

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION**

DRAFT

FACT SHEET / TECHNICAL REPORT

FOR

ORDER NO. R9-2010-0016

NPDES NO. CAS0108766

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

**DISCHARGES FROM THE
MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS (MS4s)
DRAINING THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
THE INCORPORATED CITIES OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY,
AND THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
WITHIN THE SAN DIEGO REGION**

OCTOBER 13, 2010

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	2
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Cont'd)	3
I. FACT SHEET FORMAT	4
II. CONTACT INFORMATION	5
III. PUBLIC PROCESS AND NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES	6
IV. BACKGROUND	7
V. PERMITTING APPROACH	10
VI. ECONOMIC ISSUES	12
VII. LEGAL AUTHORITY	18
VIII. FINDINGS	20
A. Basis For the Order	20
B. Regulated Parties	23
C. Discharge Characteristics	25
D. Runoff Management Programs	55
E. Statute and Regulatory Considerations	88
F. Public Process	104
IX. DIRECTIVES	105
A. Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations	105
B. Non-Storm Water Discharges	108
C. Non Storm Water Dry Weather Action Levels	113
D. Storm Water Action Levels	124
E. Legal Authority	127
F. Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program	129
F.1. Development Planning Component	129
F.2. Construction Component	146
F.3 Existing Development Component	151
F.4. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination	162
F.5. Public Participation Component	165
F.6. Education Component	166
G. Watershed Water Quality Workplan	169
H. Fiscal Analysis	172
I. Total Maximum Daily Loads	174
J. Program Effectiveness Component	175
K. Reporting	177
L. Modification of Programs	180
M. Principal Permittee Responsibilities	181
N. Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program	182
O. Standard Provisions, Reporting Requirements, And Notifications	183
P. Attachment A – Basin Plan Prohibitions	184
Q. Attachment B – Standard Provisions	185
R. Attachment C – Definitions	186
S. Attachment D – Summary of Submittals	187
T. Attachment E - Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program	188
U. Attachment F - Source Data	202

DRAFT

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AMAL	Average Monthly Action Level
AST	Active/Passive Sediment Treatment
BAT	Best Available Technology
BIA	Building Industry Association
BMP	Best Management Practice
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin
CASQA	California Stormwater Quality Association
CCC	California Coastal Commission
CC&Rs	Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
Colorado River Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Region
Copermittees	County of Riverside, the 4 incorporated cities within the County of Riverside in the San Diego Region, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWC	California Water Code
CZARA	Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990
DAMP	Drainage Area Management Plan
DNQ	Did Not Quantify
ESAs	Environmentally Sensitive Areas
FR	Federal Register
GIS	Geographic Information System
HMP	Hydromodification Management Plan
HU	Hydrologic Unit
IBI	Index of Biotic Integrity
IC/ID	Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharges
JRMP	Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
Los Angeles Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
LID	Low Impact Development
MDAL	Maximum Daily Action Level
MEP	Maximum Extent Practicable
MRP	Receiving Waters Monitoring and Reporting Program
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System

DRAFT

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Cont'd)

NAL	Non-storm Water Action Levels
ND	Not Detected
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRDC	Natural Resources Defense Council
NURP	Nationwide Urban Runoff Program
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
RCFCD	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Regional Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
RGOs	Retail Gasoline Outlets
ROWD	Riverside County Copermittees' Report of Waste Discharge (application for NPDES reissuance)
RWL	Receiving Water Limitations
SAL	Storm Water Action Level
Santa Ana Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
San Diego Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
San Francisco Bay Water Board	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification Code
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SSMP	Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
SWMP	Storm Water Management Plan
TAC	State Water Resources Control Board Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee
TIE	Toxicity Identification Evaluation
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WDRs	Waste Discharge Requirements
WLA	Waste Load Allocation
WQO	Water Quality Objective
WQBEL	Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WQS	Water Quality Standard
WRMP	Watershed Runoff Management Plan

DRAFT

I. FACT SHEET FORMAT

This Fact Sheet briefly sets forth the principle facts and the significant factual, legal, methodological, and policy questions that the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) considered in preparing Order No. R9-2010-0016. In accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) title 40 parts 124.8 and 124.56 (40 CFR 124.8 and 124.56), this Fact Sheet includes, but is not limited to, the following information:

- A. Contact information
- B. Public process and notification procedures
- C. Background information
- D. Permitting approach
- E. Economic issues
- F. Legal authority
- G. Findings
- H. Directives

Tentative Order No. R9-2010-0016 was distributed for public review on July 23, 2010. The San Diego Water Board accepted written comments on the Tentative Order until September 7, 2010. A public hearing was subsequently held on October 13, 2010 to receive oral comments from interested persons.

The San Diego Water Board's files applicable to the issuance of Order No. R9-2010-0016 are incorporated into the administrative record in support of the findings and requirements of Order No. R9-2010-0016.

DRAFT

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

San Diego Water Board

Benjamin Neill
Water Resource Control Engineer
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
858-467-2983
858-571-6972 (fax)
email: bneill@waterboards.ca.gov

Wayne Chiu, P.E.
Water Resource Control Engineer
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
858-637-5558
858-571-6972 (fax)
email: wchiu@waterboards.ca.gov

The Order and other related documents can be downloaded from the San Diego Water Board website at
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/stormwater/rsd_stormwater.shtml

All documents referenced in this Fact Sheet and in Order No. R9-2010-0016 are available for public review at the San Diego Water Board office, located at the address listed above. Public records are available for inspection during regular business hours, from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. To schedule an appointment to inspect public records, contact the San Diego Water Board Records Management Officer at 858-467-2952.

Copermittees

1. City of Murrieta	4. County of Riverside
2. City of Temecula	5. Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3. City of Wildomar	
6. City of Menifee ¹	

¹ Until an agreement to transfer the regulatory oversight of the City of Menifee's MS4 to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region under Order No. R8-2010-0033 is finalized, the City of Menifee is included as a Copermittee under Order No. R9-2010-0016.

DRAFT

III. PUBLIC PROCESS AND NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

The San Diego Water Board followed the schedule listed below for the preparation of Order No. R9-2010-0016:

- A. In December 2008, the San Diego Water Board met with the Copermitees to discuss the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) required by Order No. R9-2004-001.
- B. On January 15, 2009, the San Diego Water Board received the ROWD for the permit renewal.
- C. On October 29, 2009, the San Diego Water Board received the 2008-09 annual reports from the Copermitees for the existing permit.
- D. On February 8, 2010, the San Diego Water Board notified all known interested parties that an electronic email listserv had been established to provide information and notices on the reissuance of the municipal storm water NPDES permit for southern Riverside County.
- E. On February 18, 2010 the San Diego Water Board provided written comments on the ROWD to the Copermitees.
- F. On March 22, 2010, the San Diego Water Board met with the Copermitees to discuss the potential changes to the permit based on the ROWD and annual reports.
- G. Between April 22 and July 23, 2010, the San Diego Water Board met with the Copermitees on a weekly basis to discuss the Copermitees' concerns with the provisions of the Tentative Order.
- H. On July 23, 2010, the San Diego Water Board released the Tentative Order for public review and comment.
- I. Written comments were accepted until September 7, 2010.
- J. A public hearing of the Tentative Order was conducted on October 13, 2010.

DRAFT

IV. BACKGROUND

Order No. R9-R9-2010-0016 is the fourth iteration of the storm water permit for the municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region. The first permit was adopted in 1990. The San Diego Water Board adopted the second iteration of the permit in 1998. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) objected to the 1998 permit and reissued the permit in 1999. In 2000, the San Diego Water Board issued an addendum to the 1998 permit and incorporated the USEPA's permit by reference. The San Diego Water Board reissued the third iteration of the permit in 2004.

Municipal Storm Water Permits are required by the Federal Clean Water Act 1987 Amendments. The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) was amended in 1987 to address storm water runoff from municipal and industrial dischargers. 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 storm water runoff from their MS4s. In response to the CWA amendment (and the pending federal NPDES regulations which would implement the amendment), the San Diego Water Board issued a municipal storm water permit, Order No. 90-46, in July 1990 to the Copermittees for their municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) discharges.²

The First and Second Term Permits, Order Nos. 90-46 and 98-02, provided maximum flexibility. San Diego Water Board Order No. 90-46 contained the "essentials" of the 1990 regulations, but the requirements were written in very broad, generic terms. This was done in order to provide the maximum amount of flexibility to the Copermittees in implementing the new requirements (flexibility was, in fact, the stated reason for issuing the permit in advance of the final regulations). From staff's perspective however, "flexibility" in the form of lack of specificity, combined with the Copermittees' lack of funding and political will, also provided the Copermittees with ample reasons to take few substantive steps towards achieving water quality standards. The situation was exacerbated by the San Diego Water Board's own lack of storm water resources for oversight.

The Third-Term Permit introduced specific requirements. The regulatory approach incorporated into Order No. R9-2004-001 was a significant departure from the regulatory approach of the First and Second-Term Permits. Where San Diego Water Board Order Nos. 90-46 and 98-02 included broad, nonspecific requirements in order to provide the Copermittees with the maximum amount of flexibility in developing their programs, Order No. R9-2004-001 used detailed, specific requirements which outlined the minimum level of implementation required for the Copermittees' programs. In order to provide the Copermittees with the minimum requirements to meet the

² The 1990 permit was issued to the County of Riverside, the Orange County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the City of Temecula. Additional municipalities have been added to the MS4 NPDES permit as they have incorporated.

DRAFT

maximum extent practicable (MEP) standard for storm water of the San Diego Water Board, Order No. R9-2004-001 included more detail to emphasize the strong jurisdictional level programs developed by the Copermitees during the First and Second-Term Permits, as well as including the watershed-level program. The shift in permitting approaches resulted from the San Diego Water Board's conclusion that the lack of specificity in earlier Orders resulted in frequently unenforceable permit requirements, which in turn allowed some Copermitees to only make limited progress in implementing their programs.

The Third-Term Permit followed the San Diego County and Orange County permit templates. The shift in regulatory approaches for MS4 permits was first manifested in the 2001 MS4 permit to the owners and operators of San Diego County MS4s (Order No. 2001-01) and subsequently incorporated into the 2002 MS4 permit to the owners and operators of the Orange County MS4s (Order No. R9-2002-0001). The Third-Term Riverside County Permit included similar requirements as the 2001 San Diego County Permit and the 2002 Orange County Permit. Both the San Diego and Orange County Permits were appealed to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board).³ Minor modifications of each were made by the State Water Board, but the vast majority of the requirements were upheld. The San Diego County permit was also challenged in the Superior Court of the State of California and the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District. Further litigation on the Orange County permit was held pending the precedential decisions on the San Diego Permit. The San Diego Permit was largely upheld in the Superior and Appellate Courts. The State of California Supreme Court declined to hear a final appeal from the Building Industry Association in March 2005. Thus, the Third-Term Riverside County permit requirements remained as slightly modified by the State Water Board.

The Third-Term Permit was adopted following substantial public participation. Public participation was extensive during the adoption process of the Third-Term Permit. The draft permit was released for public review and comment on December 15, 2003. Because the proposed requirements for Riverside County were similar to those that had recently been adopted and contested in San Diego County, much of the public participation dialogue echoed the discussions held during the San Diego renewal. A public workshop was held at the Temecula City Hall on January 23, 2004 to answer questions about the Tentative Order for the Third-Term Riverside County permit. A public hearing was held on February 11, 2004 to receive testimony. The public comment period was closed on March 10, 2004. Approximately 165 written and verbal comments were received and responded to during the public workshop, the public hearing, and the written comment period on the Tentative Order for the Third-Term Riverside County permit. Following the extensive public participation process, the San Diego Water Board adopted Order No. R9-2004-001 on July 14, 2004.

³ Seven petitions were filed with the State Water Board over the Third-Term Orange County Permit. Six were placed in abeyance. Three of the petitioners sought stays. One stay request was dismissed and one was withdrawn. The active petition and stays were addressed by the State Water Board in Order WQO 2002-0014. That Order stayed provision F.5.f regarding sewage spills and modified Finding No. 26 regarding chronic toxicity.

DRAFT

Storm water programs have improved under the Third-Term Permit. Since adoption of Order No. R9-2004-001, the Copermittees' storm water programs have expanded. Audits of the Copermittees' programs and reviews of annual reports exhibit that the Copermittees' jurisdictional programs are largely in compliance with the Order. Some of the efforts currently being conducted on a regular basis by the Copermittees that were not conducted on a widespread basis prior to adoption of Order No. R9-2004-001, include: construction site storm water inspections, industrial and commercial facility storm water inspections, municipal facility storm water inspections, management of storm water quality from new development, development of best management practice (BMP) requirements for existing development, interdepartmental coordination, comprehensive water quality monitoring, and assessment of storm water program effectiveness.

Significant challenges remain. When viewed relative to the magnitude of the storm water runoff problem, enormous challenges remain, particularly regarding the management of storm water runoff on a watershed scale. Today, storm and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 continue to be the leading cause of water quality impairment in the San Diego Region.⁴ Since 1998, the number of impaired water bodies in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region on the CWA section 303(d) List of Water Quality Impaired Segments (303(d) List) has increased with each new list (i.e. new impaired water bodies listed on the 2002, 2006, and 2008 303(d) Lists). The Copermittees' monitoring data exhibits persistent exceedances of water quality objectives in the Santa Margarita watershed.⁵ The Santa Margarita watershed also has conditions that are frequently toxic to aquatic life. Bioassessment data from the watersheds further reflects these conditions, finding that macroinvertebrate communities in creeks have widespread Poor to Very Poor Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) ratings.

⁴ The potential sources of impairments are identified on the CWA section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for the San Diego Region.

⁵ Data is provided in annual reports to the San Diego Water Board. A summary of data collected during the Third-Term Permit is provided in the Riverside County Copermittees' application for permit reissuance. That summary is available on-line at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/stormwater/rsd_stormwater.shtml

DRAFT

**V. PERMITTING APPROACH
(PROGRAM INTEGRATION, FLEXIBILITY, AND DETAIL)**

The Order contains an increased emphasis on storm water discharge management on a watershed basis. This shift towards increased watershed management is consistent with planning efforts conducted by the San Diego Water Board regarding reissuance of the San Diego Permit (Order No. R9-2007-0001) and Orange County Permit (Order No. R9-2009-0002). This shift reflects recognition of the maturity of the storm water programs since they began implementing the Third-Term Permit. Addressing storm water discharge management on a watershed basis is only possible if effective jurisdictional programs have been established, and maintaining effective jurisdictional programs is crucial to the success of watershed-focused management.

There are several reasons for this shift in emphasis. An emphasis on watersheds is necessary to shift the focus of the Copermittees from program development and implementation to water quality results. After over 20 years of Copermittee program implementation, it is critical that the Copermittees link their efforts with positive impacts on water quality. Addressing storm water on a watershed scale focuses on water quality results by emphasizing the receiving waters within the watershed. The conditions of the receiving waters drive management actions, which in turn focus on the water quality problems in each watershed.

Focusing on watershed implementation does not mean that the Copermittees must expend funds outside of their jurisdictions. Rather, the Copermittees within each watershed are expected to collaborate to develop a watershed strategy to address the high priority water quality problems within each watershed. They have the option of implementing the strategy in the manner they find to be most effective. Each Copermittee can implement the strategy individually within its jurisdiction, or the Copermittees can group together to implement the strategy throughout the watershed.

While the Order includes a new emphasis on addressing storm water discharges on a watershed basis, the Order includes recognition of the importance of continued program implementation on jurisdictional and countywide levels. The Order also acknowledges that jurisdictional, watershed, and countywide efforts are not always mutually exclusive. For this reason, an attempt has been made to allow for the Copermittees' jurisdictional, watershed, and countywide programs to integrate.

In the Order, the watershed requirements serve as the mechanism for this program integration. Since jurisdictional and countywide activities can also serve watershed purposes, such activities can be integrated into the Copermittees' watershed programs, provided the activities meet certain criteria. In this manner, the Copermittees' activities do not always need to distinguish between jurisdictional, watershed, and countywide levels of implementation. Instead, they can be integrated on multiple levels.

DRAFT

Such opportunities for program integration inherently provide flexibility to the Copermittees in implementing their programs. Program integration can be expanded or minimized as the Copermittees see fit. For example, there is flexibility provided in determining the activities to be integrated and implemented in the watershed programs – watershed-based efforts, countywide efforts, enhanced jurisdictional efforts, or a mixture of the three. Significant flexibility is also provided throughout other portions of the Order.

Copermittees can choose the best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented, or required to be implemented, for development, construction, and existing development areas. Flexibility to determine which industrial or commercial sites are to be inspected is also provided to the Copermittees. Educational approaches are also to be determined by the Copermittees under the Order. Implementation of certain efforts on a countywide basis is largely optional for the Copermittees as well. Significant leeway is also provided to the Copermittees in using methods to assess the effectiveness of their various runoff management programs. This flexibility is further extended to the monitoring program requirements, which allow the Copermittees to develop monitoring approaches to several aspects of the monitoring program.

The challenge in drafting the Order is to provide the flexibility described above while ensuring that the Order is still enforceable. To achieve this, the Order frequently prescribes minimum measurable outcomes, while providing the Copermittees with flexibility in the approaches they use to meet those outcomes. Enforceability has been found to be a critical aspect of the Order. For example, the watershed requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001 were some of the Order's most flexible requirements. This lack of specificity in the watershed requirements resulted in inefficient watershed compliance efforts. This situation reflects a common outcome of flexible permit language. Such language can be unclear and unenforceable, and it can lead to implementation of inadequate programs.

To avoid these types of situations, a balance between flexibility and enforceability has been crafted into the Order. Minimum measurable outcomes are utilized to ensure the Order is enforceable, while the Copermittees are provided flexibility in deciding how they will implement their programs to meet the minimum measurable outcomes.

DRAFT

VI. ECONOMIC ISSUES

Economic discussions of storm and non-storm water management programs tend to focus on the significant costs incurred by municipalities in developing and implementing the programs. However, when considering the cost of implementing the 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.

The financial crisis and current economic environment has amplified the concerns about the costs incurred by the municipalities in implementing their programs. It is frequently cited by many of the Copermittees as a justification for reducing or modifying the requirements that must be met by their programs. While the current economic environment is a cause for concern in the short term, it also provides an opportunity for these programs to find and implement improvements and efficiencies before the next period of growth and development.

It is very difficult to ascertain the true cost of implementation of the Copermittees' management programs because of inconsistencies in reporting by the Copermittees. Reported costs of compliance for the same program element can vary widely from city to city, often by a very wide margin that is not easily explained.⁶ Despite these problems, efforts have been made to identify management program costs, which can be helpful in understanding the costs of program implementation.

Estimates of Phase I Storm Water Program Costs

The USEPA, the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards), and the State Water Board have attempted to evaluate the costs of implementing municipal storm water programs. The assessments demonstrate that true costs are difficult to ascertain and reported costs vary widely. Nonetheless, they provide a useful context for considering the costs of requirements within Order No. R9-2010-0016. In addition, reported fiscal analyses tend to neglect the costs incurred to municipalities when storm water runoff is not effectively managed. Such costs result from pollution, contamination, nuisance, and damage to ecosystems, property, and human health.

In 1999 USEPA reported on multiple studies it conducted to determine the cost of 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 \$9.08 per household annually, similar to those anticipated for Phase II municipalities.⁷

⁶ LARWQCB, 2003. Review and Analysis of Budget Data Submitted by the Permittees for Fiscal Years 2000-2003. P. 2.

⁷ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68791-68792.

DRAFT

A study on Phase I MS4 program cost was also conducted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Los Angeles Water Board), where program costs reported in the municipalities' annual reports were assessed. The Los Angeles Water Board estimated that average per household cost to implement the MS4 program in Los Angeles County was \$12.50.⁸ Since the Los Angeles County permit is very similar to Order No. R9-2004-001, this estimate is also useful in assessing general program costs in Riverside County.

The State Water Board also commissioned a study by the California State University, Sacramento to assess costs of the Phase I MS4 program. This study includes an assessment of costs incurred by Phase I MS4s throughout the State to implement their programs. Annual cost per household in the study ranged from \$18-46, with the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area (FCMA) representing the lower end of the range, and the City of Encinitas (in San Diego County) representing the upper end of the range.⁹ Included in the study is the City of Corona, which is in Riverside County under the jurisdiction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (Santa Ana Water Board).

The annual cost per household for the City of Corona's program was estimated to be \$32, which should be similar to the costs to implement the MS4 programs in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region. In contrast, the cost of the City of Encinitas' program, with an annual cost per household estimated to be \$46, may represent the upper range of Riverside County MS4 programs. However, the City of Encinitas's program cost can be considered as the high end of the spectrum for management program costs because the City has a consent decree with environmental groups regarding its program, and City of Encinitas has received recognition for implementing a superior program.

The annual costs for the City of Corona and City of Encinitas were estimated from data collected in 2003-2004. Between 2003 and 2008, the number of households in both cities has increased by approximately 3 percent and 7 percent, respectively.¹⁰ In contrast, between 2003 and 2008 the number of households in the City of Temecula has increased from 23,199 to 31,135 (34 percent)¹¹ and the City of Murrieta has increased from 22,020 to 32,664 (48 percent).¹² This significant increase in number of households indicates a significant increase in the tax base (sales and property tax) available to fund the implementation of the MS4 programs for the City of Temecula and City of Murrieta, as well as for the County of Riverside and recently incorporated cities.

⁸ Los Angeles Water Board, 2003. Review and Analysis of Budget Data Submitted by the Permittees for Fiscal Years 2000-2003. P. 2.

⁹ State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey. P. ii.

¹⁰ Southern California Association of Governments, Profile of the City of Corona, dated May 2009; and City of Encinitas, Comprehensive Financial Annual Report, dated June 30, 2009.

¹¹ Southern California Association of Governments, Profile of the City of Temecula, dated May 2009.

¹² Southern California Association of Governments, Profile of the City of Murrieta, dated May 2009.

DRAFT

The average amount spent per household in the Cities of Temecula and Murrieta, however, does not correspond with the increase in the number of households or the amount spent in municipalities in other regions. The table below compares the reported expenditures for the MS4 programs from 2006-07 to 2008-09 compared to number of households in the Cities of Encinitas, Corona, Temecula, and Murrieta.¹³

City	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	\$ Spent	Households	\$/Household	\$ Spent	Households	\$/Household	\$ Spent	Households	\$/Household
Encinitas	\$1,192,174	23,798	\$50.10	\$2,052,671	23,871	\$85.99	\$1,729,962	24,100	\$71.78
Corona	\$988,547	43,000	\$22.99	\$1,151,779	43,482	\$26.49	\$1,162,928*	43,827	\$26.53
Temecula	\$566,952	28,890	\$19.62	\$748,267	30,222	\$24.76	\$534,492	31,135	\$17.17
Murrieta	\$186,377	30,237	\$6.16	\$258,247	31,758	\$8.13	\$541,180*	32,664	\$16.56

It is important to note that the program costs reported above may not include costs incurred by other departments or programs that may support the MS4 permit programs. The costs only represent the funds spent by each municipality as reported in their jurisdictional program annual reports. In any case, the figures in the table above illustrate the disparity in the amounts reportedly budgeted and spent for the programs in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region in comparison to the amounts budgeted and spent in the Santa Ana Region and in the San Diego County portion of the San Diego Region.

It is also 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 ever 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 expected from and 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 percent of program costs are new costs fully attributable to MS4 permits. The remainder of the program costs was either pre-existing or resulted from enhancement of pre-existing programs.¹⁴ In 2000, 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 the County or Orange Drainage Area

¹³ Amount (\$) Spent figures are the actual expenditures reported in the 2006-07, 2007-08, and/or 2008/09 Annual Reports for the jurisdictional programs for each municipality (figures with * are estimated/budgeted expenditures). Number of households derived from SCAG 2009 profiles of Corona, Temecula, and Murrieta, and from City of Encinitas 2009 Financial Annual Report.

¹⁴ State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey. P. 58.

DRAFT

Management Plan (DAMP), was less than 20 percent of the total budget. The remaining 80 percent was attributable to pre-existing programs.¹⁵

Estimating Costs of Reissued Storm Water Permits

The vast majority of costs that will be incurred as a result of implementing Order No. R9-2010-0016 is not new. Storm water management programs have been in place in Riverside County for over 15 years. As shown in the discussion above, the amount spent for MS4 Permit compliance per household in the municipalities in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region is already low compared to other regions. Any increase in cost to the Copermittees, however, is still expected to be incremental in nature. Since Order No. R9-2010-0016 “fine tunes” the requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001, these cost increases are expected to be modest.

Where there may be additional elements that will incur new costs, the Riverside County Copermittees are given the time to develop the budgets and funding mechanisms to phase those elements into their programs. Additionally, development of these additional elements by the Riverside County Copermittees will have the benefit of the experiences and work already done by the San Diego County and Orange County Copermittees.

The anticipated costs of program changes are difficult to estimate because of the flexibility inherent within the Permit and the recognition that program modifications will vary among the municipalities in response to the specific needs of the local and watershed programs. In other words, the Permit is intended to allow each Copermittee to de-emphasize some program components and strengthen others based on the experience of the jurisdictional programs.

The changes in Order No. R9-2010-0016 reflect the iterative process of BMP implementation and the necessarily adaptive nature of storm water management that is expected by the USEPA. In 1996, USEPA recognized that changes to MS4 programs would occur during the reapplication period based on new information on the relative magnitude of a problem, new data on water quality impacts of the storm water discharges, and experience gained under the prior permit.¹⁶ Some changes have been proposed by the Copermittees in the permit reapplication package, and others have been included because the San Diego Water Board considers those measures necessary and feasible to protect water quality from the effects of MS4 discharges.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ Federal Register / Vol. 61, No. 155 / Friday, August 9, 1996 / Rules and Regulations. Interpretive policy memorandum on reapplication requirements for MS4s.

DRAFT

Other Economic Considerations

Economic considerations of management programs cannot be limited only to program costs. Evaluation of programs requires information on the implementation costs and information on the benefits derived from environmental protection and improvement.¹⁷ Attention is often focused on program costs, but 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 \$158-210.¹⁸ 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 reports that the annual household willingness to pay for statewide clean water is approximately \$180.¹⁹ When viewed in comparison to household costs for existing management programs, household willingness to pay estimates exhibit that per household costs incurred by the Riverside County Copermitees to implement their management programs are very low.

Placing a value on good water quality in receiving waters is very difficult. The Santa Margarita River is one of the few remaining natural gorge rivers in southern California, with approximately 70 species of special concern (rare, threatened, or endangered) regularly inhabiting the watershed, including 30 that are currently protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act.²⁰ The Upper Santa Margarita Watershed provides significant habitat and recreation opportunities. In addition, residents and businesses in the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed rely heavily of local water for drinking, agriculture, and industrial supply.

Often the value of receiving waters with good water quality manifests in other forms, such as tourism, recreational opportunities, and increased property values. When surface waters are degraded, thereby degrading the habitat, the public loses the aesthetic value and benefit of being able to use the area in and around the water. Surface waters that are able to support the beneficial uses designated in the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) can sustain plants and wildlife that can attract visitors and residents, providing aesthetic, recreational, as well as monetary value to the public. At this time, however, there have been no studies for the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region to quantify the added value that surface waters with healthy water quality can provide.

It is also important to consider the benefits of management programs in conjunction with their costs. A study conducted by the University of Southern California and

¹⁷ Ribaud M.O. and D. Heelerstein. 1992. *Estimating Water Quality Benefits: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Technical Bulletin No. 1808.

¹⁸ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68793.

¹⁹ State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey. P. iv.

²⁰ Stein, E. and Ambrose, R. 1998. Cumulative Impacts of Section 404 Clean Water Act Permitting on the Riparian Habitat of the Santa Margarita, California Watershed. *Wetlands*, Vol. 18, No. 3.

DRAFT

University of California, Los Angeles 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 reach \$18 billion.²¹ 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.²²

²¹ Los Angeles Water Board, 2004. Alternative Approaches to Stormwater Control.

²² Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68791.

DRAFT

VII. LEGAL AUTHORITY

The following statutes, regulations, and Water Quality Control Plans provide the basis for the requirements of Order No. R9-2010-0016: Clean Water Act (CWA), California Water Code (CWC), Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (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 Diego 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. R9-2010-0016, and provide the San Diego Water Board with ample underlying authority to require each of the directives of Order No. R9-2010-0016. Legal authority citations are also provided with each permit section discussion in section IX of this Fact Sheet/Technical Report.

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-storm water 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,E, and F) provide that each Copermittee’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; [...] (E) Require compliance with condition in ordinances, permits, contracts or orders; and (F) 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.”

DRAFT

40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) – Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) provides that the Copermitttee shall develop and implement a proposed management program which “shall include 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 storm water runoff from new development and significant redevelopment, construction, and commercial, residential, industrial, and municipal land uses or activities. Prevention of illicit discharges is also required.

CWC 13377 – CWC section 13377 provides that “Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the State Water Board or the Regional Water 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. R9-2010-0016 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 Diego Water Board’s portion of Riverside County. 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 and antidegradation policies.

DRAFT

VIII. FINDINGS

The findings of the Order have been modified to reduce repetition in their discussions and address new requirements. Each finding of the Order is provided and discussed below. Additional discussion relative to the findings can be found in section IX of the Fact Sheet, which provides discussions of the Order's directives.

A. Basis For the Order

Finding A.1. This Order is based on the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the Water Code, 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 Resources Control Board (State Water Board), the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin adopted by the San Diego Water Board (Basin Plan), the California Toxics Rule, and the California Toxics Rule Implementation Plan.

Discussion of Finding A.1. 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 the nine Regional 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 Regional Water Boards to set water quality objectives via adoption of Water Quality Control Plans (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 Regional Water Boards to establish waste discharge requirements (WDRs) to prohibit waste discharges in certain conditions or areas. Since 1990, the San Diego Water Board has issued area-wide MS4 NPDES permits. The Order will renew Order No. R9-2004-001 to comply with the CWA and attain water quality objectives in the Basin Plan by including numeric storm water action levels to limit the contributions of pollutants conveyed by storm water, and by including numeric non-storm water action levels for dry weather non-storm water discharges designed to ensure that the Copermitees comply with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into their MS4. Further discussions of the legal authority associated with the prohibitions and directives of the Order are provided in section VII this document.

Finding A.2. This Order reissues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0108766, which was first adopted by the San Diego Water Board on July 16, 1990 (Order No. 90-38), and then reissued on May 13, 1998 (Order No. 98-02). On May 26, 1998, the United States Environmental Protection Agency

DRAFT

(USEPA), Region IX, objected to Order No. 98-02 due to concerns regarding Receiving Water Limitations (RWL) language. The USEPA concluded that the RWL language in the permit did not comply with the CWA and its implementing regulations. On April 27, 1999, the USEPA reissued the MS4 permit, which the San Diego Water Board adopted as Addendum No. 1 to Order No. 98-02 on November 8, 2000. On July 14, 2004, the San Diego Water Board adopted the third term MS4 permit, Order No. R9-2004-001. On January 15, 2009, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD), as the Principal Copermitee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for reissuance of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Permit.

Discussion of Finding A.2. This Order renews National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0108766, which was first issued on July 16, 1990 (Order No. 90-38), and then renewed on May 13, 1998 (Order No. 98-02). The USEPA determined that Order No. 98-02 the Receiving Water Limitations (RWL) language in the permit did not comply with the CWA and its implementing regulations. The USEPA assumed responsibility and reissued the Riverside County MS4 permit on April 27, 1999. Subsequently, the San Diego Water Board adopted Addendum No. 1 to Order No. 98-02 on November 8, 2000, which incorporated the USEPA's permit by reference. On July 14, 2004, the San Diego Water Board adopted the third term MS4 permit, Order No. R9-2004-001. On January 15, 2009, in accordance with Order No. R9-2004-001, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District), as the Principal Copermitee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for reissuance of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Permit. Supporting information discussing the topic of this finding can be found in section V of this document.

Finding A.3. This Order is consistent with the following precedential Orders adopted by the State Water Board addressing MS4 NPDES Permits: Order WQ 99-05, Order WQ 2000-11, Order WQ 2001-15, Order WQO 2002-0014, and Order WQ 2009-0008 (*SWRCB/OCC FILE A-1780*).

Discussion of Finding A.3. In recent years the State Water Board has considered several appeals of MS4 permits issued by the Regional Water Boards. In State Water Board Order WQ 99-05, the State Water Board established Receiving Water Limitation Language for MS4 permits. In State Water Board Order WQ 2000-11, the State Water Board addressed design standards for Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements. In State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15, the State Water Board addressed Petitions of the San Diego County MS4 Permit issued by the San Diego Water Board in 2001 (San Diego Water Board Order No. 2001-001). In State Water Board Order WQO 2002-0014, the State Water Board addresses Petitions of the Orange County MS4 Permit issued by the San Diego Water Board in 2002 (San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2002-0001). In State Water Board Order WQ 2009-0008, the State Water Board addresses Petitions of the Los Angeles County MS4

DRAFT

Permit issued by the Los Angeles Water Board in 2006 (Los Angeles Water Board Order No. R4-2006-0074).

Finding A.4. The Fact Sheet / Technical Report for the Order No. R9-2010-0016, NPDES No. CAS0108766, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the MS4s Draining the County of Riverside, the Incorporated Cities of Riverside County, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District within the San Diego Region, includes cited regulatory and legal references and additional explanatory information and data in support of the requirements of this Order. This information, including any supplements thereto, and any response to comments on the Tentative Orders, is hereby incorporated by reference into these findings.

Discussion of Finding A.4. This Fact Sheet briefly sets forth the principle facts and the significant factual, legal, methodological, and policy questions that the San Diego Water Board considered in preparing Order No. R9-2010-0016, in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) title 40 parts 124.8 and 124.56 (40 CFR 124.8 and 124.56). This Fact Sheet includes general information regarding the watershed and the Copermittees' discharges from their MS4 systems. The discussions in the Fact Sheet include references to applicable statutes and regulations, as well as other supporting documents. The discussions in the Fact Sheet also can clarify the permit writer's intent for requirements that may appear vague or open to multiple interpretations.

DRAFT

B. Regulated Parties

Finding B.1. Each of the persons in Table 1 below, hereinafter called Copermitees or dischargers, owns or operates an MS4, through which it discharges storm water and non-storm water into waters of the United States (U.S.) within the San Diego 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 U.S.

The Cities of Murietta, Menifee and Wildomar also discharge into waters of the U.S. in the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (Santa Ana Water Board), so are located partially within both the San Diego and Santa Ana Water Board boundaries. As allowed by California Water Code (CWC) §13228, these Cities submitted written requests to be regulated for MS4 purposes under a permit adopted by only one Water Board. As authorized by CWC § 13228 and pursuant to a written agreement between the San Diego Water Board and the Santa Ana Water Board, the Cities of Murrieta and Wildomar are wholly regulated by the San Diego Water Board under this Order, including those portions of the Cities jurisdiction not within the San Diego Water Board’s region. Similarly, the City of Menifee is wholly regulated by the Santa Ana Water Board under Order No. R8-2010-0033, including those portions of the City of Menifee within the San Diego Water Board’s region.

Discussion of Finding B.1. 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 storm water and non-storm water may come 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.

Included in Table 1 of the Order are the Cities of Menifee, Murrieta, Temecula, and Wildomar, the County of Riverside, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The Cities of Wildomar and Menifee are newly incorporated cities. Both Cities were previously a part of the County of Riverside’s jurisdiction and have an MS4 interrelated to other Copermitee MS4s in the San Diego Region. The boundaries of the Cities of Menifee, Murrieta, and Wildomar fall within the jurisdiction of both the San Diego Water Board and the Santa Ana Water Board.

DRAFT

As requested by the Cities of Menifee, Murrieta, and Wildomar, and pursuant to an agreement between the San Diego and Santa Ana Water Boards as authorized by CWC section 13228, the MS4s of the Cities of Murrieta and Wildomar are to be wholly regulated by the San Diego Water Board under this Order, and the MS4 of the City of Menifee is to be wholly regulated by the Santa Ana Water Board under Order No. R8-2010-0033. The agreement between the San Diego and Santa Ana Water Board to regulate the Cities of Menifee, Murrieta, and Wildomar will be subject to change with each permit renewal. Until the an agreement between the San Diego Water Board and Santa Ana Water Board is finalized to allow the City of Menifee to be wholly regulated by the Santa Ana Water Board under Order No. R8-2010-0033, the City of Menifee will remain as a Copermittee under this Order.

Other small MS4s also exist within the portion of Riverside County in the San Diego Region. While these small MS4s are not subject to this Order, they are subject to the Phase II NPDES storm water regulations. Over time, these small MS4s will be designated for coverage under the State Water Board's statewide general storm water permit for small MS4s.

