

environmental groups, homebuilders, private citizens, and other interested parties. The following is a summary of the lengthy stakeholder process.

**(2004–2005)** Water Board staff and the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) agreed to develop a municipal regional stormwater permit. Board staff and BASMAA held monthly meetings to agree on the regional permit approach and developed concepts and ground rules for a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee for the Permit began regular monthly meetings, and there was agreement to form work groups to develop options for permit program components in table format.

**(2006)** Water Board staff, BASMAA, and nongovernmental groups met and discussed the Performance Standard (i.e., actions, implementation levels, and reporting requirements) tables from six workgroups. In addition to the Steering Committee, Work Group Stakeholder meetings focused on the six program elements to complete the Performance Standard Tables and discuss other issues in preparation for creating the first Draft Permit Provisions. Two large public workshops were held in November with all interested stakeholders to discuss Work Group products.

**(2007)** The Water Board held a public workshop in March to receive public input. Board staff distributed an Administrative Draft Permit dated May 1, 2007, held multiple meetings and received comment.

**(2007- 2008)** On December 14, 2007, Board staff distributed the Tentative Order for a 77-day written public comment period ending February 29, 2008. A public hearing for oral testimony was held on March 11, 2008. During the remainder of 2008 there were additional meetings with stakeholders, and Board staff worked on revisions to the Tentative Order and produced responses to both written comments received by February 29, 2008, and oral comments received at the March 11, 2008, hearing. The Revised Tentative Order for the MRP was released on February 11, 2009, and a May 13, 2009, hearing before the Water Board was scheduled. Written comments on the revisions to the Tentative Order were received until April 3, 2009.

**(2009)** After the May 2009 MRP Public Hearing, Water Board staff held numerous meetings with the Permittees (via the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association) and other key stakeholders including Save the Bay, NRDC, the Northern California Homebuilders, S.F. BayKeeper and the U.S. EPA. These meetings have been focused on discussion of revisions to the MRP Tentative Order in response to comments received, in an effort to resolve issues primarily related to Provisions C.3 New Development, C.8 Monitoring, C.10 Trash Load Reduction, C.11 Mercury Controls, C.12 PCBs Controls, and C.15 Exempt Non-Stormwater Discharges.

## **Implementation**

It is the Water Board's intent that this Permit shall ensure attainment of applicable water quality objectives and protection of the beneficial uses of receiving waters and associated habitat. This Permit requires that discharges shall not cause exceedances of water quality objectives nor shall they cause certain conditions to occur that create a condition of nuisance or water quality impairment in receiving waters. Accordingly, the Water Board is

requiring that these standard requirements be addressed through the implementation of technically and economically feasible control measures to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable as provided in Provisions C.1 through C.15 of this Permit and section 402(p) of the CWA. Compliance with the Discharge Prohibitions, Receiving Water Limitations, and Provisions of this Permit is deemed compliance with the requirements of this Permit. If these measures, in combination with controls on other point and nonpoint sources of pollutants, do not result in attainment of applicable water quality objectives, the Water Board may invoke Provision C.1. and may reopen this Permit pursuant to Provisions C.1 and C.15 of this Permit to impose additional conditions that require implementation of additional control measures.

Each of the Permittees is individually responsible for adoption and enforcement of ordinances and policies, for implementation of assigned control measures or best management practices (BMPs) needed to prevent or reduce pollutants in stormwater, and for providing funds for the capital, operation, and maintenance expenditures necessary to implement such control measures/BMPs within its jurisdiction. Each Permittee is also responsible for its share of the costs of the area-wide component of the countywide program to which the Permittee belongs. Enforcement actions concerning non-compliance with the Permit will be pursued against individual Permittee(s) responsible for specific violations of the Permit.

### **III. BACKGROUND**

#### **Early Permitting Approach**

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) was amended in 1987 to address urban stormwater runoff pollution of the nation's waters. One requirement of the amendment was that many municipalities throughout the United States were obligated for the first time to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for discharges of urban runoff from their Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). In response to the CWA amendment (and the pending federal NPDES regulations which would implement the amendment), the Water Board issued a municipal storm water Phase I permits in the early 1990s. These permits were issued to the entire county-wide urban areas of Santa Clara, Alameda, San Mateo and Contra Costa Counties, rather than to individual cities over 100,000 population threshold. The cities chose to collaborate in countywide groups, to pool resources and expertise, and share information, public outreach and monitoring costs, among other tasks.

During the early permitting cycles, the county-wide programs developed many of the implementation specifics which were set forth in their Stormwater Pollution Prevention Management Plans (Plans). The permit orders were relatively simple documents that referred to the stormwater Plans for implementation details. Often specific aspects of permit and Plan implementation evolved during the five year permit cycle, with relatively significant changes approved at the Water Board staff level without significant public review and comment.

## **Merging Permit Requirements and Specific Requirements Previously Contained in Stormwater Management Plans**

US EPA stormwater rules for Phase I stormwater permits envisioned a process in which municipal stormwater management programs contained the detailed BMP and specific level of implementation information, and are reviewed and approved by the permitting agency before the municipal NPDES stormwater permits are adopted. The current and previous permits established a definition of a stormwater management program and required each Permittee to submit an urban runoff management plan and annual work plans for implementing its stormwater management program. An advantage to this approach was that it provided flexibility for Permittees to tailor their stormwater management programs to reflect local priorities and needs. However, Water Board staff found it difficult to determine Permittees' compliance with the current permits, due to the lack of specific requirements and measurable outcomes of some required actions. Furthermore, federal stormwater regulations require that modifications to stormwater management programs, such as annual revisions to urban runoff management plans, be approved through a public process.

Recent court decisions have reiterated that federal regulations and State law require that the implementation specifics of Municipal Stormwater NPDES permits be adopted after adequate public review and comment, and that no significant change in the permit requirements except minor modifications can occur during the permit term without a similar level of public review and comment.

This Permit introduces a modification to these previous approaches by establishing the stormwater management program requirements and defining up front, as part of the Permit Development Process, the minimum acceptable elements of the municipal stormwater management program. The advantages of this approach are that it satisfies the public involvement requirements of both the federal Clean Water Act and the State Water Code. An advantage for Permittees and the public of this approach is that the permit requirements are known at the time of permit issuance and not left to be determined later through iterative review and approval of work plans. While it may still be necessary to amend the Permit prior to expiration, any need to this should be minimized.

This Permit does not include approval of all Permittees' stormwater management programs or annual reports as part of the administration of the Permit. To do so would require significantly increased staff resources. Instead, minimum measures have been established to simplify assessment of compliance and allow the public to more easily assess each Permittee's compliance. Each Permit provision and its reporting requirements are written with this in mind. That is, each provision establishes the required actions, minimum implementation levels (i.e., minimum percentage of facilities inspected annually, escalating enforcement, reporting requirements for tracking projects, number of monitoring sites, etc.), and specific reporting elements to substantiate that these implementation levels have been met. Water Board staff will evaluate each individual Permittee's compliance through annual report review and the audit process.

The challenge in drafting the Permit is to provide the flexibility described above considering the different sizes and resources while ensuring that the Permit is still enforceable. To achieve this, the Permit frequently prescribes minimum measurable

outcomes, while providing Permittees with flexibility in the approaches they use to meet those outcomes. Enforceability has been found to be a critical aspect of the Permit. To avoid these types of situations, a balance between flexibility and enforceability has been crafted into the Permit.

### **Current Permit Approach**

In the previous permit issuances, the detailed actions to be implemented by the Permittees were contained in Stormwater Management Plans, which were separate from the NPDES permits, and incorporated by reference. Because those plans were legally an integral part of the permits and were subject to complete public notice, review and comment, this permit reissuance incorporates those plan level details in the permit, thus merging the Permittees' stormwater management plans into the permit in one document. This Permit specifies the actions necessary to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner designed to achieve compliance with water quality standards and objectives, and effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into municipal storm drain systems and watercourses within the Permittees' jurisdictions. This set of specific actions is equivalent to the requirements that in past permit cycles were included in a separate stormwater management plan for each Permittee or countywide group of Permittees. With this permit reissuance, that level of specific compliance detail is integrated into permit language and is not a separate document.

The Permit includes requirements for the following components:

- Municipal Operations
- New Development and Redevelopment
- Industrial and Commercial Site Controls
- Illicit Discharge and Elimination
- Construction Site Controls
- Public Information and Outreach
- Water Quality Monitoring
- Pesticides Toxicity Controls
- Trash Reduction
- Mercury Controls
- PCBs Controls
- Copper Controls
- Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers (PBDE), Legacy Pesticides, and Selenium
- Exempt and Conditionally Exempt Discharges

## **IV. ECONOMIC ISSUES**

Economic discussions of urban runoff management programs tend to focus on costs incurred by municipalities in developing and implementing the programs. This is appropriate, and these costs are significant and a major issue for the Permittees. However, when considering the cost of implementing the urban runoff programs, it is also important

to consider the alternative costs incurred by not fully implementing the programs, as well as the benefits which result from program implementation.

It is very difficult to ascertain the true cost of implementation of the Permittees' urban runoff management programs because of inconsistencies in reporting by the Permittees. Reported costs of compliance for the same program element can vary widely from Permittee to Permittee, often by a very wide margin that is not easily explained.<sup>57</sup> Despite these problems, efforts have been made to identify urban runoff management program costs, which can be helpful in understanding the costs of program implementation.

In 1999, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) reported on multiple studies it conducted to determine the cost of urban runoff management programs. A study of Phase II municipalities determined that the annual cost of the Phase II program was expected to be \$9.16 per household. USEPA also studied 35 Phase I municipalities, finding costs to be similar to those anticipated for Phase II municipalities, at \$9.08 per household annually.<sup>58</sup>

A study on program cost was also conducted by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), where program costs reported in the municipalities' annual reports were assessed. The LARWQCB estimated that average per household cost to implement the MS4 program in Los Angeles County was \$12.50.

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) also commissioned a study by the California State University, Sacramento to assess costs of the Phase I MS4 program. This study is current and includes an assessment of costs incurred by the City of Encinitas in implementing its program. Annual cost per household in the study ranged from \$18-46, with the City of Encinitas representing the upper end of the range.<sup>59</sup> The cost of the City of Encinitas' program is understandable, given the City's coastal location, reliance on tourism, and consent decree with environmental groups regarding its program. For these reasons, as well as the general recognition the City of Encinitas receives for implementing a superior program, the City's program cost can be considered as the high end of the spectrum for Permittee urban runoff management program costs.

