean Water Act, which apply liability only to a discharger's own discharges, not those of others.

In conclusion, the City of Claremont urges the Board to grant the Petition and remand the permit amendment back to the Los Angeles Regional Board for hearing and revision in light of the Board's direction.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Corey Calaycay  
Mayor

c: City Council