DRAFT

C. Discharge Characteristics

Finding C.1. Discharges from the MS4 contain waste, as defined in the CWC, and pollutants that adversely affect the quality of the waters of the State. The discharge from an MS4 is a “discharge of pollutants from a point source” into waters of the U.S. as defined in the CWA.

Discussion of Finding C.1. Section 13050(d) of the CWC defines “waste” as “sewage and any and all other waste substances, liquid, solid, gaseous, or radioactive, associated with human habitation, or of human or animal origin, or from any producing, manufacturing, or processing operation, including waste placed within containers of whatever nature prior to, and for purposes of, disposal.” 40 CFR 122.2 defines “point source” as “any discernable, confined, and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to, any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, landfill leachate collection system, vessel or other floating craft from which pollutants are or may be discharged. This term does not include return flows from irrigated agriculture or agricultural storm water runoff.” 40 CFR 122.2 defines “discharge of a pollutant” as “Any addition of any pollutant or combination of pollutants to waters of the U.S. from any point source.” Also, the justification for control of pollution into waters of the state can be found at CWC section 13260(a)(1). State Water Board Order No. WQ 2001-15 verifies that discharges from the MS4 contain waste.²³

The term “urban runoff” has been removed throughout Order No. R9-2010-0016 and replaced with storm water (wet weather) or non-storm water (dry weather) runoff. This clarification is necessary to prevent the misunderstanding that regulation under this permit is subject only to urbanized areas. The term “urban runoff” is not defined in the Code of Federal Regulations or Federal Register in the regulation of Phase I MS4 discharges.

In the Copermittees’ ROWD, a distinction is made between urban land use areas and non-urban land use areas. Urban land use areas include commercial, industrial, *urban residential (less than 1 acre)*, parks and recreation facilities, and streets and roads land use categories. Non-urban land use areas include preserves and open space, agriculture, federal/state/tribal lands/non-County jurisdiction, and *rural residential (greater than 1 acre)*. The ROWD implies that only discharges from the urban land use areas are subject to the requirements of the MS4 Permit, thus rural residential (greater than 1 acre) land use areas would not be subject to the requirements of the MS4 Permit. Rural residential land use areas, however, are subject to the requirements of the MS4 Permit. The removal of the term urban runoff will further clarify the application of the requirements of the MS4 Permit.

²³ State Water Board, 2001. Order WQ 2001-15. In the Matter of Petitions of Building Industry Association of San Diego County and Western States Petroleum Association: For Review of Waster Discharge Requirements Order No. 2001-01 for Urban Runoff from San Diego County [NPDES No. CAS0108758] Issued by the Regional Board.

DRAFT

The discharge of runoff from an MS4 is a “discharge of pollutants from a point source” into waters of the U.S. as defined in the CWA. The Permit defines runoff as all flows in a storm water conveyance system (MS4 defined below) and consists of the following components:

- (1) storm water (wet weather flows) and
- (2) non-storm water discharges (dry weather flows).

The Permit defines an MS4 as a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains):

- (i) Owned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to State law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, storm water, or other wastes, including special districts under State law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or designated and approved management agency under section 208 of the CWA that discharges to waters of the United States;
- (ii) Designated or used for collecting or conveying storm water;
- (iii) Which is not a combined sewer;
- (iv) Which is not part of the Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) as defined at 40 CFR 122.26.

Permit finding D.3.c. includes natural streams that convey runoff as part of the MS4. The presence of an MS4 system is not limited to areas considered to be “urban” in nature. Though the term urban is often referred to specifically as pertaining to cities, runoff means all flows in a storm water conveyance system, regardless of the location of the conveyance system. A conveyance system owned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to State law), may be located in a setting (e.g. unincorporated area, low density residential) that is not considered by the public to be “urban” in nature. These areas are contributing pollutants to the MS4 system that must be addressed. The term runoff applies to all flows in an MS4 system, no matter where the MS4 may be located in regards to incorporated or unincorporated property. Storm water and non-storm water discharges from the rural residential (greater than 1 acre) land use category, characterized as non-urban, that enter into any part of the MS4 system (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains), are also subject to the requirements of the MS4 Permit.

DRAFT

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 40 CFR 122.26 requires that large and medium MS4s obtain a permit for all discharges from their systems. Appendix I to 40 CFR 122 designates Riverside County as having a large and medium MS4 requiring a permit. The regulations do not differentiate discharges from urban or rural MS4 systems. Rather, the regulations require the permit for all discharges from their systems. In the Final Rule establishing the Phase 1 storm water regulations, the USEPA clarified that all discharges are subject to a permit. On page 48041 of the Final Rule, the USEPA states:

“EPA recognizes that some of the counties addressed by today’s rule have, in addition to areas with high unincorporated urbanized populations, areas that are essentially rural or uninhabited and may not be the subject of planned development. While permits issued for these municipal systems **will cover** (*emphasis added*) municipal systems discharges in unincorporated portions of the county (*emphasis added*), it is the intent of EPA that management plans and other components of the programs focus on the urbanized and developing areas of the county.”

So, while the Permit covers all MS4 discharges regardless if that discharge is in an urban or unincorporated area; the Copermitees management program should focus on urbanized areas. Due to the Permit’s requirements, the Copermitees management programs will naturally focus on urbanized areas. Urbanized areas have more industry, construction, pollution and MS4s that require more inspection, maintenance, monitoring, enforcement and complaint follow-up.

USEPA further clarified on page 48041 that all MS4 discharges require permit coverage when addressing highway MS4 systems:

“[The regulations] will result in discharges from separate storm sewer systems serving State highways and other highways through storm sewers ... in unincorporated portions of specified counties being included as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems, since all municipal separate storm sewers within the boundaries of these political entities are included.”

In their summary on page 48043, the USEPA states:

“The definition [of MS4] provides that all systems within a geographical area including highways and flood controls will be covered, thereby avoiding fragmented and ill-coordinated programs;”

Neither the State Water Board’s storm water permit for Caltrans (State Water Board Order No. 99-06-DWQ) nor the Los Angeles Water Board’s MS4 permit for Ventura County include the term “urban runoff” in a significant regulatory capacity. The Caltrans permit has one reference to “urban runoff” where the term is used

DRAFT

interchangeably with “storm water.” The draft Ventura permit uses the term “urban runoff” when referring to titles of reference documents, previously adopted management plans and municipal ordinances that may contain the phrase.

The Copermittees have expressed concern regarding the regulation of pollutants from natural, undeveloped areas that enter the MS4 in an unincorporated area. Runoff and pollutants from any source entering the MS4, however, become the responsibility of the Copermittees upon entering the MS4. The assimilation of pollutants from natural, undeveloped areas is different under natural conditions compared to when they are transported through the MS4. The MS4 collection could change a natural sheet flow discharge to a concentrated point discharge. The MS4 does not provide natural infiltration or other pollutant remediation that these flows would receive in an otherwise natural drainage system. The MS4 may concentrate these natural pollutants and flows. In some cases, the MS4 may ultimately discharge the elevated concentrations of natural pollutants and flow rates to waters of the US far from the natural pollutant and flow source, causing a condition of pollution or a violation of water quality standards.

Finding C.2. MS4 storm water and non-storm water discharges are likely to contain pollutants that cause or threaten to cause a violation of surface water quality standards, as outlined in the Basin Plan. Storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are subject to the conditions and requirements established in the Basin Plan for point source discharges.

Discussion of Finding C.2. This finding is a clarification regarding the potential for discharges of storm water and non-storm water to impact the Beneficial Uses as described in the Basin Plan. As such these point source discharges require Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) to ensure that water quality standards are met. Furthermore, since point source discharges require WDRs, the discharges are subject to the prohibitions, conditions and requirements of the Basin Plan.

In addition, municipal discharges have been split into storm water and non-storm water discharges to represent the differing regulations applicable to storm water and non-storm water, though both types of discharges are likely to contain pollutants.

Finding C.3. The most common categories of pollutants in runoff include total suspended solids, sediment, pathogens (e.g., bacteria, viruses, protozoa), heavy metals (e.g., copper, lead, zinc and cadmium), petroleum products and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, synthetic organics (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, and PCBs), nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers), oxygen-demanding substances (decaying vegetation, animal waste), detergents, and trash.

Discussion of Finding C.3. The National Urban Runoff Program (NURP) study showed that heavy metals, organics, coliform bacteria, nutrients, oxygen demanding substances (e.g., decaying vegetation), and total suspended solids are found at

DRAFT

relatively high levels in storm water and non-storm water discharges.²⁴ It also found that MS4 discharges draining residential, commercial, and light industrial areas contain significant loadings of total suspended solids and other pollutants. The Basin Plan goes on to identify runoff pollutants to include lawn and garden chemicals, household and automotive care products dumped or drained on streets, and sediment that erodes from construction sites.²⁵ In addition, the State Water Board Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) finds that urban runoff pollutants include sediments, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, pathogenic bacteria, viruses, and pesticides.²⁶ Runoff that flows over streets, parking lots, construction sites, and industrial, commercial, residential, and municipal areas carries these untreated pollutants through storm drain networks directly to the receiving waters of the San Diego Region.

Finding C.4. The discharge of pollutants and/or increased flows from MS4s may cause or threaten to cause the concentration of pollutants to exceed applicable receiving water quality objectives and impair or threaten to impair designated beneficial uses resulting in a condition of pollution (i.e. unreasonable impairment of water quality for designated beneficial uses), contamination, or nuisance.

Discussion of Finding C.4. The 1992, 1994, and 1996 National Water Quality Inventory Reports to Congress prepared by USEPA showed a trend of impairment in the nation's waters from contaminated storm and non-storm water runoff.²⁷ The 1998 National Water Quality Inventory Report showed that runoff discharges affect 11 percent of rivers, 12 percent of lakes, and 28 percent of estuaries. Primary sources of impairment to rivers and streams included sediment, bacteria, nutrients, oxygen-depleting substances, metals, and pesticides. The report notes that runoff discharges are the leading source of pollution and the main factor in the degradation of surface water quality in California's coastal waters, rivers, and streams. Furthermore, the NURP study found that pollutant levels from illicit non-storm water discharges were high enough to significantly degrade receiving water quality, and threaten aquatic life, wildlife, and human health.²⁸

In addition, the Region's CWA section 303(d) list, which identifies water bodies with impaired beneficial uses within the region, also indicates that the impacts of storm water and non-storm water runoff on receiving waters are significant. Many of the impaired water bodies on the 303(d) list are impaired by constituents that have been found at high levels within storm water and non-storm water runoff by the Riverside

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ San Diego Water Board, 1994. Water Quality Control Plan, San Diego Basin, Region 9. San Diego.

²⁶ State Water Board, 1994. Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations. Nonpoint Source Management Program.

²⁷ USEPA, 2000. Quality of Our Nation's Waters: Summary of the National Water Quality Inventory 1998 Report to Congress – USEPA 841-S-00-001; Water Quality Conditions in the United States: Profile from the 1998 National Water Quality Inventory Report to Congress – USEPA 841-F-00-006.

²⁸ USEPA, 1993. Results of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program, Volume 1 – Final Report.

DRAFT

County storm water monitoring program.²⁹ Examples of constituents frequently responsible for beneficial use impairment include indicator fecal bacteria, heavy metals, toxicity, pesticides, dissolved solids, turbidity, and nutrients. These constituents have been found at high levels in runoff both regionally and nationwide.^{30,31} In addition, impairments may be caused by synergistic effects of multiple contaminants or by pollutants not currently monitored by storm water programs.

Finding C.5. Pollutants in runoff can threaten and adversely affect human health. Human illnesses have been clearly linked to recreating near storm drains flowing to receiving waters. Also, runoff pollutants in receiving waters can bioaccumulate in the tissues of invertebrates and fish, which may be eventually consumed by humans.

Discussion of Finding C.5. Human illnesses have been clearly linked to recreating near storm drains flowing to coastal waters. A landmark study, conducted by the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project, found that there was an increased occurrence of illness in people that swam in proximity to a flowing storm drain.³² A study of south Huntington Beach and north Newport Beach (both located in northern Orange County) found that an illness rate of about 0.8 percent among bathers at those beaches resulted in about \$3 million annually in health-related expenses.³³ Although the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed is inland, the watershed drains to the Pacific Ocean, and pollutants generated in the area may impact coastal waters. For example, the Santa Margarita River system provides the main source of beach sand for the beaches in northern San Diego County.³⁴ In addition, residents from the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed, who recreate at southern California beaches, benefit from clean water.

Residents and businesses in the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed also rely heavily on local water for drinking, agriculture and industrial supply. Over 40 percent of the water used in the watershed is locally produced.³⁵ In addition, surface and ground water from the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed flow to Fallbrook in San Diego County and the U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton where it is used as part of the municipal and domestic water supply.

²⁹ County of Riverside, 2009. Riverside County Municipal Copermittees 2008-09 Annual Storm Water Program Report, Section 11.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ USEPA, 1983. Results of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program, Volume 1 – Final Report.

³² 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.

³³ Dwight, R.H., et al., 2005. Estimating the Economic Burden From Illnesses Associated With Recreational Coastal Water Pollution – A Case Study in Orange County, California. Journal of Enviro. Management Vol.76. No.2 p.95-103. Also reported in: 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.

³⁴ Shapiro. 1991. Refuge in an urbanized land, the Santa Margarita River: cultural and natural resource value. Santa Margarita Research Foundation, Fallbrook, CA.

³⁵ Jenks, .J. 2002. Santa Margarita River Watershed Annual Watermaster Report: Water Year 2000-2001.

DRAFT

According to the USEPA, spilled fuel, solvents, waste oil, paints, and other maintenance fluids pose a risk to the environment, but may be especially harmful if they enter someone's drinking water supply.³⁶ Discharges of runoff from urban areas were identified by the California Department of Health Services as one of the most prevalent possible contaminating activities for drinking water sources.³⁷ This issue of potential source water contamination is of fundamental importance, because of the dependence on local water for domestic use in the Santa Margarita Watershed.

Furthermore, runoff pollutants in receiving waters can bioaccumulate in the tissues of invertebrates and fish, which may eventually be consumed by humans. Pollutants such as heavy metals and pesticides, which are commonly found in MS4 runoff, have been found to bioaccumulate and biomagnify in long-lived organisms at the higher trophic levels.³⁸ Since many aquatic species are utilized for human consumption, toxic substances accumulated in species' tissues can pose a significant threat to public health. USEPA supports this finding when it states, "As runoff flows over areas altered by development, it picks up harmful sediment and chemicals such as oil and grease, pesticides, heavy metals, and nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorus). These pollutants often become suspended in runoff and are carried to receiving waters, such as lakes, ponds, and streams. Once deposited, these pollutants can enter the food chain through small aquatic life, eventually entering the tissues of fish and humans."³⁹

Finding C.6. Runoff discharges from MS4s often contain pollutants that cause toxicity to aquatic organisms (i.e. adverse responses of organisms to chemicals or physical agents ranging from mortality to physiological responses such as impaired reproduction or growth anomalies). Toxic pollutants impact the overall quality of aquatic systems and beneficial uses of receiving waters.

Discussion of Finding C.6. The Copermittees' monitoring data exhibits frequent toxic conditions in runoff during storm events and dry weather. Toxicity varies significantly within and among sites and over time. The cause of toxicity may vary between locations, dates, and indicator organisms. The actual cause may be influenced by various factors such as development, land uses, runoff management, habitat modification, hydromodification, and native aquatic environment. Some toxicity identification evaluations (TIEs) have identified pyrethroids as a cause of toxicity in the receiving waters.⁴⁰

Finding C.7. The Copermittees discharge runoff into lakes, drinking water reservoirs, rivers, streams, creeks, bays, estuaries, coastal lagoons, the Pacific Ocean, and tributaries thereto within one of the eleven hydrologic units (Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit) comprising the San Diego Region as shown in Table 2. Some of the

³⁶ USEPA. 2004. Municipal Storm Water and Ground Water Discharge Regulations in California. F-909-04-004.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Abel, P.D, 1996. Water Pollution Biology.

³⁹ USEPA, 2000. Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide. Washington D.C. EPA 833-R-00-002.

⁴⁰ County of Riverside, 2009. Riverside County Municipal Copermittees 2008-09 Annual Storm Water Program Report, Section 11.

DRAFT

receiving water bodies have been designated as impaired by the San Diego Water Board in 2009 pursuant to CWA section 303(d).

Discussion of Finding C.7. This finding identifies the major receiving water bodies in the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit that are listed as impaired on the CWA section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters (303(d) List). The 2006 303(d) List has been approved by the San Diego Water Board, State Water Board, and USEPA.⁴¹ The 2008 303(d) List was approved by the San Diego Water Board on December 18, 2009 and is awaiting State Water Board and USEPA approval.⁴² The 303(d) list identifies waters that do not meet water quality standards after applying certain required technology-based effluent limits (“impaired” water bodies). As part of this listing process, states are required to prioritize waters/watersheds for future development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). The listed 303(d) pollutant(s) of concern do not necessarily reflect impairment of the entire corresponding major surface water bodies. The specific impaired portions of each water body are listed in the 2006 and 2008 303(d) Lists.

Since 2002, the number of water bodies and water body – pollutant combinations included on the 303(d) List, located in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region, has increased. A comparison of the 2002, 2006, and 2008 303(d) listings are summarized in the following table.

⁴¹ The approved 2006 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments is on-line at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists2006.html

⁴² The 2008 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments, approved by the San Diego Water Board, is available on-line at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/water_issues/programs/303d_list/index.shtml

DRAFT

Comparison of Riverside County 303(d) Listings

Watershed ¹	2002 303(d) List		2006 303(d) List		2008 303(d) List ²	
	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants
De Luz Creek HSA (902.21)	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	De Luz Creek	Iron Manganese	De Luz Creek	Iron Manganese Nitrogen Sulfates
Gavilan HSA (902.22)	Sandia Creek	TDS	Sandia Creek	Iron Manganese Nitrogen Sulfates TDS	Sandia Creek	Iron Sulfates TDS
	Santa Margarita River (Upper)	Phosphorus	Santa Margarita River (Upper)	Phosphorus	Santa Margarita River (Upper)	Phosphorus Toxicity
Murrieta HSA (902.32)	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	Long Canyon Creek	TDS	Long Canyon Creek	Chlorpyrifos E. Coli Fecal Coliform Iron Manganese
French HSA (902.33)	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	Warm Springs Creek	Chlorpyrifos E. Coli Fecal Coliform Iron Manganese Phosphorus Total Nitrogen as N

DRAFT

Comparison of Riverside County 303(d) Listings (Cont'd)

Watershed ¹	2002 303(d) List		2006 303(d) List		2008 303(d) List ²	
	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants	Listed Water Body	Impairing Pollutants
Gertrudis HSA (902.42)	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	Santa Gertrudis Creek	Chlorpyrifos Copper E. Coli Fecal Coliform Iron Phosphorus
Pauba HSA (902.51)	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	Temecula Creek	TDS Phosphorus Nitrogen	Temecula Creek	Chlorpyrifos Copper Phosphorus TDS Toxicity
	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	NO LISTINGS	NOT APPLICABLE	Redhawk Channel	Chlorpyrifos Copper Diazinon E. Coli Fecal Coliform Iron Manganese Nitrogen Phosphorus TDS
Wolf HSA (902.52)	Murrieta Creek	Phosphorus	Murrieta Creek	Phosphorus	Murrieta Creek	Chlorpyrifos Copper Iron Manganese Nitrogen Phosphorus Toxicity

Notes:

1. Hydrologic subarea (HSA) within the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit (HU), located in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Basin.
2. Water bodies and pollutants on the 2008 303(d) List was approved by the San Diego Water Board on December 18, 2009, and is awaiting final approval by the State Water Board and USEPA.

DRAFT

Finding C.8. Trash is a persistent pollutant which can enter receiving waters from the MS4, accumulate and be transported downstream into receiving waters over time. Trash poses a serious threat to the beneficial uses of the receiving waters, including, but not limited to, human health, rare and endangered species, navigation and human recreation.

Discussion of Finding C.8. The Copermittees to date have documented high volumes of trash coming from the MS4 system and in receiving waters.⁴³

The Basin Plan specifies the following narrative Water Quality Objective (WQO) for Floating Material:

“Waters shall not contain floating material, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum in concentrations which cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.”

The Basin Plan specifies the following narrative WQO for Suspended and Settleable Solids: Material:

“Waters shall not contain suspended and settleable solids in concentrations of solids that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.”

Additionally, high density urban areas in Southern California have been shown to be responsible for up to 60 percent of the trash that enters receiving waters from the MS4.⁴⁴ The retrofitting of existing MS4 systems, such as catch basins, in targeted high trash areas can result in significant reductions in the amount of trash entering receiving waters from the MS4.

Trash, as litter in both solid and liquid form, is consistently found on and adjacent to roadways. A California Department of Transportation Litter Management Pilot Study found that of roadway trash, plastics and Styrofoam accounted for 33 percent of trash by weight, and 43 percent by volume. Further, the study found that approximately 80 percent of the litter associated with roadways was floatable, indicating that, without capture, this litter would enter Waters of the State after a storm event, resulting in the impairment of Beneficial Uses.⁴⁵ The study, however, relied upon a mesh capture size of 0.25 inches (6.35 millimeters). This size is too large to effectively capture plastic pre-production pellets (a.k.a. “nurdles”), which are roughly 3 mm in size, and likely underestimated the total contribution of plastics. Furthermore, pre-production plastic pellets, which are small enough to be easily digested, have been found to carry

⁴³ Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Santa Margarita Watershed Annual Report

⁴⁴ The City of Los Angeles Meets Trash TMDLs Compliance with CB Inserts and Opening Covers. August 06, 2008.

⁴⁵ California Department of Transportation District 7 Litter Management Pilot Study. June 26, 2000.

DRAFT

persistent organic pollutants, including PCBs and DDT.⁴⁶

Finding C.9. The Copermittees' water quality monitoring data submitted to date documents persistent violations of Basin Plan water quality objectives for various runoff-related pollutants (indicator bacteria, dissolved solids, turbidity, metals, pesticides, etc.) at various watershed monitoring stations. Persistent toxicity has also been observed at some watershed monitoring stations. In addition, bioassessment data indicate that the majority of the monitored receiving waters have Poor to Very Poor IBI ratings. In sum, the above findings indicate that runoff discharges are causing or contributing to water quality impairments, and are a leading cause of such impairments in Riverside County.

Discussion of Finding C.9. The Copermittees have produced data that demonstrates water quality objectives are frequently not met during dry and wet weather. The 2009 Report of Waste Discharge and the 2008-2009 Annual Reports document that receiving water monitoring stations often fail to meet water quality objectives established in the Basin Plan.

Water quality in receiving waters downstream of MS4 discharges fail to meet California Toxics Rule standards⁴⁷ and Basin Plan objectives. Data submitted in the MS4 Annual Reports indicate that at various times chemical, bacteria, pesticide, and metal concentrations may exceed water quality objectives in receiving waters in both wet and dry weather conditions.

There are no other significant NPDES permitted discharges to the creeks. For instance, there are no live-stream discharges of treated waste water in the Riverside County area of the Santa Margarita watershed. The few NPDES permits in the watershed are mainly for recycled water which only discharges occasionally during the rainy season. Because the water quality monitoring indicates exceedances of water quality standards and MS4 discharges are the main source of pollutants in the watersheds, it can be inferred that the MS4 discharges are causing or contributing to water quality impairments, and are a leading cause of such impairments in Riverside County.

Finding C.10. When natural vegetated pervious ground cover is converted to impervious surfaces such as paved highways, streets, rooftops, and parking lots, the natural absorption and infiltration abilities of the land are lost. Therefore, runoff leaving a developed area is significantly greater in runoff volume, velocity, and peak flow rate than pre-development runoff from the same area. Runoff durations can also increase as a result of flood control and other efforts to control peak flow rates. Increased volume, velocity, rate, and duration of runoff greatly accelerate the erosion of

⁴⁶ Rios, L.M., Moore, C. and Patrick R. Jones. 2007. Persistent organic pollutants carried by synthetic polymers in the ocean environment. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*. Vol. 54.

⁴⁷ The California Toxics Rule criteria promulgated by the USEPA are directly applicable water quality standards for certain priority toxic pollutants in inland surface waters and enclosed bays and estuaries in California.

DRAFT

downstream natural channels. Significant declines in the biological integrity and physical habitat of streams and other receiving waters have been found to occur with as little as a 3-5 percent conversion from natural to impervious surfaces. The increased runoff characteristics from new development must be controlled to protect against increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

Finding C.11. Development creates new pollution sources as human population density increases and brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, municipal sewage, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, trash, etc. which can either be washed or directly dumped into the MS4. As a result, the runoff leaving the developed area is significantly greater in pollutant load than the pre-development runoff from the same area. These increased pollutant loads must be controlled to protect downstream receiving water quality.

Discussion of Findings C.10 and C.11. The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) 1999 Report, "*Stormwater Strategies, Community Responses to Runoff Pollution*" identifies two main causes of the storm water pollution problem in developed areas. Both causes are directly related to development:

1. Increased volume and velocity of surface runoff. There are three types of human-made impervious covers that increase the volume and velocity of runoff: (i) rooftop, (ii) transportation imperviousness, and (iii) non-porous (impervious) surfaces. As these impervious surfaces increase, infiltration will decrease, forcing more water to run off the surface, picking up speed and pollutants.
2. The concentration of pollutants in the runoff. Certain industrial, commercial, residential and construction activities are large contributors of pollutant concentrations in storm water runoff. As human population density increases, it brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, municipal sewage, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, trash, etc.

As a result of these two causes, runoff leaving developed areas is significantly greater in volume, velocity, and pollutant load than pre-development runoff from the same area.

By accommodating the traditional approach to storm water management, development has also altered the flow regime (rate, magnitude, frequency, timing, and flashiness of runoff) that supports aquatic and riparian habitats. These hydrologic changes are driven by the loss of water storage capacity in the watersheds,⁴⁸ and exacerbated by

⁴⁸ Konrad, Christopher P. and Derek K. Booth, 2005. *Hydrologic Changes in Urban Streams and Their Ecological Significance*. American Fisheries Society Symposium Vol.47 pp.157-177.

DRAFT

physical alterations of the stream channel network.⁴⁹ This relationship between development and stream channel integrity has been documented nationally and in southern California. The Copermittees support these findings in their 1993 DAMP,⁵⁰ which states:

“Many storm water runoff problems are primarily a consequence of urbanization. Water that previously soaked into the ground, removing pollutants by filtering through soil, and eventually replenishing groundwater supplies, now must flow overland and therefore enters local streams more rapidly. The rapid transport of water increases the erosion of stream banks and hillsides and does not permit filtering pollutants. Sediment carried by storm water runoff can build up in streambeds, harming fish and aquatic habitat. The sediment acts as a transport mechanism for pollutants which adhere to soil particles. Typical urban runoff pollutants found in surface waters include heavy metals, nutrients, petroleum products, sediment, bacteria, chemicals, and litter.”

Hydrologic changes from development also directly and indirectly adversely affect wetlands. Natural wetlands support many beneficial uses and provide important water-quality related ecological services, including pollutant removal, flood attenuation, and groundwater recharge.⁵¹ The Center for Watershed Protection recently provided USEPA with a synthesis of more than 100 scientific studies on the direct and indirect impacts of development, particularly urbanization, on wetlands and the role wetlands play in watershed quality. The report found that the three changes from land development with the most potential to impact wetlands include: Increased storm water runoff; decreased groundwater recharge; and flow constriction.⁵² Each of these changes can often be avoided or minimized by implementing low impact development (LID) and hydromodification BMPs.

When Order No. R9-2004-001 was adopted, studies had shown that the level of imperviousness in an area strongly correlates with the quality of nearby receiving waters.⁵³ One comprehensive study, which looked at numerous areas, variables, and methods, revealed that stream degradation occurs at levels of imperviousness as low as 10 – 20 percent.⁵⁴ Stream degradation is a decline in the biological integrity and physical habitat conditions that are necessary to support natural biological diversity. For instance, few urban streams can support diverse benthic communities with imperviousness greater than or equal to 25 percent.⁵⁵ To provide some perspective, a

⁴⁹ Poff, N.L. et al. 1997. The Natural Flow Regime: A paradigm for river conservation and restoration. *Bioscience* Vol. 47, No. 11, pp.769-784.

⁵⁰ Riverside County Copermittees. 1993. Santa Margarita Regional Drainage Area Management Plan.

⁵¹ Wright, Tiffany, et al. 2006. “Direct and Indirect Impacts of Urbanization on Wetland Quality.” Prepared by the Center for Watershed Protection. Available at: <http://www.cwp.org>. 81p.

⁵² *Ibid* p.26

⁵³ USEPA, 1999. Part II. 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. Federal Register.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*.


DRAFT

medium density, single-family home area can be from 25 percent to 60 percent impervious (variation due to street and parking design).⁵⁶

More recently, a report on the effects of impervious in southern California streams found that local ephemeral and intermittent streams are more sensitive to such effects than streams in other parts of the country. This study, by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Program, estimated a threshold of response at a two to three percent change in percent of impervious cover in a watershed.⁵⁷ This threshold is lower than the previously reported estimates by the USEPA that were cited in the Fact Sheet for Order No. R9-2004-001.

To demonstrate the principle of increased volume and velocity of runoff from urbanization, the figure below shows the flow rate of an urban vs. a natural stream. What the figure demonstrates is that urban stream flows have greater peaks and volumes, as well as shorter retention times than natural stream flows. The greater peak flows and volumes result in stream degradation through increased erosion of stream banks and damage to aquatic habitat. The shorter retention times result in less time for sediments and other pollutants to settle before being carried out to the ocean. This sediment, and the associated pollutants it carries, can be a significant cause of water quality degradation.

Flow Rate of Urban and Natural Streams⁵⁸



⁵⁶ Schueler, T.R., 1994. The Importance of Imperviousness. Watershed Protection Techniques. As cited in 64 FR 68725.

⁵⁷ Coleman, Derrick, et al. 2005. *Effect of Increases in Peak Flows and Imperviousness on the Morphology of Southern California Streams*. Technical Report No. 450 of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

⁵⁸ Adapted from Schueler, T.R., 1987. *Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

DRAFT

Increased volume and velocity of runoff adversely impacts receiving waters and their beneficial uses in many ways. According to the Urban Runoff TAC report,⁵⁹ increases in population density and imperviousness result in changes to stream hydrology including:

1. Increased peak discharges compared to pre-development levels;
2. Increased volume of storm water runoff with each storm compared to pre-development levels;
3. Decreased travel time to reach receiving water; increased frequency and severity of floods;
4. Reduced stream flow during prolonged periods of dry weather due to reduced levels of infiltration;
5. Increased runoff velocity during storms due to a combination of effects of higher discharge peaks, rapid time of concentration, and smoother hydraulic surfaces from channelization; and
6. Decreased infiltration and diminished ground water recharge.

Even though the rainfall depths in arid watersheds are lower, watershed development can greatly increase peak discharge rates during rare flood events.⁶⁰ A study conducted in arid watersheds around Riverside, CA showed that, over two decades, impervious cover increased from 9 percent to 22 percent, which resulted in an increase of more than 100 percent in the peak flow rate for the two-year storm event. The study also showed that the average annual storm water runoff volume had increased by 115 percent to 130 percent over the same time span.⁶¹

Flooding caused by the increased volume and velocity of runoff from urbanization in the upper Santa Margarita watershed are clear examples of the effects described above. Disastrous flooding has occurred more frequently in recent years. In the last century, flood events occurred in 1938, 1969, 1980, 1993, 1995, and 1998.⁶² In the 1993 flood event, the Cities of Murrieta and Temecula sustained \$12 million dollars in damage, and Camp Pendleton sustained \$88 million in damage. Future flooding is expected to occur more frequently because of continued urban development within the watershed, and flood damages are expected to continue accruing at an estimated annual rate of \$1,780,300.

Prior hydromodification studies in California have shown that the increase in impervious cover, and thus change in runoff volume, velocity, rate, and duration, results in a shift in the range of storms that produce geomorphically significant flows within receiving waters (see above discussion). Additionally, studies in California have determined that ninety percent of the geomorphic "work" done within channels

⁵⁹ State Water Board, 1994. Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations. Nonpoint Source Management Program.

⁶⁰ Schueler and Holland, 2000. Storm Water Strategies for Arid and Semi-Arid Watersheds (Article 66). The Practice of Watershed Protection. P. 695-706.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2000. Final EIS/EIR, Murrieta Creek Flood Control Project.

DRAFT

receiving flows from developed areas now occurs from flows below the 10 year peak flow event.⁶³

This increased volume, velocity, rate, and duration of runoff greatly accelerates the erosion of the beds and banks within downstream receiving waters. Additionally, storm water flows which runoff directly from impervious surfaces into the MS4 and thus receiving waters prevent the associated runoff of natural sediments which would occur in pre-project conditions. This combined alteration of the physical condition of storm water runoff results in accelerated downstream erosion of receiving water bed and banks. The excessive erosion of stream beds and banks releases pollutants found in soils into receiving waters, degrades macroinvertebrate habitat (see D.2.c), eliminates spawning habitat, reduces associated wetland and riparian habitat, and threatens existing infrastructure adjacent to receiving waters. Bank sloughing within creeks and streams increases the pollutant loading to those receiving waters, particularly for turbidity and phosphorous.⁶⁴ In arid environments, accelerated channel erosion has been shown to have synergistic impacts within watersheds. Increased channel erosion within Las Vegas wash has resulted in the loss of over 1,000 acres of wetland and riparian habitat, released additional pollutants into downstream receiving waters, and eliminated in-stream habitat and water quality conditions required for existing threatened and endangered species.⁶⁵

Regarding the impact of development on storm water runoff pollutant loads, the San Diego Water Board's Basin Plan states:

Nonpoint source pollution is primarily the result of man's uses of land such as urbanization, roads and highways, vehicles, agriculture, construction, industry, mineral extraction, physical habitat alteration (dredging/filling), hydromodification (diversion, impoundment, channelization), silviculture (logging), and other activities which disturb land.⁶⁶ As a result, when rain falls on and drains through urban freeways, industries, construction sites, and neighborhoods it picks up a multitude of pollutants. The pollutants can be dissolved in the runoff and quickly transported by gravity flow through a vast network of concrete channels and underground pipes referred to as storm water conveyance systems. Such systems ultimately discharge the polluted runoff, without treatment, into the nation's creeks, rivers, estuaries, bays, and oceans.⁶⁷

According to the Center for Watershed Protection, urbanization strongly shapes the quality of both surface and ground water in arid and semi-arid regions of the

⁶³ Santa Clara Valley Hydromodification Management Plan. April 21, 2005.

⁶⁴ Sekely, A.C., Mulla, D.J. and D.W. Bauer. 2002. Streambank slumping and its contribution to the phosphorus and suspended sediment loads of the Blue Earth River, Minnesota. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. September 2002 vol. 57 no. 5 243-250.

⁶⁵ Tuttle, P.L. and E.L. Orsak. 2002. Las Vegas Wash Water Quality and Implications to Fish and Wildlife. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

⁶⁶ San Diego Water Board, 1994. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. P. 4-66.

⁶⁷ Ibid. P. 4-69 - 4-70.

DRAFT

southwest. Since rain events are so rare, pollutants have more time to build up on impervious surfaces compared to humid regions. Therefore, the pollutant concentrations of storm water runoff from arid watersheds tend to be higher than that of humid watersheds.⁶⁸ The effect of antecedent rainfall events is demonstrated in a report from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) that found the concept of a seasonal first flush is applicable to the southern California climate.⁶⁹

Finding C.12. Development and urbanization especially threaten environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs), such as water bodies designated as supporting a RARE beneficial use (supporting rare, threatened or endangered species) and CWA 303(d)-impaired water bodies. Such areas have a much lower capacity to withstand pollutant loads than other, more sensitive areas. In essence, development that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may become significant in a particularly sensitive environment. Therefore, additional controls to reduce storm water pollutants from new and existing development may be necessary for areas adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA.

Discussion of Finding C.12. ESAs are defined in the Order as “Areas that include but are not limited to all CWA section 303(d) impaired water bodies; areas designated as Areas of Special Biological Significance by the Basin Plan; water bodies designated with the RARE beneficial use by the Basin Plan; areas designated as preserves or their equivalent under the Natural Communities Conservation Program within the Cities and County of Riverside; and any other equivalent environmentally sensitive areas which have been identified by the Copermitttees.”

Areas that meet this definition are inherently sensitive habitats containing unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species, or are not achieving their designated beneficial uses. As discussed above, runoff is known to contain a wide range of pollutants and has demonstrated toxicity to plants and animals. Therefore, it is necessary to apply additional storm water controls for developments within, adjacent to, or directly discharging to ESAs. This need for additional storm water controls is addressed within each component of the Order. USEPA supports the requirement for additional storm water controls, stating “For construction sites that discharge to receiving waters that do not support their designated use or other waters of special concern, additional construction site controls are probably warranted and should be strongly considered.”⁷⁰ Further support for requiring additional controls to reduce pollutants in storm water

⁶⁸ Schueler and Holland, 2000. Storm Water Strategies for Arid and Semi-Arid Watersheds (Article 66). The Practice of Watershed Protection. P. 695-706.