It is important to note that reported program costs are not all attributable to compliance with MS4 permits. Many program components, and their associated costs, existed before any MS4 permits were issued. For example, street sweeping and trash collection costs cannot be solely or even principally attributable to MS4 permit compliance, since these practices have long been implemented by municipalities. Therefore, true program cost resulting from MS4 permit requirements is some fraction of reported costs. The California State University, Sacramento study found that only 38% of program costs are new costs fully attributable to MS4 permits. The remainder of program costs were either pre-existing or resulted from enhancement of pre-existing programs.<sup>60</sup> The County of Orange found that even lesser amounts of program costs are solely attributable to MS4 permit compliance, reporting that the amount attributable to implement its Drainage Area Management Plan, its municipal

<sup>57</sup> LARWQCB, 2003. Review and Analysis of Budget Data Submitted by the Permittees for Fiscal Years 2000-2003.p.2

<sup>58</sup> Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68791-68792.

<sup>59</sup> State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey. P. ii

<sup>60</sup> Ibid. P. 58.

stormwater permit requirements, is less than 20% of the total budget. The remaining 80% is attributable to pre-existing programs.<sup>61</sup>

It is also important to acknowledge that the vast majority of costs that will be incurred as a result of implementing the Order are not new. Urban runoff management programs have been in place in this region for over 15 years. Any increase in cost to the Permittees will be incremental in nature.

Urban runoff management programs cannot be considered in terms of their costs only. The programs must also be viewed in terms of their value to the public. For example, household willingness to pay for improvements in fresh water quality for fishing and boating has been estimated by USEPA to be \$158-210.<sup>62</sup> This estimate can be considered conservative, since it does not include important considerations such as marine waters benefits, wildlife benefits, or flood control benefits. The California State University, Sacramento study corroborates USEPA's estimates, reporting annual household willingness to pay for statewide clean water to be \$180.<sup>63</sup> When viewed in comparison to household costs of existing urban runoff management programs, these household willingness to pay estimates exhibit that per household costs incurred by Permittees to implement their urban runoff management programs remain reasonable.

Another important way to consider urban runoff management program costs is to consider the implementation cost in terms of costs incurred by not improving the programs. Urban runoff in southern California has been found to cause illness in people bathing near storm drains.<sup>64</sup> A study of south Huntington Beach and north Newport Beach found that an illness rate of about 0.8% among bathers at those beaches resulted in about \$3 million annually in health-related expenses.<sup>65</sup> Extrapolation of such numbers to the beaches and other water contact recreation in San Francisco Bay and the tributary creeks of the region could result in huge expenses to the public.

Urban runoff and its impact on receiving waters also places a cost on tourism. The California Division of Tourism has estimated that each out-of-state visitor spends \$101.00 a day. The experience of Huntington Beach provides an example of the potential economic impact of poor water quality. Approximately 8 miles of Huntington Beach were closed for two months in the middle of summer of 1999, impacting beach visitation and the local economy.

Finally, it is important to consider the benefits of urban runoff management programs in conjunction with their costs. A recent study conducted by USC/UCLA assessed the costs and benefits of implementing various approaches for achieving compliance with the MS4 permits in the Los Angeles Region. The study found that non-structural systems would cost \$2.8 billion but provide \$5.6 billion in benefit. If structural systems were determined to be needed, the study found that total costs would be \$5.7 to \$7.4 billion, while benefits could

<sup>61</sup> County of Orange, 2000. A NPDES Annual Progress Report. P. 60. More current data from the County of Orange is not used in this discussion because the County of Orange no longer reports such information.

<sup>62</sup> Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68793.

<sup>63</sup> State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey. P. iv.

<sup>64</sup> Haile, R.W., et al, 1996. An Epidemiological Study of Possible Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay. Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project.

<sup>65</sup> Los Angeles Times, May 2, 2005. Here's What Ocean Germs Cost You: A UC Irvine Study Tallies the Cost of Treatment and Lost Wages for Beachgoers Who Get Sick.

reach \$18 billion.<sup>66</sup> Costs are anticipated to be borne over many years – probably ten years at least. As can be seen, the benefits of the programs are expected to considerably exceed their costs. Such findings are corroborated by USEPA, which found that the benefits of implementation of its Phase II storm water rule would also outweigh the costs.<sup>67</sup>

## V. LEGAL AUTHORITY

The following statutes, regulations, and Water Quality Control Plans provide the basis for the requirements of Order No. R2-2009-0074: CWA, California Water Code (CWC), 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 124 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for Storm Water Discharges, Final Rule), Part II of 40 CFR Parts 9, 122, 123, and 124 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System – Regulations for Revision of the Water Pollution Control Program Addressing Storm Water Discharges; Final Rule), Water Quality Control Plan – Ocean Waters of California (California Ocean Plan), Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan), 40 CFR 131 Water Quality Standards; Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule (California Toxics Rule), and the California Toxics Rule Implementation Plan.

The legal authority citations below generally apply to directives in Order No. R2-2009-0074, and provide the Water Board with ample underlying authority to require each of the directives of Order No. R2-2009-0074.. Legal authority citations are also provided with each permit provision in this Fact Sheet.

CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) – The CWA requires in section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) that permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers “shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewers.”

CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) – The CWA requires in section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) that permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers “shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.”

40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B,C,E, and F) – Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B,C,D,E, and F) require that each Permittee’s permit application “shall consist of: (i) Adequate legal authority. A demonstration that the applicant can operate pursuant to legal authority established by statute, ordinance or series of contracts which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to: [...] (B) Prohibit through ordinance, order or similar means, illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer; (C) Control through ordinance, order or similar means the discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer of spills, dumping or disposal of materials other than storm water; (D) Control through interagency agreements among co-applicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system; (E) Require compliance with condition in ordinances, permits, contracts or orders; and (F) Carry out all

<sup>66</sup> LARWQCB, 2004. Alternative Approaches to Stormwater Control.

<sup>67</sup> Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68791.

inspection, surveillance and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with permit conditions including the prohibition on illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer.”

40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) – Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) requires “a comprehensive planning process which involves public participation and where necessary intergovernmental coordination, to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable using management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions which are appropriate. The program shall also include a description of staff and equipment available to implement the program. [...] Proposed programs may impose controls on a system wide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls. [...] Proposed management programs shall describe priorities for implementing controls.”

40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A -D) – Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A -D) require municipalities to implement controls to reduce pollutants in urban runoff from new development and significant redevelopment, construction, and commercial, residential, industrial, and municipal land uses or activities. Control of illicit discharges is also required.

CWC 13377 – CWC section 13377 requires that “Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the state board or the regional boards shall, as required or authorized by the CWA, as amended, issue waste discharge requirements and dredged or fill material permits which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary, thereto, together with anymore stringent effluent standards or limitation necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance.”

Order No. R2-2009-0074 is an essential mechanism for achieving the water quality objectives that have been established for protecting the beneficial uses of the water resources in the San Francisco Bay Region. Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) requires MS4 permits to include any requirements necessary to “achieve water quality standards established under CWA section 303, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” The term “water quality standards” in this context refers to a water body’s beneficial uses and the water quality objectives necessary to protect those beneficial uses, as established in the Basin Plan.

### **State Mandates**

This Permit does not constitute an unfunded local government mandate subject to subvention under Article XIII B, Section (6) of the California Constitution for several reasons, including, but not limited to, the following. First, this Permit implements federally mandated requirements under CWA section 402, subdivision (p)(3)(B). (33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B).) This includes federal requirements to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges, to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, and to include such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants. Federal cases have held that these provisions require the development of permits and permit provisions on a case-by-case basis to satisfy federal requirements. (Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. USEPA



(9th Cir. 1992) 966 F.2d 1292, 1308, fn. 17.) The authority exercised under this Permit is not reserved state authority under the CWA's savings clause (cf. *Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 613, 627-628 [relying on 33 U.S.C. § 1370, which allows a state to develop requirements that are not less stringent than federal requirements]), but instead, is part of a federal mandate to develop pollutant reduction requirements for MS4. To this extent, it is entirely federal authority that forms the legal basis to establish the permit provisions. (See, *City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd.-Santa Ana Region* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 1377, 1389; *Building Industry Association of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 882-883.)

Likewise, the provisions of this Permit to implement total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) are federal mandates. The CWA requires TMDLs to be developed for waterbodies that do not meet federal water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. § 1313(d).) Once USEPA or a state develops a TMDL, federal law requires that permits must contain effluent limitations consistent with the assumptions of any applicable WLA. (40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)

Second, the local agencies' (Permittees') obligations under this Permit are similar to, and in many respects less stringent than, the obligations of nongovernmental dischargers who are issued NPDES permits for stormwater discharges. With a few inapplicable exceptions, the CWA regulates the discharge of pollutants from point sources (33 U.S.C. § 1342) and the Porter-Cologne regulates the discharge of waste (Water Code, section 13263), both without regard to the source of the pollutant or waste. As a result, the costs incurred by local agencies to protect water quality reflect an overarching regulatory scheme that places similar requirements on governmental and nongovernmental dischargers. (See *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 57-58 [finding comprehensive workers compensation scheme did not create a cost for local agencies that was subject to state subvention].)

The CWA and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act largely regulate stormwater with an even hand, but to the extent that there is any relaxation of this evenhanded regulation, it is in favor of the local agencies. Except for MS4s, the CWA requires point source dischargers, including discharges of stormwater associated with industrial or construction activity, to comply strictly with water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C), *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (1999) 191 F.3d 1159, 1164-1165 [noting that industrial stormwater discharges must strictly comply with water quality standards].) As discussed in prior State Water Board decisions, this Permit does not require strict compliance with water quality standards. (SWRCB Order No. WQ 2001-15, p. 7.) The Permit, therefore, regulates the discharge of waste in municipal stormwater more leniently than the discharge of waste from nongovernmental sources.

Third, the Permittees have the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for compliance with this Permit. The fact sheet demonstrates that numerous activities contribute to the pollutant loading in the MS4. Permittees can levy service charges, fees, or assessments on these activities, independent of real property ownership. (See, e.g., *Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 830, 842 [upholding inspection fees associated with renting property].) The ability of a local agency to defray the cost of a program without raising

taxes indicates that a program does not entail a cost subject to subvention. (County of Fresno v. State of California (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487-488.)