⁶⁹ Stenstrom, Michael and Masoud Kayhanian, 2005. *First Flush Phenomenon Characterization*. Prepared for Caltrans. Report No. CTSW-RT-05-73-02.6 Study jointly performed by UCLA and UCD. Most of the data presented was collected from three highly urbanized highway sites in west Los Angeles. Much effort went into developing a quantitative way of defining the mass first flush. Other aspects include: variability of water quality during storm events, litter characteristics, correlation among constituents, first flush of organics and particle size distribution, new methods for measuring oil and grease, and grab and composite sampling strategies. The report is available on-line at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/stormwater/special/newsetup/>

⁷⁰ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. Washington D.C. EPA/833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

discharges to ESAs can be found in *Mitigation of Storm Water Impacts From New Developments in Environmentally Sensitive Areas*, a technical report written by the Los Angeles Water Board.⁷¹

Finding C.13. Although dependent on several factors, the risks typically associated with properly managed infiltration of runoff (especially from residential land use areas) are not significant. The risks associated with infiltration can be managed by many techniques, including (1) designing landscape drainage features that promote infiltration of runoff, but do not “inject” runoff (injection bypasses the natural processes of filtering and transformation that occur in the soil); (2) taking reasonable steps to prevent the illegal disposal of wastes; (3) protecting footings and foundations; (4) ensuring that each drainage feature is adequately maintained in perpetuity; and (5) pretreatment.

Discussion of Finding C.13. Infiltration is an effective means for managing runoff. However, measures must be taken to protect groundwater quality when infiltration of runoff is implemented. USEPA supports runoff infiltration and provides guidance for protection of groundwater: “With a reasonable degree of site-specific design considerations to compensate for soil characteristics, infiltration may be very effective in controlling both urban runoff quality and quantity problems. This strategy encourages infiltration of urban runoff to replace the natural infiltration capacity lost through urbanization and to use the natural filtering and sorption capacity of soils to remove pollutants; however, the potential for some types of urban runoff to contaminate groundwater through infiltration requires some restrictions.”⁷² The restrictions placed on runoff infiltration in this Order are based on recommendations provided by the USEPA Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory. The State Water Board found in Order WQ 2000-11 on the appeal of the Los Angeles Water Board’s Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements that the guidance provided in the above referenced document by the USEPA Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory is sufficient for the protection of groundwater quality from runoff infiltration. To further protect groundwater quality, the Order also includes guidance from the Los Angeles Water Board,⁷³ the State of Washington,⁷⁴ and the State of Maryland.⁷⁵ Subsequently, the California Storm Water Quality Association (CASQA) has produced technical guidance for post-construction treatment BMPs to protect ground water quality⁷⁶.

⁷¹ Los Angeles Water Board, 2001. *Mitigation of Storm Water Impacts From New Developments In Environmentally Sensitive Areas*.

⁷² USEPA, 1994. *Potential Groundwater Contamination from Intentional and Nonintentional Stormwater Infiltration*. EPA 600 SR-94 051.

⁷³ Los Angeles Water Board, 2000. *Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County*.

⁷⁴ Washington State Department of Ecology, 1999. *Draft Stormwater Management in Washington State. Volume V – Runoff Treatment BMPs*. Pub. No. 99-15.

⁷⁵ Maryland Department of the Environment, 1999. *2000 Maryland Stormwater Design Manual. Volume I*.

⁷⁶ CASQA. *The New Development and Redevelopment Handbook*, 2003. Available on-line at <http://www.cabmphandbooks.org/Development.asp>

DRAFT

Finding C.14. Non-storm water (dry weather) discharge from the MS4 is not considered a storm water (wet weather) discharge and therefore is not subject to regulation under the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) standard from CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(iii), which is explicitly for “Municipal ... *Stormwater Discharges* (emphasis added)” from the MS4. Rather, non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers, per CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), are to be effectively prohibited. Such dry weather non-storm water discharges have been shown to contribute significant levels of pollutants and flow in arid, developed Southern California watersheds and are to be effectively prohibited under the CWA.

Discussion of Finding C.14.

Permitting Framework

The CWA prohibits the discharge of any pollutant from a point source into waters of the United States unless the discharger of the pollutant(s) obtains a NPDES permit pursuant to CWA section 402. The discharge of storm water and/or non-storm water from an MS4 system is considered a discharge from a point source. As discussed below, however, the CWA regulates storm water and non-storm water discharges under different standards.

In 1987 the CWA was amended to include provisions that specifically concerned NPDES permitting requirements for storm water discharges from MS4 systems. Section 402(p) of the CWA regulates the discharge of storm water from a point source, the municipal separate storm sewers. Such discharges of storm water are subject to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) storm water standard and the related iterative process. The MEP standard for storm water discharges reflects Congress’ recognition that the variability of flow and intensity of storm events render difficult strict compliance with water quality standards by MS4s. However, this standard was not considered applicable to non-storm water discharges, which under 402(p) are required to be effectively prohibited from entering the MS4. Clearly, if non-storm water discharges must be effectively prohibited from entering the MS4, the very next requirement (402(p)(3)(B)(iii)) requiring discharges from the MS4 be reduced to the MEP intends that the discharge of pollutants be limited to storm water. Unless exempt or authorized under a separate NPDES permit, non-storm water discharges are not authorized to enter the MS4 in the first instance and are considered to be illicit discharges.

The Federal Register further clarifies that such discharges through an MS4 are not authorized under the CWA (55 Federal Register (FR) 47995):

“Today’s rule defines the term “illicit discharge” to describe any discharge through a municipal separate storm sewer system that is not composed entirely of storm water and that is not covered by an NPDES permit. Such illicit discharges are not authorized under the Clean Water Act. Section 402(p)(3)(B) requires that permits for discharges from municipal separate storm sewers require the municipality to “effectively prohibit” non-storm water discharges from

DRAFT

the municipal separate storm sewer...Ultimately, such non-storm water discharges through a municipal separate storm sewer must either be removed from the system or become subject to an NPDES permit.”

The federal regulations (40 CFR 122.26(d)(vi)(2)(B)) require that the municipal separate storm sewer discharger prohibit “through ordinance, order or similar means, illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer.” As owners and operators of the MS4, Copermittees cannot passively receive discharges from third parties (Federal Register 68766) and thus are responsible for the discharge of any non-storm water from their MS4.

The State Water Board’s recent precedential order (Order WQ 2009-0008) affirming a Los Angeles County MS4 permit modification, consistent with USEPA’s prior interpretations, recognizes that “[n]either the Clean Water Act nor the federal storm water regulations define ‘non-storm water.’ ‘Illicit discharge’ is defined as any discharge to an MS4 ‘not composed entirely of storm water.’ Thus, ‘illicit discharge’ is the most nearly applicable definition of ‘non-storm water’ found in federal law and is often used interchangeably with that term.”⁷⁷

Storm Water and Non-storm Water Definitions

By definition non-storm water is not precipitation related. 40 CFR 122.26(b)(13) states that: “Storm water means storm water runoff, snowmelt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.” While “surface runoff and drainage” is not defined in federal law, it is related to precipitation events such as rain and/or snowmelt (see 55 FR 47995-96). The term “surface runoff and drainage” does not include all incidental flows in the MS4 system, but consists of flows relating to precipitation events as clarified by the Federal Register, USEPA’s documents and permitting, and other Regional Water Board Orders.

The Federal Register (55 FR 47995-47996) provides clarification on the distinction between storm water and non-storm water discharges, including their regulation:

“In response to the comments which requested EPA to define the term storm water broadly to include a number of classes of discharges **which are not in any way related to precipitation events, EPA believes that this rulemaking is not an appropriate forum for addressing the appropriate regulation of such non-storm water discharges**, even though some classes of non-storm water discharges may typically contain only minimal amounts of pollutants. Congress did not intend that the term storm water be used to describe any discharge that has a de minimis amount of pollutants, not did it intend for section 402(p) to be used to provide a moratorium from permitting other non-storm water discharges.”

⁷⁷ State Water Board Order WQ-2009-0008 (*In the Matter of the Petition of County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District*, adopted August 4, 2009), p. 4.

DRAFT

As recently recognized by the State Water Board in a precedential decision upholding an MS4 permit modification adopted by the Los Angeles Water Board, “U.S. EPA has previously rejected the notion that ‘storm water,’ as defined at 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(b)(13), includes dry weather flows. In U.S. EPA’s preamble to the storm water regulations, U.S. EPA rejected an attempt to define storm water to include categories of discharges ‘not in any way related to precipitation events.’⁷⁸ Thus, USEPA has made it clear that it deems discharges unrelated to precipitation events to be non-storm water discharges. 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B) itself provides specific examples of non-storm water discharges:

“...the following category of non-storm water discharges or flows shall only be addressed where such discharges are identified by the municipality as sources of pollutants to the United States: water line flushing, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, rising ground waters, uncontaminated groundwater infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20) to separate storm sewers, uncontaminated pumped groundwater,...”

USEPA also removed street wash waters from the definition of storm water, as USEPA specifically identified this discharge as being non-storm water (55 FR page 47996). Additionally, section 1.2.2.2 of USEPA’s Multi-Sector General Permit for Industrial Activities (MSGP-2000) considers fire hydrant flushings, irrigation drainage, landscape watering, and foundation or footing drains to be non-storm water discharges. USEPA’s September 1999 Storm Water Management Fact Sheet for Non-Storm Water Discharges to Storm Sewers states that non-storm water discharges can include discharges of process water, air conditioning condensate, non-contact cooling water, vehicle wash water, or sanitary wastes.

While these types of non-storm water discharges (or illicit discharges) may be regulated under storm water permits because as a practical matter they can enter and be discharged from the MS4 systems, they are not regulated as storm water discharges under the CWA because they are unrelated to precipitation events. As indicated above, the State Water Board’s recent discussion of this issue supports the conclusion that non-storm water discharges are unrelated to precipitation events. In its Order affirming amendments to the Los Angeles County MS4 permit to implement a TMDL to control bacteria in dry weather flows, the State Water Board rejected petitioners County of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District implied assertion that the definition of “storm water” contained in the federal regulations (defined as “surface run-off and drainage”) includes the run-off and drainage from non-storm events. The State Water Board notes that the challenged permit provisions do not apply to storm water flows in that they apply only during dry weather conditions as defined in the permit. In upholding the challenged order, the State Water Board notes that the Los Angeles Water Board’s permit language followed

⁷⁸ State Water Board Order WQ-2009-0008 (*In the Matter of the Petition of County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District*, adopted August 4, 2009), p. 7.

DRAFT

USEPA's approach, referring to USEPA's rejection of attempts to define storm water to include categories of discharges "not in any way related to precipitation events."⁷⁹

Lastly, the San Diego Water Board and State Water Board have issued multiple, separate NPDES permits for non-storm water discharges, including, but not limited to, San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2008-0002 (extracted groundwater), San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2002-0020 (hydrostatic discharge), and State Water Board Order No. 2006-0008-DWQ (utility vaults), pursuant to section 402 of the CWA.

Permitting Non-storm Water Discharges

Non-storm water discharges may contain pollutants which result from various activities that occur within areas draining into the MS4. This includes, but is not limited to, illicit discharges and connections, exempted categories of discharge not a source of pollutants (40 CFR 122.26(d)), and discharges into the MS4 covered under a separate NPDES permit. As such, existing and proposed discharges of non-storm water from MS4s:

- a) Result from similar activities through the MS4 system;
- b) Are the same type of water;
- c) Require similar action levels for the protection of the Beneficial Uses of the receiving waters;
- d) Require similar monitoring;
- e) Are under the passive control of the owner and operator of the MS4 system; and
- f) Are more appropriately regulated under a general permit than individual permits.

The U.S. EPA's approach (and the San Diego Water Board's under its approved program) for non-storm water discharges from MS4s is to regulate these discharges under the existing 402 NPDES framework (FR 47995 and 48037 see below) for discharges to surface waters. The NPDES program (40 CFR 122.44(d)) utilizes discharge prohibitions and effluent limitations as regulatory mechanisms to regulate non-storm water discharges, including the use of technology and water quality-based effluent limitations. Non-numerical effluent limitations, such as BMPs for non-storm water discharges may only be authorized where numerical effluent limits are infeasible or where the practices are reasonably necessary to achieve effluent limitations and standards or to carry out the purposes and intent of the CWA (40 CFR 122.44(k) see below).

⁷⁹ State Water Board Order WQ-2009-0008 (*In the Matter of the Petition of County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District*, adopted August 4, 2009), p. 7 (quoting 55 FR 47990, 47995).

DRAFT

The Federal Register (55, page 48037) provides clarification that non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are to be regulated under section 402, not 402(p):

“Conveyances which continue to accept other “non-storm water” discharges (e.g. discharges without an NPDES permit) with the exceptions noted above (*exempted discharges that are not a source of pollutants*) do not meet the definition of municipal separate storm sewer and are not subject to 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA unless such discharges are issued separate NPDES permits. Instead, conveyances which continue to accept non-storm water discharges which have not been issued separate NPDES permits are subject to sections 301 and 402 of the CWA.”

This regulatory approach is consistent with the approach recently upheld by the State Water Board in a precedential order adopted on August 4, 2009. In this Order, the State Water Board rejected a challenge to amendments to the Los Angeles County MS4 permit that require compliance with receiving water limitations and discharge prohibitions for dry weather, non-storm water discharges. Petitioners there argued that the receiving water limits and discharge prohibitions for dry weather dischargers were inappropriate and that the Los Angeles Water Board should instead have regulated the discharges with the maximum extent practicable standard, through an iterative process. The State Water Board concludes that dry weather discharges, as defined in the permit and in the underlying TMDL, “are more appropriately regarded as non-storm water discharges, which the Clean Water Act requires to be effectively prohibited.”⁸⁰

As stated above, for NPDES permits under 402 of the CWA, the Code of Federal Regulations (122.44(k)) clarify that a discharger may utilize BMPs to control or abate the discharge of pollutants when:

- “(1) Authorized under section 304(e) of the CWA for the control of toxic pollutants and hazardous substances from ancillary industrial activities;
- (2) Authorized under section 402(p) of the CWA for the control of storm water discharges;
- (3) Numeric limits are infeasible; or
- (4) The practices are reasonably necessary to achieve effluent limitations and standards or to carry out the purposes and intent of the CWA.”

For the last 20 years, Riverside County NPDES permits for discharges of storm water have regulated non-storm water discharges from the MS4. These permits required Copermitees (dischargers) to prohibit non-storm water discharges into (thus through and from) their MS4 systems, implement a program to prevent illicit discharges, and monitor to identify illicit discharges and exempted discharges that are a source of pollution. These measures are considered Best Management Practices (BMPs), are

⁸⁰ State Water Board Order WQ-2009-0008 (*In the Matter of the Petition of County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District*, adopted August 4, 2009), p. 8

DRAFT

required to be included in NPDES permits issued under section 402(p) of the CWA, and are considered by USEPA to be an interim approach to permitting non-storm water discharges from the MS4 in accordance with section 402 of the CWA and CFR 122.44(k).

As explained in the discussion of Finding C.15., below, the Copermittees' reliance on BMPs for the past 20 years has not resulted in compliance with applicable water quality standards. The San Diego Water Board has evaluated (in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)) past and existing controls (BMPs), non-storm water monitoring results, the sensitivity of the species in receiving waters (e.g. endangered species), and the potential for effluent dilution, and has determined that existing BMPs to control pollutants in storm water discharges are not sufficient to protect water quality standards in receiving waters and the existing requirement that Copermittees effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 historically results in the discharge of pollutants to the receiving waters. Thus, numeric action levels for non-storm water, dry weather, discharges from the MS4 and required actions following observed exceedances of numeric action levels have been established. For further discussion regarding the development of action levels please see Finding E.10 and discussion.

Dry weather action levels are applicable to non-storm water discharges of effluent from the MS4 system. Non-storm water effluent discharges from the MS4 are those which occur during dry weather conditions. These action levels are not applied to storm water discharges, as defined within the Order. Storm water discharges regulated by the Order are required to meet the MEP standard and related iterative process and have separate action levels.

Dry weather action levels are applicable to non-storm water discharges from the MS4 system into receiving waters. Non-storm water discharges are already required to be prohibited unless specifically exempted or covered under a separate NPDES permit. Dry weather action levels apply to non-storm water discharges of effluent from a point source into receiving waters. The MS4 is not a receiving water. Should a discharger wish to discharge a non-exempt category to the MS4 system, such discharges require a separate NPDES permit pursuant to sections 402 and 301 of the CWA. It is also infeasible to monitor and sample every discharge into the MS4, as such discharges are diffuse by nature and may vary spatially and temporally.

Finding C.15. Non-storm water discharges to the MS4 granted an influent exception [i.e. which are exempt from the effective prohibition requirement set forth in CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii)] under 40 CFR 122. 26 are included within this Order. Any exempted discharges identified by Copermittees as a source of pollutants are subsequently required to be *addressed* (emphasis added) as illicit discharges through prohibition and incorporation into existing IC/ID programs. Furthermore, the USEPA contemplates that permitting agencies such as the San Diego Water Board may also identify exempted discharges as a source of pollutants required to be addressed as illicit

DRAFT

discharges (See Vol. 55 FR 48037). The San Diego Water Board and the Copermittees have identified landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn water, previously exempted discharges, as a source of pollutants and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the U.S.

Discussion of Finding C.15. The FR (Vol. 55, page 48037) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B) clarify that certain components and categories of non-storm water discharges into the MS4 are not required to be prohibited. The Code of Federal Regulations requires the discharger have:

“...a program, including inspections, to implement through ordinance, orders or similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system; this program shall address all types of illicit discharges, however, the following category of non-storm water discharges or flows shall only be addressed where such discharges are identified by the municipality as sources of pollutants to waters of the United States: water line flushing, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, rising ground waters, uncontaminated groundwater infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20) to separate storm sewers, uncontaminated pumped groundwater,...”

The categories of non-storm water discharges into the MS4, as listed under 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B), are not required to be prohibited unless identified by the Copermittees as sources of pollutants to waters of the United States. The FR (Vol. 55, page 48037), however, goes on to clarify that:

“However, the Director may include permit conditions that either require municipalities to prohibit or otherwise control any of these types of discharge where appropriate.”

Thus, the Copermittees or the San Diego Water Board may identify any of these categories of non-storm water discharges as a source of pollutants. As such, the identification of any of these categories as a source of pollutants requires them to be addressed as illicit discharges, which are not authorized under the CWA, and are required to be “effectively prohibited” as illicit discharges via ordinance, order or similar means. The prohibition of previously exempted discharges of non-storm water to waters of the United States from entering, and necessarily being discharged from an MS4, conforms with CWA requirements for standards and enforcement for effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards (33 U.S.C. 1311(b)(1)(C)).

To date the San Diego Water Board and the Copermittees have identified overspray and drainage from potable and reclaimed water landscape irrigation as a substantial source and conveyance mechanism for pollutants into waters of the United States. Several municipalities throughout the San Diego Region (e.g., cities and counties of Orange County and San Diego County) have reported and/or identified runoff originating from landscape irrigation as potential sources of dry weather flows conveying pollutants into

DRAFT

their MS4s. This is also supported by legislation (Assembly Bill 1881) recently enacted by the State of California, which has identified runoff resulting from over irrigation not only as a waste of water resources, but also as a source of pollutants to the state's waterways.

Irrigation runoff into the MS4, as identified by the San Diego Water Board and the Copermitees, is a source of pollutants to waters of the United States, and is required to be *addressed* (emphasis added) as an illicit discharge per 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1) by prohibition through implementing and enforcing an ordinance, order or similar means. The San Diego Water Board and the Copermitees have identified irrigation water as a source of pollutants and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the United States, when applied improperly in excess and thereafter entering the MS4, in the following documents:

- The Cities and County of Riverside "Only Rain in the Storm Drain" Pollution Prevention Program identifies runoff from irrigation as a source of pollutants to waters of the United States in the following documents:

1) The Landscape and Garden public education brochure states:

"Soil, yard wastes, over-watering [emphasis added] and garden chemicals become part of the urban runoff mix that winds it way through streets, gutters and storm drains before entering lakes, rivers, streams, etc."

2) In a survey distributed at public outreach events,⁸¹ the answer to the question about where lawn irrigation water goes states:

"Water that leaves your lawn from irrigation...can pick up motor oil and grease from vehicles, excess fertilizer from your lawn, bacteria from pet waste, and excess pesticides from your yard. These pollutants can be carried down streets and storm drains directly to our streams, lakes and rivers without treatment!"

- In 2006, the State Water Board allocated Grant funding to the **SmartTimer/Edgescape Evaluation Program (SEEP)**. The project targets irrigation runoff by retrofitting existing development and documenting the conservation and runoff improvements. The Grant Application states that:

"Irrigation runoff contributes flow & pollutant loads to creeks and beaches that are 303(d) listed for bacteria indicators."

⁸¹ A copy of the survey was provided in the Riverside County Copermitees' Report of Waste Discharge, dated January 15, 2009, page 39.

DRAFT

Furthermore, the grant application states:

“Regional program managers agree that the reduction and/or elimination of irrigation-related urban flows and associated pollutant loads may be key to successful attainment of water quality and beneficial use goals as outlined in the San Diego Basin Plan and Bacteria TMDL over the long term.”

This is reinforced in the project descriptions and objectives:

“Elevated dry-weather storm drain flows, composed primarily ... of landscape irrigation water wasted as runoff, carry pollutants that impair recreational use and aquatic habitats all along Southern California’s urbanized coastline. Storm drain systems carry the wasted water, along with landscape derived pollutants such as bacteria, nutrients and pesticides, to local creeks and the ocean. Given the local Mediterranean climate, excessive perennial dry season stream flows are an unnatural hydrologic pattern, causing species shifts in local riparian communities and warm, unseasonal contaminated freshwater plumes in the near-shore marine environment”.

The basis of this grant project is that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants. In addition, they indicate that this alteration of natural flows is impacting the Beneficial Uses of Waters of the State and U.S. The results of this study can be applied broadly to any area where over-irrigation takes place, including Riverside County. Preliminary results from the study indicate that that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants.

- Several municipalities in the San Diego Region have identified runoff from irrigation as a source of pollutants to waters of the United States in the following documents:
 - 1) The **Watershed Action Plan Annual Report(s)** for the 2006-2007 reporting period was submitted by the County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District and Copermittees within the San Juan Creek, Laguna Coastal Streams, Aliso Creek, and Dana Point Coastal Streams Watersheds. San Juan Creek, Laguna Coastal Streams, Aliso Creek and Dana Point Coastal Streams are all currently 303(d) listed as impaired for Indicator Bacteria within their watersheds and/or in the Pacific Ocean at the discharge points of their watersheds. The Orange County Copermittees, within their Watershed Action Strategy Table for Fecal Indicator Bacteria:

DRAFT

“Support programs to reduce or eliminate the discharge of anthropogenic dry weather nuisance flow throughout the [...] watershed. Dry weather flow is the transport medium for bacteria and other 303(d) constituents of concern”. Additionally, they state that “conditions in the MS4 contribute to high seasonal bacteria propagation in-pipe during warm weather. Landscape irrigation is a major contributor to dry weather flow, both as surface runoff due to over-irrigation and overspray onto pavements; and as subsurface seepage that finds its way into the MS4.”

- 2) The **Carlsbad Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Report** was submitted by the Carlsbad Watershed Copermittees (Cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, Escondido, Oceanside, San Marcos, Solana Beach, and Vista, and the County of San Diego). In the WUMRP Annual Report, the Carlsbad Watershed Copermittees stated the following:

“The Carlsbad Watershed Management Area (WMA) collective watershed strategy identifies bacteria, sediment, and nutrients as high priority water quality pollutants in the Agua Hedionda (904.3 – bacteria and sediment), Buena Vista (904.2 – bacteria), and San Marcos Creek (904.5 – nutrients) Hydrologic Areas. Bacteria, sediment, and nutrients have been identified as potential discharges from over-irrigation.”

- 3) The **San Diego Bay Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) 2007-2008 Annual Report** was submitted by the San Diego Bay Watershed Copermittees (Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, and San Diego, the County of San Diego, the Port of San Diego, and the San Diego County Airport Authority). In Appendix D of the WUMRP Annual Report, titled Likely Sources of Pollutants, the San Diego Bay Watershed Copermittees identified over-irrigation of lawns as a pollutant generating activity from business and/or residential land uses for bacteria, pesticides, and sediment.

Within the reports above, municipalities throughout San Diego and Orange counties have acknowledged that runoff from over-irrigation is a potential or likely source of several types of pollutants to waters of the United States. Because there are landscaped areas in Riverside County that receive irrigation similar to San Diego and Orange counties, runoff from over-irrigation is also a likely source of pollutants to waters of the United States in Riverside County.

- There is statewide recognition of the pollution caused by over-irrigation, and current legislation already requires cities and counties to prohibit over-irrigation. On September 28, 2006 Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger approved Assembly Bill 1881, The Water Conservation in Landscaping Act (AB 1881, Laird). The

DRAFT

act requires cities, counties, and charter cities and charter counties, to adopt landscape water conservation ordinances by January 1, 2010. Additionally, the law required the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to prepare a Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for use by local agencies. The Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on September 10, 2009. All local agencies were required to adopt a water efficient landscape ordinance by January 1, 2010. Local agencies could adopt the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance developed by DWR, or an ordinance considered at least as effective as the Model Ordinance. The Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance includes a requirement that local agencies prohibit runoff from irrigation (§ 493.2):

“(a) Local agencies shall prevent water waste resulting from inefficient landscape irrigation by prohibiting runoff [emphasis added] from leaving the target landscape due to low head drainage, overspray, or other similar conditions where water flows onto adjacent property, non-irrigated areas, walks, roadways, parking lots, or structures. Penalties for violation of these prohibitions shall be established locally.”

- On October 08, 2009, the State of California Department of Water Resources issued a letter to all cities and counties within the State of California giving reminder of required adoption of the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The letter states that:

“Other benefits include reduced irrigation runoff, reduced pollution of waterways, drought resistance, and less green waste.”

- On December 18, 2009, the San Diego Water Board adopted Order No. R9-2009-0002, the fourth-term Orange County permit, which found that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants. Landscape irrigation, irrigation water, and lawn watering were categories removed from the list of non-storm water discharges not prohibited to be discharged into the MS4.

DRAFT

D. Runoff Management Programs

Finding D.1.a. This Order specifies requirements necessary for the Copermitees to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the MEP. However, since MEP is a dynamic performance standard, which evolves over time as runoff management knowledge increases, the Copermitees' runoff management programs must continually be assessed and modified to incorporate improved programs, control measures, best management practices (BMPs), etc. in order to achieve the evolving MEP standard. Absent evidence to the contrary, this continual assessment, revision, and improvement of runoff management program implementation is expected to ultimately achieve compliance with water quality standards in the Region.

Discussion of Finding D.1.a. Under CWA section 402(p), municipalities are required to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants from their MS4s to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MEP is the critical technology-based performance standard that municipalities must attain. The MEP standard is an ever-evolving, flexible, and advancing concept, which considers technical and economic feasibility. As knowledge about controlling storm water runoff continues to evolve, so does that which constitutes MEP. Reducing the discharge of storm water pollutants to the MEP requires Copermitees to assess each program component and revise activities, control measures, best management practices (BMPs), and measurable goals, as necessary to meet MEP.

To achieve the MEP standard, municipalities must employ whatever BMPs are technically feasible (i.e. are likely to be effective) and are not cost prohibitive. The major emphasis is on technical feasibility. Reducing storm water pollutants to the MEP means choosing effective BMPs, and rejecting applicable BMPs only where other effective BMPs will serve the same purpose, or the BMPs would not be technically feasible, or the cost would be prohibitive. In selecting BMPs to achieve the MEP standard, the following factors may be useful to consider:

1. Effectiveness: Will the BMPs address a pollutant (or pollutant source) of concern?
2. Regulatory Compliance: Is the BMP in compliance with storm water regulations as well as other environmental regulations?
3. Public Acceptance: Does the BMP have public support?
4. Cost: Will the cost of implementing the BMP have a reasonable relationship to the pollution control benefits to be achieved?
5. Technical Feasibility: Is the BMP technically feasible considering soils, geography, water resources, etc?

If a municipality reviews a lengthy menu of BMPs and chooses to select only a few of the least expensive BMPs, it is likely that MEP has not been met. On the other hand, if a municipal discharger employs all applicable BMPs except those where it can show

DRAFT

that they are not technically feasible in the locality, or whose cost is prohibitive, it would have met the standard. Where a choice may be made between two BMPs that should provide generally comparable effectiveness, the discharger may choose the least expensive alternative and exclude the more expensive BMP. However, it would not be acceptable either to reject all BMPs that would address a pollutant source, or to pick a BMP based solely on cost, which would be clearly less effective. In selecting BMPs the municipality must make a serious attempt to comply and practical solutions may not be easily dismissed. In any case, the burden is on the municipal discharger to comply with its permit. After selecting BMPs, it is the responsibility of the discharger to ensure that all BMPs are implemented.⁸²

A definition of MEP is not provided in either the federal statute or in the federal regulations. The final determination regarding whether a municipality has reduced storm water pollutants to the MEP can only be made by the San Diego Water Board or the State Water Board, and not by the municipal discharger. While the San Diego Water Board or the State Water Board ultimately define MEP, it is the responsibility of the Copermittees to initially propose actions that implement BMPs to reduce storm water pollution to the MEP. In other words, the Copermittees' runoff management programs to be developed under the Order are the Copermittees' proposals of MEP. Their total collective and individual activities conducted pursuant to their runoff management programs become their proposal for MEP as it applies both to their overall effort, as well as to specific activities. The Order provides a minimum framework to guide the Copermittees in meeting the MEP standard for storm water.

It is the San Diego Water Board's responsibility to evaluate the proposed programs and specific BMPs to determine what constitutes MEP, using the above guidance and the court's 1994 decision in NRDC v. California Department of Transportation, Federal District Court, Central District of California. The federal court stated that a Copermittee must evaluate and implement BMPs except where (1) other effective BMPs will achieve greater or substantially similar pollution control benefits; (2) the BMP is not technically feasible; or (3) the cost of BMP implementation greatly outweighs the pollution control benefits. In the absence of a proposal acceptable to the San Diego Water Board, the San Diego Water Board will define MEP by requiring implementation of additional measures by the Copermittees.

The Copermittees' continual evolution in meeting the MEP standard is expected to achieve compliance with water quality standards. USEPA has consistently supported this expectation. In its Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) in Storm Water Permits, USEPA states "the interim permitting approach uses best management practices (BMPs) in first-round storm water permits, and expanded or better-tailored BMPs in subsequent permits, where necessary, to provide for attainment of water quality standards."⁸³ USEPA reiterated its position in 1999, when it stated regarding the Phase II municipal storm water regulations that

⁸² State Water Board, 1993. Memo Entitled Definition of Maximum Extent Practicable.

⁸³ Federal Register / Vol. 61, No. 166 / August 26, 1996 / P. 43761.

DRAFT

“successive iterations of the mix of BMPs and measurable goals will be driven by the objective of assuring maintenance of water quality standards” and “EPA anticipates that a permit for a regulated small MS4 operator implementing BMPs to satisfy the six minimum control measures will be sufficiently stringent to protect water quality, including water quality standards [...]”⁸⁴

The requirements of the Order are expected to achieve compliance with receiving water quality standards. The approach to be used is the continual assessment, revision, and improvement of Copermittee best management practice implementation. This approach is consistent with the CWA and State Water Board guidance. In *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (1999, 197 F. 3d 1035), the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit states: “Under 33 U.S.C. section 1342 (p)(3)(B)(iii), the EPA’s choice to include either management practices or numeric limitations in the permits was within its discretion.” In addition, the approach is consistent with State Water Board Order WQ 99-05, which outlines an iterative approach for achieving compliance with water quality standards.

Finding D.1.b. The Copermittees have generally been implementing the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Programs (JRMPS) required pursuant to Order No. R9-2004-001 since July 14, 2005. Prior to that, the Copermittees were regulated by Order No. 98-02 since May 13, 1998. MS4 discharges, however, continue to cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards as evidenced by the Copermittees’ monitoring results.⁸⁵

Discussion of Finding D.1.b. In response to Order No. R9-2004-001, the Copermittees have developed their runoff management programs. In order to implement the plans, the Copermittees have, among other things, developed BMP requirements, improved inter- and intra-governmental coordination, improved training programs, improved illicit discharge detection procedures, and improved their monitoring efforts. Although the programmatic improvements have led to better implementation of BMPs, the Copermittees’ monitoring data demonstrate that additional or revised BMPs are necessary to prevent discharges from MS4s from causing and contributing to violations of water quality standards. A discussion of data collected by the Copermittees is included in the discussion for Finding C.9.

Finding D.1.c. This Order contains new or modified requirements that are necessary to improve Copermittees’ efforts to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the MEP and achieve water quality standards. Some of the new or modified requirements, such as the revised Watershed Water Quality Workplan (Watershed Workplan) section, are designed to specifically address these high priority water quality problems. Other requirements, such as for unpaved roads, are a result of San Diego Water Board’s identification of water quality problems through investigations

⁸⁴ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68753-68754.

⁸⁵ County of Riverside, 2009. Riverside County Municipal Copermittees 2008-09 Annual Storm Water Program Report, Section 11..

DRAFT

and complaints during the previous permit period. Other new or modified requirements address program deficiencies that have been noted during audits, report reviews, and other San Diego Water Board compliance assessment activities. Additional changes in the monitoring program provide consistency with the Code of Federal Regulations, USEPA guidance, State Water Board guidance, and the Southern California Monitoring Coalition recommendations.

Discussion of Finding D.1.c. The Copermittees are required to update and expand their runoff management programs on jurisdictional and watershed levels in order to improve their efforts to reduce the contribution of storm water pollutants in runoff to the MEP and meet water quality standards. Changes to Order No. R9-2004-001's requirements have been made to help ensure these two standards are achieved by the Copermittees.

The Orders' jurisdictional requirements have changed based on findings by the San Diego Water Board during typical compliance assurance activities, audits, or receipt of complaints.⁸⁶ Where the audits found common implementation problems, requirements have been altered to better ensure compliance. In addition, the San Diego Water Board conducted reviews of the jurisdictional annual reports submitted by the Copermittees. Updates to the requirements for the Copermittees' programs are also based in part on information found in the Copermittees' ROWD,⁸⁷ requirements that were included in the San Diego and Orange County MS4 permits, and discussions with the Riverside County Copermittees.

To better focus on attainment of water quality standards, the Order's jurisdictional and watershed requirements have been improved. The conditions of the receiving waters now drive management actions, which in turn focus diminishing resources on the highest priority water quality problems within the receiving waters in the watershed. Improvements to jurisdictional and watershed requirements were also made to facilitate a mutually clear understanding of the requirements between the San Diego Water Board and Copermittees.

During the previous permit period, the San Diego Water Board identified, through investigations and complaints, sediment discharges from unpaved roads as a significant source of water quality problems in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region. Enforcement and inspection activities conducted by the San Diego Water Board during the previous permit term have found a lack of source control for many unpaved roads within the jurisdiction of the Copermittees. Unpaved roads are a source of sediment that can be discharged in runoff to receiving waters, especially during storm events. Erosion of unpaved roadways occurs when soil particles are loosened and carried away from the roadway base, ditch, or road bank by water, wind,

⁸⁶ Audit reports, report reviews, and inspection reports are available for review at the San Diego Water Board office.

⁸⁷ All significant changes made to the Order's requirements are described and explained in detail in Fact Sheet section IX.

DRAFT

traffic, or other transport means. Exposed soils, high runoff velocities and volumes, sandy or silty soil types, and poor compaction increase the potential for erosion.

Road construction, culvert installation, and other 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 public works activities along unpaved roads have the potential to significantly affect sediment discharge and transport within streams and other waterways, which can degrade the beneficial uses of those waterways.

USEPA also recognizes that discharges from unpaved roads are a threat to water quality. USEPA guidance⁸⁸ emphasizes the threat of unpaved roads to water quality:

“Dirt and gravel roads are a major potential source of these pollutants [sediment] and pollutants that bind to sediment such as oils, nutrients, pesticides, herbicides, and other toxic substances]. Many roads have unstable surfaces and bases. Roads act like dams, concentrating flows that accelerate erosion of road materials and roadsides. Both unstable surfaces and accelerated erosion then lead to sediment and dust.”