Fourth, the Permittees have requested permit coverage in lieu of compliance with the complete prohibition against the discharge of pollutants contained in CWA section 301, subdivision (a) (33 U.S.C. § 1311(a)) and in lieu of numeric restrictions on their discharges. To the extent Permittees have voluntarily availed themselves of the Permit, the program is not a state mandate. (Accord County of San Diego v. State of California (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 107-108.) Likewise, the Permittees have voluntarily sought a program-based municipal stormwater permit in lieu of a numeric limits approach. (See City of Abilene v. USEPA (5th Cir. 2003) 325 F.3d 657, 662-663 [noting that municipalities can choose between a management permit or a permit with numeric limits].) The Permittees' voluntary decision to file a report of waste discharge proposing a program-based permit is a voluntary decision not subject to subvention. (See Environmental Defense Center v. USEPA (9th Cir. 2003) 344 F.3d 832, 845-848.)

Fifth, the Permittees' responsibility for preventing discharges of waste that can create conditions of pollution or nuisance from conveyances that are within their ownership or control under State law predates the enactment of Article XIII B, Section (6) of the California Constitution.

This Permit is based on the federal CWA, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the CWC, commencing with Section 13000), applicable State and federal regulations, all applicable provisions of statewide Water Quality Control Plans and Policies adopted by the State Water Board, the Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule, and the California Toxics Rule Implementation Plan.

**Discussion:** In 1987, Congress established CWA Amendments to create requirements for storm water discharges under the NPDES program, which provides for permit systems to regulate the discharge of pollutants. Under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, the State Water Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Water Boards) have primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality, including the authority to implement the CWA. Porter-Cologne (section 13240) directs the Water Boards to set water quality objectives via adoption of Basin Plans that conform to all state policies for water quality control. As a means for achieving those water quality objectives, Porter-Cologne (section 13243) further authorizes the Water Boards to establish waste discharge requirements (WDRs) to prohibit waste discharges in certain conditions or areas. Since 1990, the Water Board has issued area-wide MS4 NPDES permits. The Permit will re-issue Order Nos. 99-058, 99-059, 01-024, R2-2003-0021, R2-2003-0034 to comply with the CWA and attain water quality objectives in the Basin Plan by limiting the contributions of pollutants conveyed by urban runoff. Further discussions of the legal authority associated with the prohibitions and directives of the Permit are provided in section V. of this document.

This Permit supersedes NPDES Permit Nos. CAS029718, CAS029831, CAS029912, CAS029921, CAS612005, and CAS612006.

## **Basin Plan**

The Urban Runoff Management, Comprehensive Control Program section of the Basin Plan requires the Permittees to address existing water quality problems and prevent new problems associated with urban runoff through the development and implementation of a comprehensive control program focused on reducing current levels of pollutant loading to storm drains to the maximum extent practicable. The Basin Plan comprehensive program requirements are designed to be consistent with federal regulations (40 CFR Parts 122-124) and are implemented through issuance of NPDES permits to owners and operators of MS4s. A summary of the regulatory provisions is contained in Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations at section 3912. The Basin Plan identifies beneficial uses and establishes water quality objectives for surface waters in the Region, as well as effluent limitations and discharge prohibitions intended to protect those uses. This Permit implements the plans, policies, and provisions of the Water Board's Basin Plan.

## **Statewide General Permits**

The State Water Board has issued NPDES general permits for the regulation of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activities and construction activities. To effectively implement the New Development (and significant redevelopment) and Construction Controls, Illicit Discharge Controls, and Industrial and Commercial Discharge Controls components in this Permit, the Permittees will conduct investigations and local regulatory activities at industrial and construction sites covered by these general permits. However, under the CWA, the Water Board cannot delegate its own authority to enforce these general permits to the Permittees. Therefore, Water Board staff intends to work cooperatively with the Permittees to ensure that industries and construction sites within the Permittees' jurisdictions are in compliance with applicable general permit requirements and are not subject to uncoordinated stormwater regulatory activities.

## **Regulated Parties**

Each of the Permittees listed in this Permit owns or operates a MS4, through which it discharges urban runoff into waters of the United States within the San Francisco Bay Region. These MS4s fall into one or more of the following categories: (1) a medium or large MS4 that services a population of greater than 100,000 or 250,000 respectively; or (2) a small MS4 that is "interrelated" to a medium or large MS4; or (3) an MS4 which contributes to a violation of a water quality standard; or (4) an MS4 which is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States.

## **Permit Coverage**

The Permittees each have jurisdiction over and maintenance responsibility for their respective MS4s in the Region. Federal, State or regional entities within the Permittees' boundaries, not currently named in this Permit, operate storm drain facilities and/or discharge stormwater to the storm drains and watercourses covered by this Permit. The Permittees may lack jurisdiction over these entities. Consequently, the Water Board recognizes that the Permittees should not be held responsible for such facilities and/or discharges. The Water Board will consider such facilities for coverage under NPDES permitting pursuant to USEPA Phase II stormwater regulations. Under Phase II, the Water

Board intends to permit these federal, State, and regional entities through use of a Statewide Phase II NPDES General Permit.

Discussion: Section 402 of the CWA prohibits the discharge of any pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source, unless that discharge is authorized by a NPDES permit. Though urban runoff comes from a diffuse source, it is discharged through MS4s, which are point sources under the CWA. Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(a) (iii) and (iv) provide that discharges from MS4s, which service medium or large populations greater than 100,000 or 250,000 respectively, shall be required to obtain a NPDES permit. Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(a)(v) also provides that a NPDES permit is required for "A [storm water] discharge which the Director, or in States with approved NPDES programs, either the Director or the USEPA Regional Administrator, determines to contribute to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States." Such sources are then designated into the program.

## VI. PERMIT PROVISIONS

### A. Discharge Prohibitions

**Prohibition A.1. Legal Authority** – CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) – The CWA requires in section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) that permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers "shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewers."

**Prohibition A.2. Legal Authority** – San Francisco Bay Basin Plan, 2006 Revision, Chapter 4 Implementation, Table 4-1, Prohibition 7.

### B. Receiving Water Limitations

**Receiving Water Limitation B.1. Legal Authority** – Receiving Water Limitations are retained from previous Municipal Stormwater Runoff NPDES permits. They reflect applicable water quality standards from the Basin Plan.

**Receiving Water Limitation B.2. Legal Authority** – Receiving Water Limitations are retained from previous Municipal Stormwater Runoff NPDES permits. They reflect applicable water quality standards from the Basin Plan.

### C. Provisions

#### C.1. Compliance with Discharge Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations

##### Legal Authority

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 13377, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** The Water Board's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan) contains the following waste discharge prohibition: "The discharge of waste to waters of the state in a manner causing, or threatening to cause a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in California Water Code Section 13050, is prohibited."

California Water Code section 13050(l) states "(1) 'Pollution' means an alteration of the quality of waters of the state by waste to a degree which unreasonably affects either of the following: (A) The water for beneficial uses. (B) Facilities which serve beneficial uses. (2) 'Pollution' may include 'contamination.'"

California Water Code section 13050(k) states "'Contamination' means an impairment of the quality of waters of the state by waste to a degree which creates a hazard to public health through poisoning or through the spread of disease. 'Contamination' includes any equivalent effect resulting from the disposal of waste, whether or not waters of the state are affected."

California Water Code section 13050(m) states "'Nuisance' means anything which meets all of the following requirements: (1) Is injurious to health, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property. (2) Affects at the same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons, although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal. (3) Occurs during, or as a result of, the treatment or disposal of wastes."

California Water Code section 13241 requires each water board to "establish such water quality objectives in water quality control plans as in its judgment will ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses and the prevention of nuisance [...]."

California Water Code Section 13243 provides that a water board, "in a water quality control plan or in waste discharge requirements, may specify certain conditions or areas where the discharge of waste, or certain types of waste, will not be permitted."

California Water Code Section 13263(a) provides that waste discharge requirements prescribed by the water board implement the Basin Plan.

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A -D) require municipalities to implement controls to reduce pollutants in urban runoff from commercial, residential, industrial, and construction land uses or activities.

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A -D) require municipalities to have legal authority to control various discharges to their MS4.

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) requires municipal storm water permits to include any requirements necessary to "[a]chieve water quality standards established under section 303 of the CWA, including State narrative criteria for water quality."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires NPDES permits to include limitations to “control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.”

State Water Resources Control Board (“State Water Board”) Order WQ 1999-05, is a precedential order requiring that municipal stormwater permits achieve water quality standards and water quality standard based discharge prohibitions through the implementation of control measures, by which Permittees’ compliance with the permit can be determined. The State Water Board Order specifically requires that Provision C.1 include language that Permittees shall comply with water quality standards based discharge prohibitions and receiving water limitations through timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce pollutants in the discharges. State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15 refines Order 1999-05 by requiring an iterative approach to compliance with water quality standards that involves ongoing assessments and revisions.

## C.2. Municipal Operations

### Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to Provision C.2:

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), California Water Code (CWC) section 13377, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(1) requires, "A description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls to reduce pollutants (including floatables) in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(3) requires, "A description for operating and maintaining public streets, roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems, including pollutants discharged as a result of deicing activities."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(4) requires, "A description of procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving waterbodies and that existing structural flood control devices have been evaluated to determine if retrofitting the device to provide additional pollutant removal from storm water is feasible."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(5) requires, "A description of a program to monitor pollutants in runoff from operating or closed municipal landfills or other treatment, storage or disposal facilities for municipal waste, which shall identify priorities and procedures for inspections and establishing and implementing control measures for such discharges."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(6) requires, "A description of a program to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer which will include, as appropriate, controls such as educational activities, permits, certifications, and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors, and controls for application in public right-of-ways and at municipal facilities."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires NPDES permits to include limitations to "control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality."

### **Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.2**

- C.2-1** Municipal maintenance activities are potential sources of pollutants unless appropriate inspection, pollutant source control, and cleanup measures are implemented during routine maintenance works to minimize pollutant discharges to storm drainage facilities.

Sediment accumulated on paved surfaces, such as roads, parking lots, parks, sidewalks, landscaping, and corporation yards, is the major source of point source pollutants found in urban runoff. Thus, Provision C.2 requires the Permittees to designate minimum BMPs for all municipal facilities and activities as part of their ongoing pollution prevention efforts as set forth in this Permit. Such prevention measures include, but are not limited to, activities as described below. The work of municipal maintenance personnel is vital to minimize stormwater pollution, because personnel work directly on municipal storm drains and other municipal facilities. Through work such as inspecting and cleaning storm drain drop inlets and pipes and conducting municipal construction and maintenance activities upstream of the storm drain, municipal maintenance personnel are directly responsible for preventing and removing pollutants from the storm drain. Maintenance personnel also play an important role in educating the public and in reporting and cleaning up illicit discharges.

- C.2-2** Road construction and other activities can disturb the soil and drainage patterns to streams in undeveloped areas, causing excess runoff and thereby erosion and the release of sediment. In particular, poorly designed roads can act as man-made drainages that carry runoff and sediment into natural streams, impacting water quality.

Provision C.2 also requires the Permittees to implement effective BMPs for the following rural works maintenance and support activities: (a) Road design, construction, maintenance, and repairs in rural areas that prevent and control road-related erosion and sediment transport; (b) Identification and prioritization of rural roads maintenance on the basis of soil erosion potential, slope steepness, and stream habitat resources; (c) Road and culvert construction designs that do not impact creek functions. New or replaced culverts shall not create a migratory fish passage barrier, where migratory fish are present, or lead to stream instability; (d) Development and implement an inspection program to maintain roads structural integrity and prevent impacts on water quality; (e) Provide adequate maintenance of rural roads adjacent to streams and riparian habitat to reduce erosion, replace damaging shotgun culverts, re-grade roads to slope outward where consistent with road engineering safety standards, and install water bars; and (f) When replacing existing culverts or redesigning new culverts or bridge crossings use measures to reduce erosion, provide fish passage and maintain natural stream geomorphology in a stable manner.

Road construction, culvert installation, and other rural maintenance activities can disturb the soil and drainage patterns to streams in undeveloped areas, causing excess runoff and thereby erosion and the release of sediment. Poorly



designed roads can act as preferential drainage pathways that carry runoff and sediment into natural streams, impacting water quality. In addition, other rural public works activities, including those the BMP approach would address, have the potential to significantly affect sediment discharge and transport within streams and other waterways, which can degrade the beneficial uses of those waterways. This Provision would help ensure that these impacts are appropriately controlled.

### **Specific Provision C.2 Requirements**

**Provision C.2.a-f.** (Operation and Maintenance of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) facilities) requires that the Permittees implement appropriate pollution control measures during maintenance activities and to inspect and, if necessary, clean municipal facilities such as conveyance systems, pump stations, and corporation yards, before the rainy season. The requirements will assist the Permittees to prioritize tasks, implement appropriate BMPs, evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented BMPs, and compile and submit annual reports.

**Provision C.2.d.** (Stormwater Pump Stations) In late 2005, Board staff investigated the occurrence of low salinity and dissolved oxygen conditions in Old Alameda Creek (Alameda County) and Alviso Slough (Santa Clara County) in September and October of 2005. Board staff became aware of this problem in their review of receiving water and discharge sampling conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey as part of its routine monitoring on discharges associated with the former salt ponds managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Santa Clara County and the California Department of Fish and Game in Alameda County.

In the case of Old Alameda Creek, discharge of black-colored water from the Alvarado pump station to the slough was observed at the time of the data collection on September 7, 2005, confirming dry weather urban runoff as the source of the documented violations of the 5 mg/L dissolved oxygen water quality objective. Such conditions were measured again on September 21, 2005.

On October 17, 2005, waters in Alviso Slough were much less saline than the salt ponds and had the lowest documented dissolved oxygen of the summer, suggesting a dry weather urban runoff source. The dissolved oxygen sag was detected surface to bottom at 2.3 mg/L at a salinity of less than 1 part per thousand (ppt), mid-day, when oxygen levels should be high at the surface. The sloughs have a typical depth of 6 feet.

Board staff's investigations of these incidents, documented in a memorandum,<sup>68</sup> found that "storm water pump stations, universally operated by automatic float triggers, have been confirmed as the cause in at least one instance, and may represent an overlooked source of controllable pollution to the San Francisco Bay Estuary and its tidal sloughs. . . the discharges of dry weather urban runoff from these pump stations are not being

<sup>68</sup> Internal Water Board Memo dated December 2, 2005: "Dry Weather Urban Weather Urban Runoff Causing or Contributing to Water Quality Violations: Low Dissolved Oxygen (DO) in Old Alameda Creek and Alviso Slough"

managed to protect water quality, and [that] surveillance monitoring has detected measurable negative water quality consequences of this current state of pump station management.”

Pump station discharges of dry weather urban runoff can cause violations of water quality objectives. These discharges are controllable point sources of pollution that are virtually unregulated. The Water Board needs a complete inventory of dry weather urban runoff pump stations and to require BMP development and implementation for these discharges now. In the long term, Water Board staff should prioritize the sites from the regional inventory for dry weather diversion to sanitary sewers and encourage engineering feasibility studies to accomplish the diversions in a cost-effective manner. Structural treatment alternatives should be explored for specific pump stations.

To address the short term goals identified in the previous paragraph, Provision C.2.g. requires the Permittees to implement the following measures to reduce pollutant discharges to stormwater runoff from Permittee-owned or operated pump stations:

1. Establish an inventory of pump stations within each Permittee's jurisdiction, including pump station locations and key characteristics, and inspection frequencies.
2. Inspect these pump stations regularly, but at least two times a year, to address water quality problems, including trash control and sediment and debris removal.
3. Inspect trash racks and oil absorbent booms at pump stations in the first business day after ¼-inch within 24 hours and larger storm events. Remove debris in trash racks and replace oil absorbent booms, as needed.

### **C.3. New Development and Redevelopment**

#### **Legal Authority**

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA Sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWA Section 402(a), CWC Section 13377, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, E, and F), 40 CFR 131.12, and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

#### **Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.3**

- C.3-1** Urban development begins at the land use planning phase; therefore, this phase provides the greatest cost-effective opportunities to protect water quality in new development and redevelopment. When a Permittee incorporates policies and principles designed to safeguard water resources into its General Plan and development project approval processes, it has taken a critical step toward the preservation and most of local water resources for current and future generations.
- C.3-2** Provision C.3. is based on the assumption that Permittees are responsible for considering potential stormwater impacts when making planning and land use decisions. The goal of Provision C.3. is for Permittees to use their planning authority to include appropriate source control, site design, and stormwater treatment measures to address both soluble and insoluble stormwater runoff pollutant discharges and prevent increases in runoff flow from new development and redevelopment projects. This goal is to be accomplished primarily through the implementation of low impact development (LID) techniques. Neither Provision C.3. nor any of its requirements are intended to restrict or control local land use decision-making authority.
- C.3-3** Certain control measures implemented or required by Permittees for urban runoff management might create a habitat for vectors (e.g., mosquitoes and rodents) if not properly designed or maintained. Close collaboration and cooperative efforts among Permittees, local vector control agencies, Water Board staff, and the State Department of Public Health are necessary to minimize potential nuisances and public health impacts resulting from vector breeding.
- C.3-4** The Water Board recognized in its Policy on the Use of Constructed Wetlands for Urban Runoff Pollution Control (Resolution No. 94-102) that urban runoff treatment wetlands that are constructed and operated pursuant to that Resolution and are constructed outside a creek or other receiving water are stormwater treatment systems and, as such, are not waters of the United States subject to regulation pursuant to Sections 401 or 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. Water Board staff is working with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to identify how maintenance for stormwater treatment controls required under permits such as this Permit can be appropriately streamlined, given CDFG and USFWS requirements, and particularly those that address special status species. This Permit requires Permittees to ensure that constructed wetlands installed by

Regulated Projects are consistent with Resolution No. 94-102 and the operation and maintenance requirements contained therein.

- C.3-5** The Permit requires Permittees to ensure that onsite, joint, and offsite stormwater treatment systems and HM controls installed by Regulated Projects are properly operated and maintained for the life of the projects. In cases where the responsible parties for the treatment systems or HM controls have worked diligently and in good faith with the appropriate state and federal agencies to obtain approvals necessary to complete maintenance activities for the treatment systems or HM controls, but these approvals are not granted, the Permittees shall be considered by the Water Board to be in compliance with Provision C.3.h.iii. of the Permit.

### **Specific Provision C.3 Requirements**

**Provision C.3.a.** (New Development and Redevelopment Performance Standard Implementation) sets forth essentially the same legal authority, development review and permitting, environmental review, training, and outreach requirements that are contained in the existing permits. This Provision also requires the Permittees to encourage all projects not regulated by Provision C.3., but that are subject to the Permittees' planning, building, development, or other comparable review, to include adequate source control and site design measures, which include discharge of appropriate wastestreams to the sanitary sewer, subject to the local sanitary agency's authority and standards. Lastly, this Provision requires Permittees to revise, as necessary, their respective General Plans to integrate water quality and watershed protection with water supply, flood control, habitat protection, groundwater recharge, and other sustainable development principles and policies. Adequate implementation time has been allocated to Provisions C.3.a.i.(6)-(8), which may be considered new requirements.

**Provision C.3.b.** (Regulated Projects) establishes the different categories of new development and redevelopment projects that Permittees must regulate under Provision C.3. These categories are defined on the basis of the land use and the amount of impervious surface created and/or replaced by the project because all impervious surfaces contribute pollutants to stormwater runoff and certain land uses contribute more pollutants. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants as the natural, vegetated soil they replaced can. Also, urban development creates new pollution by bringing higher levels of car emissions that are aurally deposited, car maintenance wastes, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, and trash, which can all be washed into the storm sewer.

**Provision C.3.b.ii.(1)** lists Special Land Use Categories that are already regulated under the current stormwater permits. Therefore, extra time is not necessary for the Permittees to comply with this Provision, so the Permit Effective Date is set as the required implementation date. For these categories, the impervious surface threshold (for classification as a Regulated Project subject to Provision C.3.) will be decreased from the current 10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> to 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> beginning two years from the Permit Effective Date. These special land use categories represent land use types

that may contribute more polluted stormwater runoff. Regulation of these special land use categories at the lower impervious threshold of 5,000 square feet is considered the maximum extent practicable and is consistent with State Board guidance, court decisions, and other Water Boards' requirements. In the precedential decision contained in its WQ Order No. 2000-11, the State Board upheld the SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) requirements issued by the Los Angeles Water Board's Executive Officer on March 8, 2000, and found that they constitute MEP for addressing pollutant discharges resulting from Priority Development Projects. The State Board re-affirmed that SUSMP requirements constitute MEP in their Order WQ 2001-15. Provision C.3.b.ii.(1)'s requirement that development projects in the identified Special Land Use Categories adding and/or replacing > 5000 ft<sup>2</sup> of impervious surface shall install hydraulically sized stormwater treatment systems is consistent with the SUSMP provisions upheld by the State Board. Provision C.3.b.ii.(1) is also consistent with Order No. R9-2007-0001 issued by the San Diego Water Board, Order Nos. R4-2009-0057 and R4-2001-182 issued by the Los Angeles Water Board, Order No. 2009-0030 issued by the Santa Ana Water Board, and State Board's Order WQ 2003-0005 issued to Phase II MS4s. Under Order WQ 2003-0005, Phase II MS4s with populations of 50,000 and greater must apply the lower 5000 ft<sup>2</sup> threshold for requiring stormwater treatment systems by April 2008. The MRP allows two years from the MRP effective date for the Permittees to implement the lower 5000 ft<sup>2</sup> threshold for the special land use categories, three and half years later than the Phase II MS4s. However, the additional time is necessary for the Permittees to revise ordinances and permitting procedures and conduct training and outreach.