There are several guidance documents, developed by the USEPA,⁸⁹ the US Forest Service,⁹⁰ the University of California,⁹¹ and others, that include design and construction specifications and BMPs that are readily available for implementation by private and public entities. Implementing design and other source control BMPs for unpaved roads in the region is necessary to reduce and minimize the impacts of sediment discharged during storm events from unpaved roads to the MS4s and receiving waters.

Finding D.1.d. Updated individual Drainage Area Management Plans (individual DAMPs) and Watershed Stormwater Management Plans (watershed SWMPs), which describe the Copermittees’ runoff management programs in their entirety, are needed to guide the Copermittees’ runoff management efforts and aid the Copermittees in tracking runoff management program implementation. Hereinafter, the individual DAMP is referred to as the JRMPs and the Watershed SWMP is referred to as the Watershed Workplan. It is practicable for the Copermittees to update the JRMPs and Watershed Workplans within the timeframe specified in this Order, since significant efforts to develop these programs have already occurred.

⁸⁸ USEPA 2006 “Environmentally Sensitive Maintenance for Dirt and Gravel Roads.” Gesford and Anderson, USEPA-PA-2005.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ US Forest Service, 1996. Forest Service Specifications for Construction of Roads & Bridges. EM-7720-100. Revised August 1996.

⁹¹ University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2007. Rural Roads: A Construction and Maintenance Guide of California Landowners. Publication 8262.

DRAFT

Discussion of Finding D.1.d. Development of runoff management plans is a crucial runoff management measure and should be considered a BMP. The plans help organize and focus the Copermittees' programs and guide their implementation. In its statewide assessment report to USEPA Region IX and the State Water Board, Tetra Tech, Inc. concluded that the lack of a master storm water planning document must be considered a serious program deficiency⁹². When submitted to the San Diego Water Board, the plans provide useful correspondence between the Copermittees and the San Diego Water Board. The Plans also become available for review by the public, and thus facilitate public participation in runoff management decisions. Finally, while development and submittal of runoff management plans are not necessary to ensure compliance of the Copermittees' runoff management programs with the Order, the San Diego Water Board is provided with a means to track Copermittee implementation.

The focus of the Order is on development and implementation of storm water programs which meet MEP, rather than creation of Copermittee plans which exhibit MEP. While the Order does not rely upon the plans to ensure MEP and other standards are achieved, the plans still serve a useful purpose. As stated above, the plans serve to organize the Copermittees' efforts to address runoff. As a practical matter, any program of the size required by the Order should be documented in writing. This serves to guide implementation of the program by the numerous individuals responsible for program implementation.

Runoff management plans are not necessary for ensuring compliance with the Order because the Order itself contains sufficient detailed requirements to ensure that compliance with discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, and the narrative standard of MEP for storm water are achieved. Implementation by the Copermittees of programs in compliance with the Order's requirements, prohibitions, and receiving water limitations is the pertinent compliance standard to be used under the Order, as opposed to assessing compliance by reviewing the Copermittees' implementation of their plans alone. The San Diego Water Board ensures compliance with the Order by reviewing annual reports, conducting inspections, performing audits, and through other general program oversight.

Runoff management plans are particularly important and useful for municipalities when program implementation is spread across several departments and/or when municipalities experience staff turnover.⁹³ Each Copermittee relies on multiple employees or contractors for program implementation, but the spread of responsibility varies among Copermittees.⁹⁴ Written jurisdictional plans ensure appropriate coordination within each municipality.

⁹² Tetra Tech, Inc. 2006. *Assessment Report on Tetra Tech's Support of California's MS4 Stormwater Program*. Produced for USEPA Region IX and the California State and Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

⁹³ Tetra Tech, Inc. 2005. *Program Evaluation Report*. Orange County Storm Water Program: Cities of Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills, Lake Forest, and Rancho Santa Margarita.

⁹⁴ Responsible departments and employees are described in the 2005-06 Annual Reports for the MS4 programs.

DRAFT

Copermittees' runoff management plans are simply descriptions of their runoff management programs required under the Order. These plans serve as procedural correspondence which guides program implementation and aids the Copermittees and San Diego Water Board in tracking implementation of the programs. In this manner, the plans are not functional equivalents of the Order. For these reasons, the Copermittees' runoff management plans need not be an enforceable part of the Order.

The Copermittees' plans and programs can be updated on or before June 30, 2012 because much of their plans and programs are already in existence. In fact, many parts of their plans and programs have been in place for 15 years. Moreover, the adoption of Order No. R9-2004-001 required a larger scale reorganization of the Copermittees' programs than Order No. R9-2010-0016, but also only allowed one year for program updates. The Copermittees were generally able to meet the time schedule required under Order No. R9-2004-001. After discussions with the Copermittees, based on the timing of the adoption of the Order and the Copermittee's fiscal planning cycles, in conjunction with consideration for the current economic conditions, the San Diego Water Board agreed that additional time to update the Copermittees' plans and programs may be warranted. Thus, the Copermittees must update their plans and programs on or before June 30, 2012, which provides the Copermittees over 18 months, instead of 1 year, to update their plans and programs.

Finding D.1.e. Pollutants can be effectively reduced in storm water runoff by the application of a combination of pollution prevention, source control, and treatment control BMPs. Pollution prevention is the reduction or elimination of pollutant generation at its source and is the best "first line of defense". Source control BMPs (both structural and non-structural) minimize the contact between pollutants and flows (e.g., rerouting run-on around pollutant sources or keeping pollutants on-site and out of receiving waters). Treatment control BMPs remove pollutants that have been mobilized by wet-weather or dry-weather flows.

Discussion of Finding D.1.e. The State Water Board finds in its Order WQ 98-01 that BMPs are effective in reducing pollutants in storm water runoff, stating that "implementation of BMPs [is] generally the most appropriate form of effluent limitations when designed to satisfy technology requirements, including reduction of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable." A State Water Board TAC further supports this finding by recommending "that nonpoint source pollution control can be accomplished most effectively by giving priority to [BMPs] in the following order:

1. Pollution Prevention – implementation of practices that use or promote pollution free alternatives;
2. Source Control – implementation of control measures that focus on preventing or minimizing urban runoff from contacting pollution sources;

DRAFT

3. Treatment Control – implementation of practices that require treatment of polluted runoff either onsite or offsite.⁹⁵

Pollution prevention, the reduction or elimination of pollutant generation at its source, is an essential aspect of BMP implementation. Fewer pollutants are available to be washed from developed areas when the generation of pollutants by activities is limited. Thus, pollutant loads in storm water discharges are reduced from these areas. In addition, there is no need to control or treat pollutants that are never generated. Furthermore, pollution prevention BMPs are generally more cost effective than removal of pollutants by treatment facilities or cleanup of contaminated media.^{96,97}

In the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Congress established a national policy that emphasizes pollution prevention over control and treatment. CWC section 13263.3(a) also supports pollution prevention, stating “The Legislature finds and declares that pollution prevention should be the first step in a hierarchy for reducing pollution and managing wastes, and to achieve environmental stewardship for society. The Legislature also finds and declares that pollution prevention is necessary to support the federal goal of zero discharge of pollutants into navigable waters.” Finally, the Basin Plan also supports this finding by stating “To eliminate pollutants in storm water, one can either clean it up by removing pollutants or prevent it from becoming polluted in the first place. Because of the overwhelming volume of storm water and the enormous costs associated with pollutant removal, pollution prevention is the only approach that makes sense.”⁹⁸

USEPA also supports the utilization of a combination of BMPs to address pollutants in runoff. For example, USEPA has found there has been success in addressing illicit discharge related problems through BMP initiatives like storm drain stenciling and recycling programs, including household hazardous waste special collection days.⁹⁹ Structural BMP performance data has also been compiled and summarized by USEPA.¹⁰⁰

The summary provides the performance ranges of various types of structural BMPs for removing suspended solids, nutrients, pathogens, and metals from storm water flows. These pollutants are generally a concern in storm water in the San Diego Region and

⁹⁵ State Water Board, 1994. Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations. Nonpoint Source Management Program.

⁹⁶ Deviny, J.S. et al. 2004. *Alternative Approaches to Stormwater Quality Control*. Prepared for the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Found as Appendix H to *NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey*. Prepared for the California State Water Resources Control Board by the Office of Water Programs California State University, Sacramento. Available on-line at: <http://www.owp.csus.edu/research/npdes/>

⁹⁷ Schueler, T.R., 2000. Center for Watershed Protection. Assessing the Potential for Urban Watershed Restoration, Article 142.

⁹⁸ San Diego Water Board, 1994. Water Quality Control Plan, San Diego Basin, Region 9.

⁹⁹ USEPA, 1999. 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. 64 FR 68728.

¹⁰⁰ USEPA, 1999. Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Storm Water Best Management Practices. EPA 821-R-99-012.

DRAFT

Riverside County. For suspended solids, the least effective structural BMP type was found to remove 30-65 percent of the pollutant load, while the most effective was found to remove 65-100 percent of the pollutant load. For nutrients, the least effective structural BMP type was found to remove 15-45 percent of the pollutant load, while the most effective was found to remove 65-100 percent of the pollutant load. For pathogens, the least effective structural BMP type was found to remove <30 percent of the pollutant load, while the most effective was found to remove 65-100 percent of the pollutant load. For metals, the least effective structural BMP type was found to remove 15-45 percent of the pollutant load, while the most effective was found to remove 65-100 percent of the pollutant load.

It is important to note that the CWA and NPDES federal regulations clearly require control of discharges into the MS4. CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) states that MS4 permits must "prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers." 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) requires Copermitees to "detect and remove [...] illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer." See Finding C.14 and Discussion.

The Order's approach to regulating discharges into and from the MS4 is in accordance with State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15. In that order, the State Water Board reviewed the San Diego County permit (Order No. 2001-01) requirements and made one change to one prohibition.¹⁰¹ The Order upheld all other requirements of the current permit. Order No. R9-2010-0016 incorporates the one change made by the State Water Board, and continues the approach of Order No. 2001-01 (the basis for the current permit), as it was upheld by the State Water Board in Order WQ 2001-15. State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15 supports such requirements, stating: "It is important to emphasize that dischargers into MS4s continue to be required to implement a full range of BMPs, including source control."

The Court of Appeals, Fourth Appellate District, found that the current permit's approach to regulation of discharges into the MS4 was appropriate. Since the Order utilizes the same approach, the court decision supports the Order's requirements.

Finding D.1.f. Runoff needs to be addressed during the three major phases of urban development (planning, construction, and use) in order to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants to the MEP, effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges and protect receiving waters. Development which is not guided by water quality planning policies and principles can unnecessarily result in increased pollutant load discharges, flow rates, and flow durations which can negatively impact receiving water beneficial uses. Construction sites without adequate BMP implementation result in sediment runoff rates which greatly exceed natural erosion rates of undisturbed lands, causing

¹⁰¹ The State Water Board removed the prohibition of discharges *into* the MS4 that cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives. The revision allows for treatment of storm water flows once the pollutants have entered the MS4. It does not affect the effective prohibition on certain dry-weather flows into the MS4 that is required by the Clean Water Act.

DRAFT

siltation and impairment of receiving waters. Existing development generates substantial pollutant loads which are discharged in runoff to receiving waters.

Discussion of Finding D.1.f. MS4 permits are issued to municipalities because of their land use authority. The ultimate responsibility for the pollutant discharges, increased runoff, and inevitable long-term water quality degradation that results from development lies with local governments. This responsibility is based on the fact that it is the local governments that have authorized the development (i.e. conversion of natural pervious ground cover to impervious surfaces) and the land uses that generate the pollutants and runoff. Furthermore, the MS4 through which the pollutants and increased flows are conveyed, and ultimately discharged into natural receiving waters, are owned and operated by the same local governments. In summary, the Copermittees under the Order are responsible for discharges into and out of their MS4s because (1) they own and operate the MS4; and (2) they have the legal authority that authorizes the very development and land uses with generate the pollutants and increased flows in the first place.

For example, since grading cannot commence prior to the issuance of a local grading permit, the Copermittees have a built-in mechanism to ensure that all grading activities are protective of receiving water quality. The Copermittee has the authority to withhold issuance of the grading permit until the project proponent has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Copermittee that the project will not violate their ordinances or cause the Copermittee to be in violation of its MS4 permit. Since the Copermittee will ultimately be held responsible for any discharges from the grading project by the San Diego Water Board, the Copermittee will want to use its own permitting authority to ensure that whatever measures the Copermittee deems necessary to protect discharges into its MS4 are in fact taken by the project proponent.

The Order holds the local government accountable for this direct link between its land use decisions and water quality degradation. The Order recognizes that each of the three major stages in the development process (development planning, construction, and the use or operational stage) are controlled by and must be authorized by the local government. Accordingly, this permit requires the local government to implement, or require others to implement, appropriate best management practices to reduce storm water pollutant discharges and increased flow during each of the three stages of development.

Including plans for BMP implementation during the design phase of new development and redevelopment offers the most cost effective strategy to reduce storm water runoff pollutant loads to surface waters.¹⁰² The Phase II regulations for small municipalities reflect the necessity of addressing runoff during the early planning phase. Due to the greater water quality concerns generally experienced by larger municipalities, Phase II requirements for small municipalities are also applicable to larger municipalities such as

¹⁰² USEPA, 2000. Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide. EPA 833-R-00-002.

DRAFT

the Copermittees. The Phase II regulations direct municipalities to develop, implement, and enforce a program to address storm water runoff from new development and redevelopment projects that disturb greater than or equal to one acre, including projects less than one acre that are part of a larger common plan of development or sale. The program must ensure that controls are in place that would prevent or minimize water quality impacts. This includes developing and implementing strategies which include a combination of structural and/or non-structural BMPs appropriate to the locality. The program must also ensure the adequate long-term operation and maintenance of BMPs.¹⁰³ USEPA expands on the Phase II regulations for urban development when it recommends that Copermittees:

“Adopt a planning process that identifies the municipality’s program goals (e.g., minimize water quality impacts resulting from post-construction runoff from new development and redevelopment), implementation strategies (e.g., adopt a combination of structural and/or non-structural BMPs), operation and maintenance policies and procedures, and enforcement procedures. In developing your program, you should consider assessing existing ordinances, policies, programs and studies that address storm water runoff quality.”

Management of storm water runoff during the construction phase is also essential. USEPA explains in the preamble to the Phase II regulations that storm water discharges generated during construction activities can cause an array of physical, chemical, and biological water quality impacts. Specifically, the biological, chemical and physical integrity of the waters may become severely compromised due to runoff from construction sites. Fine sediment from construction sites can adversely affect aquatic ecosystems by reducing light penetration, impeding sight-feeding, smothering benthic organisms, abrading gills and other sensitive structures, reducing habitat by clogging interstitial spaces within the streambed, and reducing intergravel dissolved oxygen by reducing the permeability of the bed material. Water quality impairment also results, in part, because a number of pollutants are preferentially absorbed onto mineral or organic particles found in fine sediment. The interconnected process of erosion (detachment of the soil particles), sediment transport, and delivery is the primary pathway for introducing key pollutants, such as nutrients, metals, and organic compounds into aquatic systems.¹⁰⁴

Finally, storm water and non-storm water runoff from existing development must be addressed. The Copermittees’ monitoring data exhibits that significant water quality problems exist in receiving waters which receive runoff from areas with extensive existing development, such as Aliso Creek. Source identification, BMP requirements, inspections, and enforcement are all important measures which can be implemented to address runoff from existing development. USEPA supports inspections and enforcement by municipalities when it states “Effective inspection and enforcement

¹⁰³ USEPA, 1999. 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. 64 FR 68845.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 64 FR 68728.

DRAFT

requires [...] penalties to deter infractions and intervention by the municipal authority to correct violations. Enforcement mechanisms [...] also must be described.”¹⁰⁵

Finding D.1.g. Annual reporting requirements included in this Order are necessary to meet federal requirements and to evaluate the effectiveness and compliance of the Copermittees’ programs.

Discussion of Finding D.1.g. The annual reporting requirements are consistent with federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.41, which states:

“The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system of a municipal separate storm sewer system that has been designated by the Director under section 122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such a system. The report shall include: (1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions; (2) Proposed changes to the storm water management program that are established as permit condition, Such proposed changes shall be consistent with § 122.26(d)(2)iii) of this part; (3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit application under § 122.26(d)(2)iv) and (d)(2)v) of this part; (4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year; (5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report; (6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs; and (7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation.”

CWC section 13267 provides that “the regional board may require that any person who has discharged [...] shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring reports which the regional board requires.”

The San Diego Water Board must assess the reports to ensure that the Copermittees’ programs are adequate to assess and address water quality. The reporting requirements can also be useful tools for the Copermittees to review, update, or revise their programs. Areas or issues which have received insufficient efforts can also be identified and improved.

Finding D.1.h. This Order establishes Storm Water Action Levels (SALs) for selected pollutants based on USEPA Rain Zone 6 (arid southwest) Phase I MS4 monitoring data for pollutants in storm water. The SALs were computed as the 90th percentile of the data set, utilizing the statistical based population approach, one of three approaches recommended by the State Water Board’s Storm Water Panel in its report, ‘The Feasibility of Numerical Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water

¹⁰⁵ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities (June 2006). SALs are identified in section D of this Order. Copermittees must implement a timely, comprehensive, cost-effective storm water pollution control program to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water from the permitted areas so as not to exceed the SALs. Exceedance of SALs may indicate inadequacy of programmatic measures and BMPs required in this Order.

Discussion of Finding D.1.h. Section 402(p) of the CWA states MS4 permits for storm water 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. This includes requiring numeric effluent limitations for storm water.

SALs are not numeric effluent limitations, which is reflected in language which clarifies an excursion above a SAL does not create a presumption that MEP is not being met. Instead, a SAL exceedance is to be used by the Copermittee as an indication that the MS4 storm water discharge point is a definitive "bad actor," and the result from the monitoring needs to be considered as part of the iterative process for reducing pollutants in storm water to the MEP.

The CWA defines effluent limitations as:

"Any restriction imposed by the Director on quantities, discharge rates, and concentrations of pollutants which are "discharged" from "point sources" into "waters of the United States"..." A SAL is not a restriction on a quantity, rate or concentration, but is a level at which actions that further reduce pollutants from that discharge point need to be evaluated in order to reduce storm water pollutants to the MEP. Thus, SALs are not effluent limitations as defined by the CWC or CWA.

The approach of using "action levels" is consistent with recommendations made by USEPA in their Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits, dated August 26, 1996:

"Under the Clean Water Act (CWA) and NPDES regulations, permitting authorities may employ a variety of conditions and limitations in storm water permits, including best management practices, performance objectives, narrative conditions, monitoring triggers, action levels (e.g., monitoring benchmarks, toxicity reduction evaluation action levels), etc., as the necessary water-quality based limitations, where numeric water quality based effluent limitations are determined to be unnecessary or infeasible". As such, these action levels are not considered numeric water quality-based effluent limitations.

DRAFT

It should be noted that a purpose of monitoring, required under this and previous Orders, is to aid in the evaluation of implemented programs and BMPs in reducing pollutants in storm water discharges to the MEP. The Monitoring and Reporting Program states:

This Receiving Waters Monitoring and Reporting Program is intended to meet the following goals:

2. Measure and improve the effectiveness of the Copermittees' runoff management programs;
3. Assess the chemical, physical, and biological impacts to receiving waters resulting from MS4 discharges;
4. Characterize storm water discharges;
5. Identify sources of specific pollutants;
6. Prioritize drainage and sub-drainage areas that need management actions; and
9. Provide information to implement required BMP improvements.

Since the first permit (adopted 20 years ago), Copermittees have utilized non-numerical limitations (BMPs) to control and abate the discharge of any pollutants in storm water discharges to the MEP. Copermittees have been accorded 20 years to research, develop, and deploy BMPs that are capable of reducing storm water discharges from the MS4 to levels represented in SALs. Storm Water Action Levels are set at such a level that any exceedance of a SAL will clearly indicate BMPs being implemented are insufficient to protect the Beneficial Uses of waters of the State. Copermittee shall utilize the exceedance information as a high priority consideration when adjusting and executing annual work plans, as required by this Permit. Failure to appropriately consider and react to SAL exceedances in an iterative manner creates a presumption that the Copermittee(s) have not complied to the MEP.

SALs have been developed utilizing Phase I storm water effluent data (updated February 2008, <http://rpitt.eng.ua.edu/Research/ms4/mainms4.shtml>) from the arid west region (USEPA Rain Zone 6). USEPA Rainfall Zone 6, which includes MS4 effluent data from Orange, San Diego, Los Angeles, Ventura and San Bernadino County. The approach taken to derive SALs is a straightforward percentile approach, with the SAL being set as the 90th percentile of the dataset for each constituent. This approach is consistent with the 2006 State Water Board Panel Report:

"The statistically based population approach would once again rely on the average distribution of measured water quality values developed from many water quality samples taken for many events at many locations. In this case, however, the Action Level would be defined by the central tendency and variance estimates from the population data. For example, the Action Level could be set as two standard deviations above the mean, i.e. if measured concentrations are consistently higher than two standard deviations above the mean, an Action Level would be triggered. Other population based measures

DRAFT

of central tendency could be used (i.e. geometric mean, median, etc.) or estimates of variance (i.e. prediction intervals, etc.). Regardless of which population based estimators are used (or percentile from above), the idea would be to identify the [statistically derived] point at which managers feel concentrations are significantly beyond the norm."

SALs are measurable criteria which quantify the performance of BMPs for a particular watershed or subwatershed that discharges storm water MS4 effluent from that particular discharge point. Thus, Copermittees can utilize SAL results to determine the effectiveness BMPs on the effluent from a particular area of the MS4.

SALs represent the lowest 10 percent of pollutant reduction for USEPA Rain Zone 6 MS4 Phase I programs discharging to waters of the United States. For the past 20 years, Copermittees have utilized non-numerical limitations (BMPs) to control and abate the discharge of any pollutants in storm water discharges to the MEP. Copermittees have been accorded 20 years to research, develop, and deploy BMPs that are capable of reducing storm water discharges from the MS4 to levels represented in SALs. Storm Water Action Levels are set at such a level that any exceedance of a SAL will indicate to the Copermittee(s) that the discharge is within the lowest 10% of monitored outfalls. Therefore, an exceedance of a SAL warrants priority consideration within the Copermittee iterative process.

Finding D.2.a. The Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SSMP) requirements contained in this Order are consistent with Order WQ 2000-11 adopted by the State Water Board on October 5, 2000. In the precedential order, the State Water Board found that the design standards, which essentially require that runoff generated by 85 percent of storm events from specific development categories be infiltrated or treated, reflect the MEP standard. The order also found that the SSMP requirements are appropriately applied to the majority of the Priority Development Project categories that are also contained in section F.1 of this Order. The State Water Board also gave California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) the needed discretion to include additional categories and locations, such as retail gasoline outlets (RGOs), in SSMPs.

Discussion of Finding D.2.a. The post-construction requirements and design standards contained in the SSMP section of Order No. R9-2010-0016 constitute MEP consistent with State Water Board guidance, court decisions, and San Diego Water Board requirements. The State Water Board and San Diego Water Board have made several recent decisions in regards to inclusion of SSMP requirements in MS4 permits. In a precedential decision, State Water Board Order WQ 2000-11, the State Water Board found that the SSMP provisions constitute MEP for addressing storm water pollutant discharges resulting from Priority Development Projects. The provisions of the SSMP section of the Order are also consistent with those previously issued by the San Diego Water Board for Riverside County (Order No. R9-2004-001), Southern Orange County (Order Nos. R9-2002-0001 and R9-2009-0002) and San Diego County

DRAFT

(Order Nos. R9-2001-01 and R9-2007-0001), as well as requirements in the Los Angeles County MS4 permit (Order No. R4-2001-182). In State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15, the State Water Board reaffirmed that SSMP requirements constitute MEP. Moreover, the SSMP requirements of the San Diego County MS4 permit (Order No. R9-2001-01) were upheld when the California State Supreme Court declined to hear the matter on appeal.

Finding D.2.b. Controlling runoff pollution by using a combination of onsite source control and site design BMPs augmented with treatment control BMPs before the runoff enters the MS4 is important for the following reasons: (1) Many end-of-pipe BMPs (such as diversion to the sanitary sewer) are typically ineffective during significant storm events; (2) Whereas, onsite source control BMPs can be applied during all runoff conditions end-of-pipe BMPs are often incapable of capturing and treating the wide range of pollutants which can be generated on a sub-watershed scale; (3) End-of-pipe BMPs are more effective when used as polishing BMPs, rather than the sole BMP to be implemented; (4) End-of-pipe BMPs do not protect the quality or beneficial uses of receiving waters between the pollutant source and the BMP; and (5) Offsite end-of-pipe BMPs do not aid in the effort to educate the public regarding sources of pollution and their prevention.

Discussion of Finding D.2.b. Many end-of-pipe BMPs are designed for low flow conditions because their end-of-pipe location prevents them from being designed for large storm events. This results in the end-of-pipe BMPs being overwhelmed, bypassed, or ineffective during larger storm events more frequently than onsite BMPs designed for larger storms. BMPs are also frequently most effective for a particular type of pollutant (such as sediment). Such BMPs may be appropriate for small sites with a limited suite of pollutants generated; however, end-of-pipe BMPs must typically be able to address a wide range of pollutants generated by a sub-watershed, limiting their effectiveness and/or increasing costs. Moreover, the location of some end-of-pipe BMPs allow for untreated pollutants to be discharged to and degrade receiving waters prior to their reaching the BMPs. This fails to protect receiving waters, which is the purpose of BMP implementation. In addition, opportunities to educate the public regarding runoff pollution can be lost when end-of-pipe BMPs are located away from pollutant sources and out of sight. Onsite BMPs can lead to a better public understanding of runoff issues since their presence can provide a visible and/or tangible lesson in pollution prevention.

Finding D.2.c. Use of Low-Impact Development (LID) site design BMPs at new development, redevelopment and retrofit projects can be an effective means for minimizing the impact of storm water runoff discharges from the development projects on receiving waters. LID is a site design strategy with a goal of maintaining or replicating the pre-development hydrologic regime through the use of design techniques. LID site design BMPs help preserve and restore the natural hydrologic cycle of the site, allowing for filtration and infiltration which can greatly reduce the volume, peak flow rate, velocity, and pollutant loads of storm water runoff. Current

DRAFT

runoff management, knowledge, practices and technology have resulted in the use of LID BMPs as an acceptable means of meeting the storm water MEP standard.

Discussion of Finding D.2.c. The CWA is the cornerstone of surface water quality protection in the United States. (The Act does not deal directly with ground water or with water quantity issues.) The statute employs a variety of regulatory and nonregulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters so that they can support the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, wildlife and recreation in and on the water.

Increasing the volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas will eventually greatly accelerate downstream erosion, impair stream habitat in natural drainages, and negatively impact beneficial uses. Development and urbanization increase pollutant loads and volume while simultaneously increasing impervious area. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants and thus lose the purification and infiltration provided by naturally vegetated soil. Furthermore, impervious surfaces tend to concentrate pollutants on the top of the surface that are then washed off into the MS4 and waters of the State in a concentrated manner. The use of LID site design BMPs can be an effective means of minimizing the impact of runoff discharges on receiving waters. By reducing water pollution, reducing runoff and increasing groundwater recharge, LID helps to improve the quality of receiving surface waters, stabilize the flow rates of receiving waters (preventing downstream hydromodification), reduce downstream flooding and protect and enhance water supply sources. Current runoff management, knowledge, practice and technology has resulted in the use of LID BMPs as an acceptable means of meeting the MEP standard for storm water treatment.

Current municipal codes may oppose or hinder the design, use and implementation of specific elements of LID. These codes include, but are not limited to, emergency services access requirements, building landscape ordinances, building height limits and parking space requirements. It is essential for Copermittees to work with other responsible agencies and/or update codes that have the potential to impact the use of LID.

The Local Government Commission, a non-profit organization working to build livable communities, developed a set of principles known as the *Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use*¹⁰⁶ that provide the opportunity to reduce costs and improve the reliability and quality of our water resources. Implementation of LID incorporates several of the Ahwahnee principles such as:

¹⁰⁶ Local Government Commission, "The Ahwahnee Water Principles – A Blueprint for Regional Sustainability", http://water.lgc.org/Members/tony/docs/lgc_water_guide.pdf

DRAFT

1. "Community Design should be compact, mixed use, walkable and transit-oriented so that urban runoff pollutants are minimized and the open lands that absorb water are preserved to the maximum extent possible."
3. "Water holding areas such as creek beds, recessed athletic fields, ponds, cisterns, and other features that serve to recharge groundwater, reduce runoff, improve water quality and decrease flooding should be incorporated into the urban landscape."
4. "All aspects of landscaping from the selection of plants to soil preparation and the installation of irrigation systems should be designed to reduce water demand, retain runoff, decrease flooding, and recharge groundwater."
5. "Permeable surfaces should be used for hardscape. Impervious surfaces such as driveways, streets, and parking lots should be minimized so that land is available to absorb storm water, reduce polluted urban runoff, recharge groundwater and reduce flooding."

The use of LID site design BMPs helps reduce the amount of impervious area associated with development and allows storm water to infiltrate into the soil. Natural vegetation and soil filters storm water runoff and reduces the volume and pollutant loads of storm water. Studies have revealed that the level of imperviousness resulting from development and urbanization is strongly correlated with the water quality impairment of nearby receiving waters.¹⁰⁷ In many cases, the impacts on receiving waters due to changes in hydrology can be more significant than those attributable to the contaminants found in storm water discharges.¹⁰⁸ These impacts include stream bank erosion (increased sediment load and subsequent deposition), benthic habitat degradation, and decreased diversity of macroinvertebrates. Although conventional BMPs do reduce storm water pollutant loads, they may not effectively control adverse effects from changes in the discharge hydrologic conditions.¹⁰⁹

The Order includes requirements for developments to include site design BMPs that mimic or replicate the natural hydrologic cycle. Open space designs which maximize pervious surfaces and retention of "natural" drainages have been found to reduce both the costs of development and pollutant export.¹¹⁰ Moreover, USEPA finds including plans for a "natural" site design and BMP implementation during the design phase of new development and redevelopment offers the most cost effective strategy to reduce storm water pollutant loads to surface waters.¹¹¹ In addition, a recent U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development guidance document on low-impact development notes that the use of LID-based storm water management design allows land to be

¹⁰⁷ USEPA, 1999. 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.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ USEPA, 2000. Low-Impact Development: A literature review. EPA-841-B-00-005. 35p.

¹¹⁰ Center for Watershed Protection, 2000. "The Benefits of Better Site Design in Residential Subdivisions." Watershed Protection Techniques. Vol. 3. No. 2.

¹¹¹ USEPA, 1999. 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.

DRAFT

developed, but in a cost-effective manner that helps mitigate potential environmental impacts.¹¹²

Finding D.2.d. RGOs are significant sources of pollutants in storm water runoff. RGOs are points of convergence for motor vehicles for automotive related services such as repair, refueling, tire inflation, and radiator fill-up and consequently produce significantly higher loadings of hydrocarbons and trace metals (including copper and zinc) than other developed areas.

Discussion of Finding D.2.d. RGOs are included in the Order as a Priority Development Project category because RGOs produce significantly greater loadings of hydrocarbons and trace metals (including copper and zinc) than other developed areas. To meet the storm water MEP standard, source control and structural treatment BMPs are needed at RGOs that meet the following criteria: (a) 5,000 square feet or more or (b) an average daily traffic (ADT) of 100 or more vehicles per day. These are appropriate thresholds since vehicular development size and volume of traffic are good indicators of potential impacts of storm water runoff from RGOs on receiving waters.

This finding has been added to satisfy State Water Board Order WQ 2000-11's requirements for including RGOs as a Priority Development Category. State Water Board Order WQ 2000-11 acknowledged that a threshold (size, average daily traffic, etc.) appropriate to trigger SSMP requirements should be developed for RGOs and that specific findings regarding RGOs should be included in MS4 permits to justify the requirement.¹¹³

Finding D.2.e. Industrial sites are significant sources of pollutants in runoff. Pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from industrial sites are similar or exceed pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from other land uses, such as commercial or residential land uses. As with other land uses, LID site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs are needed at industrial sites in order to meet the MEP standard. These BMPs are necessary where the industrial site is larger than 10,000 square feet. The 10,000 square feet threshold is appropriate, since it is consistent with requirements in other Phase I NPDES storm water regulations throughout California.

¹¹² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, 2003. "The Practice of Low Impact Development." Prepared by: NAHB Research Center, Inc. Upper Marlboro, Maryland. Contract No. H-21314CA. 131p.

¹¹³ State Water Board, 2000. Order WQ 2000-11. In the Matter of the Petitions of The Cities Of Bellflower, Et Al., The City Of Arcadia, And Western States Petroleum Association Review of January 26, 2000 Action of the Regional Board And Actions and Failures to Act by both the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region and Its Executive Officer Pursuant to Order No. 96-054, Permit for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Run-Off Discharges Within Los Angeles County [NPDES NO. CAS614001] SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1280, A-1280(a) and A-1280(b)

DRAFT

Discussion of Finding D.2.e. Industrial sites can be a significant source of pollutants in storm water runoff. In an extensive review of storm water literature, the Los Angeles Water Board found widespread support for the finding that "industrial and commercial activities can also be considered hot spots as sources of pollutants." It also found that "industrial and commercial areas were likely to be the most significant pollutant source areas" of heavy metals.¹¹⁴ Likewise, storm water runoff from heavy industry in the Santa Clara Valley has been found to be extremely toxic.¹¹⁵ These findings are corroborated by USEPA, which states in the preamble to the 1990 Phase I NPDES storm water regulations that "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." Since heavy industrial sites can be a significant source of pollutants in runoff in a manner similar to other SSMP project categories such as commercial development or automotive repair shops, it is appropriate to include heavy industrial sites as a SSMP category in the Order.

The Phase I NPDES storm water regulations require the Copermittees to "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 sites of industrial activity" (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)). In addition, it has been established that the MEP standard for the control of storm water runoff from new development projects includes incorporation of the SSMP requirements. Since the Copermittees must both control storm water pollutants from industrial sites and meet the storm water MEP standard for new development, it is appropriate to apply the SSMP requirements to heavy industrial sites.

The State Water Board's Order WQ 2000-11 indicates that it is appropriate to apply SSMP requirements to categories of development where evidence shows the category of development can be a significant source of pollutants. As evidenced above, heavy industrial sites can be a significant source of pollutants. Therefore, the Order includes heavy industrial sites as a SSMP Priority Development Project category.

Finding D.2.f. If not properly designed or maintained, certain BMPs implemented or required by municipalities for runoff management may create a habitat for vectors (e.g. mosquitoes and rodents). Proper BMP design and maintenance to avoid standing water, however, can prevent the creation of vector habitat. Nuisances and public health impacts resulting from vector breeding can be prevented with close collaboration and cooperative effort between municipalities, local vector control agencies, and the California Department of Public Health during the development and implementation of runoff management programs.

¹¹⁴ Los Angeles Water Board. 2001.

¹¹⁵ Schueler and Holland, 2000. Storm Water Strategies for Arid and Semi-Arid Watersheds (Article 66). The Practice of Watershed Protection.

DRAFT

Discussion of Finding D.2.f. The implementation of certain structural BMPs or other runoff treatment systems can result in significant vector problems in the form of increased breeding or harborage habitat for mosquitoes, rodents or other potentially disease transmitting organisms. The implementation of BMPs that retain water may provide breeding habitat for a variety of mosquito species, some of which have the potential to transmit diseases such as Western Equine Encephalitis, St. Louis Encephalomyelitis, and malaria. Recent BMP implementation studies by Caltrans¹¹⁶ in District 7 and District 11 have demonstrated mosquito breeding associated with some types of BMPs. The Caltrans BMP Retrofit Pilot study cited lack of maintenance and improper design as factors contributing to mosquito production. However, a Watershed Protection Techniques article describes management techniques for selecting, designing, and maintaining structural treatment BMPs to minimize mosquito production.¹¹⁷ State and local runoff management programs that include structural BMPs with the potential to retain water have been implemented in Florida and the Chesapeake Bay region without resulting in significant public health threats from mosquitoes or other vectors.¹¹⁸

Finding D.2.g. The increased volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas has the potential to greatly accelerate downstream erosion, impair stream habitat in natural drainages, and negatively impact beneficial uses. Development and urbanization increase pollutant loads in storm water runoff and the volume of storm water runoff. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants and thus lose the purification and infiltration provided by natural vegetated soil. Hydromodification measures for discharges to hardened channels allow for the future restoration of the hardened channels to their natural state, thereby restoring the chemical, physical, and biological integrity and beneficial uses of local receiving waters.

Discussion of Finding D.2.g. Increasing the volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas will eventually greatly accelerate downstream erosion, impair stream habitat in natural drainages, and negatively impact beneficial uses. Development and urbanization increase pollutant loads and volume while simultaneously increasing impervious area. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants and thus lose the purification and infiltration provided by naturally vegetated soil.