This Provision contains a "grandfathering" clause, which allows any private development project in a special land use category for which a planning application has been deemed complete by a Permittee on or before the Permit effective date to be exempted from the lower 5,000 square feet impervious surface threshold (for classification as a Regulated Project) as long as the project applicant is diligently pursuing the project. Diligent pursuance may be demonstrated by the project applicant's submittal of supplemental information to the original application, plans, or other documents required for any necessary approvals of the project by the Permittee. If during the time period between the Permit effective date and the required implementation date of December 1, 2011, for the 5000 square feet threshold, the project applicant has not taken any action to obtain the necessary approvals from the Permittee, the project will then be subject to the lower 5000 square feet impervious surface threshold specified in Provision C.3.b.ii.(1).

For any private development project in a special land use category with an application deemed complete after the Permit effective date, the lower 5000 square feet impervious surface threshold (for classification as a Regulated Project) shall not apply if the project applicant has received final discretionary approval for the project before the required implementation date of December 1, 2011 for the 5000 square feet threshold.

Previous stormwater permits also used the "application deemed complete" date as the date for determining Provision C.3. applicability, but it was tied to the implementation date for new requirements and not the Permit effective date. The Permit Streamlining Act requires that a public agency must determine whether a permit application is complete within 30 days after receipt; if the public agency does not make this determination, the application is automatically deemed complete after 30 days. Data we have collected from audits and file reviews as well as reported to us by Permittees confirm that in many cases, the development permit applications have indeed not been reviewed for compliance with Provision C.3. requirements and yet have automatically been deemed complete 30 days after the application submittal date. As soon as the Permit is adopted, there is certainty about any new requirements that must be implemented during the Permit term. Therefore, the "application deemed complete" date should only be used to exempt projects that have reached this milestone by the Permit effective date and not years later at a new requirement's implementation date. However, this change requires consideration of those applications that are deemed complete after the Permit effective date. Because there is certainty with regard to new requirements as soon as the Permit becomes effective, we have tied the "final discretionary approval" date to a new requirement's implementation date for determining whether to exempt the projects with applications deemed complete after the Permit effective date. After a project receives "final discretionary approval" it would be too late in the permitting process to implement new requirements, particularly since this type of approval requires actions by city councils or boards of supervisors. Therefore, the "grandfathering" language is a hybrid that makes use of both the "application deemed complete" date and the "final discretionary approval" date, two known and recognized milestones in development planning.

As for private projects, public projects should be far enough along in the design and approval process to warrant being grandfathered and essentially exempted from complying with the lower 5000 ft<sup>2</sup> threshold when it becomes effective. Previous stormwater permits grandfathered projects that only had funds committed by the new threshold's effective date, which was too early because projects can be held for years before design can begin, well after funding commitments have been made. Conversely, application of the grandfathering exemption to projects that have construction scheduled to begin by the threshold effective date (or 2 years after the MRP effective date) may be too late in the permitting process to implement new threshold requirements, particularly since this type of approval requires actions by city councils or boards of supervisors. Therefore, the Permit provides the grandfathering exemption for projects that have construction set to begin within 1 year of the threshold effective date (or 3 years after the MRP effective date).

**Provisions C.3.b.ii.(2)-(3)** describe land use categories that are already regulated under the current stormwater permits; therefore, extra time is not necessary for the Permittees to comply with these Provisions and the implementation date is the Permit effective date. Because the Vallejo Permittees do not have post-

construction requirements in their current stormwater permit, the Permit allows an extra year for them to comply with these Provisions.

**Provision C.3.b.ii.(4)** applies to road projects adding and/or replacing 10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of impervious surface, which include the construction of new roads and sidewalks and bicycle lanes built as part of the new roads; widening of existing roads with additional traffic lanes; and construction of impervious trails that are greater than 10 feet wide or are creekside (within 50 feet of the top of bank). Although widening existing roads with bike lanes and sidewalks increases impervious surface and therefore increases stormwater pollutants because of aerial deposition, they have been excluded from this Provision because we recognize the greater benefit that bike lanes and sidewalks provide by encouraging less use of automobiles. Likewise, this Provision also contains specific exclusions for: sidewalks built as part of a new road and built to direct stormwater runoff to adjacent vegetated areas; bike lanes built as part of a new road but not hydraulically connected to the new road and built to direct stormwater runoff to adjacent vegetated areas; impervious trails built to direct stormwater runoff to adjacent vegetated areas, or other non-erodible permeable areas, preferably away from creeks or towards the outboard side of levees; and sidewalks, bike lanes, or trails constructed with permeable surfaces.

In the case of road widening projects where additional lanes of traffic are added, the 50% rule also applies. That is, the addition of traffic lanes resulting in an alteration of more than 50 percent of the impervious surface of an existing street or road that was not subject to Provision C.3, the entire project, consisting of all existing, new, and/or replaced impervious surfaces, must be included in the treatment system design (i.e., stormwater treatment systems must be designed and sized to treat stormwater runoff from the entire street or road that had additional traffic lanes added).

Where the addition of traffic lanes results in an alteration of less than 50 percent of the impervious surface of an existing street or road that was not subject to Provision C.3, only the new and/or replaced impervious surface of the project must be included in the treatment system design (i.e., stormwater treatment systems must be designed and sized to treat stormwater runoff from only the new traffic lanes). However, if the stormwater runoff from the existing traffic lanes and the added traffic lanes cannot be separated, any onsite treatment system must be designed and sized to treat stormwater runoff from the entire street or road. If an offsite treatment system is installed or in-lieu fees paid in accordance with Provision C.3.e., the offsite treatment system or in-lieu fees must address only the stormwater runoff from the added traffic lanes.

Because road widening and trail projects belong to a newly added category of Regulated Projects, adequate implementation time has been included as well as "grandfathering" language. (See discussion under Provision C.3.b.ii.(1).)

**Provision C.3.b.iii.** requires that the Permittees cumulatively complete 10 pilot "green street" projects within the Permit term. This Provision was originally intended to require stormwater treatment for road rehabilitation projects on

arterial roads that added and/or replaced > 10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of impervious surface. We acknowledge the logistical difficulties in retrofitting roads with stormwater treatment systems as well as the funding challenges facing municipalities in the Bay Area. However, we are aware that some cities have or will have funding for “green street” retrofit projects that will provide water quality benefits as well as meet broader community goals such as fostering unique and attractive streetscapes that protect and enhance neighborhood livability, serving to enhance pedestrian and bike access, and encouraging the planting of landscapes and vegetation that contribute to reductions in global warming. Therefore, instead of requiring post-construction treatment for all road rehabilitation of arterial streets, this Provision requires the completion of 10 pilot “green street” projects by the Permittees within the Permit term. These projects must incorporate LID techniques for site design and treatment in accordance with Provision C.3.c. and provide stormwater treatment pursuant to Provision C.3.d. and must be representative of the three different types of streets: arterial, collector, and local. To ensure equity and an even distribution of projects, at least two pilot projects must be located in each of the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara. Parking lot projects are acceptable as pilot projects as long as both parking lot and street runoff is addressed. Because these are pilot projects, we have not specified a minimum or maximum size requirement and the details of which cities will have these projects are to be determined by the Permittees.

**Provision C.3.c** (Low Impact Development (LID)) recognizes LID as a cost-effective, beneficial, holistic, integrated stormwater management strategy<sup>69</sup>. The goal of LID is to reduce runoff and mimic a site’s predevelopment hydrology by minimizing disturbed areas and impervious cover and then infiltrating, storing, detaining, evapotranspiring, and/or biotreating stormwater runoff close to its source. LID employs principles such as preserving and recreating natural landscape features and minimizing imperviousness to create functional and appealing site drainage that treat stormwater as a resource, rather than a waste product. Practices used to adhere to these LID principles include measures such as preserving undeveloped open space, rain barrels and cisterns, green roofs, permeable pavement, and biotreatment through rain gardens, bioretention units, bioswales, and planter/tree boxes.

This Provision sets forth a three-pronged approach to LID with source control, site design, and stormwater treatment requirements. The concepts and techniques for incorporating LID into development projects, particularly for site design, have been extensively discussed in BASMAA’s Start at the Source manual (1999) and its companion document, Using Site Design Techniques to Meet Development Standards for Stormwater Quality (May 2003), as well as in various other LID reference documents.

**Provision C.3.c.i.(1)** lists source control measures that must be included in all Regulated Projects as well as some that are applicable only to certain types of

<sup>69</sup> USEPA, *Reducing Stormwater Costs through Low Impact Development (LID) Strategies and Practices* (Publication Number EPA 841-F-07-006, December 2007) <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/costs07>



businesses and facilities. These measures are recognized nationwide as basic, effective techniques to minimize the introduction of pollutants into stormwater runoff. The current stormwater permits also list these methods; however, they are encouraged rather than required. By requiring these source control measures, this Provision sets a consistent, achievable standard for all Regulated Projects and allows the Board to more systematically and fairly measure permit compliance. This Provision retains enough flexibility such that Regulated Projects are not forced to include measures inappropriate, or impracticable, to their projects. This Provision does not preclude Permittees from requiring additional measures that may be applicable and appropriate.

**Provision C.3.c.i.(2)(a)** lists site design elements that must be implemented at all Regulated Projects. These design elements are basic, effective techniques to minimize pollutant concentrations in stormwater runoff as well as the volume and frequency of discharge of the runoff. On the basis of the Board staff's review of the Permittees' Annual Reports and CWA section 401 certification projects, these measures are already being done at many projects. One design element requires all Regulated Projects to include at least one site design measure from a list of six which includes recycling of roof runoff, directing runoff into vegetated areas, and installation of permeable surfaces instead of traditional paving. All these measures serve to reduce the amount of runoff and its associated pollutants being discharged from the Regulated Project.

**Provision C.3.c.i.(2)(b)** requires each Regulated Project to treat 100% of the Provision C.3.d. runoff with LID treatment measures onsite or with LID treatment measures at a joint stormwater treatment facility. LID treatment measures are harvesting and re-use, infiltration, evapotranspiration, or biotreatment. A properly engineered and maintained biotreatment system may be considered only if it is infeasible to implement harvesting and re-use, infiltration, or evapotranspiration at a project site. Infeasibility may result from conditions including the following:

- Locations where seasonal high groundwater would be within 10 feet of the base of the LID treatment measure.
- Locations within 100 feet of a groundwater well used for drinking water.
- Development sites where pollutant mobilization in the soil or groundwater is a documented concern.
- Locations with potential geotechnical hazards.
- Smart growth and infill or redevelopment sites where the density and/or nature of the project would create significant difficulty for compliance with the onsite volume retention requirement.
- Locations with tight clay soils that significantly limit the infiltration of stormwater.

This Provision recognizes the benefits of harvesting and reuse, infiltration and evapotranspiration and establishes these methods at the top of the LID treatment hierarchy. This Provision also acknowledges the challenges, both institutional and technical, to providing these LID methods at all Regulated Projects. There

are certainly situations where biotreatment is a valid LID treatment measure and this Provision allows Permittees the flexibility to make this determination so that Regulated Projects are not forced to include measures inappropriate or impracticable to the project sites. However, Permittees are required to submit a report within 18 months of the Permit effective date and prior to the required implementation date on the criteria and procedures that Permittees will employ to determine when harvesting and re-use, infiltration, or evapotranspiration is feasible and infeasible at a Regulated Project site. The Permittees are also required to submit a second report two years after implementing the new LID requirements that documents their experience with determining the feasibility and infeasibility of harvesting and reuse, infiltration, and evapotranspiration at Regulated Project sites. This report shall also discuss barriers, including institutional and technical site specific constraints, to implementation of infiltration, harvesting and reuse, or evapotranspiration and proposed strategies for removing these identified barriers.

This Provision specifies minimum specifications for biotreatment systems to be considered as LID treatment and requires Permittees to develop soil media specifications. Because this Provision recognizes green roofs as biotreatment systems for roof runoff, it also requires Permittees to develop minimum specifications for green roofs.

Provision C.3.c.ii. establishes the implementation date for the new LID requirements of Provision C.3.c.i. to be two years after the Permit effective date. Grandfathering language consistent with Provision C.3.b.ii.(1) has been included in this Provision to exempt private development projects (that are far along in their permitting and approval process) and public projects (that are far along in their funding and design) from the requirements of Provision C.3.c.i.

**Provision C.3.d** (Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems) lists the hydraulic sizing design criteria that the stormwater treatment systems installed for Regulated Projects must meet. The volume and flow hydraulic design criteria are the same as those required in the current stormwater permits. These criteria ensure that stormwater treatment systems will be designed to treat the optimum amount of relatively smaller-sized runoff-generating storms each year. That is, the treatment systems will be sized to treat the majority of rainfall events generating polluted runoff but will not have to be sized to treat the few very large annual storms as well. For many projects, such large treatment systems become infeasible to incorporate into the projects. Provision C.3.d. also adds a new combined flow and volume hydraulic design criteria to accommodate those situations where a combination approach is deemed most efficient.

**Provision C.3.d.iv.** defines infiltration devices and establishes limits on the use of stormwater treatment systems that function primarily as infiltration devices. The intent of the Provision is to ensure that the use of infiltration devices, where feasible and safe from the standpoint of structural integrity, must also not cause or contribute to the degradation of groundwater quality at the project sites. This Provision requires infiltration devices to be located a minimum of 10 feet

(measured from the base) above the seasonal high groundwater mark and a minimum of 100 feet horizontally away from any known water supply wells, septic systems, and underground storage tanks with hazardous materials, and other measures to ensure that any potential threat to the beneficial uses of ground water is appropriately evaluated and avoided.

**Provision C.3.e** (Alternative or In-Lieu Compliance with Provision C.3.c.) recognizes that not all Regulated Projects may be able to install LID treatment systems onsite because of site conditions, such as existing underground utilities, right-of-way constraints, and limited space.

**Provision C.3.e.i.** In keeping with LID concepts and strategies, we expect new development projects to provide LID treatment onsite and to allocate the appropriate space for these systems because they do not have the site limitations of redevelopment and infill site development in the urban core. However, this Provision does not restrict alternative compliance to redevelopment and infill projects because the Permittees have requested flexibility to make the determination of when alternative compliance is appropriate. Based on the lack of offsite alternative compliance projects installed during the current stormwater permit terms, it seems that having to find offsite projects is already a great disincentive. Therefore, this Provision allows any Regulated Project to provide LID treatment for up to 100% of the required Provision C.3.d. stormwater runoff at an offsite location or pay equivalent in-lieu fees to provide LID treatment at a Regional Project, as long as the offsite and Regional Projects are in the same watershed as the Regulated Project.

For the LID Treatment at an Offsite Location alternative compliance option, offsite projects must be constructed by the end of construction of the Regulated Project. We acknowledge that a longer timeframe may be required to complete construction of offsite projects because of administrative, legal, and/or construction delays. Therefore, up to 3 years additional time is allowed for construction of the offsite project; however, to offset the untreated stormwater runoff from the Regulated Project that occurs while construction of the offsite project is taking place, the offsite project must be sized to treat an additional 10% of the calculated equivalent quantity of both stormwater runoff and pollutant loading for each year that it is delayed. Permittees have commented that for projects that are delayed, requiring treatment of an additional (10-30)% of stormwater runoff may result in costly re-design of treatment systems. In those cases, payment of in-lieu fees to provide the additional treatment at a Regional Project is a viable alternative.

For the Payment of In-Lieu Fees to a Regional Project alternative compliance option, the Regional Project must be completed within 3 years after the end of construction of the Regulated Project. We acknowledge that a longer timeframe may be required to complete construction of Regional Projects because they may involve a variety of public agencies and stakeholder groups and a longer planning and construction phase. Therefore, the timeline for completion of a Regional Project may be extended, up to 5 years after the completion of the Regulated

Project, with prior Water Board Executive Officer approval. Executive Officer approval will be granted contingent upon a demonstration of good faith efforts to implement the Regional Project, such as having funds encumbered and applying for the appropriate regulatory permits.

**Provision C.3.e.ii. (Special Projects)** When considered at the watershed scale, certain types of smart growth, high density, and transit-oriented development can either reduce existing impervious surfaces, or create less “accessory” impervious areas and auto-related pollutant impacts. Incentive LID treatment reduction credits approved by the Water Board may be applied to these types of Special Projects.

This Provision requires that by December 1, 2010, Permittees shall submit a proposal to the Water Board containing the following information:

- Identification of the types of projects proposed for consideration of LID treatment reduction credits and an estimate of the number and cumulative area of potential projects during the remaining term of this permit for each type of project..
- Identification of institutional barriers and/or technical site specific constraints to providing 100% LID treatment onsite that justify the allowance for non-LID treatment measures onsite.
- Specific criteria for each type of Special Project proposed, including size, location, minimum densities, minimum floor area ratios, or other appropriate limitations.
- Identification of specific water quality and environmental benefits provided by these types of projects that justify the allowance for non-LID treatment measures onsite.
- Proposed LID treatment reduction credit for each type of Special Project and justification for the proposed credits. The justification shall include identification and an estimate of the specific water quality benefit provided by each type of Special Project proposed for LID treatment reduction credit.
- Proposed total treatment reduction credit for Special Projects that may be characterized by more than one category and justification for the proposed total credit.

**Provision C.3.f** (Alternative Certification of Adherence to Numeric Sizing Criteria for Stormwater Treatment Systems) allows Permittees to have a third-party review and certify a Regulated Project’s compliance with the hydraulic design criteria in Provision C.3.d. Some municipalities do not have the staffing resources to perform these technical reviews. The third-party review option addresses this staffing issue. This Provision requires Permittees to make a reasonable effort to ensure that the third-party reviewer has no conflict of interest with regard to the Regulated Project being reviewed. That is, any consultant, contractor or their employees hired to design and/or construct a stormwater treatment system for a Regulated Project can not also be the certifying third party.

**Provision C.3.g.** (Hydromodification Management, HM) requires that certain new development projects manage increases in stormwater runoff flow and volume so that post-project runoff shall not exceed estimated pre-project runoff rates and durations, where such increased flow and/or volume is likely to cause increased potential for erosion of creek beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other adverse impacts on beneficial uses due to increased erosive force.

**Background for Provision C.3.g.** Based on Hydrograph Modification Management Plans prepared by the Permittees, the Water Board adopted hydromodification management (HM) requirements for Alameda Permittees (March 2007), Contra Costa Permittees (July 2006), Fairfield-Suisun Permittees (March 2007), Santa Clara Permittees (July 2005), and San Mateo Permittees (March 2007). Within Provision C.3.g, the major common elements of these HM requirements are restated. Attachments B–F contain the HM requirements as adopted by the Water Board, with some changes to correct minor errors and to provide consistency across the Region. Attachment F contains updated HM requirements for the Santa Clara Permittees. Permittees will continue to implement their adopted HM requirements; where Provision C.3.g. contradicts the Attachments, Provision C.3.g. shall be implemented. Additional requirements and/or options contained in the Attachments, above and beyond what is specified in Provision C.3.g., remain unaltered by Provision C.3.g. In all cases, the HM Standard must be achieved.

The Alameda, Santa Clara and San Mateo Permittees have adapted the Western Washington Hydrology Model<sup>70</sup> for modeling runoff from development project sites, sizing flow duration control structures, and determining overall compliance of such structures and other HM control structures (HM controls) in controlling runoff from the project sites to manage hydromodification impacts as described in the Permit. The adapted model is called the Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM).<sup>71</sup> All Permittees may use the BAHM if its inputs reflect actual conditions at the project site and surrounding area, including receiving water conditions. As Permittees gain experience in designing and operating HM controls, the Programs may make adjustments in the BAHM to improve its function in controlling excess runoff and managing hydromodification impacts. Notification of all such changes shall be given to the Water Board and the public through such mechanism as an electronic email list.