Historic hydromodification impacts, such as concrete lining and channelization, have impacted the natural physical habitat of urban streams resulting in low IBI scores. The Copermitttee's monitoring to date indicates decreased IBI scores in the developed

¹¹⁶ Caltrans, 2000. BMP Retrofit Pilot Studies: A Preliminary Assessment of Vector Production.

¹¹⁷ Watershed Protection Techniques, 1995. Mosquitoes in Constructed Wetlands: A Management Bugaboo? 1(4):203-207.

¹¹⁸ Shaver, E. and R. Baldwin, 1995. Sand Filter Design for Water Quality Treatment in Herricks, E., Ed. Stormwater Runoff and Receiving Systems: Impact, Monitoring, and Assessment, CRC Lewis Publishers, New York, NY.

DRAFT

watersheds when compared to reference sites, with developed sites consistently having poor or very poor IBI scores. While habitat scores remained stable over the last reporting period, with scores of marginal to sub-optimal, the Copermittes have consistently monitored high levels of fine sediment in habitat assessments and often changing vegetative cover. However, the impact of persistent toxicity at the bioassessment stations in conjunction with physical habitat scores is unknown.¹¹⁹

Hydromodification impacts result in poor physical habitat conditions through streambed scour, erosion, vegetation displacement, sediment deposition, channelization, and channel modifications. Increased sediment loads from hydromodification causes other impacts to physical habitats including increased turbidity which then may cause increased temperatures. In addition, an increased sediment load may have an increased biological content thereby increasing the sediment oxygen demand and lowering the dissolved oxygen available for aquatic life.¹²⁰

The objective of the CWA is “to restore and maintain the chemical, *physical*, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters (emphasis added).” Stream restoration by removing concrete and other unnatural materials is a major step toward achieving that objective. The success of future stream restoration and stabilization is, however, dependent on preventing and reducing physical impacts from activities upstream. Therefore, hydromodification management measures are necessary upstream of modified (e.g. concrete, rip rap, etc.) channels in addition to non-modified channels.

Please see discussion of Findings C.10 and C.11 for additional information about impacts due to increasing volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas.

Finding D.3.a. In accordance with federal NPDES regulations and to ensure the most effective oversight of industrial and construction site discharges, discharges of runoff from industrial and construction sites are subject to dual (State and local) storm water regulation. Under this dual system, each Copermittes is responsible for enforcing its local permits, plans, and ordinances, and the San Diego Water Board is responsible for enforcing the General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit, State Water Board Order 2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 (General Construction Permit) and the General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit, State Water Board Order 97-03-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000001 (General Industrial Permit). NPDES municipal regulations require that municipalities develop and implement measures to address runoff from industrial and construction activities. Those measures may include the implementation of other BMPs in addition to those BMPs that are required under the statewide general permits for activities subject to both State and local regulation.

¹¹⁹ Riverside County Copermittes, 2008-2009 Santa Margarita Watershed Annual Report.

¹²⁰ USEPA, National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Hydromodification, EPA 841-B-07-002, July 2007.

DRAFT

Discussion of Finding D.3.a. USEPA finds the control of pollutant discharges from industry and construction so important to receiving water quality that it has established a double system of regulation over industrial and construction sites. This double system of regulation consists of two parallel regulatory systems with the same common objective: to keep pollutants from industrial and construction sites out of the MS4. In this double system of regulation for runoff from industrial and construction sites, local governments must enforce their legal authorities (i.e. local ordinances and permits) while the San Diego Water Board must enforce its legal authority (i.e. statewide general industrial and construction storm water permits). These two regulatory systems are designed to complement and support each other. Municipalities are not required to enforce San Diego Water Board and State Water Board permits. They are required, however, to enforce their ordinances and permits. The Federal regulations are clear that municipalities have responsibility to prevent non-storm water and address storm water runoff from industrial and construction sites which enters their MS4s.

Municipalities have this responsibility because they have the authority to issue land use and development permits. Since municipalities are the lead permitting authority for industrial land use and construction activities, they are also the lead for enforcement regarding runoff discharges from these sites. For sites where the municipality is the lead permitting authority, the San Diego Water Board will work with the municipality and provide support where needed. The San Diego Water Board will assist municipalities in enforcement against non-compliant sites after the municipality has exhibited a good faith effort to bring the site into compliance.

According to USEPA, the storm water regulations envision that NPDES permitting authorities and municipal operators will cooperate to develop programs to monitor and control pollutants in storm water discharges from industrial facilities.¹²¹ USEPA discusses the “dual regulation” of construction sites in its Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide, which states “Even though all construction sites that disturb more than one acre are covered nationally by an NPDES storm water permit, the construction site runoff control minimum measure [...] is needed to induce more localized site regulation and enforcement efforts, and to enable operators [...] to more effectively control construction site discharges into their MS4s.”¹²² While the Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide applies to small municipalities, it is applicable to the Copermitees, because they are similar in size and have the potential to discharge similar pollutant types as Phase II municipalities.

Finding D.3.b. Identification of sources of pollutants in runoff (such as municipal areas and activities, industrial and commercial sites/sources, construction sites, and residential areas), development and implementation of BMPs to address those

¹²¹ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

¹²² USEPA, 2000. Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide. EPA 833-R-00-002.

DRAFT

sources, and updating ordinances and approval processes are necessary for the Copermittees to ensure that discharges of pollutants from its MS4 in storm water are reduced to the MEP and that non-storm water discharges are not occurring. Inspections and other compliance verification methods are needed to ensure minimum BMPs are implemented. Inspections are especially important at areas that are at high risk for pollutant discharges.

Discussion of Finding D.3.b. Source identification is necessary to characterize the nature and extent of pollutants in discharges and to develop appropriate BMPs. It is the first step in a targeted approach to runoff management. Source identification helps identify the location of potential sources of pollutants in runoff. Pollutants found to be present in receiving waters can then be traced to the sites which frequently generate such pollutants. In this manner source inventories can help to target inspections, monitoring, and potential enforcement. This allows for limited inspection, monitoring, and enforcement time to be most effective. USEPA supports source identification as a concept when it recommends construction, municipal, and industrial source identification in guidance and the federal regulations.^{123,124}

The development of BMPs for identified sources will help ensure that appropriate, consistent controls are implemented at all types of development and areas. Copermittees must reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the maximum extent practicable. To achieve this level of pollutant reduction, BMPs must be implemented. Designation of minimum BMPs helps ensure that appropriate BMPs are implemented for various sources. These minimum BMPs also serve as guidance as to the level of water quality protection required. USEPA requires development and implementation of BMPs for construction, municipal, commercial, industrial, and residential sources at 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A-D).

Updating ordinances and approval processes is necessary in order for the Copermittees to control discharges to their MS4s. USEPA supports updating ordinances and approval processes when it states “A crucial requirement of the NPDES storm water regulation is that a municipality must demonstrate that it has adequate legal authority to control the contribution of pollutants in storm water discharged to its MS4. [...] In order to have an effective municipal storm water management program, a municipality must have adequate legal authority to control the contribution of pollutants to the MS4. [...] ‘Control,’ in this context, means not only to require disclosure of information, but also to limit, discourage, or terminate a storm water discharge to the MS4.”¹²⁵

¹²³ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

¹²⁴ 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(ii)

¹²⁵ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

Inspections provide a necessary means for the Copermittees to evaluate compliance of pollutant sources with their municipal ordinances and minimum BMP requirements. USEPA supports inspections when it recommends inspections of construction, municipal, and industrial sources.¹²⁶ Inspection of high risk sources are especially important because of the ability of frequent inspections to help ensure compliance, thereby reducing the risk associated with such sources. USEPA suggests that inspections can improve compliance when it states “Effective inspection and enforcement requires [...] penalties to deter infractions and intervention by the municipal authority to correct violations.”¹²⁷

Finding D.3.c. Historic and current development makes use of natural drainage patterns and features as conveyances for runoff. Urban streams used in this manner are part of the municipalities MS4s regardless of whether they are natural, anthropogenic, or partially modified features. In these cases, the urban stream is both an MS4 and receiving water.

Discussion of Finding D.3.c. An MS4 is defined in the federal regulations as a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains), owned or operated by a Copermittee, and designed or used for collecting or conveying runoff.¹²⁸ Natural drainage patterns and urban streams are frequently used by municipalities to collect and convey runoff away from development within their jurisdiction. Therefore, the San Diego Water Board considers natural drainages that are used for conveyances of runoff, regardless of whether or not they’ve been altered by the municipality, as both part of the MS4s and as receiving waters. To clarify, an unaltered natural drainage, which receives runoff from a point source (channeled by a Copermittee to drain an area within their jurisdiction), which then conveys the runoff to an altered natural drainage or a man-made MS4, is both an MS4 and a receiving water.¹²⁹

Finding D.3.d. As operators of the MS4s, the Copermittees cannot passively receive and discharge pollutants from third parties. By providing free and open access to an MS4 that conveys discharges to waters of the U.S., the operator essentially accepts responsibility for discharges into the MS4 that it does not prohibit or otherwise control. These discharges may cause or contribute to a condition of contamination or a violation of water quality standards.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

¹²⁸ USEPA, 2000. EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Code of Federal Regulations, Vol. 40, Part 122.

¹²⁹ San Diego Water Board, 2001. Response in Opposition to Petitions for Review of California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region Order No. 2001-01 – NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758 (San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit).

DRAFT

Discussion of Finding D.3.d. CWA section 402(p) requires operators of MS4s to prohibit non-storm water discharges into their MS4s. This is necessary because pollutants which enter the MS4 generally are conveyed through the MS4 to be eventually discharged into receiving waters. If a municipality does not prohibit non-storm water discharges, it is providing the pathway (its MS4) which enables pollutants to reach receiving waters. Since the municipality's storm water management service can result in pollutant discharges to receiving waters, the municipality must accept responsibility for the water quality consequences resulting from this service. Furthermore, third party discharges can cause a municipality to be out of compliance with its permit. Since pollutants from third parties which enter the MS4 will eventually be discharged from the MS4 to receiving waters, the third party discharges can result in a situation of municipality non-compliance if the discharges lead to an exceedance of water quality standards. For these reasons, each Copermittee must prohibit and/or control discharges from third parties to its MS4. USEPA supports this concept when it states "the operators of regulated small MS4s cannot passively receive and discharge pollutants from third parties" and "the operator of a small MS4 that does not prohibit and/or control discharges into its system essentially accepts 'title' for those discharges. At a minimum, by providing free and open access to the MS4s that convey discharges to the waters of the United States, the municipal storm sewer system enables water quality impairment by third parties."¹³⁰

In a recent decision issued for *United States v. Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)*,¹³¹ the court found that WSDOT, by allowing runoff from its MS4 to a receiving water that is part of a Superfund site, is an "arranger" of "disposal or treatment of hazardous substances" as defined under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) by "designing, constructing, and operating drainage systems whose sole function was to collect highway runoff and dispose of it into nearby water-bodies." The court went on to state that "WSDOT did design the drainage system and...has the ability to redirect, contain or treat its contaminated runoff."

Finding D.3.e. Waste and pollutants which are deposited and accumulate in MS4 drainage structures will be discharged from these structures to waters of the U.S. unless they are removed. These discharges may cause or contribute to, or threaten to cause or contribute to, a condition of pollution in receiving waters. For this reason, pollutant discharges from storm water into MS4s must be reduced using a combination of management measures, including source control and an effective MS4 maintenance program implemented by each Copermittee.

Discussion of Finding D.3.e. When rain falls and drains freeways, industries, construction sites, and neighborhoods, it picks up a multitude of pollutants. Gravity flow transports the pollutants to the MS4. Illicit discharges and connections also can

¹³⁰ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68765-68766.

¹³¹ United State District Court, Western District of Washington at Tacoma, Case No. C08-5722RJB, Order on Motions for Partial Summary Judgment, dated June 7, 2010.

DRAFT

contribute a significant amount of pollutants to MS4s. MS4s are commonly designed to convey their contents as quickly as possible. Due to the resulting typically high flow rates within the concrete conveyance systems of MS4s, pollutants which enter or are deposited in the MS4 and not removed are generally flushed unimpeded through the MS4 to waters of the United States. Since treatment generally does not occur within the MS4, in such cases reduction of storm water pollutants to the MEP must occur prior to discharges entering the MS4.

The importance of this concept is supported by the tons of wastes/pollutants that have been removed from the Copermittees' MS4s as reported in their ROWD.¹³² Moreover, these pollutants will be discharged into receiving waters unless an effective MS4 and structural treatment BMP maintenance program is implemented by the Copermittees. The requirement for Copermittees to conduct a MS4 maintenance program is specifically directed in both the Phase I and Phase II storm water regulations. Regarding MS4 cleaning, USEPA states "The removal of sediment, decaying debris, and highly polluted water from catch basins has aesthetic and water quality benefits, including reducing foul odors, reducing suspended solids, and reducing the load of oxygen-demanding substances that reach receiving waters."¹³³ It goes on to say, "Catch basin cleaning is an efficient and cost-effective method for preventing the transport of sediment and pollutants to receiving water bodies." USEPA also finds that "Lack of maintenance often limits the effectiveness of storm water structural controls such as detention/retention basins and infiltration devices. [...] The proposed program should provide for maintenance logs and identify specific maintenance activities for each class of control, such as removing sediment from retention ponds every five years, cleaning catch basins annually, and removing litter from channels twice a year."¹³⁴

Finding D.3.f. Enforcement of local runoff related ordinances, permits, and plans is an essential component of every runoff management program and is specifically required in the federal storm water regulations and this Order. Each Copermittee is individually responsible for adoption and enforcement of ordinances and/or policies, implementation of identified control measures/BMPs needed to prevent or reduce pollutants in storm water runoff, and for the allocation of funds for the capital, operation and maintenance, administrative, and enforcement expenditures necessary to implement and enforce such control measures/BMPs under its jurisdiction. Education is an important aspect of every effective runoff management program and the basis for changes in behavior at a societal level. Education of municipal planning, inspection, and maintenance department staffs is especially critical to ensure that in-house staffs understand how their activities impact water quality, how to accomplish their jobs while protecting water quality, and understand their specific roles and responsibilities for compliance with this Order. Public education, designed to target various urban land

¹³² Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).

¹³³ USEPA, 1999. Storm Water O&M Fact Sheet, Catch Basin Cleaning. EPA 832-F-99-011.

¹³⁴ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

users and other audiences, is also essential to inform the public of how individual actions affect receiving water quality and how adverse effects can be minimized.

Discussion of Finding D.3.f. The Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A – D) are clear in placing responsibility on municipalities for control of runoff from third party activities and land uses to their MS4.¹³⁵ In order for municipalities to assume this responsibility, they must implement ordinances, permits, and plans addressing runoff from third parties. Assessments for compliance with their ordinances, permits, and plans are essential for a municipality to ensure that third parties are not causing the municipality to be in violation of its municipal storm water permit. When conditions of non-compliance are determined, enforcement is necessary to ensure that violations of municipality ordinances and permits are corrected. When the Copermittees determine a violation of its storm water ordinance, it must pursue correction of the violation. Without enforcement, third parties do not have incentive to correct violations. USEPA supports enforcement by municipalities when it states “Effective inspection and enforcement requires [...] penalties to deter infractions and intervention by the municipal authority to correct violations. Enforcement mechanisms [...] also must be described.”¹³⁶

Education is a critical BMP and an important aspect of runoff management programs. USEPA finds that “An informed and knowledgeable community is critical to the success of a storm water management program since it helps ensure the following: Greater support for the program as the public gains a greater understanding of the reasons why it is necessary and important, [and] greater compliance with the program as the public becomes aware of the personal responsibilities expected of them and others in the community, including the individual actions they can take to protect or improve the quality of area waters.”¹³⁷

Regarding target audiences, USEPA also states “The public education program should use a mix of appropriate local strategies to address the viewpoints and concerns of a variety of audiences and communities, including minority and disadvantaged communities, as well as children.”

Finding D.3.g. Public participation during the development of runoff management programs is necessary to ensure that all stakeholder interests and a variety of creative solutions are considered.

Discussion of Finding D.3.g. This finding is supported by the Phase II Storm Water Regulations, which state “early and frequent public involvement can shorten implementation schedules and broaden public support for a program.” USEPA goes

¹³⁵ USEPA, 2000. EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Code of Federal Regulations, Vol. 40, Part 122.

¹³⁶ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA/833-B-92-002.

¹³⁷ USEPA, 2000. Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide. EPA 833-R-00-002.

DRAFT

on to explain, “Public participation is likely to ensure a more successful storm water program by providing valuable expertise and a conduit to other programs and governments.”¹³⁸

Finding D.3.h. Retrofitting existing development with storm water treatment controls, including LID, is necessary to address storm water discharges from existing development that may cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or a violation of water quality standards. Although SSMP BMPs are required for redevelopment, the current rate of redevelopment will not address water quality problems in a timely manner. Cooperation with private landowners is necessary to effectively identify, implement, and maintain retrofit projects for the preservation, restoration, and enhancement of water quality.

Discussion of Finding D.3.h. Existing BMPs are not sufficient to protect the Beneficial Uses of receiving waters from storm water MS4 discharges, as evidenced by 303(d) listings and exceedances of Water Quality Objectives from the Copermittees’ monitoring reports. As recognized in USEPA guidance, waters in the region cannot be protected without also addressing degradation caused by storm water discharges from existing development. This requires more than just a new development and redeveloped sites program, which at best can only hold the line. For this reason USEPA recommends that storm water programs include a retrofit plan or program for retrofitting existing development.¹³⁹

Implementing more advanced BMPs, including the retrofitting of existing development with LID BMPs, is part of the iterative process. Based on the current rate of redevelopment compared to existing BMPs, the use of LID only on new and redevelopment will not adequately address current water quality problems, including downstream hydromodification. Retrofitting existing development is practicable for a municipality through a systematic evaluation, prioritization and implementation plan focused on impaired water bodies, pollutants of concern, areas of downstream hydromodification, feasibility and effective communication and cooperation with private property owners.

To actually improve the quality of receiving waters, discharges from existing developed sites need to be mitigated, which generally means implementation of measures to retrofit existing development sites with storm water control measures that can retain and/or treat storm water on site. Retrofitting existing development is possible and reasonable to significantly improve water quality in receiving waters.

Successful retrofitting programs have been implemented in such diverse locations as Seattle, Washington¹⁴⁰; Portland, Oregon¹⁴¹, Santa Monica, California¹⁴²; Kansas City,

¹³⁸ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68755.

¹³⁹ USEPA, 2010. MS4 Permit Improvement Guide. EPA 833-R-10-001.

¹⁴⁰ SEA Street, http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/CityDesign/What_We_Do/Outreach/Folio/DPDS_008014.asp

¹⁴¹ Clean River Rewards, <http://www.portlandonline.com/BES/index.cfm?c=eedef>

DRAFT

Kansas¹⁴³; and Montgomery County, MD¹⁴⁴. When appropriately applied as in this Order, retrofitting existing development meets MEP.

Finding D.4.a. Since runoff within a watershed can flow from and through multiple land uses and political jurisdictions, watershed-based runoff management can greatly enhance the protection of receiving waters. Such management provides a means to focus on the most important water quality problems in each watershed. By focusing on the most important water quality problems, watershed efforts can maximize protection of beneficial use in an efficient manner. Effective watershed-based runoff management actively reduces pollutant discharges and abates pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems. Watershed-based runoff management that does not actively reduce pollutant discharges and abate pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems can necessitate implementation of the iterative process outlined in section A.3 of the this Order. Watershed management of runoff does not require Copermittees to expend resources outside of their jurisdictions. In some cases, however, this added flexibility provides more, and possibly more effective, alternatives for minimizing waste discharges. Watershed management requires the Copermittees within a watershed to develop a watershed-based management strategy, which can then be implemented on a jurisdictional basis.

Discussion of Finding D.4.a. In recent years, addressing water quality issues from a watershed perspective has increasingly gained attention. Regarding watershed-based permitting, the USEPA *Watershed-Based NPDES Permitting Policy Statement* issued on Jan. 7, 2004 states the following:

USEPA continues to support a holistic watershed approach to water quality management. The process for developing and issuing NPDES permits on a watershed basis is an important tool in water quality management. USEPA believes that developing and issuing NPDES permits on a watershed basis can benefit all watershed stakeholders, from the NPDES permitting authority to local community members. A watershed-based approach to point source permitting under the NPDES program may serve as one innovative tool for achieving new efficiencies and environmental results. USEPA believes that watershed-based permitting can:

- Lead to more environmentally effective results;
- Emphasize measuring the effectiveness of targeted actions on improvements in water quality;
- Provide greater opportunities for trading and other market based approaches;

¹⁴² City of Santa Monica, Urban Runoff program,
<http://www.smgov.net/Departments/OSE/categories/content.aspx?id=4007>

¹⁴³ 10,000 Rain Gardens, <http://www.rainkc.com/>

¹⁴⁴ Rainscapes, <http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/Content/DEP/Rainscapes/home.html>

DRAFT

- Reduce the cost of improving the quality of the nation's waters;
- Foster more effective implementation of watershed plans, including total maximum daily loads (TMDLs); and
- Realize other ancillary benefits beyond those that have been achieved under the CWA (e.g., facilitate program integration including integration of Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act programs).

Watershed-based permitting is a process that ultimately produces NPDES permits that are issued to point sources on a geographic or watershed basis. In establishing point source controls in a watershed-based permit, the permitting authority may focus on watershed goals, and consider multiple pollutant sources and stressors, including the level of nonpoint source control that is practicable. In general, there are numerous permitting mechanisms that may be used to develop and issue permits within a watershed approach.

This USEPA guidance is in line with State Water Board and San Diego Water Board watershed management goals. For example, the State Water Board's TAC recommends watershed-based water quality protection, stating "Municipal permits should have watershed specific components." The TAC further recommends that "All NPDES permits and Waste Discharge Requirements should be considered for reissuance on a watershed basis."

In addition, the Basin Plan states that "public agencies and private organizations concerned with water resources have come to recognize that a comprehensive evaluation of pollutant contributions on a watershed scale is the only way to realistically assess cumulative impacts and formulate workable strategies to truly protect our water resources. Both water pollution and habitat degradation problems can best be solved by following a basin-wide approach."

In light of USEPA's policy statement and the State Water Board's and San Diego Water Board's watershed management goals, the San Diego Water Board seeks to expand watershed management in the regulation of runoff from the MS4. Watershed-based MS4 permits can provide for more effective receiving water quality protection by focusing on specific water quality problems. The entire watershed for the receiving water can be assessed, allowing for critical areas and practices to be targeted for corrective actions. Known sources of pollutants of concern can be investigated for potential water quality impacts. Problem areas can then be addressed, leading to eventual improvements in receiving water quality. Management of runoff on a watershed basis allows for specific water quality problems to be targeted so that efforts result in maximized water quality improvements.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁵ San Diego Water Board, 2004. San Diego County Municipal Storm Water Permit Reissuance Analysis Summary. P. 1.

DRAFT

Finding D.4.b. Some runoff issues, such as general education and training, can be effectively addressed on a regional basis. Regional approaches to runoff management can improve program consistency and promote sharing of resources, which can result in implementation of more efficient programs.

Discussion of Finding D.4.b. Copermittees in Riverside County participate in several runoff-related activities whose scope extends beyond the area subject to this Order. These include countywide activities (e.g., portions of Riverside County fall under the jurisdictions of the Santa Ana Water Board and California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Region (Colorado River Water Board)), southern California, and statewide activities. Copermittees' participation in these regional activities is generally directed at improving management capability, preventing redundancy and taking advantage of economies of scale. For instance, Copermittees seek to develop consistency between watershed and/or jurisdictional programs (e.g., through standards development), and to collaborate on certain program activities such as education, training, and monitoring.

Finding D.4.c. It is important for the Copermittees to coordinate their water quality protection and land use planning activities to achieve the greatest protection of receiving water bodies. Copermittee coordination with other watershed stakeholders, especially the State of California Department of Transportation, the U.S. federal government, sovereign American Indian tribes, and water and sewer districts, is also important.

Discussion of Finding D.4.c. Conventional planning and zoning can be limited in their ability to protect the environmental quality of creeks, rivers, and other water bodies. Watershed-based planning is often ignored, despite the fact that receiving waters unite land by collecting runoff from throughout the watershed. Since watersheds unite land, they can be used as an effective basis for planning. Watershed-based planning enables local and regional areas to realize economic, social, and other benefits associated with growth, while conserving the resources needed to sustain such growth, including water quality.

This type of planning can involve four steps: (1) Identify the watersheds shared by the participating jurisdictions; (2) Identify, assess, and prioritize the natural, social, and other resources in the watersheds; (3) Prioritize areas for growth, protection, and conservation, based on prioritized resources; and (4) Develop plans and regulations to guide growth and protect resources. Local governments have started with simple, yet effective, steps toward watershed planning, such as adopting a watershed-based planning approach, articulating the basic strategy in their General Plans, and beginning to pursue the basic strategy in collaboration with neighboring local governments who share the watersheds. Examples of new mechanisms created to facilitate watershed-based planning and zoning include the San Francisquito Creek

DRAFT

Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Process and the Santa Clara Basin
Watershed Management Initiative.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association., 1999. Start at the Source. Forbes Custom Publishing. Available on-line at: http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/basmaa_satsm.htm

DRAFT

E. Statute and Regulatory Considerations

Finding E.1. The RWL language specified in this Order is consistent with language recommended by the USEPA and established in State Water Board Order WQ-99-05, *Own Motion Review of the Petition of Environmental Health Coalition to Review Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-03, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108740*, adopted by the State Water Board on June 17, 1999. The RWL language in this Order requires compliance with water quality standards, which for storm water discharges is to be achieved through an iterative approach requiring the implementation of improved and better-tailored BMPs over time. Compliance with receiving water limitations based on applicable water quality standards is necessary to ensure that MS4 discharges will not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards and the creation of conditions of pollution, contamination, or nuisance.

Discussion of Finding E.1. The RWL language in the Order requires storm water compliance with water quality standards through an iterative approach for implementing improved and better-tailored BMPs over time. The iterative BMP process requires the implementation of increasingly stringent BMPs until receiving water quality standards are achieved. This is necessary because implementation of BMPs alone cannot ensure attainment of receiving water quality standards. For example, a BMP that is effective in one situation may not be applicable in another. An iterative process of BMP development, implementation, and assessment is needed to promote consistent compliance with receiving water quality objectives. If assessment of a given BMP confirms that the BMP is ineffective, the iterative process should be restarted, with redevelopment of a new BMP that is anticipated to result in compliance with receiving water quality objectives.

The issue of whether storm water discharges from MS4s must meet water quality standards has been intensely debated in past years. The argument arises because CWA section 402(p) fails to clearly state that municipal dischargers of storm water must meet water quality standards. On the issue of industrial discharges of storm water, the statute clearly indicates that industrial dischargers must meet both (1) the technology-based standard of “best available technology economically achievable (BAT)” and (2) applicable water quality standards. On the issue of municipal discharges however, the statute states that municipal dischargers must meet (1) the technology-based standard of “MEP” and (2) “such other provisions that the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.” The statute fails, however, to specifically state that municipal dischargers must meet water quality standards.

As a result, the municipal storm water dischargers have argued that they do not have to meet water quality standards; and that they only are required to meet MEP for storm water. Environmental interest groups maintain that not only do MS4 discharges have to meet water quality standards, but that MS4 permits must also comply with numeric effluent limitations for the purpose of meeting water quality standards. On the issue of

DRAFT

water quality standards, USEPA, the State Water Board, and the San Diego Water Board have consistently maintained that MS4s must indeed comply with water quality standards. On the issue of whether water quality standards must be met by numeric effluent limitations, USEPA, the State Water Board (in Orders WQ 91-03 and WQ 91-04), and the San Diego Water Board have maintained that MS4 permits can contain narrative requirements for the implementation of BMPs in place of numeric effluent limitations for storm water discharges.¹⁴⁷

In addition to relying on USEPA's legal opinion concluding that MS4s must meet MEP for storm water and water quality standards, the State Water Board also relied on the CWA's explicit authority for States to require "such other provisions that the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants" in addition to the technology-based standard of MEP for storm water discharges. To further support its conclusions that MS4 permit dischargers must meet water quality standards, the State Water Board relied on provisions of the CWC that specify that all waste discharge requirements must implement applicable Basin Plans and take into consideration the appropriate water quality objectives for the protection of beneficial uses.

The State Water Board first formally concluded that permits for MS4s must contain effluent limitations based on water quality standards in its Order WQ 91-03. In that Order, the State Water Board also concluded that it was appropriate for Regional Water Boards to achieve this result by requiring best management practices, rather than by inserting numeric effluent limitations into MS4 permits. Later, in Order WQ 98-01, the State Water Board prescribed specific precedent setting Receiving Water Limitations language to be included in all future MS4 permits. This language specifically requires that MS4 dischargers meet water quality standards and allows for the use of narrative BMPs (increasing in stringency and implemented in an iterative process) as the mechanism by which water quality standards can be met for storm water discharges.

In Order WQ 99-05, the State Water Board modified its receiving water limitations language in Order WQ 98-01 to meet specific objections by USEPA (the modifications resulted in stricter compliance with water quality standards). State Water Board Order WQ 99-05 states:

"In Order WQ 98-01, the State Board ordered that certain receiving water limitation language be included in future municipal storm water permits. Following inclusion of that language in permits issued by the San Francisco Bay and San Diego Water Boards for Vallejo and Riverside respectively, the USEPA objected to the permits. The USEPA objection was based on the receiving

¹⁴⁷ For the most recent assessment, see Storm Water Panel Recommendations to the California State Water Resources Control Board, 2006. *The Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial, and Construction Activities.*

DRAFT

water limitation language. The USEPA has now issued those permits itself and has included receiving water limitation language it deems appropriate.

In light of USEPA's objection to the receiving water limitation language in Order WQ 98-01 and its adoption of alternative language, the State Board is revising its instructions regarding receiving water limitation language for municipal storm water permits. It is hereby ordered that Order WQ 98-01 will be amended to remove the receiving water limitation language contained therein and to substitute the USEPA language. Based on the reasons stated here, and as a precedent decision, the following receiving water limitation language shall be included in future municipal storm water permits."

In the 1999 case involving MS4 permits issued by USEPA to several Arizona cities (*Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 1999, 197 F. 3d 1035), the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld USEPA's requirement for MS4 dischargers to meet water quality standards, but it did so on the basis of USEPA's discretion rather than on the basis of strict compliance with the CWA. In other words, while holding that the CWA does not require all MS4 discharges to comply strictly with state water quality standards, the Court also held that USEPA has the authority to determine that ensuring strict compliance with state water quality standards is necessary to control pollutants. On the question of whether MS4 permits must contain numeric effluent limitations, the court upheld USEPA's use of iterative BMPs in place of numeric effluent limitations for storm water discharges.

On October 14, 1999, the State Water Board issued a legal opinion on the federal appellate decision and provided advice to the Regional Water Boards on how to proceed in the future. In the memorandum, the State Water Board concludes that the recent Ninth Circuit opinion upholds the discretion of USEPA and the State to (continue to) issue storm water permits to MS4s that require compliance with water quality standards through iterative BMPs. Moreover, the memorandum states that "[...] because most MS4 discharges enter impaired water bodies, there is a real need for permits to include stringent requirements to protect those water bodies. As TMDLs are developed, it is likely that MS4s will have to participate in pollutant load reductions, and the MS4 permits are the most effective vehicles for those reductions." In summary, the State Water Board found that the Regional Water Boards should continue to include the RWL established in State Water Board Order WQ 99-05 in all future permits.

The issue of the RWLs language was also central to the Building Industry Association's (BIA's) (and others') appeal of San Diego Water Board Order No. 2001-01 (San Diego MS4 permit), which was used as a template for San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2002-0001 (Orange County MS4 permit). BIA contended that the storm water MEP standard was a ceiling on what could be required of the Copermittees in implementing their runoff management programs, and that Order No. 2001-01's receiving water limitations requirements exceeded that ceiling. In other words, BIA

DRAFT

argued that the Copermitees could not be required to comply with receiving water limitations if they necessitated efforts which went beyond the MEP standard. Again, the courts upheld the San Diego Water Board's discretion to require compliance with water quality standards in municipal storm water permits, without limitation. The Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District found that the San Diego Water Board has "the authority to include a permit provision requiring compliance with water quality standards."¹⁴⁸ On further appeal by BIA, the California State Supreme Court declined to hear the matter.

While implementation of the iterative BMP process is a means to achieve compliance with water quality objectives for storm water MS4 discharges, it does not shield the discharger from enforcement actions for continued non-compliance with water quality standards. Consistent with USEPA guidance,¹⁴⁹ regardless of whether or not an iterative process is being implemented, discharges that cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards are in violation of Order No. R9-2010-0016.

Finding E.2. The Basin Plan, identifies the following existing and potential beneficial uses for surface waters in Riverside County: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN), Agricultural Supply (AGR), Industrial Process Supply (PROC), Hydropower Generation (POW), Industrial Service Supply (IND), Ground Water Recharge (GWR), Contact Water Recreation (REC1), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE), Spawning, Reproduction and/or Early Development (SPWN) and Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL).

Discussion of Finding E.2. The southwestern portion of Riverside County is within the San Diego Region. The Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region falls within Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit. The major streams within the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit are the Santa Margarita River, Temecula Creek, and Murrieta Creek. Other surface water bodies include De Luz Creek, Sandia Canyon Creek, Warm Springs Creek, San Gertrudis Creek, and Wilson Creek. Major inland water bodies include Lake Skinner and Vail Lake.

The Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit includes unincorporated portions of Riverside County, the Cities of Menifee, Murrieta, Temecula, and Wildomar..

Based on the 2000 census, approximately 150,000 people resided within the permitted area. Since the 2000 census, however, several new developments, especially in the Cities of Temecula and Murrieta have increased the housing stock of the area, and the population is now significantly higher. As of January 1, 2009, approximately 250,000

¹⁴⁸ Building Industry Association et al., v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al. 2004.

¹⁴⁹ USEPA, 1998. Jan. 21, 1998 correspondence, "State Board/OCC File A-1041 for Orange County," from Alexis Strauss to Walt Petit, and March 17, 1998 correspondence from Alexis Strauss to Walt Petit.

DRAFT

people reside in the permitted area, with approximately 30,000 people living in the unincorporated area of Riverside County (31,163) and approximately 220,000 living in the Cities of Menifee (613), Murrieta (99,574), Temecula (102,604), and Wildomar (22,240).¹⁵⁰

Finding E.3. This Order is in conformance with State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*, and the federal Antidegradation Policy described in 40 CFR 131.12.

Discussion of Finding E.3. Runoff management programs are required to be designed to reduce pollutants in storm water MS4 discharges to the maximum extent practicable and achieve compliance with water quality standards. Therefore, implementation of runoff management programs, which satisfy the requirements of Order No. R9-2010-0016, will prevent violations of receiving water quality standards. The Basin Plan states that “Water quality objectives must [...] conform to US EPA regulations covering antidegradation (40 CFR 131.12) and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California*.” As a result, when water quality standards are met, USEPA and State Water Board antidegradation policy requirements are also met.

Finding E.4. Section 6217(g) of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires coastal states with approved coastal zone management programs to address non-point pollution impacting or threatening coastal water quality. CZARA addresses five sources of non-point pollution: agriculture, silviculture, urban, marinas, and hydromodification. This NPDES permit addresses the management measures required for the urban category, with the exception of septic systems. The adoption and implementation of this NPDES permit relieves the Copermitttee from developing a non-point source plan, for the urban category, under CZARA. The San Diego Water Board addresses septic systems through the administration of other programs.

Discussion of Finding E.4. Coastal states are required to develop programs to protect coastal waters from nonpoint source pollution, as mandated by the federal CZARA. CZARA section 6217 identifies polluted runoff as a significant factor in coastal water degradation, and requires implementation of management measures and enforceable policies to restore and protect coastal waters. In lieu of developing a separate NPS program for the coastal zone, California’s NPS Pollution Control Program was updated in 2000 to address the requirements of both the CWA section 319 and the CZARA section 6217 on a statewide basis. The California Coastal Commission (CCC), the State Water Board, and the nine Regional Water Boards are the lead State agencies for upgrading the program, although 20 other State agencies also participate. Pursuant to the CZARA (section 6217(g)) Guidance Document the development of runoff management programs pursuant to this NPDES permit fulfills

¹⁵⁰ Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Santa Margarita Watershed Annual Progress Report

DRAFT

the need for cities within watersheds that discharge to the coastal zone to develop an runoff non-point source plan identified in the State's Non-point Source Program Strategy and Implementation Plan.¹⁵¹

Finding E.5. Section 303(d)(1)(A) of the CWA requires that "Each state shall identify those waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limitations...are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard (WQS) applicable to such waters." The CWA also requires states to establish a priority ranking of impaired waterbodies known as Water Quality Limited Segments and to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for such waters. This priority list of impaired waterbodies is called the Section 303(d) List. The 2006 303(d) List was approved by the State Water Board on October 25, 2006. On June 28, 2007 the 2006 303(d) List for California was given final approval by the USEPA. The 303(d) List was recently updated, and on December 16, 2009 the 2008 303(d) List was approved by the San Diego Water Board. The 2008 303(d) List is awaiting State Water Board and USEPA approval.