The Contra Costa Permittees have developed sizing charts for the design of flow duration control devices. Attachment C requires the Contra Costa Permittees to conduct a monitoring program to verify the performance of these devices. Following the satisfactory conclusion of this monitoring program, or conclusion of other study(s) that demonstrate devices built according to Attachment C specifications satisfactorily protect streams from excess erosive flows, the Water Board intends to allow the use of the Contra Costa sizing charts, when tailored to local conditions, by other stormwater programs and Permittees. Similarly, any other control strategies or criteria approved by the Board would be made available across the Region. This would be accomplished.

<sup>70</sup> [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/wwhm\\_training/wwhm/wwhm\\_v2/instructions\\_v2.html](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/wwhm_training/wwhm/wwhm_v2/instructions_v2.html)

<sup>71</sup> See [www.bayareahydrologymodel.org](http://www.bayareahydrologymodel.org), Resources.

through Permit amendment or in another appropriate manner following appropriate public notification and process.

The Fairfield-Suisun Permittees have developed design procedures, criteria, and sizing factors for infiltration basins and bioretention units. These procedures, criteria, and sizing factors have been through the public review process already, and are not subject to public review at this time. Water Board staff's technical review found that the procedures, criteria, and sizing factors are acceptable in all ways except one: they are based on an allowable low flow rate that exceeds the criteria established in this Permit. Fairfield-Suisun Permittees may choose to change the design criteria and sizing factors to the allowable criterion of 20 percent of the 2-year peak flow, and seek Executive Officer approval of the modified sizing factors. This criterion, which is greater than the criterion allowed for other Bay Area Stormwater Countywide Programs, is based on data collected from Laurel and LedgeWood Creeks and technical analyses of these site-specific data. Following approval by the Executive Officer and notification of the public through such mechanism as an email list-serve, project proponents in the Fairfield-Suisun area may meet the HM Standard by using the Fairfield-Suisun Permittees' design procedures, criteria, and sizing factors for infiltration basins and/or bioretention units.

Attachments B and F allow the Alameda and Santa Clara Permittees to prepare a user guide to be used for evaluating individual receiving waterbodies using detailed methods to assess channel stability and watercourse critical flow. This user guide would reiterate and collate established stream stability assessment methods that have been presented in these Programs' HMPs, which have undergone Water Board staff review and been made available for public review. After the Programs have collated their methods into user guide format, received approval of the user guide from the Executive Officer, and informed the public through such process as an email list-serve, the user guide may be used to guide preparation of technical reports for: implementing the HM standard using in-stream or regional measures; determining whether certain projects are discharging to a watercourse that is less susceptible (from point of discharge to the Bay) to hydromodification (e.g., would have a lower potential for erosion than set forth in this Permit); and/or determining if a watercourse has a higher critical flow and project(s) discharging to it are eligible for an alternative  $Q_{cp}$ <sup>72</sup> for the purpose of designing on-site or regional measures to control flows draining to these channels (i.e., the actual threshold of erosion-causing critical flow is higher than 10 percent of the 2-year pre-project flow).

The Water Board recognizes that the collective knowledge of management of erosive flows and durations from new and redevelopment is evolving, and that the topics listed below are appropriate topics for further study. Such a study may be initiated by Water Board staff, or the Executive Officer may request that all Bay Region municipal stormwater Permittees jointly conduct investigations as appropriate. Any future

<sup>72</sup>  $Q_{cp}$  is the allowable low flow discharge from a flow control structure on a project site. It is a means of apportioning the critical flow in a stream to individual projects that discharge to that stream, such that cumulative discharges do not exceed the critical flow in the stream.

proposed changes to the Permittees' HM provisions may reflect improved understanding of these issues:

- Potential incremental costs, and benefits to waterways, from controlling a range of flows up to the 35- or 50-year peak flow, versus controlling up to the 10-year peak flow, as required by this Permit;
- The allowable low-flow (also called  $Q_{cp}$  and currently specified as 10–20 percent of the pre-project 2-year runoff from the site) from HM controls;
- The effectiveness of self-retaining areas for management of post-project flows and durations; and/or
- The appropriate basis for determining cost-based impracticability of treating stormwater runoff and controlling excess runoff flows and durations.

Within Attachments B-F, this Permit allows for alternative HM compliance when on-site and regional HM controls and in-stream measures are not practicable. Alternative HM compliance includes contributing to or providing mitigation at other new or existing development projects that are not otherwise required by this Permit or other regulatory requirements to have HM controls. The Permit provides flexibility in the type, location, and timing of the mitigation measure. The Board recognizes that handling mitigation funds may be difficult for some municipalities because of administrative and legal constraints. The Board intends to allow flexibility for project proponents and/or Permittees to develop new or retrofit stormwater treatment or HM control projects within a broad area and reasonable time frame. Toward the end of the Permit term, the Board will review alternative projects and determine whether the impracticability criteria and options should be broadened or made narrower.

**Provision C.3.g.i.** defines the subset of Regulated Projects that must install hydromodification controls (HM controls). This subset, called HM Projects, are Regulated Projects that create and/or replace one acre or more of impervious surface and are not specifically excluded within Attachments B–F of the Permit. Within these Attachments, the Permittees have identified areas where the potential for single-project and/or cumulative development impacts to creeks is minimal, and thus HM controls are not required. Such areas include creeks that are concrete-lined or significantly hardened (e.g., with concrete) from point of discharge and continuously downstream to their outfall into San Francisco Bay; underground storm drains discharging to the Bay; and construction of infill projects in highly developed watersheds.<sup>73</sup>

**Provision C.3.g.ii.** establishes the standard hydromodification controls must meet. The HM Standard is based largely on the standards proposed by Permittees in their Hydrograph Modification Management Plans. The method for calculating post-project runoff in regards to HM controls is standard practice in Washington State and is equally applicable in California.

<sup>73</sup> Within the context of Provision C.3.g., “highly developed watersheds; refer to catchments or sub-catchments that are 65 percent impervious or more.

**Provision C.3.g.iii.** identifies and defines three methods of hydromodification management.

**Provision C.3.g.iv.** sets forth the information on hydromodification management to be submitted in the Permittees' Annual Reports.

**Provision C.3.g.v.** requires the Vallejo Permittees to develop a Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP), because the Vallejo Permittees have not been required to address HM impacts to date. Vallejo's current permit was issued by USEPA and does not require the Vallejo Permittees' to develop an HMP. The Vallejo Permittees may choose to adopt and implement one or a combination of the approaches in Attachments B-F.

**Provision C.3.h** (Operation and Maintenance of Stormwater Treatment Systems) establishes permitting requirements to ensure that proper maintenance for the life of the project is provided for all onsite, joint, and offsite stormwater treatment systems installed. The Provision requires Permittees to inspect at least 20% of these systems annually, at least 20% of all vault-based systems annually, and every treatment system at least once every 5 years. Requiring inspection of at least 20% of the total number of treatment and HM controls serves to prevent failed or improperly maintained systems from going undetected until the 5th year. We have the additional requirement to inspect at least 20% of all installed vault-based systems because they require more frequent maintenance and problems arise when the appropriate maintenance schedules are not followed. Also, problems with vault systems may not be as readily identified by the projects' regular maintenance crews. Neither of these inspection frequency requirements interferes with the Permittees' current ability to prioritize their inspections based on factors such as types of maintenance agreements, owner or contractor maintained systems, maintenance history, etc. This Provision also requires the development of a database or equivalent tabular format to track the operation and maintenance inspections and any necessary enforcement actions against Regulated Projects and submittal of Reporting Table C.3.h., which requires standard information that should be collected on each operation and maintenance inspection. We require this type of information to evaluate a Permittee's inspection and enforcement program and to determine compliance with the Permit. Summary data alone without facility-specific inspection findings does not allow us to determine whether Permittees are doing timely follow-up inspections at problematic facilities and taking appropriate enforcement actions.

Stormwater treatment system maintenance has been identified as a critical aspect of addressing urban runoff from Regulated Projects by many prominent urban runoff authorities, including CASQA, which states that "long-term performance of BMPs [stormwater treatment systems] hinges on ongoing and proper maintenance."<sup>74</sup> USEPA also stresses the importance of BMP [stormwater treatment system] maintenance,

---

<sup>74</sup> California Stormwater Quality Association, 2003. Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook – New Development and Redevelopment, p. 6-1.



stating that "Lack of maintenance often limits the effectiveness of stormwater structure controls such as detention/retention basins and infiltration devices."<sup>75</sup>

**Provision C.3.i.** (Required Site Design Measures for Small Project and Detached Single-Family Homes Projects) introduces new requirements on single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2500 square feet or more of impervious surface and small development projects that create and/or replace > 2500 ft<sup>2</sup> to <10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> impervious surface (collectively over the entire project). A detached single-family home project is defined as the building of one single new house or the addition and/or replacement of impervious surface to one single existing house, which is not part of a larger plan of development.

This Provision requires these projects to select and implement one or more stormwater site design measures from a list of six. These site design measures are basic methods to reduce the amount and flowrate of stormwater runoff from projects and provide some pollutant removal treatment of the runoff that does leave the projects. Under this Provision, only projects that already require approvals and/or permits under the Permittees' current planning, building, or other comparable authority are regulated. Hence this Provision does not require Permittees to regulate small development and single-family home projects that would not otherwise be regulated under the Permittees' current ordinances or authorities. Water Board staff recognizes that the stormwater runoff pollutant and volume contribution from each one of these projects may be small; however, the cumulative impacts could be significant. This Provision serves to address some of these cumulative impacts in a simple way that will not be too administratively burdensome on the Permittees. To assist these small development and single-family home projects, this Provision also requires the Permittees to develop standard specifications for lot-scale site design and treatment measures.

<sup>75</sup> USEPA. 1992. *Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Application for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems*. EPA 833-B-92-002.

## **C.4. Industrial and Commercial Site Controls**

### **Legal Authority**

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 13377, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, D, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C) requires, "A description of a program to monitor and control pollutants in storm water discharges to municipal systems from municipal landfills, hazardous waste treatment, disposal and recovery facilities, industrial facilities that are subject to section 313 of title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), and industrial facilities that the municipal permit applicant determines are contributing a substantial pollutant loading to the municipal storm sewer system."

### **Specific Provision C.4. Requirements**

#### **Provision C.4.a (Legal Authority for Effective Site Management)**

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A) provides that each Permittee must demonstrate that it can control "through ordinance, permit, contract, order or similar means, the contribution of pollutants to the municipal storm sewer by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and the quality of storm water discharged from site of industrial activity." This section also describes requirements for effective follow-up and resolution of actual or threatened discharges of either polluted non-stormwater or polluted stormwater runoff from industrial/commercial sites.