Discussion of Finding E.5. Section 303(d) of the federal CWA (CWA, 33 USC 1250, et seq., at 1313(d)), requires States to identify waters that do not meet water quality standards after applying certain required technology-based effluent limits ("impaired" water bodies). States are required to compile this information in a list and submit the list to USEPA for review and approval. This list is known as the Section 303(d) list of impaired waters, or 303(d) List. As part of this listing process, States are required to prioritize waters/watersheds for future development of TMDLs. The State Water Board and Regional Water Boards have ongoing efforts to monitor and assess water quality, to prepare the 303(d) List, to prioritize waters/watersheds for TMDL development, and to subsequently develop TMDLs. TMDLs developed and adopted by the San Diego Water Board are incorporated into the Basin Plan via a Basin Plan Amendment as authorized under CWC section 13240.

The 2006 California 303(d) List identifies impaired receiving water bodies and their watersheds within the State of California.¹⁵² The San Diego Water Board recently updated the 303(d) List for the San Diego Region and adopted the 2008 303(d) List on December 16, 2009.¹⁵³ The number of water bodies listed as impaired in the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit increased from 6 water bodies (13 water body / impairing pollutant combinations) on the 2006 303(d) List to 9 water bodies (49 water body / impairing pollutant combinations) on the 2008 303(d) List, indicating the receiving water quality has been degraded further (see Table 2). Storm water and non-storm water runoff that is discharged from the Copermitttees' MS4s is a leading cause of receiving water quality impairment in the San Diego Region.

¹⁵¹ State Water Board/CCC, 2000. Nonpoint Source Program Strategy and Implementation Plan, 1998-2013 (PROSIP).

¹⁵² The approved 2006 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments is on-line at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists2006.html.

¹⁵³ The 2008 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments, approved by the San Diego Water Board, is available on-line at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/water_issues/programs/303d_list/index.shtml

DRAFT

Finding E.6. This Order 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 Order implements federally mandated requirements under CWA § 402. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B).) Second, the local agency Copermittees' obligations under this Order are similar to, and in many respects less stringent than, the obligations of non-governmental and new dischargers who are issued NPDES permits for storm water and non-storm water discharges. Third, the local agency Copermittees have the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for compliance with this Order. Fourth, the Copermittees have requested permit coverage in lieu of compliance with the complete prohibition against the discharge of pollutants contained in CWA § 301, subdivision (a) (33 U.S.C. § 1311(a)) and in lieu of numeric restrictions on their MS4 discharges (i.e. effluent limitations). Fifth, the local agencies' 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. Likewise, the provisions of this Order to implement TMDLs are federal mandates. The CWA requires TMDLs to be developed for water bodies that do not meet federal water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. sec. 1313(d).) Once the UUSEPA or a state develops a TMDL, federal law requires that permits must contain effluent limitations consistent with the assumptions of any applicable wasteload allocation. (40 C.F.R. sec. 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)

Discussion of Finding E.6. This Order 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 Order 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-storm water discharges, to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water 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 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. U.S. E.P.A. (9th Cir. 1992) 966 F.2d 1292, 1308, fn. 17.)

The authority exercised under this Order 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 which are not "less stringent" than federal requirements]), but instead, is part of a federal mandate to develop pollutant reduction requirements for municipal separate storm sewer systems. 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,

DRAFT

1389; Building Industry Ass'n of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 882-883.)

Second, the local agency Copermittees' obligations under this Order are similar to, and in many respects less stringent than, the obligations of non-governmental dischargers who are issued NPDES permits for storm water 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 (CWC § 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 storm water with an even hand, but to the extent there is any relaxation of this even-handed regulation, it is in favor of the local agencies. Except for municipal separate storm sewer systems, the CWA requires point source dischargers, including discharges of storm water 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 storm water discharges must strictly comply with water quality standards].) As discussed in prior State Water Board decisions, this Order does not require strict compliance with water quality standards. (State Water Board Order WQ 2001-15, p. 7.) The Order, therefore, regulates the discharge of waste in municipal storm water more leniently than the discharge of waste from non-governmental sources.

Third, the local agency Copermittees have the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for compliance with this Order. The fact sheet demonstrates that numerous activities contribute to the pollutant loading in the municipal separate storm sewer system. Local agencies can levy service charges, fees, or assessments on these activities, independent of real property ownership. (See, e.g., Apartment Ass'n 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 Copermittees 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 effluent limitations on their storm water discharges. To the extent, the local agencies 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

DRAFT

Copermittees have voluntarily sought a program-based municipal storm water permit in lieu of a numeric limitations approach on their storm water discharge. (See *City of Abilene v. U.S. E.P.A.* (5th Cir. 2003) 325 F.3d 657, 662-663 [noting that municipalities can choose between a management permit or a permit with numeric limitations].) The local agencies' 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 local agencies' 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.

Finding E.7. Runoff treatment and/or mitigation must occur prior to the discharge of runoff into receiving waters. Treatment BMPs must not be constructed in waters of the U.S. or State unless the runoff flows are sufficiently pretreated to protect the values and functions of the water body. Federal regulations at 40 CFR 131.10(a) state that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a designated use for any waters of the U.S. Authorizing the construction of a runoff treatment facility within a water of the U.S., or using the water body itself as a treatment system or for conveyance to a treatment system, would be tantamount to accepting waste assimilation as an appropriate use for that water body. Furthermore, the construction, operation, and maintenance of a pollution control facility in a water body can negatively impact the physical, chemical, and biological integrity, as well as the beneficial uses, of the water body. Without federal authorization (e.g., pursuant to CWA § 404), waters of the U.S. may not be converted into, or used as, waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Similarly, waste discharge requirements pursuant to CWC §13260 are required for the conversion or use of waters of the State as waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Diversion from waters of the U.S./State to treatment facilities and subsequent return to waters of the U.S. is allowable, provided that the effluent complies with applicable NPDES requirements.

Discussion of Finding E.7. Runoff treatment and/or mitigation in accordance with any of the requirements in the Order must occur prior to the discharge of storm water into receiving waters. Allowing storm water polluted runoff to enter receiving waters prior to treatment to the MEP will result in degradation of the water body and potential exceedances of water quality standards, from the discharge point to the point of dissipation, infiltration, or treatment. Furthermore, the construction, operation, and maintenance of a pollution control facility in a water body can negatively impact the physical, chemical, and biological integrity, as well as the beneficial uses, of the water body. This requirement is supported by federal regulation 40 CFR 131.10(a) and USEPA guidance. According to USEPA,¹⁵⁴ "To the extent possible, municipalities should avoid locating structural controls in natural wetlands. Before considering siting

¹⁵⁴ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

of controls in a natural wetland, the municipality should demonstrate that it is not possible or practicable to construct them in sites that do not contain natural wetlands. Practices should be used that settle solids, regulate flow, and remove contaminants prior to discharging storm water into a wetland.”

Additional Federal guidance discusses the implementation of wetlands to treat municipal storm water discharges (USEPA, 2000. *Guiding Principles for Constructed Treatment Wetlands: Providing for Water Quality and Wildlife Habitat*). It states:

“..treatment wetlands should not be constructed in a waters of the U.S. unless you can sufficiently pretreat the stormwater flows to protect the values and functions of the waters of the U.S. Because storm water is an unpredictable effluent source and can contain high levels of toxic substances, nutrients, and pathogens, we strongly encourage that you construct the treatment wetland in uplands and use best management practices in these projects.”¹⁵⁵

Consistent with USEPA guidance, the conversion or use of waters of the U.S./State into runoff treatment facilities or conveyance facilities for untreated storm water discharges must be appropriately reviewed by both Federal and State resource agencies. Such projects may be subject to federal permitting pursuant to CWA section 404 if discharges of dredged or fill material is involved.

The placement of hydromodification controls within waters of the U.S./State may also be subject to federal and/or state permitting, but would not necessarily be considered a pollutant treatment BMP. Provided that grade control structures are designed to re-establish a natural channel gradient and correct excessive changes to the sediment transport regime caused by urbanization, rather than to create a series of artificial hydrological impoundments for the purpose of treating pollution, this type of project is not considered an in-stream treatment BMP.

Finding E.8. The issuance of waste discharge requirements and an NPDES permit for the discharge of runoff from MS4s to waters of the U.S. is exempt from the requirement for preparation of environmental documents under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Division 13, Chapter 3, section 21000 et seq.) in accordance with the CWC section 13389.

Discussion of Finding E.8. CWC section 13389 exempts the adoption of waste discharge requirements (such as NPDES permits) from CEQA requirements: “Neither the State Water Board nor the Regional Water Boards shall be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code prior to the adoption of any waste discharge requirement, except requirements for new sources as defined in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.”

¹⁵⁵ USEPA, 2000. *Guiding Principles for Constructed Treatment Wetlands: Providing for Water Quality and Wildlife Habitat*, (EPA 843-B-00-003).

DRAFT

This CEQA exemption was challenged during BIA's (and others') appeal of Order No. 2001-01. BIA contended that the CEQA exemption did not apply to permit requirements where the San Diego Water Board utilized its discretion to craft permit requirements which were more prescriptive than required by federal law. The Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District disagreed with this argument, stating "we also reject Building Industry's argument to the extent it contends the statutory CEQA exemption in CWC section 13389 is inapplicable to a particular NPDES permit provision that is discretionary, rather than mandatory, under the CWA."¹⁵⁶ On further appeal by BIA, the California State Supreme Court declined to hear the matter.

In a recent decision, the Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second Appellate District, upheld the CEQA exemption for municipal storm water NPDES permits (County of Los Angeles, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.).¹⁵⁷

Finding E.9. Storm water discharges from developed and developing areas in Riverside County are significant sources of certain pollutants that cause, may be causing, threatening to cause or contributing to water quality impairment in the waters of Riverside County. Furthermore, as delineated in the CWA section 303(d) list in Table 2, the San Diego Water Board has found that there is a reasonable potential that municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges from MS4s cause or may cause or contribute to an excursion above water quality standards for the following pollutants: Indicator Bacteria, Copper, Manganese, Iron, Chlorpyrifos, Sulfates, Phosphorous, Nitrogen, Toxicity, and Turbidity. In accordance with CWA section 303(d), the San Diego Water Board is required to establish TMDLs for these pollutants to these waters to eliminate impairment and attain water quality standards. Therefore, certain early pollutant control actions and further pollutant impact assessments by the Copermitees are warranted and required pursuant to this Order.

Discussion of Finding E.9. CWA section 303(d)(1)(A) requires that:

"Each state must identify those waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limitations...are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard (WQS) applicable to such waters."

The CWA also requires states to establish a priority ranking of impaired water bodies known as Water Quality Limited Segments and to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for such waters. This priority list of impaired water bodies is called the 303(d) List. The current 303(d) List was approved by the State Water Board on October 25, 2006. On June 28, 2007 the 2006 303(d) List for California was given final approval by USEPA. Every two years the State of California is required by CWA section 303(d) and 40 CFR(130.7) to develop and submit to the USEPA for approval

¹⁵⁶ Building Industry Association et al., v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al. 2004.

¹⁵⁷ Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. BS080792. Partial publication dated November 6, 2006.

DRAFT

an updated 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. The San Diego Water Board recently updated the 303(d) List and adopted the 2008 303(d) List on December 16, 2009.¹⁵⁸ The 2008 303(d) List is awaiting approval by the State Water Board and USEPA. The number of water bodies listed as impaired in the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit increased from 6 water bodies (13 water body / pollutant combinations) on the 2006 303(d) List to 9 water bodies (49 water body / pollutant combinations) on the 2008 303(d) List, indicating the receiving water quality has been degraded further (see Table 2).

Multiple water bodies in Riverside County have been identified as impaired and placed on the 303(d) List. The 303(d) listing of a water body and subsequent TMDL development is required when regulations under current permits, such as Technology Based Effluent Limitations (TBELs), are not stringent enough to meet Water Quality Standards and protect the Beneficial Uses of Waters of the State.

Storm water discharges from developed and developing areas in Riverside County are a significant source of certain pollutants that cause, may be causing, threatening to cause, or contributing to water quality impairment in the waters of Riverside County. Furthermore, the CWA section 303(d) list indicates that there is a reasonable potential that municipal storm water and dry weather discharges from MS4s cause, or may cause, or contribute to an excursion above water quality standards for the following pollutants: Indicator Bacteria, Copper, Manganese, Iron, Chlorpyrifos, Sulfates, Phosphorous, Nitrogen, Total Dissolved Solids, Toxicity and Turbidity (see Table 2). In accordance with CWA section 303(d), the San Diego Water Board is required to establish TMDLs for these pollutants in these waters to eliminate impairment and attain water quality standards. Per 40 CFR(130.7), WLAs are required for all point sources, including storm water and non-storm water discharges from MS4s. Therefore, focused pollutant control actions and further pollutant impact assessments by the Copermitees are warranted and required pursuant to this Order.

MS4 Permits address only those TMDL WLAs that have been adopted by the San Diego Water Board and have been approved by the State Water Board, Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and USEPA. WLAs are portions of a receiving water's loading capacity that is allocated to one of its existing or future point sources of pollution. To date, no TMDLs and WLAs have been adopted to address impaired water bodies in the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit. When TMDLs and WLAs are adopted and approved, they will be incorporated into the MS4 permit. The TMDL WLAs in MS4 Permits can be addressed using water quality-based numeric effluent limitations (WQBELs) calculated at end-of-pipe. WQBELs must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the WLAs.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ The 2008 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments, approved by the San Diego Water Board, is available on-line at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/water_issues/programs/303d_list/index.shtml

¹⁵⁹ Per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)

DRAFT

Finding E.10. This Order requires each Copermitee to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into its MS4. However, historically pollutants have been identified as present in dry weather non-storm water discharges from the MS4s through 303(d) listings, monitoring conducted by the Copermitees under Order No. R9-2004-001, and there are others expected to be present in dry weather non-storm water discharges because of the nature of these discharges. This Order includes action levels for pollutants in non-storm water, dry weather discharges from the MS4. The non-storm water action levels are designed to ensure that the Order's requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into the MS4 is being complied with. Non-storm water action levels in the Order are based upon numeric or narrative water quality objectives and criteria as outlined in the Basin Plan, the State Water Board's Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California (Ocean Plan), and State Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). An exceedance of an action level requires specified responsive action by the Copermitees. This Order describes what actions the Copermitees must take when an exceedance of an action level is observed. Exceedances of non-storm water action levels do not alone constitute a violation of this Order but could indicate non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 or other prohibitions established in this Order. Failure to undertake required source investigation and elimination action following an exceedance of a non-storm water action level (NAL or action level) is a violation of this Order. The San Diego Water Board recognizes that use of action levels will not necessarily result in detection of all unauthorized sources of non-storm water discharges because there may be some discharges in which pollutants do not exceed established action levels. However, establishing NALs at levels appropriate to protect water quality standards is expected to lead to the identification of significant sources of pollutants in dry weather non-storm water discharges.

Discussion of Finding E.10. This Order includes the existing requirement that Copermitees effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges in the MS4s. It also includes the following prohibition set forth in the Basin Plan: "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 CWC section 13050 is prohibited." (Prohibition A.1.) As discussed in the Order's Findings on discharge characteristics, e.g., C.2., C.4., C.6., C.7., C.9., C.14., and C.15., the Copermitees' reliance on BMPs for the past 20 years has not resulted in compliance with applicable water quality standards or compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water in the MS4. The San Diego Water Board has evaluated (in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)) past and existing control BMPs, non-storm water effluent monitoring results, the sensitivity of the species in receiving waters (e.g. endangered species), and the potential for effluent dilution, and has determined that existing BMPs to control pollutants in storm water discharges are not sufficient to protect water quality standards in receiving

DRAFT

waters, and the existing requirement that Copermitees effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4, historically results in the discharge of pollutants to the receiving waters.

Therefore it is appropriate to establish dry weather non-storm water action levels based upon established water quality standards to measure pollutants levels in the discharge of dry weather non-storm water that could indicate non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 and/or that these discharges are causing, or threatening to cause, a condition of pollution, contamination or nuisance in the receiving waters. NALs are not numeric effluent limitations. While not alone a violation of this Order, an exceedance of an NAL requires the Copermitees to initiate a series of source investigation and elimination actions to address the exceedance. Results from the NAL monitoring are to be used in developing the Copermitees annual work plans. Failure to undertake required source investigation and elimination action following an exceedance of an NAL is a violation of this Order. Also refer to further discussion in the Directives section C of the Fact Sheet.

A purpose of monitoring, required under this and previous Orders, as stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program is to “detect and eliminate illicit discharges and illicit connections to the MS4” and to answer the following core management questions:

1. Are conditions in receiving waters protective, or likely to be protective, of beneficial uses?
2. What is the extent and magnitude of the current or potential receiving water problems?
3. What is the relative MS4 discharge contribution to the receiving water problem(s)?
4. What are the sources of MS4 discharge that contribute to receiving water problem(s)?
5. Are conditions in receiving waters getting better or worse?

For the past 20 years, Copermitees have utilized their illicit connection / illicit discharge (IC/ID) program to identify and eliminate non-storm water discharges that are sources of pollutants to the MS4. The Copermitees are also subject to the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into the MS4s. Historically, discharges of unauthorized non-storm water do occur, resulting in the discharge of pollutants to the receiving water. NALs have been included in this Order to ensure that the Copermitees comply with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges that are a source of pollutants in the receiving waters.

DRAFT

Finding E.12. With this Order, the San Diego Water Board has completed the re-issuance of the fourth iteration of the Phase I MS4 NPDES Permits for the Copermittees in the portions of San Diego County, Orange County, and Riverside County within the San Diego Region. The NPDES Permit requirements issued to the Copermittees in each county have substantially the same core requirements such as discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, jurisdictional components, and monitoring. In addition, the Copermittees cooperate regionally to develop monitoring with the Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition and to develop program effectiveness with the California Stormwater Quality Association. Regional programs could improve the Copermittees' compliance with other permit components such as development of the Hydromodification Management Plans and Retrofitting Existing Development with more consistent implementation and cost sharing. Re-issuing the NPDES Permit requirements within five years for three counties under three different permits requires the San Diego Water Board to expend significant time and resources for issuance of the permits through three separate public proceedings, thereby greatly reducing the time and resources available to oversee compliance. Multiple permits also create confusion for determining compliance among regulated entities, especially the land development community. The San Diego Water Board recognizes that issuing a single MS4 permit for all Phase I entities in the San Diego Region will provide consistent implementation, improve communication among agencies within watersheds crossing multiple jurisdictions, and minimize staff resources spent with each permit renewal. The San Diego Water Board plans to develop a single regional MS4 permit prior to the expiration of this Order that will transfer the Copermittees' enrollment to the regional permit upon expiration of this Order.

Discussion of Finding E.12. With the advances in storm water science and regulation in the last decade, the additional complexity has resulted in a more significant amount of San Diego Water Board staff time and resources required to complete each Phase I MS4 Permit renewal. On average, the renewal of the fourth iteration of the Phase I MS4 Permits for each county has taken approximately 2 years and multiple staff to complete. The time and resources required to complete each renewal has diverted staff time and resources away from the San Diego Water Board's ability to oversee and ensure compliance with the permit provisions and requirements.

With the adoption of this Order, all the Phase I MS4s in the San Diego Region (i.e. Copermittees of Orange County, Riverside County and San Diego County) will essentially be subject to the same set of core requirements. Because there are now more similarities than differences among the permit provisions and requirements, developing and issuing a single regionwide permit to the Phase I MS4 entities may be appropriate with the next (i.e. fifth) iteration of the Phase I MS4 Permits.

This approach would provide a consistent set of regulatory requirements throughout the San Diego Region, thereby reducing the confusion that is created with different sets of requirements between areas in close proximity to each other. A regional set of

DRAFT

requirements for the discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, jurisdictional program components (i.e., new development, construction, existing development, retrofitting), hydromodification management plans, low impact development design requirements, and monitoring would also make it easier for the programs in the three counties to share and transfer information and program efficiencies, and cooperate on a regionwide basis. Regionwide consistency would be especially beneficial where there are multiple counties involved in implementing permit requirements, such as the Santa Margarita watershed with parts of San Diego County and Riverside County, regional TMDLs (e.g., beaches and creeks bacteria TMDLs), or regional monitoring efforts or studies (e.g., Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition, Bight '08).

An additional benefit would be the reduction of staff time and resources that will be required to renew future Phase I MS4 Permits, which would only be required once every 5 years for a single regionwide permit instead of once every 1 to 3 years for three separate permits. Because of these benefits, the San Diego Water Board plans to develop a single regional Phase I MS4 Permit with the next iteration of the San Diego County MS4 Permit, which will incorporate the Orange County and Riverside County Phase I MS4 entities upon the expiration of their respective permits, or sooner.

DRAFT

F. Public Process

Finding F.1. The San Diego Water Board has notified the Copermitees, all known interested parties, and the public of its intent to consider adoption of an Order prescribing waste discharge requirements that would serve to renew an NPDES permit for the existing MS4 discharges of pollutants to waters of the U.S.

Discussion of Finding F.1. Public notification of development of a draft permit is required under Federal regulation 40 CFR 124.10(a)(1)(ii). This regulation states “(a) Scope. (1) The Director shall give public notice that the following actions have occurred: (ii) A draft permit has been prepared under Sec. 124.6(d).” Public notifications “shall allow at least 30 days for public comment,” as required under Federal regulation 40 CFR 124.10(b)(1).

Finding F.2. The San Diego Water Board has held a public hearing on October 13, 2010 and heard and considered all comments pertaining to the terms and conditions of this Order.

Discussion of Finding F.2. Public hearings are required under CWC section 13378, which states “Waste discharge requirements and dredged or fill material permits shall be adopted only after notice and any necessary hearing.” Federal regulation 40 CFR 124.12(a)(1) also requires public hearings for draft permits, stating “The Director shall hold a public hearing whenever he or she finds, on the basis or requests, a significant degree of public interest in a draft permit(s).” Regarding public notice of a public hearing, Federal regulation 40 CFR 124.10(b)(2) states that “Public notice of a public hearing shall be given at least 30 days before the hearing.”

DRAFT

IX. DIRECTIVES

This section discusses significant changes which have been made to the requirements of the Order from the requirements which were previously included in Order No. R9-2004-001. For each section of the Order that has been changed there is a discussion which describes the change that was made and provides the rationale for the change. In addition, comments on the Copermittees' ROWD recommendations, as they pertain to each changed requirement of the Order, are provided.

Requirements of the Order that are not discussed in this section have not been significantly changed from those requirements previously included in Order No. R9-2004-001. For such requirements, discussions and rationale for the requirements can be found in section VIII of the Fact Sheet/Technical Report for San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2004-001, dated July 14, 2004. Section VIII also provides additional background information for those requirements that have undergone significant change which are described in detail in this report. The Fact Sheet/Technical Report is available for download at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/stormwater/rsd_stormwater.shtml

Legal authority citations are provided for each major section of the Order. These citations apply to all applicable requirements within the section for which they are provided.

A. Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations

The following legal authority applies to section A:

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 Quality Control Plan for the San Diego 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 CWC section 13050, is prohibited."

CWC 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."

DRAFT

CWC 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.”

CWC 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.”

CWC section 13241 requires each Regional 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 [...]”

CWC section 13243 provides that “A regional 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.”

CWC section 13263(a) provides that waste discharge requirements prescribed by the San Diego 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 storm water 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.”

DRAFT

Section A of the Order combines two previously distinct requirement sections – Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations. These sections have been combined into one section for organization purposes and to reduce redundancy, since both sections address the same issue. These changes have no net effect on the implementation and enforcement of the Order.

Section A.3 describes the “iterative process.” The Copermitees must reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants to the MEP and ensure that their MS4 discharges do not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. If the Copermitees have reduced storm water pollutant discharges to the MEP, but their discharges are still causing or contributing to violations of water quality standards, the Order provides a clear and detailed process for the Copermitees to follow. This process is often referred to as the "iterative process" and can be found at section A.3. The language of section A.3 is prescribed by the State Water Board and is included in MS4 permits statewide. Section A.3 essentially requires additional BMPs to be implemented until MS4 storm water discharges no longer cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards.

The State Policy with respect to maintaining high quality waters has been added to clarify that discharges from the MS4 that cause or contribute to a violation of the Policy for high quality waters is prohibited.

The Copermitee must notify the San Diego Water Board of storm water discharges that are causing or contributing to an exceedance of applicable water quality standards. This notification can be in the form of an email or letter, with a summary of the pollutants in the storm water discharge that are exceeding the applicable water quality standards, and where and when the exceedances occurred. After notification is provided to the San Diego Water Board, the Copermitee must submit a report that describes the BMPs that are currently being implemented and the additional BMPs that will be implemented by the Copermitee to prevent or reduce the pollutants in the storm water discharge from causing or contributing to the exceedances of the applicable water quality standards. The report is separate from the notification and may be submitted with the Annual Report, unless the San Diego Water Board requests an earlier submittal of the report.

DRAFT

B. Non-Storm Water Discharges

The following legal authority applies to section B:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA sections 402, 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), 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and 40 CFR 122.44.

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) requires MS4 operators “to detect and remove (or require the discharger to the municipal separate 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) provides that the Copermittees shall prevent all types of illicit discharges into the MS4 except for certain non-storm water discharges.

Section B of the Order has been reworded to simplify and clarify the requirements for addressing non-storm water discharges that are not prohibited. This rewording has no net effect on the implementation and enforcement of the Order.

Section B.2 identifies categories of non-storm water discharges that do not have to be addressed as illicit discharges unless identified by a Copermittee or the San Diego Water Board as a category that is a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. If a Copermittee or the San Diego Water Board identifies a category of non-storm water discharges as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S., the category must be addressed through a program, including inspections, to implement and enforce an ordinance, orders, or other similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the MS4.¹⁶⁰

The program includes enforcement of an ordinance, orders, or other legal authority that prohibits the category of non-storm water discharges from entering the MS4. Implementation of the program is through the IC/ID program, described in Directive F.4, which includes requirements for investigating/inspecting illicit discharges and enforcing the ordinance, orders, or other legal authority that prohibits the category of non-storm water discharges from entering the MS4.

The federal regulations list several categories of non-storm water discharges or flows that do not have to be addressed by the program unless a Copermittee or the San Diego Water Board identifies a category as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. These categories are often referred to as “exempt” discharges that are “allowed” to be discharged into the MS4. There are two types of categories of non-storm water discharges or flows that are considered “exempt”: 1) anthropogenic (e.g., water line

¹⁶⁰ Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1)

DRAFT

flushing, air conditioner condensate), and 2) non-anthropogenic (e.g., springs, rising ground water).

For “exempt” anthropogenic categories of non-storm water discharges or flows that are identified as sources of pollutants to waters of the U.S., those categories become illicit discharges and are no longer “allowed” to be discharged to the MS4. The IC/ID program addresses those discharges (i.e. investigation of illicit discharges and enforcement of ordinances prohibiting illicit discharges to the MS4).

For “exempt” non-anthropogenic discharges or flows that are identified as sources of pollutants to waters of the U.S., the IC/ID program cannot be fully implemented with enforcement. Categories of non-storm water discharges or flows that originate due to a natural source (e.g., springs or rising ground water) can be investigated and identified, but it would be difficult to enforce ordinances prohibiting these discharges to the MS4. In these cases, the Copermittee may need to implement other control measures to prevent the illicit discharges from non-anthropogenic sources from entering the MS4 (e.g., sealing the storm drains to prevent infiltration).

The IC/ID program also identifies categories of “exempt” non-storm water discharges that are sources of pollutants to waters of the U.S. If an individual discharge within a category of “exempt” non-storm water discharges is found to be an isolated incidence or source of pollutants and not representative of the category as a whole, the entire category does not need to be removed from the list of “exempt” categories of non-storm water discharges. If, however, the Copermittees or the San Diego Water Board find that a pattern of isolated incidents or sources are consistently discharging pollutants to waters of the U.S. over a period of time, or throughout the region, the category must be identified as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. warranting removal from the list of “exempt” categories of non-storm water discharges.

The San Diego Water Board and several municipalities throughout the San Diego Region (e.g., cities and counties of Orange County and San Diego County) have reported and/or identified runoff originating from landscape irrigation as likely sources of dry weather flows conveying pollutants into their MS4s. This is also supported by legislation (Assembly Bill 1881) recently enacted by the State of California, which has identified runoff resulting from over irrigation not only as a waste of water resources, but also as a source of pollutants to the state’s waterways. Discharges from landscape irrigation have been identified by the San Diego Water Board and the Copermittees as a source of pollutants and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the United States in the following:

- In educational materials developed by The Cities and County of Riverside “Only Rain in the Storm Drain” Pollution Prevention Program, the Landscape and Garden brochure states: “Soil, yard wastes, *over-watering* [emphasis added] and garden chemicals become part of the urban runoff mix that winds it way through streets, gutters and storm drains before entering lakes, rivers, streams, etc.”

DRAFT

- In an educational survey developed by The Cities and County of Riverside “Only Rain in the Storm Drain” Pollution Prevention Program distributed at Public Outreach events, the answer to the question about where lawn irrigation water goes states: *“Water that leaves your lawn from irrigation...can pick up motor oil and grease from vehicles, excess fertilizer from your lawn, bacteria from pet waste, and excess pesticides from your yard. These pollutants can be carried down streets and storm drains directly to our streams, lakes and rivers without treatment!”*
- In 2006, the State Water Board allocated Grant funding to the Smarttimer/Edgescape Evaluation Program (SEEP). The project targets irrigation runoff by retrofitting existing development and documenting the conservation and runoff improvements. The Grant Application states that “Irrigation runoff contributes flow & pollutant loads to creeks and beaches that are 303(d) listed for bacteria indicators”. Furthermore, the grant application states that “Regional program managers agree that the reduction and/or elimination of irrigation-related urban flows and associated pollutant loads may be key to successful attainment of water quality and beneficial use goals as outlined in the Basin Plan and Bacteria TMDL over the long term”. This is reinforced in the project descriptions and objectives: “Elevated dry-weather storm drain flows, composed primarily ... of landscape irrigation water wasted as runoff, carry pollutants that impair recreational use and aquatic habitats all along Southern California’s urbanized coastline. Storm drain systems carry the wasted water, along with landscape derived pollutants such as bacteria, nutrients and pesticides, to local creeks and the ocean. Given the local Mediterranean climate, excessive perennial dry season stream flows are an unnatural hydrologic pattern, causing species shifts in local riparian communities and warm, unseasonal contaminated freshwater plumes in the near-shore marine environment”. The basis of this grant project is that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants. In addition, they indicate that the alteration of natural flows is impacting the Beneficial Uses of waters of the State. The results of this study can be applied broadly to any area where over-irrigation takes place, including Riverside County. Preliminary results from the study indicate that that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants.
- In the Watershed Action Plan Annual Report(s) for the 2006-2007 reporting period, submitted by the County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District and Copermittees within the San Juan Creek, Laguna Coastal Streams, Aliso Creek, and Dana Point Coastal Streams Watersheds, the Orange County Copermittees, within their Watershed Action Strategy Table for Fecal Indicator Bacteria state that *“Support programs to reduce or eliminate the discharge of anthropogenic dry weather nuisance flow throughout the [...] watershed. Dry weather flow is the transport medium for bacteria and other 303(d) constituents of concern”*.

DRAFT

Additionally, they state that “*conditions in the MS4 contribute to high seasonal bacteria propagation in-pipe during warm weather. Landscape irrigation is a major contributor to dry weather flow, both as surface runoff due to over-irrigation and overspray onto pavements; and as subsurface seepage that finds its way into the MS4.*”

- In the Carlsbad Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Report, submitted by the Carlsbad Watershed Copermittees (Cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, Escondido, Oceanside, San Marcos, Solana Beach, and Vista, and the County of San Diego), the Carlsbad Watershed Copermittees state “*The Carlsbad Watershed Management Area (WMA) collective watershed strategy identifies bacteria, sediment, and nutrients as high priority water quality pollutants in the Agua Hedionda (904.3 – bacteria and sediment), Buena Vista (904.2 – bacteria), and San Marcos Creek (904.5 – nutrients) Hydrologic Areas. Bacteria, sediment, and nutrients have been identified as potential discharges from over-irrigation.*”
- In Appendix D of the San Diego Bay WURMP 2007-2008 Annual Report, submitted by the San Diego Bay Watershed Copermittees (Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, and San Diego, the County of San Diego, the Port of San Diego, and the San Diego County Airport Authority), the San Diego Bay Watershed Copermittees identified *over-irrigation of lawns* from business and/or residential land uses as a likely pollutant source for bacteria, pesticides, and sediment.
- On September 28, 2006 Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger approved Assembly Bill 1881, The Water Conservation in Landscaping Act (AB 1881, Laird). The act requires cities, counties, and charter cities and charter counties, to adopt landscape water conservation ordinances by January 1, 2010. Additionally, the law required the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to prepare a Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for use by local agencies. The Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on September 10, 2009. All local agencies were required to adopt a water efficient landscape ordinance by January 1, 2010. Local agencies could adopt the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance developed by DWR, or an ordinance considered at least as effective as the Model Ordinance. The Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance includes a requirement that local agencies prohibit runoff from irrigation (§ 493.2): “*Local agencies shall prevent water waste resulting from inefficient landscape irrigation by prohibiting runoff from leaving the target landscape [emphasis added] due to low head drainage, overspray, or other similar conditions where water flows onto adjacent property, non-irrigated areas, walks, roadways, parking lots, or structures. Penalties for violation of these prohibitions shall be established locally.*”

DRAFT

- On October 08, 2009, the State of California Department of Water Resources issued a letter to all cities and counties within the State of California giving reminder of required adoption of the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The letter states that: “*Other benefits include reduced irrigation runoff, reduced pollution of waterways [emphasis added], drought resistance, and less green waste.*”
- On December 18, 2009, the San Diego Water Board adopted Order. No. R9-2009-0002, the fourth-term Orange County permit, which found that over-irrigation (landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering) into the MS4 is a source and conveyance of pollutants. Landscape irrigation, irrigation water, and lawn watering were categories removed from the list of non-storm water discharges not prohibited to be discharged into the MS4.
- The San Diego Water Board has responded to complaints about and observed runoff from over-irrigation entering the MS4s in the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region.

Several significant changes have been made to the list of categories of non-storm water discharges that do not have to be addressed as illicit discharges. A footnote has been added to dechlorinated swimming pool discharges on the list to specify that this category does not include saline swimming pool discharges. The list has been modified to remove the landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering “exempt” discharge categories (i.e. no longer “allowed” to enter the MS4). Language has been also added to the section to clarify differences in the federal regulations under 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B) and for the authority of the Director (i.e. San Diego Water Board) in regards to identifying exempted discharges.

Because the landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn watering “exempt” discharge categories have been removed from section B, per identification as a source and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the United States when discharged from the MS4, these illicit discharges must be addressed per 40 CFR 122.26(d)(iv)(B). The San Diego Water Board is requiring these discharges be addressed as illicit discharges by the Copermittees. This is consistent with the Federal Regulations (55 FR 48037). Thus, the discharges are to be prohibited via ordinance, order, or similar means and incorporated as part of the Copermittees IC/ID program.

Section B.3 has been clarified by the recognition of building fire suppression system maintenance (e.g. fire sprinklers) as an illicit discharge. The San Diego Water Board has found that such discharges contain waste, and as such the San Diego Water Board is requiring these discharges be addressed as illicit discharges by the Copermittees. This is consistent with the Federal Regulations (55 FR 48037). Thus, the discharges are to be prohibited via ordinance, order or similar means and incorporated as part of the Copermittees IC/ID program.

DRAFT

C. Non Storm Water Dry Weather Action Levels

The following legal authority applies to section C:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA section 402, 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), CWC §13377. 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, E, and F), and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

Specific Legal Authority:

CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii) provides that MS4 permits “shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the storm sewers.”

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) provides that the proposed management program “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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “a program, including inspections, to implement and enforce an ordinance, orders or similar means to prevent illicit discharges to the municipal storm sewer system; this program description shall address all types of illicit discharges, however the [listed exempt] category of non-storm water discharges or flows shall be addressed where such discharges are identified by the municipality as sources of pollutants to waters of the United States.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(2) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “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.”

Section C establishes non-storm water dry weather action levels (see also Finding C.14, Finding E.10, and the Discussion for those sections).

Non-exempted, non-storm water discharges are to be effectively prohibited from entering the MS4 or become subject to another NPDES permit (see Federal Register, Vol. 55, No. 222, pg. 47995). Conveyances which continue to accept non-exempt, non-storm water discharges do not meet the definition of MS4 and are not subject to section 402(p)(3)(B) of the CWA unless the discharges are issued separate NPDES

DRAFT

permits. Instead, conveyances that continue to accept non-exempt, non-storm water discharges that do not have a separate NPDES permit are subject to sections 301 and 402 of the CWA (see Federal Register, Vol. 55, No. 222, pg. 48037).

The Order requires the sampling of a representative percentage of major outfalls and other identified stations within each hydrologic subarea. While it is important to assess all major outfall discharges from the MS4 into receiving waters, to date the Copermittees have implemented a dry-weather monitoring program that has consisted of 4 water quality parameters collected in receiving waters, not major outfalls. In the ROWD the Copermittees have proposed relocating IC/ID (non-storm water) monitoring sites to major outfalls and increasing the level of monitoring. It is expected that the Copermittees will need to utilize current 303(d) listings, land use, the history of IC/ID complaints and the sensitivity of receiving waters in the selection and annual sampling of a representative percentage of major outfalls in accordance with the requirements under section C.4. It is expected the selection of major outfalls will be done in conjunction with the Copermittees' required updates to the MS4 map in section F.4.b of the Order.

The Order requires an increase in the number and type of pollutants sampled in non-storm water from major outfalls. To date, Copermittees have not sampled major outfalls, only receiving waters, and sampling was limited to total dissolved solids, dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity and specific conductance. Additional sampling was generally, though not always, conducted by Copermittees if initial sampling exceeded a Copermittee threshold. With the exception of dissolved oxygen, the current thresholds do not represent water quality objectives, as sampling may not trigger a threshold, but may still be exceeding a water quality objective. This Order requires non-storm water discharges to be sampled for additional pollutants including indicator bacteria, nutrients (nitrate and phosphorous), Methylene Blue Active Substances (MBAS), pesticides and metals. These pollutants are expected to be present in non-storm water discharges, are pollutants for which receiving waters are 303(d) listed as impaired or have been identified as present through receiving water monitoring.

Background and Rationale for Requirements

The San Diego Water Board developed the requirements for dry weather, non-storm water action levels based upon an evaluation of existing controls, monitoring and reporting programs (effluent and receiving water), special studies, and based upon Findings C.1 C.3, C.4, C.6, C.7 and C.14. In addition, the Copermittees' ROWD supports the establishment of action levels which can be used in the effectiveness assessment program to ensure a minimum level of program implementation and identify shortcomings in their MS4 programs.¹⁶¹

¹⁶¹ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).

DRAFT

Water Quality Control Plan

CWA section 303(c) requires the state to establish Water Quality Standards (WQS). WQS define the water quality goals of a water body, or part thereof, by designating their use or uses to be made of the water and by setting criteria necessary to protect those uses.

The San Diego Water Board's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan was adopted by the San Diego Water Board on September 8, 1994, and was subsequently approved by the State Water Board on December 13, 1994. Subsequent revisions to the Basin Plan have also been adopted by the San Diego Water Board and State Water Board.

National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR)

The USEPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, which was amended on May 4, 1995, and November 9, 1999. The CTR was adopted by USEPA on May 18, 2000,¹⁶² and amended on February 13, 2001.¹⁶³ These rules include water quality criteria for priority pollutants and are applicable to non-storm water discharges from the MS4. Criteria for 126 priority pollutants are established by the CTR. USEPA promulgated this rule to fill a gap in California water quality standards that was created in 1994 when a California court overturned the State's water quality control plans containing criteria for priority toxic pollutants. The federal criteria are legally applicable in the State of California for inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries for all purposes and programs under the CWA.

Antidegradation Policy

Section 131.12 of 40 CFR requires that the State water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Boards' Basin Plans implement, and incorporate by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. Permitted non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 CFR section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

¹⁶² Federal Register / Vol. 65, No. 97 / May 18, 2000 / Rules and Regulation P. 31861-31719; Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Part 131

¹⁶³ Federal Register / Vol. 66, No. 30 / February 13, 2001 / Rules and Regulation P. 9960-9962; Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Part 131

DRAFT

Sources of Drinking Water Policy

State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 establishes state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal and domestic supplies. Requirements of this Order include action levels, where appropriate, reflecting municipal and domestic supply use as all waters within the County of Riverside under this Order are specifically assigned municipal and domestic supply as a Beneficial Use.

Monitoring and Reporting

40 CFR section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Sections 13267 and 13383 of CWC authorize the Regional Water Boards to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement state and federal regulations. The Monitoring and Reporting Program can be found as Attachment E of the Order.

Dilution or Mixing Zones

In order to protect the Beneficial Uses of receiving waters from pollutants as a result of non-storm water MS4 discharges, this Order does not provide for a mixing zone or a zone of initial dilution except when the discharge is to the surf zone.

The San Diego Region has predominantly intermittent and ephemeral rivers and streams (Inland Surface Waters) which vary in flow volume and duration at spatial and temporal scales. Therefore, it is assumed that any non-storm water discharge from the MS4 into the receiving water is likely to be of a quantity and duration that does not allow for dilution or mixing. For ephemeral systems, non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are likely to be the only surface flows present within the receiving water during the dry season. Additionally, all surface waters within the jurisdiction of this Order have been designated in the Basin Plan with municipal supply (MUN) as a beneficial use.

It is appropriate to base numeric action levels for dry weather non-storm water discharges on these considerations.

Establishment of Action Levels

Action levels in the Order are based upon numeric or narrative water quality objectives and criteria as defined in the Basin Plan and the State Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The San Diego Water Board recognizes that use of action levels will not necessarily result in detection of all unauthorized sources of non-storm water discharges because there may be some discharges in which pollutants do not exceed established action levels.

In June of 2006, the State Water Board's Blue Ribbon Storm Water Panel released its report titled 'The Feasibility of Numerical Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of

DRAFT

Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities.’ The report only examined numerical limits as applied to storm water and not non-storm water. In the recommendations, the Blue Ribbon panel proposed storm water action levels which are computed using statistical based population approaches. For example, section D of the Permit uses a recommended statistical approach to develop storm water action levels. The Blue Ribbon panel did not examine the efficacy of action levels or recommendations for development of action levels for non-storm water discharges.

For discharges to inland surface waters, action levels are based on the USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic species, the USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of human health, water quality criteria and objectives in the applicable State plans, effluent concentration available using best available technology, and 40 CFR 131.38. Since the assumed initial dilution factor for the discharge is zero and a mixing zone is not allowed, a non-storm water discharge from the MS4 could not cause an excursion from numeric receiving water quality objectives if the discharge is in compliance with the action levels contained in the Order.

Dry weather monitoring of non-storm water conducted in receiving waters under the previous Order (Order No. R9-2004-001), which relies on BMPs as controls to protect water quality standards, has identified the presence of pollutants commonly found in non-storm water discharges. Monitoring of Indicator Bacteria, pH, Dissolved Oxygen, Phosphorus, Nitrate, Turbidity, Methylene Blue Active Substances (MBAS), and metals in receiving waters has shown concentrations that exceed state water quality criteria. It is appropriate to establish numeric action levels for these pollutants to ensure that the Copermitees are complying with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4s.

Water Quality Limited Segments on the current 303(d) list (2008) within the jurisdiction of this Order have been identified due to exceedances of Sulfate and Total Dissolved Solids criteria from a source which is currently unknown (see Table 2). These pollutants are not monitored for in non-storm water effluent under the current non-storm water MS4 monitoring program. While this Order does not establish a numeric action level for these constituents at this time, this Order now requires non-storm water MS4 discharge monitoring to include monitoring for Sulfates, Total Dissolved Solids, and Chlorides.

Priority pollutants analyzed included Cadmium, Copper, Chromium, Lead, Nickel, Silver and Zinc. These priority pollutants are likely to be present in non-storm water MS4 discharges (see Finding C.3) though dissolved metal effluent monitoring was not conducted under the previous Order. The most stringent applicable water quality criteria have been identified for these seven metals and, excluding Chromium (VI), and all are dependent on receiving water hardness. The conversion factors for Cadmium and Lead are also water hardness dependent (40 CFR 131.38(b)(2)). These levels are established as the action levels for these constituents.

DRAFT

While effluent monitoring is not available from the previous Order, the monitoring that was done for metal concentrations in receiving waters often lacked a measurement of receiving water hardness. Due to the multiple point source discharges of non-storm water from the MS4, a discharge may enter a receiving water whose hardness will vary temporally. In addition, hardness may vary spatially within and among receiving waters.

However, other information is available to determine the appropriateness of an action level. Existing monitoring concentrations absent of receiving water data, no dilution credit or mixing zone allowance, current 303(d) listings of receiving waters for other pollutants, receiving water monitoring data, and the classification of waters as critical habitat for endangered and species of concern, provide evidence that NALs are appropriate for these priority pollutants at this time in order to ensure that the Copermitees comply with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4s.

Existing receiving water pollutant concentration data (see attachment F) provides evidence that it is appropriate to include NAL based comparisons to water quality criteria given observed hardness levels, assumption of a conservative hardness level when data is absent, or designation of receiving waters as having MUN as a beneficial use. Although dry weather receiving water data is limited (see attachment F), data has been collected that documents exceedances of CTR criteria for Lead, Nickel, and Copper given the measured hardness for the receiving water. Absent receiving water hardness, Zinc has been detected in receiving waters at concentrations which may be in exceedance of CTR criteria depending on receiving water hardness. Additionally, Cadmium and Chromium were detected at elevated levels, though the concentrations were within CTR criteria given the observed receiving water hardness. However, these detections typically coincided with detections of other exceedances of water quality standards for other pollutants, including metals. Chromium and Nickel were also detected at levels that did not exceed CTR, but did exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for receiving waters.

As discussed, inland surface waters have conservatively been allotted a mixing zone and dilution credit of zero. As such, any discharge of these priority pollutants is likely to impact the receiving water, regardless of the quantity or rate of discharge.

As discussed in Finding C.7 and discussion, multiple receiving waters within the County of Riverside are 303(d) listed for a number of pollutants, including toxicity. The 303(d) listing of a water body as impaired provides evidence that the receiving water(s) are already experiencing negative impacts. These water quality limited segments are more susceptible to degradation from the synergistic addition of more pollutants, even from upstream discharges. It is therefore appropriate to include NALs designed to ensure that the Copermitees are complying with the requirement to

DRAFT

effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into the MS4s.

Copermittees have monitored the receiving waters for MS4 discharges pursuant to requirements under Order No. R9-2004-001. Dry weather receiving water data indicates poor conditions within waters receiving non-storm water MS4 discharges. Bioassessment conducted under the Order (2004-present) has documented all non-reference sites as consistently having poor or very poor IBI scores, likely due in part to receiving water chemistry and toxicity¹⁶⁴.

Receiving waters and downstream receiving waters within the jurisdiction of this Order contain species and/or are classified as critical habitat (or are exempted pursuant to Integrated National Resource Management Plans) for endangered, threatened, and state species of special concern including, but not limited to, *E. newberryi*, *A. marmorata pallida*, and *G. orcutti*.

Furthermore, the Santa Margarita River has been designated with the RARE beneficial use.

Dry Weather Non-Storm Water Action Levels Calculations for Discharges to Inland Surface Waters

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, the NALs were calculated with the following considerations and assumptions:

No dilution credit is considered for the discharge. Therefore, the discharge must comply with the Water Quality Objective at the point of discharge.

For NALs based on CTR, implementation was done using the procedure list as outlined in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) (see below example).

NAL CTR/SIP Calculation – Chromium VI Example:

Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants in the State of California is described in the CTR table listed in 40 CFR 131.38.

¹⁶⁴ Riverside County Copermittees 2007-08 and 2008-09 Annual Progress Reports.

DRAFT

A		B Freshwater		C Saltwater		D Human Health (10 ⁻⁶ risk for carcinogens) For consumption of:	
# Compound	CAS Number	Criterion Maximum Conc. ^d B1	Criterion Continuous Conc. ^d B2	Criterion Maximum Conc. ^d C1	Criterion Continuous Conc. ^d C2	Water & Organisms (μ g/L) D1	Organisms Only (μ g/L) D2
1. Antimony	7440360					14 a,s	4300 a,t
2. Arsenic ^b	7440382	340 i,m,w	150 i,m,w	69 i,m	36 i,m		
3. Beryllium	7440417					n	n
4. Cadmium ^b	7440439	4.3 e,i,m,w,x	2.2 e,i,m,w	42 i,m	9.3 i,m	n	n
5a. Chromium (III)	16065831	550 e,i,m,o	180 e,i,m,o			n	n
5b. Chromium (VI) ^b	18540299	16 i,m,w	11 i,m,w	1100 i,m	50 i,m	n	n
6. Copper ^b	7440508	13 e,i,m,w,x	9.0 e,i,m,w	4.8 i,m	3.1 i,m	1300	
7. Lead ^b	7439921	65 e,i,m	2.5 e,i,m	210 i,m	8.1 i,m	n	n
8. Mercury ^b	7439976	[Reserved]	[Reserved]	[Reserved]	[Reserved]	0.050 a	0.051 a
9. Nickel ^b	7440020	470 e,i,m,w	52 e,i,m,w	74 i,m	8.2 i,m	610 a	4600 a
10. Selenium ^b	7782492	[Reserved] p	5.0 q	290 i,m	71 i,m	n	n
11. Silver ^b	7440224	3.4 e,i,m		1.9 i,m			
12. Thallium	7440280					1.7 a,s	6.3 a,t
13. Zinc ^b	7440666	120 e,i,m,w,x	120 e,i,m,w	90 i,m	81 i,m		

Freshwater criterion maximum concentration (CMC) = 16 ug/L

Freshwater criterion continuous concentration (CCC) = 11 ug/L

These criteria are expressed in terms of the dissolved fraction of the metal in the water column. [See footnote “m” to Table in paragraph (b)(1) of 40 CFR 131.38].

40 CFR 122.45(c) requires that this Order include effluent limitations as total recoverable concentration; therefore it is appropriate to include action levels also as total recoverable concentration.

The SIP requires that if it is necessary to express a dissolved metal value as a total recoverable and a site-specific translator has not yet been developed, the San Diego Water Board shall use the applicable conversion factor from 40 CFR 131.38.

The term “Conversion Factor” (CF) represents the recommended conversion factor for converting a metal criterion expressed as the total recoverable fraction in the water column to a criterion expressed as the dissolved fraction in the water column.

Total recoverable concentration * CF = Dissolved concentration criterion

or

Total recoverable concentration = Dissolved concentration criterion/ CF

DRAFT

§ 131.38

40 CFR Ch. I (7-1-08 Edition)

Metal	Conversion factor (CF) for freshwater acute criteria	CF for freshwater chronic criteria	CF for saltwater acute criteria	CF ^a for saltwater chronic criteria
Antimony	(^d)	(^d)	(^d)	(^d)
Arsenic	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Beryllium	(^d)	(^d)	(^d)	(^d)
Cadmium	^b 0.944	^b 0.909	0.994	0.994
Chromium (III)	0.316	0.860	(^d)	(^d)
Chromium (VI)	0.982	0.962	0.993	0.993
Copper	0.960	0.960	0.83	0.83
Lead	^b 0.791	^b 0.791	0.951	0.951
Mercury
Nickel	0.998	0.997	0.990	0.990
Selenium	(^c)	0.998	0.998

CF for Chromium VI = .982 and .962, so the total recoverable concentrations for chromium VI:

16 ug/L dissolved (CMC)/ 0.982 (CF) = 16.3 ug/L total recoverable CMC
 11 ug/L dissolved (CCC) / 0.962 (CF) = 11.4 ug/L total recoverable CCC

Effluent Variability multiplier and Coefficient of Variation (CV)

For each concentration based on an aquatic life criterion, the long-term average (LTA) is calculated by multiplying the concentration with a factor that adjusts for effluent variability. The multiplier can be found in Table 1 of the SIP. Since this Order does not have existing data to properly conduct a variability analysis in accordance with the SIP, the CV has been set equal to 0.6 per SIP requirements. The current effluent data is limited due to the small number of representative outfalls sampled, the lack of outfalls discharging to representative water bodies within the Region, and the targeted nature of the sampling design.

Based upon a CV of 0.6, Table 1 of the SIP requires an effluent variability as follows:

Acute Multiplier = 0.321
 Chronic Multiplier = 0.527

The long-term average (LTA) is calculated by multiplying the total recoverable concentrations for zinc with the acute and chronic multipliers:

LTA Acute = 16.3 ug/L * 0.321 = 5.23
 LTA Chronic = 86 11.4 ug/L * 0.527 = 6.01

The maximum daily action level (MDAL) and average monthly action level (AMAL) will be based on the most limiting of the acute and chronic LTA, in the case for copper the most limiting LTA is the acute of 5.23 ug/L

NALs are calculated by multiplying the most limiting LTA with a multiplier that adjusts for the averaging periods and exceedance frequencies of the criteria and the effluent limitations. The multiplier can be found in Table 2 of the SIP. Since this Order has

DRAFT

insufficient data, the CV has been set to 0.6 and since sampling frequency is four times a month or less, n has been set equal to 4 per the SIP.

Table 2. Long-Term Average (LTA) Multipliers for Calculating Effluent Limitations

Coefficient of Variation	MDEL Multiplier	AMEL Multiplier			MDEL/AMEL Multiplier		
	99 th Percentile Occurrence Probability	95 th Percentile Occurrence Probability			MDEL = 99 th Percentile Occurrence Probability AMEL = 95 th Percentile Occurrence Probability		
(CV)		n = 4	n = 8	n = 30	n = 4	n = 8	n = 30
0.1	1.25	1.08	1.06	1.03	1.16	1.18	1.22
0.2	1.55	1.17	1.12	1.06	1.33	1.39	1.46
0.3	1.90	1.26	1.18	1.09	1.50	1.60	1.74
0.4	2.27	1.36	1.25	1.12	1.67	1.82	2.02
0.5	2.68	1.45	1.31	1.16	1.84	2.04	2.32
0.6	3.11	1.55	1.38	1.19	2.01	2.25	2.62

Therefore, from Table 2 of the SIP, the LTA multipliers will be as follows:

MDAL Multiplier = 3.11
AMAL Multiplier = 1.55

The MDAL and AMAL limits are calculated by multiplying the LTA with an LTA multiplier for each limit:

MDAL = 5.23 ug/L * 3.11 = 16 ug/L
AMAL = 5.23 ug/L * 1.55 = 8.1 ug/L

Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing Requirements

A WET limit is required if a discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an exceedance of applicable water quality standards, including numeric and narrative. Since these types of discharges are prohibited under this Order, WET limits are not applicable.

Discussion of AMALs, MDALs and Instantaneous Maximums

Where practical, action levels in this Order have been expressed as both AMALs and MDALs. Certain action levels may not practicably be expressed as AMALs and MDALs due to specific Basin Plan water quality objective language, sampling requirements and/or a lack of Criteria. Based upon the likely sampling frequency of the Copermittees, the frequency of sampling will occur such that grab samples are taken once per sampling day. This single sample would then be subject to MDALs and

DRAFT

Instantaneous Maximum levels. In this case, the more conservative action level would apply. In addition, it is expected that some effluent monitoring will occur less than or equal to once per month. In this scenario, the MDAL, AMAL and Instantaneous Maximum levels would need to be met based upon one sample (unless sampling did not occur). For some Basin Plan water quality objectives, AMALs have been excluded and only MDALs/Instantaneous Maximums set to prevent redundancy in action levels.

Compliance with Action Levels (Priority Pollutants)

Compliance with action levels shall be determined as follows:

Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with this Order if the Copermittee failed to take the prescribed action in response to a concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample that is greater than the action level and greater than or equal to the reported Minimum Level (exceedance of an action level). Regardless of the Copermittee's actions in response to an exceedance, they are still subject to the prohibitions found in sections A and B of the Order.

When determining to take an action in response to the AMALs and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "did not quantify" (DNQ) or "not detected" (ND). In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:

- (1) The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
- (2) The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of those points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.

DRAFT

D. Storm Water Action Levels

The following legal authority applies to section D:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA §402, §402(p)(3)(B)(iii), CWC §13377, 40 CFR §122.44, 40 CFR §122.26(d)(1)(iv), 40 CFR §122.26(d)(2)(i)(E and F), and 40 CFR §122.26(d)(2)(iii and iv).

Specific Legal Authority:

CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) provides that MS4 permits “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.”

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(E and F) provides that the Copermittee “Require compliance with conditions in ordinances, permits, contracts or orders;” and “Carry out all inspection, surveillance and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with permit conditions ...”

Copermittees must conduct a comprehensive monitoring program as required under Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii), including the collection of quantitative MS4 storm water effluent data from outfalls.

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (d) provide that NPDES permits include any requirements necessary to “Achieve water quality standards,... including State narrative criteria for water quality.”

Section D has been added to establish storm water action levels (see also Finding D.1.h and Discussion).

Introduction

The Copermittees’ ROWD supports the establishment of action levels which can be used in the effectiveness assessment program to ensure a minimum level of program implementation and identify shortcomings in their MS4 programs.¹⁶⁵ Storm Water Action Level (SAL) concentrations, standards and constituents have been developed and incorporated into the monitoring requirements for wet weather.

¹⁶⁵ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).


DRAFT

SAL Concentration/Standards

SAL pollutant levels were developed from a regional subset of nationwide Phase I MS4 data by using USEPA Climate Zone 6 (arid west) data.¹⁶⁶ Utilizing data from USEPA Climate Zone 6 resulted in SALs which closely reflect the environmental conditions experienced in Riverside County. The localized subset of data includes sampling events from multiple Southern California locations including Orange, San Diego, Riverside, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino Counties. The dataset includes samples taken from highly built-out impervious areas and from storm events representative of Southern California conditions.

Additionally, utilization of regional data is appropriate due to the addition of data into the nationwide Phase I MS4 monitoring dataset in February 2008. This additional data increased the number of USEPA Climate Zone 6 samples to more than 400, and included additional monitoring events within Southern California (see figure below).

Sample Sizes Used to Calculate Storm Water Action Levels



In addition, the SALs reflect the water quality standards in the Basin Plan for the San Diego Region, the California Toxic Rule and USEPA Water Quality Criteria. Since it is the goal of the SALs, through the iterative and MEP process, to have outfall storm

¹⁶⁶ Data used to develop SAL are provided in Attachment F to Order No. R9-2010-0016, and obtained from <http://rpitt.eng.ua.edu/Research/ms4/mainms4.shtml>

DRAFT

water discharges meet all applicable water quality objectives, the list of constituents to be tested and protocol for testing has been developed to provide a reference point to evaluate the iterative MEP process.

SALs were developed based upon receiving water monitoring results and CWA section 303(d) impaired waters listings. Nitrogen, Copper and Phosphorous are all pollutants for which receiving waters are 303(d) listed as impaired and for which sufficient data was available to develop SALs. Additionally, receiving water monitoring, including from storm events monitored by the Copermittees, has demonstrated excursions and/or potential excursions, often absent receiving water hardness, above water quality criteria for turbidity (NTU), Cadmium, Lead, and Zinc. SALs were not developed for some pollutants for which receiving waters are 303(d) listed as impaired due to a lack of representative data available. These pollutants are required to be monitored but are not subject to a SAL under the Order.

Monitoring

The SALs require the measurement of hardness and to provide more specificity in the assessment of samples with SALs for total metal concentrations. While USEPA Climate Region 6 data includes a large sample size for concentrations of total metals, the impact the concentration will have on receiving waters will vary with receiving water hardness. Since it is the goal of the SALs, through the iterative and MEP process, to have MS4 storm water discharges meet all applicable water quality objectives, the hardness of the receiving water should be used when assessing the total metal concentration of a sample. Thus, when an exceedance of a SAL concentration is detected for a metal, the Copermittee must determine if that exceedance is above the existing applicable water quality limitation based upon the hardness of the receiving water. The water quality limitations Copermittees must use to assess total metal SAL exceedances are the California Toxic Rule (CTR) and USEPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for Freshwater Aquatic Life 1 hour maximum concentrations. The 1 hour maximum concentration is to be used for comparison since it is expected to most replicate the impacts to waters of the State from the first flush following a precipitation event.

DRAFT

E. Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to section E:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A) provides that the Copermittees shall develop and implement legal authority to “Control through ordinance, 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 sites of industrial activity.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(D) provides that the Copermittees shall develop and implement legal authority to “Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system.”

Illicit discharge is defined under Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(b)(2) as “any discharge to a municipal separate storm sewer system that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit (other than the NPDES permit for discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer) and discharges resulting from fire fighting activities.”

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

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(ii) requires from the Copermittee “A description of existing legal authority to control discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system.”

Section E.1.b requires the Copermittees to prohibit all identified illicit discharges not otherwise allowed pursuant to section B.2 including but not limited to:

- (1) Sewage;
- (2) Discharges of wash water resulting from the hosing or cleaning of gas stations, auto repair garages, or other types of automotive services facilities;
- (3) Discharges resulting from the cleaning, repair, or maintenance of any type of equipment, machinery, or facility including motor vehicles, cement-related equipment, and port-a-potty servicing, etc.;
- (4) Discharges of wash water from mobile operations such as mobile automobile washing, steam cleaning, power washing, and carpet cleaning, etc.;

DRAFT

- (5) Discharges of wash water from the cleaning or hosing of impervious surfaces in municipal, industrial, commercial, and residential areas including parking lots, streets, sidewalks, driveways, patios, plazas, work yards and outdoor eating or drinking areas, etc.;
- (6) Discharges of runoff from material storage areas containing chemicals, fuels, grease, oil, or other hazardous materials;
- (7) Discharges of pool or fountain water containing chlorine, biocides, toxic amounts of salt, or other chemicals; discharges of pool or fountain filter backwash water;
- (8) Discharges of sediment, pet waste, vegetation clippings, or other landscape or construction-related wastes; and
- (9) Discharges of food-related wastes (e.g., grease, fish processing, and restaurant kitchen mat and trash bin wash water, etc.).

Section E.1.j has been added to the Order to ensure that BMPs implemented by third parties are effective. Since the Copermitees cannot passively receive and discharge pollutants from third parties, the Copermitees must ensure discharges of storm water pollutants to the MS4 are reduced to the MEP. In order to achieve this, the Copermitees must be able to ensure that effective BMPs are being implemented by requiring the third parties to document BMP effectiveness. Regarding the Copermitees' ability to require documentation and reporting from third parties, USEPA states "municipalities should provide documentation of their authority to enter, sample, inspect, review, and copy records, etc., as well as demonstrate their authority to require regular reports."¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁷ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part 2 of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

F. Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program

F.1. Development Planning Component

The following legal authority applies to section F.1:

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).

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(2) provides that Copermittees develop and implement a management program which is to include “A description of planning procedures including a comprehensive master plan to develop, implement and enforce controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers which receive discharges from areas of new development and significant redevelopment. Such plans shall address controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers after construction is completed.”

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.”

Sections F.1.a and F.1.b (General Plan and Environmental Review Process) require the Copermittees to update and revise their General Plan (or equivalent plan) and environmental review processes to ensure water quality and watershed protection principles are included. The Copermittees are required to detail any changes to the General Plan or environmental review process in their Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program Annual Reports. The General Plan must be updated to include water quality and watershed protection principles for all new development and redevelopment projects.

The change made to these sections requires updating the General Plan and Environmental Review Process on an as-needed basis. Each Copermittee has either updated, is in the process of updating, or has assessed its General Plan to ensure the General Plans include the required principles and are in compliance with Order No. R9-2004-001.

Section F.1.c (Approval Process Criteria and Requirements) requires that all development projects (regardless of size) implement BMPs to reduce storm water pollutant discharges to the MEP. Source control and site design BMP requirements were not clearly described in this section of Order No. R9-2004-001. Additional detail has been added to this section to better describe the source control and site design

DRAFT

BMPs needed for implementation. This additional detail is consistent with the requirements of the SSMP, also known in Riverside County as the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). However, only source control and site design BMPs that apply to all types of development projects are required (e.g., properly designed trash storage areas).

The requirements are consistent with Order No. R9-2004-001. However, some elements are not contained in the current DAMP¹⁶⁸ (e.g., buffer zones). One exception is that Order No. R9-2004-001's requirement that applicants must provide evidence of coverage under the General Industrial Permit has been removed, since industrial tenants for a development project are usually not known during the planning stage.

The section has also been modified to reflect the prohibition of over-irrigation runoff to the MS4, as well as LID requirements. Additionally, this section requires the use of native and/or low water use plants for landscaping, and rainwater harvesting, where feasible.

Sections F.1.d and F.1.d.(1) (Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plans and Definition of Priority Development Project) require the Copermittees to review and update their SSMPs (also known in Riverside County as Water Quality Management Plans – WQMPs) for compliance with the Order. The sections also require all Priority Development Projects falling under certain categories to meet SSMP requirements. The update is necessary to ensure that the Copermittees' SSMPs are consistent with the changes that have been made to the Order's SSMP requirements. The requirement for the development/adoption of a Model SSMP has been removed since a model was completed and adopted in 2005.

The SSMP section of the Order has been reformatted for clarity. There are also some significant changes. Changes have been made in response to USEPA program evaluations, recent BMP development and effectiveness studies, recent reports on the magnitude of problems caused by hydromodification, and reviews of annual reports and the ROWD submitted by the Copermittees.

In addition, the Order requires that a one-acre threshold be phased in over two years for the priority development category. This one-acre threshold was selected to be consistent with the State Water Board's Phase II NPDES requirements for small municipalities (Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ). The one-acre threshold is also included to be consistent with the State Water Board's Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-0009-WQO), to ensure all Development Projects subject to the post-construction BMP requirements of the Construction General Permit will implement SSMP post-construction BMP requirements. The one-acre determination applies to the amount of

¹⁶⁸ Riverside County Copermittees. *Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP)2006*. July 21, 2006.

DRAFT

ground area disturbed, not the total size of the parcel or project. Each Copermitttee may also lower this threshold if desired.

Section F.1.d.(2) (Priority Development Project Categories) includes several changes to improve, simplify, and clarify the Priority Development Project categories.

One of the most significant changes is that where a new Development Project feature, such as a parking lot, falls into a Priority Development Project Category, the entire project footprint is subject to SSMP requirements. This criterion was not included in Order No. R9-2004-001. It is included, however, in the Model San Diego SSMP that was approved by the San Diego Water Board in 2002. It is included in this Order because existing development inspections by Riverside County municipalities show that facilities included in the Priority Development Project Categories routinely pose threats to water quality. This permit requirement will improve water quality and program efficiency by preventing future problems associated with partly treated storm water runoff from redevelopment sites. This approach to improving storm water runoff from existing developments is practicable because municipalities have a better ability to regulate new developments than existing developments.

Another significant change is a new category for any new development projects that create 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces (collectively over the entire project site). This category applies to commercial, industrial, residential, mixed use, and public projects on private or public land.

Section F.1.d.(2)(g) was modified to allow the Copermitttees to develop a standard roadway design and post-construction BMP guidance document that could be used by the Copermitttees in lieu of a project specific SSMP for each public works road construction project. The guidance document must comply with the SSMP requirements, including the LID and hydromodification BMP requirements. The roadway design and post-construction BMP guidance must be included in the updated SSMP, and may be utilized after the San Diego Water Board has determined that the updated SSMP is acceptable.

Development of new industrial sites was not included as a category in the Priority Development Projects in Order No. R9-2004-001 because industrial NPDES requirements already establish storm water criteria. Industrial sites are now included in the new development category of the Order to be consistent with Phase II rules and to close loopholes.

Section F.1.d.(3) (Pollutants of Concern) requires Copermitttees to update their procedures for identifying pollutants of concern for each Priority Development Project. This is important to do periodically because of changing water quality conditions and designations of impairments or areas of concern. Furthermore Copermitttees continually learn more about pollutant-generating activities as they conduct inspections and investigations, and that information must be incorporated into the SSMP process.

DRAFT

Section F.1.d.(4) (Low Impact Development BMP Requirements) requires the Copermittees to require each Priority Development Project to implement low impact development (LID) BMPs to reduce the amount of polluted storm water runoff from those sites. The Copermittees' ROWD proposes to revise the Riverside County Storm Water Quality BMP Design Handbook to incorporate LID design concepts.¹⁶⁹ The primary approach in LID site design BMPs is to limit the permanent loss of existing infiltration capacity because loss of infiltration is a major contributor to wet weather pollution discharges. General means to accomplish that goal include retaining natural infiltration areas of a site and limiting the amount of impervious surfaces. The Order does not require a specific or relative amount of pervious surfaces be added to a project. The Order seeks to retain on-site capture of the 85th percentile storm.

The Copermittees must require LID BMPs to be implemented for each Priority Development Project, unless found to be technically infeasible. LID BMPs must be formally considered during the plan review process for Priority Development Projects. The LID review process for each Priority Development Project is expected to include an assessment of LID BMP techniques to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, and/or retain runoff close to the source of the runoff. The review process is also expected to include an assessment of the potential collection of storm water for on site and off site reuse opportunities. In cases where LID BMPs are found to be technically infeasible, the Copermittees may grant a waiver to the Priority Development Project for all or a portion of the LID BMP requirements.

The Order directs the Copermittees to require new development projects to employ certain classes of LID site design BMPs. The required LID site design BMPs take advantage of features that are incorporated into the Priority Development Project, such as landscaping or walkways. It also requires that projects seek to maintain natural water drainage features rather than instinctively convey water in buried pipes and engineered ditches that eliminate natural water quality treatment functions. These types of site design BMPs are both effective and achievable.

LID BMPs must be sized and designed to ensure onsite retention without runoff, of the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event ("design capture volume"). This is consistent with other municipal storm water NPDES permits recently adopted by the Los Angeles and Santa Ana Water Boards, as well as the permit recently adopted by the San Diego Water Board for Orange County. The requirement for a numerical BMP design standard is well established for treatment control BMPs and is required in permits throughout the nation such as in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Georgia, and Washington D.C. Since the 85th percentile storm event has previously been used as the numeric design standard for treatment control BMPs; the same size storm event can be applied as the numeric design standard for LID BMPs.

¹⁶⁹ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).

DRAFT

The average 24-hour, 85th percentile rainfall for the Riverside County portion of the San Diego Region was calculated to be approximately 0.6 inches of rain.¹⁷⁰

The retention and restoration of natural drainage features, such as ephemeral streams, wetlands, and depressions, can be particularly important because small tributaries are essential to the maintenance of the chemical, biological, and physical integrity of larger water bodies.¹⁷¹ The loss and modification of such natural water resources to accommodate post-development storm water management leads to direct and indirect adverse effects on water quality that are felt both on the project site and off the site within the watershed.^{172,173,174} Effects to aquatic beneficial uses from altered drainage features can occur downstream and upstream. The length of upstream or downstream effect of channel modifications is dependant on the specific structure type and channel slope.¹⁷⁵ For instance, road culverts can act as partial barriers to upstream distribution of native aquatic macroinvertebrates in urban streams, while bridges can provide adequate passage.¹⁷⁶ As a result of the adverse effects to water quality and beneficial uses, the State of California nonpoint source pollution program management measures for urban areas includes limiting the destruction of natural drainage features and natural conveyance areas.¹⁷⁷ Additionally, any project proposing to discharge dredge and/or fill material to waters of the United States and/or State is required to obtain a CWA section 401 Water Quality Certification and/or Waste Discharge Requirements from the San Diego Water Board or State Water Board.

LID site design BMP options do not need to be costly.¹⁷⁸ Some design options, such as concave vegetated surfaces or routing rooftop or walkway runoff to landscaped areas, are cost neutral.¹⁷⁹ Other LID site design BMPs, such as minimizing parking stall widths or use of efficient irrigation devices, are oftentimes already required. In addition, use of LID site design BMPs reduces storm water runoff quantity, allowing for

¹⁷⁰ San Diego Water Board, 2004. Fact Sheet/Technical report for Order No. R9-2004-001, dated July 14, 2004.

¹⁷¹ Aquatic scientists comment letter (April 10, 2003) on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on the Clean Water Act Regulatory Definition of "Waters of the United States." (Docket ID No. OW-2002-0050). This letter is a synthesis of scientific information regarding ephemeral, intermittent, and headwater streams. It was written to USEPA by 85 leading aquatic scientists.

¹⁷² Wright, Tiffany, et al. 2006. *Direct and Indirect Impacts of Urbanization on Wetland Quality*. Prepared by the Center for Watershed Protection for the USEPA Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds. 81p. Available on-line at <http://www.cwp.org>

¹⁷³ Konrad, Christopher P. and Derek K. Booth, 2005. *Hydrologic Changes in Urban Streams and Their Ecological Significance*. American Fisheries Society Symposium. Vol. 45 pp.157-177.