#### **Provision C.4.b (Inspection Plan)**

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C)(1) provides that Permittees must "identify priorities and procedures for inspections and establishing and implementing control measures for such discharges." The Permit requires Permittees to implement an industrial and commercial site controls program to reduce pollutants in runoff from all industrial and commercial sites/sources.

##### **Provision C.4.b.ii.(1) (Commercial and Industrial Source Identification)**

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(ii) provides that Permittees "Provide an inventory, organized by watershed of the name and address, and a description (such as SIC codes) which best reflects the principal products or services provided by each facility which may discharge, to the municipal separate storm sewer, storm water associated with industrial activity."

USEPA requires "measures to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges to municipal separate storm sewers from municipal landfills, hazardous waste treatment, disposal and recovery facilities, industrial facilities that are subject to section 313 of title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of

1986 (SARA).”<sup>76</sup> USEPA “also requires the municipal storm sewer Permittees to describe a program to address industrial dischargers that are covered under the municipal storm sewer permit.”<sup>77</sup> To more closely follow USEPA’s guidance, this Permit also includes operating and closed landfills, and hazardous waste treatment, disposal, storage and recovery facilities.

The Permit requires Permittees to identify various industrial sites and sources subject to the General Industrial Permit or other individual NPDES permit. USEPA supports the municipalities regulating industrial sites and sources that are already covered by an NPDES permit:

Municipal operators of large and medium municipal separate storm sewer systems are responsible for obtaining system-wide or area permits for their system’s discharges. These permits are expected to require that controls be placed on storm water discharges associated with industrial activity which discharge through the municipal system. It is anticipated that general or individual permits covering industrial storm water discharges to these municipal separate storm sewer systems will require industries to comply with the terms of the permit issued to the municipality, as well as other terms specific to the Permittee.<sup>78</sup>

And:

Although today’s rule will require industrial discharges through municipal storm sewers to be covered by separate permit, USEPA still believes that municipal operators of large and medium municipal systems have an important role in source identification and the development of pollutant controls for industries that discharge storm water through municipal separate storm sewer systems is appropriate. Under the CWA, large and medium municipalities are responsible for reducing pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers to the maximum extent practicable. Because storm water from industrial facilities may be a major contributor of pollutants to municipal separate storm sewer systems, municipalities are obligated to develop controls for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity through their system in their storm water management program.<sup>79</sup>

**Provision C.4.b.ii.(5) (Inspection Frequency)**

USEPA guidance<sup>80</sup> says, “management programs should address minimum frequency for routine inspections.” The USEPA Fact Sheet—Visual Inspection<sup>81</sup> says, “To be effective, inspections must be carried out routinely.”

<sup>76</sup> *Federal Register*. Vol. 55, No. 222, Friday, November 16, 1990. Rules and Regulations. P. 48056.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>78</sup> *Federal Register*. Vol. 55, No. 222, Friday, November 16, 1990, Rules and Regulations. P. 48006.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid*. P. 48000

<sup>80</sup> USEPA. 1992. Guidance 833-8-92-002, section 6.3.3.4 “Inspection and Monitoring”.

<sup>81</sup> USEPA. 1999. 832-F-99-046, “Storm Water Management Fact Sheet – Visual Inspection”.

**Provision C.4.c (Enforcement Response Plan)** requires the Permittees to establish an Enforcement Response Plan (ERP) that ensures timely response to actual or potential stormwater pollution problems discovered in the course of industrial/commercial stormwater inspections. The ERP also provides for progressive enforcement of violations of ordinances and/or other legal authorities. The ERP will provide guidance on the appropriate use of the various enforcement tools, such as verbal and written notices of violation, when to issue a citations, and require cleanup requirements, cost recovery, and pursue administrative or and criminal penalties. All violations must be corrected in a timely manner with the goal of correcting them before the next rain event but no longer than 10 business days after the violations are discovered.

**Provision C.4.d (Staff Training)** section of the Permit requires the Permittees to conduct annual staff trainings for inspectors. Trainings are necessary to keep inspectors current on enforcement policies and current MEP BMPs for industrial and commercial stormwater runoff discharges.

## C.5. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

### Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to section C.5:

**Broad Legal Authority:** CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 13377, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, D, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

**Specific Legal Authority:** Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(iii)(B)(1) provides that the Permittee shall include in their application, "the location of known municipal storm sewer system outfalls discharging to waters of the United States."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(iii)(B)(5) provides that the Permittee shall include in their application, "The location of major structural controls for storm water discharge (retention basins, detention basins, major infiltration devices, etc.)"

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B) provides that the Permittee shall have, "adequate legal authority to prohibit through ordinance, order or similar means, illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B) provides that the Permittee shall, "Carry out all inspection, surveillance and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with permit conditions including the prohibition on illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) requires, "shall be based on a description of a program, including a schedule, to detect and remove (or require the discharger to the municipal storm sewer to obtain a separate NPDES permit for) illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1) requires, "a program, including inspections, to implement and enforce an ordinance, orders or similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the municipal storm sewer system."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(2) requires, "a description of procedures to conduct on-going field screening activities during the life of the permit, including areas or locations that will be evaluated by such field screens."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(3) requires, "procedures to be followed to investigate portions of the separate storm sewer system that, based on the results of the field screen, or other appropriate information, indicate a reasonable potential of containing illicit discharges or other sources of non-storm water."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4) requires, "a description of procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(5) requires, "a description of a program to promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of the presence of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges from municipal separate storm sewers."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(7) requires, "a description of controls to limit infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to municipal separate storm sewer systems where necessary."

### **Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.5**

- C.5-1.** Illicit and inadvertent connections to MS4 systems result in the discharge of waste and chemical pollutants to receiving waters. Every Permittee must have the ability to discover, track, and clean up stormwater pollution discharges by illicit connections and other illegal discharges to the MS4 system.
- C.5-2** Illicit discharges to the storm drain system can be detected in several ways. Permittee staff can detect discharges during their course of other tasks, and business owners and other aware citizens can observe and report suspect discharges. The Permittee must have a direct means for these reports of suspected polluted discharges to receive adequate documentation, tracking, and response through problem resolution.

### **Specific Provision C.5 Requirements**

**Provision C.5.a (Legal Authority)** requires each Permittee have adequate legal authority to effectuate cessation, abatement, and/or clean up of non-exempt non-stormwater discharges per Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B). Illicit and inadvertent connections to MS4 systems result in the discharge of waste and chemical pollutants to receiving waters. Every Permittee must have the ability to discover, track, and clean up stormwater pollution discharges by illicit connections and other illegal discharges to the MS4 system.

**Provision C.5.b (ERP)** requires Permittees to establish an ERP that ensures timely response to illicit discharges and connections to the MS4 and provides progressive enforcement of violations of ordinances and/or other legal authorities. This section also requires Permittees to establish criteria for triggering follow-up investigations. Additional language has been added to this section to clarify the minimum level of effort and time frames for follow-up investigations when violations are discovered. Timely investigation and follow up when action levels are exceeded is necessary to identify sources of illicit discharges, especially since many of the discharges are transitory. The requirements for all violations to be corrected before the next rain event but no longer than 10 business days when there is evidence of illegal non-stormwater discharge, dumping, or illicit connections having reached municipal storm drains is necessary to ensure timely response by Permittees.

**Provision C.5.c (Spill and Dumping Response, Complaint Response, and Frequency of Inspections)** Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4) requires, “a description of procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer.” This Provision of the Permit requires the Permittees to establish and maintain a central point of contact including phone numbers for spill and complaint reporting. Reports from the public are an essential tool in discovering and investigating illicit discharge activities. Maintaining contact points will help ensure that there is effective reporting to assist with the discovery of prohibited discharges. Each Permittee must have a direct means for these reports of suspected polluted discharges to receive adequate documentation, tracking, and response through problem resolution.

**Provision C.5.d (Control of Mobile Sources)** requires each Permittee to develop and implement a program to reduce the discharge of pollutants from mobile businesses. The purpose of this section is to establish oversight and control of pollutants associated with mobile business sources to the MEP.

**Provision C.5.e (Collection System Screening and MS4 Map Availability)** Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(3) requires, “procedures to be followed to investigate portions of the separate storm sewer system that, based on the results of the field screen, or other appropriate information, indicate a reasonable potential of containing illicit discharges or other sources of non-storm water.” This Provision of the Permit requires the Permittees to conduct follow up investigations and inspect portions of the MS4 for illicit discharges and connections. Permittees shall implement a program to actively seek and eliminate illicit connections and discharges during their routine collection system screening and during screening surveys at strategic check points. Additional wording has been added to this section to clarify and ensure that all appropriate municipal personnel are used in the program to observe and report these illicit discharges and connections when they are working the system.

This section also requires the Permittees to develop or obtain a map of their entire MS4 system and drainages within their jurisdictions and provide the map to the public for review. As part of the permit application process federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(iii)(B)(1) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(iii)(B)(5) specify that dischargers must identify the location of any major outfall that discharges to waters of the United States, as well as the location of major structural controls for stormwater discharges. A major outfall is any outfall that discharges from a single pipe with an inside diameter of 36 inches or more or its equivalent (discharge from a single conveyance other than a circular pipe which is associated with a drainage area of more than 50 acres) or; for areas zoned for industrial activities, any pipe with a diameter of 12 inches or more or its equivalent (discharge from other than a circular pipe associated with a drainage area of 2 acres or more). The permitting agency may not process a permit until the applicant has fully complied with the application requirements.<sup>82</sup> If, at the time of application, the information is unavailable, the Permit must require implementation of a program to meet the application requirements.<sup>83</sup> The requirement in this Provision of the Permit for

<sup>82</sup> 40 CFR 124.3 (applicable to state programs, see section 123.25).

<sup>83</sup> 40 CFR. 122.26(d)(1)(iv)(E).

Permittees to prepare maps of the MS4 system will help ensure that Permittees comply with federal NPDES permit application requirements that are more than 10 years old.

**Provision C.5.f (Tracking and Case Follow-up)** section of the Permit requires Permittees to track and monitor follow-up for all incidents and discharges reported to the complaint/spill response system that could pose a threat to water quality. This requirement is included so Permittees can demonstrate compliance with the ERP requirements of Section C.5.b and to ensure that illicit discharge reports receive adequate follow up through to resolution.