¹⁷⁴ Coleman, Derrick, et al. 2005. *Effect of Increases in Peak Flows and Imperviousness on the Morphology of Southern California Streams*. Technical Report No. 450 of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

¹⁷⁵ Fischenich, J.C. 2001. "Impacts of stabilization measures," EMRRP Technical Notes Collection (ERDC TNEMRRP- SR-32), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. <http://www.wes.army.mil/el/emrrp>

¹⁷⁶ Blakely, Tanya J., et al. 2006. *Barriers To The Recovery Of Aquatic Insect Communities In Urban Streams* Freshwater Biology Vol. 51(9), 1634–1645.

¹⁷⁷ California Nonpoint Source Encyclopedia, Management Measure 3.1.b. Runoff from Developing Areas, Site Development and Management Measure 3.3.a. Runoff from Existing Development, Existing Development.

¹⁷⁸ USEPA, 2000. Low-Impact Development: A literature review. EPA-841-B-00-005. 35p.

¹⁷⁹ Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association., 1999. Start at the Source. Forbes Custom Publishing. Available on-line at: http://www.scvurppp-w2k.com/basmaa_satsm.htm. pp. 149.

DRAFT

treatment control BMPs and other storm water infrastructure on site to be smaller, therefore savings costs for both developers and municipalities.^{180,181}

Because of the potential economic and environmental benefits of using LID site design, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, developed “*The Practice of Low Impact Development (LID)*” to assist the housing industry during the land development process.¹⁸² This document focuses specifically on technologies that affect both the cost impacts and environmental issues associated with land development. Much of the report focuses on storm water management because LID storm water management systems can save capital costs for developers and maintenance costs for municipalities.¹⁸³ The executive summary of the HUD report notes:

This approach to land development, called Low Impact Development (LID), uses various land planning and design practices and technologies to simultaneously conserve and protect natural resource systems and reduce infrastructure costs. LID still allows land to be developed, but in a cost-effective manner that helps mitigate potential environmental impacts. LID is best suited for new, suburban development.

Developers can use site and structure designs that reduce building footprints, decrease the amount of paved infrastructure, and provide for dispersed drainage and infiltration of runoff from impervious surfaces to reduce the effective impervious surface.¹⁸⁴ The concept of effective impervious surface is important, because when runoff from these surfaces is directed to pervious areas rather to an impervious drainage system (i.e. curbs, gutters, street surfaces, storm drain pipes), it can infiltrate, evaporate, or be taken up by vegetation, thereby reducing the total volume of storm water runoff leaving a site.

In addition to all the benefits discussed above, LID BMPs have several other advantages over conventional treatment control BMPs. As previously discussed, implementing LID BMPs can save on maintenance costs for municipalities and property owners. LID BMPs are typically easier to operate and maintain compared to conventional mechanical treatment control BMP technologies. Because LID BMPs are easier to operate and maintain, they are also more reliable compared to conventional mechanical treatment control BMP technologies, thus more sustainable over the long term.

¹⁸⁰ National Association of Home Builders Research Center. *Builders Guide to Low Impact Development*. Available on-line at <http://www.toolbase.org>

¹⁸¹ National Association of Home Builders Research Center. *Municipal Guide to Low Impact Development*. Available on-line at <http://www.toolbase.org>

¹⁸² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, 2003. *The Practice of Low Impact Development*. Prepared by: NAHB Research Center, Inc. Upper Marlboro, Maryland. Contract No. H-21314CA.

¹⁸³ Ibid. Executive Summary, p.x.

¹⁸⁴ Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association. 2003. *Using Site Design Techniques to Meet Development Standards for Stormwater Quality*. Available on-line at: <http://www.basmaa.org/>

DRAFT

Through its process of conditioning development projects under the CWA section 401 Water Quality Certification program, the San Diego Water Board finds that the level of LID site design BMP implementation in the Order is feasible for all projects. The LID BMP requirements will help ensure that LID site design BMPs are implemented for new development projects. LID site design BMPs are a critical component of storm water runoff management at new development projects, since the LID BMPs provide multiple benefits including preservation of hydrologic conditions, reduction of pollutant discharges, cost effectiveness, and green space.

The Order provides the Copermittees with flexibility in implementing the LID site design BMP requirements by providing a LID BMP waiver program. For Priority Development Projects where infiltration LID BMPs are not technically feasible for retaining all or part of the design capture volume on site without runoff, a waiver may be granted for the remaining portion of the design capture volume to be treated with other LID BMPs. The Riverside County Copermittees plan on allowing the implementation of the LID BMPs contained in the Riverside County LID Design Manual if infiltration LID BMPs are found to be technically infeasible to retain all of the design capture volume. Other LID BMP design and guidance manuals that are acceptable to the Copermittees and/or San Diego Water Board may also be considered.

If infiltration LID BMPs and/or other LID BMPs are technically infeasible to retain and/or treat all or part of the design capture volume for a Priority Development Project, a waiver may be granted for the remaining portion of the design capture volume. The waiver would allow the remaining portion of the design capture volume to be treated with conventional treatment control BMPs and some form of mitigation.

The use of conventional treatment control BMPs for Priority Development Projects is expected to be allowed by the Copermittees on a very limited basis, and only when a Copermittee finds that LID BMPs are technically infeasible for retaining and/or treating the full design capture volume. In such cases, the Copermittee may issue a waiver for the Priority Development Project from all or a portion of the LID BMP requirements. The LID BMP waiver program that must be developed and implemented by the Copermittee(s) is discussed below under section F.1.d.(7). The criteria that the Copermittee(s) may use to make a finding of technical infeasibility for implementing LID BMPs are also discussed under section F.1.d.(7).

Section F.1.d.(5) (Source Control BMP Requirements) requires that Priority Development Projects implement a minimum set of source control BMPs to protect the water quality of receiving waters from discharges of runoff from these projects. This section has been added to provide more detail and clarify the Order's requirements for source control BMPs. The minimum source control BMPs listed as required by this section must be implemented by each Priority Development Project. In cases where one or more of the minimum source control BMPs are not warranted as part of the site

DRAFT

design for the Priority Development Project (e.g., no outdoor material storage and/or work areas), those source control BMPs are not expected to be implemented.

Section F.1.d.(6) (Treatment Control BMP Requirements) includes several design requirements for any treatment control BMPs that are allowed to be implemented (i.e. granted a waiver for all or part of the LID BMP requirements) on Priority Development Projects. These requirements are generally consistent with Order No. R9-2004-001, with two exceptions. First, the Order limits the selections of methods used to determine the appropriate volume of storm water runoff to be treated. The modification ensures that priority development project proponents utilize the most accurate information to determine the volume or flow of runoff which must be treated.

Second, the Order requires that treatment control BMPs selected for implementation at Priority Development Projects have a removal efficiency rating that is ranked with high or medium pollutant removal frequency for the project's most significant pollutants of concern. The requirement allows exceptions for those projects that, with a feasibility analysis, can justify the use of a treatment control BMP with a low removal efficiency for a Priority Development Project. This requirement is needed because to date, the Copermittees have generally approved low removal efficiency treatment control BMPs without justification or evidence that use of higher efficiency treatment BMPs was considered and found to be infeasible. Specifically, it has been found during audits of the Copermittees' SSMP programs that many SSMP reports do not adequately describe the selection of treatment control BMPs.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, USEPA's contractor Tetra Tech, Inc. recommends that "project proponents should begin with the treatment control that is most effective at removing the pollutants of concern [...] and provide justification if that treatment control BMP is not selected."¹⁸⁶

In addition, treatment control BMPs must be designed and implemented with measures to avoid the creation of nuisance or pollution associated with vectors, such as mosquitoes, rodents, and flies. Related guidelines are identified in guidance from CASQA.¹⁸⁷ Additional considerations are outlined in publications from the California Department of Health Services and University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.¹⁸⁸

Section F.1.d.(7) (Low-Impact Development BMP Waiver Program) requires the Copermittees to develop, collectively or individually, a LID BMP waiver program. For some Priority Development Project sites, it may be technically infeasible to implement the required LID BMPs to retain and/or treat the design capture volume due to the site

¹⁸⁵ PG Environmental, 2008. Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and County of Riverside MS4 Inspection Report.

¹⁸⁶ Tetra Tech, Inc., 2005. Program Evaluation Report –San Diego Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) Evaluation. P. 5.

¹⁸⁷ For example, see the California Stormwater BMP Handbook guidelines for Extended Detention Basins (TC-22) at <http://www.cabmphandbooks.org>.

¹⁸⁸ Marco Metzger. "Managing Mosquitoes in Stormwater Treatment Devices." University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Publication No. 8125. Available at <http://anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu>.

DRAFT

constraints. For this reason, the San Diego Water Board has added to the Order a requirement for the Copermittees to develop such a program. The LID BMP waiver program would provide the opportunity for development projects to avoid partial or full LID BMP implementation in exchange for implementation of conventional treatment control BMPs and mitigation. The program would maintain equal water quality benefits as properly implemented LID BMPs when partial LID BMPs are coupled with some form of mitigation.

LID BMPs are not limited to infiltration BMPs, and may also include storage, evaporation, evapotranspiration, filtration, and/or on site reuse BMPs. Thus, the San Diego Water Board expects that every site will be able to implement some form of LID BMPs to some extent. The LID BMP waiver program is expected to be used by the Copermittees on a limited basis, and only when a Copermittee finds that LID BMPs are technically infeasible for retaining and/or treating the full design capture volume. The Order provides several conditions under which a Copermittee may find that the implementation of LID BMPs to retain and/or treat the design capture volume is technically infeasible [see section F.1.d.(7)(b)(i)-(iii)]. The Copermittees are not limited to the conditions listed in the Order, and may identify other conditions in the SSMP that would allow a finding of technical infeasibility.

Making a finding of technical infeasibility for the implementation of the LID BMP requirements on any Priority Development Project is at the discretion of each Copermittee through their SSMP plan review process. For any project proponent that would like to receive a waiver for all or part of the LID BMP requirements, the Copermittees may require and/or use any information to make a finding of technical infeasibility.

A separate technical report developed by the project proponent or the Copermittee to support a finding of technical infeasibility may not always be necessary to meet the requirements of this Order. In most cases, it is expected that the information that is provided in the project proponent's SSMP plan review documents (e.g., geotechnical reports, site design plans) will allow the Copermittees to determine whether or not it is technically feasible for LID BMPs to be implemented to retain and/or treat all or part of the design capture volume. The reason(s) for a Copermittee making a finding a technical infeasibility and granting a LID BMP waiver for any project must be provided in the Annual Report.

For Priority Development Projects that are granted a waiver for all or a portion of the LID BMP requirements, mitigation will be required to achieve water quality benefits that will be lost without the LID BMP retention and/or treatment. Any LID BMP waiver program which allows development projects to forgo all or part of the LID BMP implementation requirements must include mitigation provisions which will achieve similar water quality benefits. To ensure that this is the case for the LID BMP waiver program, minimum mitigation provisions for the program have been added to the Order.

DRAFT

Mitigation can be achieved on site or off site. On site mitigation may include additional sizing multipliers for conventional treatment control BMPs implemented on the site to treat a larger range of storm events to achieve the same or greater pollutant load removal expected from retention of the design capture volume. Off site mitigation may include other pollutant treatment projects that are not located on the site that will achieve the same or greater pollutant removal expected from on site LID BMPs for the design capture volume. For example, off site mitigation projects may include green streets projects, existing development retrofit projects, retrofit incentive programs, regional BMPs and/or riparian restoration projects. Off site mitigation projects may also satisfy the Order's retrofitting requirements in section F.3.d.

In addition to these mitigation options, the Order allows the Copermittees to develop and propose additional forms of mitigation (e.g., pollutant credit system, mitigation fund) that could be implemented as part of the LID BMP waiver program by the Copermittee(s). Any additional forms of mitigation proposed by the Copermittees would be subject to approval by the San Diego Water Board Executive Officer prior to implementation.

Section F.1.d.(8) (LID and Treatment Control BMP Standards) addresses a need for the Copermittees to develop and apply consistent criteria for the design and maintenance of structural treatment BMPs. Correct BMP design is critical to ensure that BMPs are effective and perform as intended. Without design criteria, there is no assurance that this will occur, since there is no standard for design or review. As an example, Ventura County has developed a BMP manual that includes standard design procedure forms for BMPs. Ventura County's *Technical Guidance Manual for Storm Water Quality Control Measures* is available at <http://www.vcstormwater.org/publications.htm>.¹⁸⁹ CASQA also confirms the necessity of design criteria when it includes such criteria in its New Development and Redevelopment BMP Handbook.¹⁹⁰ This issue is noted in the ROWD, and the Copermittees propose to develop standard design checklist/plans/details for selected source control and treatment BMPs.¹⁹¹

Section F.1.d.(9) (Implementation Process) requires the Copermittee to implement a process to verify compliance with SSMP requirements. The process must identify at what point in the planning process that projects must meet SSMP requirements and what are roles/responsibilities of municipal departments. The intent of this requirement is to provide consistency in the application of the SSMP between the Copermittees. This requirement was included in previous Order No. R9-2004-001.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ California Stormwater Quality Association, 2003. Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook – New Development and Redevelopment.

¹⁹¹ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).

DRAFT

Section F.1.d.(10) (Post-construction BMP Review) requires the Copermittees to keep their SSMP up to date with BMP effectiveness studies for low-impact design and treatment control BMPs. This requirement will ensure that two important types of information be included in those efforts: Site design BMPs and treatment BMPs that are assessed as part of contracts with the State Water Board and San Diego Water Board. Projects funded with such state grants must include effectiveness assessments using a quality assurance plan. As a result, such studies generally provide reliable sources of local data and should be included in the SSMP.

Sections F.1.e (BMP Construction Verification) requires the Copermittees to verify that the BMPs are being constructed for each Priority Development Project subject to SSMP requirements (SSMP project). SSMP projects that improperly construct or fail to construct site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs can pose a significant threat to water quality. Section F.1.e is included in response to recommendations from USEPA.¹⁹²

In some cases SSMP projects may wish to allow occupancy and/or use of a portion of the site prior to full completion of the project. Section F.1.e is not intended to require a project to be fully (i.e. all phases and areas) completed before the occupancy and/or intended use of a portion of the site is allowed. A Copermittee, however, must verify that the BMPs designed to treat and control pollutants from the completed portion of the project are properly constructed before the occupancy and/or intended use of the completed portion is allowed. The BMPs must be specifically designed to control pollutants from the completed portion of the site that will be occupied and/or used prior to the full completion of the SSMP project.

Section F.1.f (BMP Maintenance Tracking) is included in the Order to ensure the continued effectiveness of the post-construction BMP requirements. BMPs need to be properly constructed and adequately maintained to ensure that they are operating correctly and remain effective in removing pollutants from a project site's runoff prior to discharging to receiving waters.

To facilitate the tracking of BMP maintenance, each Copermittee must develop and maintain a database of Priority Development Projects subject to SSMP requirements (SSMP projects) and the post-construction BMPs implemented for each SSMP project. The inventory is not expected or required to include LID BMPs that are implemented on a lot by lot basis in low density residential areas. The inventory, however, must include the post-construction BMPs for all other development or redevelopment SSMP project sites.

The Order requires BMPs at all high priority SSMP project sites as well as all Copermittee project sites with BMPs to be inspected by the Copermittees annually.

¹⁹² Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68845. USEPA recommends such practices in the Phase II storm water regulations, promoting "inspections during construction to verify BMPs are built as designed."

DRAFT

Other measures, verification methods, and inspection frequencies may be used for BMPs at lower priority SSMP project sites. SSMP project sites with the highest potential for causing or contributing to a threat to water quality or an existing impairment of water quality are required to be inspected by the Copermittees on an annual basis.

Twenty percent of all SSMP projects are required to be inspected by the Copermittees annually. If the number of high priority SSMP project sites is 20 percent or more of the total number of SSMP projects in the Copermittee's inventory, this requirement will be met. If, however, the number of high priority SSMP project sites is less than 20 percent of the total number of SSMP projects in the Copermittee's inventory, additional lower priority SSMP project sites must be inspected to make up the difference. Selection of the additional lower priority SSMP project sites will be at the discretion of the Copermittee, but are selected based on each site's potential threat to water quality.

The prioritization of the SSMP project sites requiring inspections by the Copermittees will be developed by the Copermittees and reported in the updated JRMP. The prioritization of SSMP project sites may be revised on an annual basis based on inspection findings, and the Copermittees must report changes in prioritization, and justification for each change, in the Annual Report.

The Order includes several criteria that must be considered by the Copermittees in determining the priority of a SSMP project site's threat to water quality. Receiving waters that are listed as impaired by pollutants and/or with discharges exceeding action levels are water bodies most at risk for impairment of beneficial uses. Thus, at a minimum, high priority SSMP projects must include sites that are known or suspected to generate pollutants in an area that is tributary (i.e. upstream within the same Hydrologic Subarea) to a receiving water body listed as impaired for those pollutants; and/or, a receiving water body where exceedances of action levels for those pollutants are observed; and/or, a receiving water body where exceedances of NALs for those pollutants are observed and the Copermittee has not been able to identify the source.

Section F.1.h (Hydromodification) expands and clarifies current requirements for control of MS4 discharges to limit hydromodification effects caused by changes in runoff resulting from development and urbanization. The requirements are based on findings and recommendations of the Riverside County Storm Water Program,¹⁹³ the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition (SMC),^{194,195} and the Storm Water Panel on Numeric

¹⁹³ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge (San Diego Region).

¹⁹⁴ Coleman, Derrick, et al. 2005. *Effect of Increases in Peak Flows and Imperviousness on the Morphology of Southern California Streams*. Technical Report No. 450 of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

¹⁹⁵ Stein, Eric and Susan Zaleski. 2005. *Managing Runoff to Protect Natural Streams: The Latest Developments on Investigation and Management of Hydromodification in California*. Proceedings of a special technical workshop co-sponsored by California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA), Stormwater Monitoring Coalition (SMC), and University of Southern California Sea Grant (USC Sea Grant). Technical Report No. 475 of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

DRAFT

Effluent Limits (Numeric Effluent Panel).¹⁹⁶ Added specificity is needed due to the current lack of a clear standard for controlling hydromodification resulting from development. More specific requirements are also warranted because hydromodification is increasingly recognized as a major factor affecting water quality and beneficial uses.

Hydromodification is the change in a watershed's runoff characteristics resulting from development, together with associated morphological changes to channels receiving the runoff. As the total area of impervious surfaces increases, infiltration of rainfall decreases, causing more water to run off the surface and at a higher velocity than natural conditions. While erosion in channels is a naturally occurring process, increased runoff rates, volumes, and velocities from developed areas can produce erosive flows in channels under rainfall conditions which are unnatural and were not previously problematic. Moreover, runoff from developed areas increases the duration of time that channels are exposed to erosive flows. The increase in the volume of runoff and the length of time that erosive flows occur ultimately intensify the amount and potential of channel erosion, subsequently causing changes in sediment transport characteristics and the hydraulic geometry (width, depth, and slope) of channels.¹⁹⁷

These types of changes have been documented in southern California. It has been reported that researchers studying flood frequencies in Riverside County have found that increases in watershed imperviousness of only 9-22 percent can result in increases in peak flow rates for the two-year storm event of up to 100 percent.¹⁹⁸ Such changes in runoff have significant impacts on channel morphology. It has recently been found that ephemeral/intermittent channels in southern California appear to be more sensitive to changes in imperviousness than channels in other areas. Morphology of small channels in southern California was found to change with only 2-3 percent watershed imperviousness, as opposed to 7-10 percent watershed imperviousness in other parts of the nation.¹⁹⁹

Sediment that would normally be eroded from the developed areas (i.e. naturally eroded if the area remained undeveloped) is typically coarser grained and deposited closer to the source. Coarser grained sediments that are deposited also provide or contribute to habitat that is more hospitable to aquatic flora and fauna.

Developed areas and increased impervious surface change the types and quality of sediment that are discharged in runoff to the channels under rainfall conditions, which

¹⁹⁶ Storm Water Panel Recommendations to the California State Water Resources Control Board. 2006. The Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial, and Construction Activities.

¹⁹⁷ Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program, 2005. Hydromodification Management Plan. P. 1-1.

¹⁹⁸ Schueler and Holland, 2000. Storm Water Strategies for Arid and Semi-Arid Watersheds (Article 66). The Practice of Watershed Protection.

¹⁹⁹ Coleman, et. al., 2005. Effect of Increases in Peak Flows and Imperviousness on the Morphology of Southern California Streams. P. iv.

DRAFT

can have any adverse impact on downstream habitats. Sediment in runoff from developed areas and impervious surfaces are typically finer grained, which remains suspended for longer periods of time and can affect aquatic flora (e.g., reduce photosynthesis by limiting transmittance of light) and fauna (e.g., interfere with respiration). Several types of pollutants generated on developed areas (e.g., pesticides, nutrients, bacteria, metals, hydrocarbons) also tend to adsorb on to finer grained sediments. In addition, finer grained sediments get deposited further away from the source or point of discharge. These changes in the characteristics and quality of the sediment in the runoff from developed areas also contribute to the hydromodification effects on downstream channels.

Effects of hydromodification are evident in Riverside County and recognized by the Copermittees. Analyses of bioassessment data within the San Diego Region has indicated that physical changes to stream channels caused by hydromodification are likely responsible, in part, for the low bioassessment scores in urbanized settings.²⁰⁰ This pattern is consistent under Order No. R9-2004-001, although non-reference bioassessment monitoring was limited to two sites located at mass loading stations. These sites consistently exhibited poor or very poor IBI scores and sub-optimal or marginal habitat. In addition to poor habitat, water chemistry and toxicity impacts were documented at mass and tributary loading stations, likely exacerbating the observed low IBI scores.²⁰¹ It is important to recognize that the physical changes in stream channels are a direct result of MS4 discharges, but that two separate mechanisms are involved in bringing about those changes. First, is a change in the flow regime caused by the increase in impervious surfaces and loss of natural conveyance systems. Discharges to receiving waters from the MS4 outfalls do not mimic the natural discharges from former tributaries to that receiving water, and the change results in erosion. Second, the physical stream habitat in many places has been severely modified in order to efficiently convey those increased storm water discharges to the ocean. Where streams are hardened and/or buried to convey storm water, they cannot provide adequate water quality and other necessary conditions to support beneficial uses. Both of these issues are addressed in the Order.

The Copermittees' recognize the need to improve management of hydromodification. The ROWD proposes to revise the SSMP to incorporate additional information from ongoing hydromodification studies conducted by the SMC. The Order allows the Copermittees to adopt criteria consistent with future SMC findings in the development of their Hydromodification Management Plan.

Section F.1.h. requires the Copermittees to submit a draft Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) on or before June 30, 2013. This will provide the Copermittees over 2 years to develop the draft HMP.

Section F.1.h (1) describes several elements that must be included in the HMP. For

²⁰⁰ See San Diego Water Board Order No. R9-2009-002 Fact Sheet.

²⁰¹ Riverside County Copermittees Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Santa Margarita Watershed Annual Progress Report.

DRAFT

example, the HMP must identify a method for assessing susceptibility of channel segments which receive runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects, and include a channel standard to ensure that the stability of the channel is not compromised as a result of discharges from the Priority Development Projects. The HMP must also identify a range of flows where Priority Development Projects could cause hydromodification effects and subsequent stream instability.

Maintaining the pre-development flows and durations from a Priority Development Project will significantly reduce the potential for increased erosion caused by development. Loss of natural sediment that will be removed because of otherwise pervious areas covered by the impervious development and removal of pollutants in runoff from Priority Development Projects, however, can still increase the potential for increased erosion. Runoff that is discharged from a project that lacks sediment becomes “sediment hungry” and can result in increased erosion upstream and downstream from the point of discharge. Thus, the HMP must also identify a method and compensate for the loss of sediment supply that is expected due to development and include a performance and/or design standard that will be able to mitigate for that expected loss of sediment supply.

The HMP must require Priority Development Projects to implement control measures (such as LID or detention basins) to prevent hydromodification and resultant degradation of stream conditions upstream and/or downstream of project sites. To compare post-project flow rates and durations to pre-project flow rates and durations, the HMP must specify that the pre-development (naturally occurring) flow rates and durations shall be used when assessing pre-project conditions, so that the naturally occurring hydrology throughout the watershed is eventually restored.

In cases where a stream has been armored with concrete, rip rap, or other man-made materials, the HMP shall require the assessment of a comparable soft-bottom channel as the channel standard, as opposed to using the characteristics of the hardened channel as the channel standard. This is to ensure that hydromodification management measures are already in place should any portion of the hardened channel be returned to its natural state, thereby restoring the physical integrity of the creek and its Beneficial Uses. The only exceptions are for projects that discharge storm water runoff into underground storm drains or conveyance channels with bed and banks that have been concrete lined all the way to water storage reservoirs or lakes, where effects from hydromodification are not expected. Other exceptions that are acceptable to the San Diego Water Board may be identified in the final HMP.

The HMP must also include metrics for assessing impacts to downstream watercourses from Priority Development Projects, as well as assessing improvements to these watercourses. The metrics must be able to assess changes to the channels as Priority Development Projects are developed and constructed in the watershed. Monitoring and evaluating changes to the physical conditions of the channels receiving runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects will provide the Copermitttees

DRAFT

data that can be used to determine whether or not the HMP is effective at reducing the increased erosive forces caused by development and impervious surfaces over time.

In addition to metrics to assess changes to the physical conditions of the channels, the Copermittees must monitor and evaluate the biological conditions (e.g., habitat quality, benthic flora and fauna, IBI scores) of the channels. This is because historic hydromodification impacts, such as concrete lining and channelization, are suspected to have impacted the natural physical habitat of urban streams resulting in low IBI scores. The Copermittee's 2008-2009 monitoring report indicated decreased IBI scores at mass loading stations below urbanized watersheds, in part due to marginal or suboptimal habitat. The Monitoring and Reporting Program in the Order includes new requirements for monitoring of habitat for bioassessment, with the "Full" suite of physical/habitat characterization measurements found in the SWAMP Bioassessment Standard Operating Procedures being required with each bioassessment sample. Additional bioassessment sites are also required at locations higher in the watershed, which is expected to more closely reflect localized impacts. Therefore, the IBI scores required by the Monitoring and Reporting Program will be a useful metric in terms of assessing both impacts to streams from Priority Development Projects and improvements due to implementation of the HMP management measures. The Copermittees may also develop or utilize other metrics and identify other monitoring locations that can be used to assess the effectiveness of the HMP on the physical and biological conditions of the channels.

In addition to the control measures that must be included in the HMP to prevent or minimize hydromodification effects from Priority Development Projects, section F.1.h.(2) requires the HMP to include additional management measures to be used on Priority Development Projects based on a prioritized consideration of the following elements in this order: 1) site-design control measures, 2) on-site management measures, 3) the use of regional control measures upstream of receiving waters, and lastly, 4) in-stream management and control measures (not to include reinforcement with non-naturally occurring materials). The suite of management measures must also include stream restoration as a viable option to achieve the channel standard and subsequently restore Beneficial Uses. In-stream controls are expected to be in the form of stream restoration or rehabilitation. The use of stream restoration is expected to be an option that is used in conjunction with other on site management measures and not by itself as the only management measure. Stream restoration or rehabilitation projects that are considered in-stream controls for the purpose of preventing or minimizing hydromodification effects do not include projects that use non-naturally occurring materials (e.g., concrete, rip-rap, or gabions, etc.), but may include projects that use natural materials and/or create stable and sustainable channel configurations.

The San Diego Water Board recognizes that fully achieving post-project runoff flow rates and durations that do not exceed pre-development (naturally occurring) runoff flow rates and durations on redevelopment projects with existing impervious surfaces

DRAFT

may be challenging. Thus, section F.1.h.(3) has been included to allow the Copermittees to propose, as part of the HMP, a waiver program specifically for Priority Development Projects that are redevelopment projects, as defined by section F.1.d.(1)(b). Because redevelopment projects may not be able to achieve post-project runoff flow rates and durations that do not exceed pre-development (naturally occurring) runoff flow rates and durations through onsite management and control measures, offsite mitigation measures may be required. Redevelopment projects, however, must be able to achieve post-project runoff flow rates and durations that are less than or equal to pre-project and down to pre-development runoff flow rates and durations to be eligible to receive a waiver under the program. If a project is granted a waiver, the incremental hydromodification impacts from not achieving the pre-development (naturally occurring) runoff flow rates and durations for the project site must be fully mitigated with offsite mitigation. Offsite mitigation measures may include utilizing regional hydrologic control measures (e.g., regional detention or infiltration basins) or rehabilitation of stream channels to achieve sustainable channel configurations.

Section F.1.h (6) describes interim hydromodification criteria that must be implemented by the Copermittees until the final HMP is found to be adequate by the San Diego Water Board Executive Officer. The Copermittees currently have hydromodification requirements in the SSMP (section 4.4 of the Riverside County WQMP). Until the final HMP is required to be implemented, the Copermittees must continue implementing their existing hydromodification requirements. The existing hydromodification requirements²⁰² allow exemptions for Priority Development Projects if they meet one of three conditions. One of those conditions is if a project discharges directly to a publicly-owned, operated and maintained MS4. This condition has been too broadly applied and has resulted in many projects being exempt from the hydromodification requirements in the past.

Therefore, the Order modifies the conditions that may exempt Priority Development Projects from implementing the interim hydromodification criteria. The modifications to the conditions are minor and can be implemented in the interim until the final HMP is approved. This allows the Copermittees to focus their resources on development of the final HMP.

Finally, the requirements included in section F.1.h do not supersede the LID BMP requirements in section F.1.d. (4). In certain situations, the requirements to incorporate LID BMPs will satisfy the requirements for hydromodification management. Using LID is a viable option for both accomplishing hydromodification management and pollutant load reductions.

²⁰² Riverside County Copermittees, 2006 (updated in 2009). Riverside County Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), Section 4.4.

DRAFT

Section F.1.i (Unpaved Roads Development) specifically requires the Copermitees to implement or require implementation of BMPs for erosion and sediment control after construction of all new unpaved roads. As discussed for Finding D.1c, design and source control BMPs for unpaved roads are needed to minimize the discharge of sediment to the MS4s and receiving waters, especially during storm events. There are several guidance documents available (see Discussion for Finding D.1.c) that include design and source control BMPs that can be readily implemented by the Copermitees for the development of new unpaved roads.

F.2. Construction Component

The following legal authority applies to section F.2:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of a program to implement and maintain structural and non-structural best management practices to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff from construction sites to the municipal storm sewer system.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(1) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of procedures for site planning which incorporate consideration of potential water quality impacts.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(2) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of requirements for nonstructural and structural best management practices.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(3) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of procedures for identifying priorities for inspecting sites and enforcing control measures which consider the nature of the construction activity, topography, and the characteristics of soils and receiving water quality.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(4) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of appropriate educational and training measures for construction site operators.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A) provides that each Copermitee 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

DRAFT

water discharges associated with industrial activity and the quality of storm water discharged from site of industrial activity.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14) provides that “The following categories of facilities are considered to be engaging in ‘industrial activity’ for the purposes of this subsection: [...] (x) Construction activity including cleaning, grading and excavation activities [...].”

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.”

Section F.2 has additions to ensure the protection of threatened and endangered species and requires the consideration of potential impacts from the use of Active/Passive Sediment Treatment (AST) at sites determined by the Copermittees to be exceptional threats to water quality. These requirements were added to ensure additional protection of the Beneficial Uses of waters of the State.

Section F.2.a (Ordinance Update) requires each Copermittee to review and update its grading and storm water ordinances as necessary to comply with the MS4 permit. By updating the grading and storm water ordinances, the Copermittees will have the necessary legal authority to require construction sites to implement effective BMPs that will reduce pollutant discharges to the maximum extent practicable. The Order allows the Copermittees 365 days to review and update their ordinances. The 365 days should be adequate to allow for the relatively minor changes that might be needed since their ordinances were last updated under Order No. R9-2004-001.

Section F.2.b (Source Identification) requires the Copermittees to develop and update a watershed based inventory of all construction sites regardless of size or ownership. This section has been modified to require the inventory be updated regularly, rather than annually because constructions sites tend to change often within the course of a year. More frequent updates will ensure the Copermittees have a more accurate inventory of construction sites within their jurisdiction. A regularly updated inventory of active construction sites will assist the Copermittees in ensuring that all sites are inspected per Order requirements. The Order does not specify the frequency of updates, and instead relies on each Copermittee to develop updates appropriate to local construction activity. Failure to maintain a useful inventory would be a violation of the Order.

Section F.2.c (Site Planning and Project Approval Process) requires Copermittees to incorporate consideration of potential water quality impacts prior to approval and issuance of construction and grading permits.

DRAFT

This section now requires the Copermittes to review project proponents' runoff management plans for compliance with local regulations, policies, and procedures. USEPA recommends that it is often easier and more effective to incorporate storm water quality controls during the site plan review process or earlier.²⁰³ In the Phase I storm water regulations, USEPA states that a primary control technique is good site planning.²⁰⁴ USEPA goes on to say that the most efficient controls result when a comprehensive storm water management system is in place.²⁰⁵ To determine if a construction site is in compliance with construction and grading ordinances and permits, USEPA states that the "MS4 operator should review the site plans submitted by the construction site operator before ground is broken."²⁰⁶ Site plan review aids in compliance and enforcement efforts since it alerts the "MS4 operator early in the process to the planned use or non-use of proper BMPs and provides a way to track new construction activities."²⁰⁷

The Copermittes have the discretion to determine the depth and detail of the review, as well as the method by which the review will be conducted. The Copermittes review must at least verify that the project proponent's runoff management plan complies with the Copermittes's construction, storm water, and grading ordinances and permits prior to issuing the permit.

Section F.2.d (BMP Implementation) includes modifications to the requirements for each Copermittes to designate and ensure implementation of a set of minimum BMPs at construction sites. These modifications are based on San Diego Water Board findings and experience during implementation of Order No. R9-2004-001.

As a result, the Order requires a minimum set of BMPs to be designated for all sites. In addition to the minimum set of BMPs, enhanced BMPs must be designated and implemented for sites tributary to (i.e. upstream within the same Hydrologic Subarea of) a 303(d) listed water body, or within, directly adjacent to, or discharging directly to ESAs. Enhanced BMPs are control actions and measures specifically targeted to the pollutant or condition of concern and of higher quality and effectiveness than the minimum control measures otherwise required. Enhanced BMPs are expected to be better and more effective for pollutant removal than the minimum set of BMPs.

For sites that are identified as exceptional threat to water quality, active/passive sediment treatment (AST) is required to be implemented in addition to the minimum set and/or enhanced sediment control BMPs. AST is required at construction sites that are identified by the Copermittes as an exceptional threat to water quality due to high turbidity or suspended sediment levels in the site's effluent even when other

²⁰³ USEPA, 1992. Guidance 833-8-92-002. Section 6.3.2.1.

²⁰⁴ Federal Register / Vol. 55, No. 222 / Friday, November 16, 1990 / Rules and Regulations. P. 48034.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ USEPA, 2000. Guidance 833-R-00-002. Section 4.6.2.4, P. 4-30.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., P. 4-31.

DRAFT

sediment control BMPs have been implemented. In cases where the Copermittee's designated minimum set of BMPs and/or enhanced BMPs are not able or expected to be able to reduce turbidity or suspended sediment levels to a level that will be protective of water quality, AST is necessary and is considered MEP for the discharges from these sites.

AST has been effectively implemented extensively in the other states and in the Central Valley Region of California.²⁰⁸ In addition, the San Diego Water Board's inspectors have observed AST being effectively implemented at large sites greater than 100 acres and at small, less than 5 acre, in-fill sites. AST is often necessary for Copermittees to ensure that discharges from construction sites are not causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. For example, the Basin Plan lists the water quality objective for turbidity as 20 NTU for all hydrologic areas and subareas except for the Coronado HA (10.10) and the Tijuana Valley (11.10). For certain construction sites with high clay content soils, large slopes and exposed areas, the only technology that is likely to meet 20 NTU is AST combined with erosion and sediment controls. To ensure the MEP standard and water quality standards are met, the requirement for implementation of AST at exceptional threat construction sites has been added to the Order, while still providing sufficient flexibility for each Copermittee's unique program.

The Copermittees may define types of construction sites, and/or at any time identify any construction sites after inspections, that are considered exceptional threats to water quality warranting AST. AST may include any sediment control technologies that are capable of reducing turbidity or suspended sediment levels in a construction site's discharge to meet water quality standards in receiving waters.

The Order does not include seasonal restrictions on grading. Seasonal restrictions on grading for storm water are difficult to implement due to the conflict between seasonal grading restrictions, avian breeding and nesting seasons and the seasonal passage of endangered salmonids; therefore the seasonal grading restrictions have not been included with the other BMPs in the Order. For example, the Least Bell's Vireo and the Coastal California Gnatcatcher, found in southern California, are listed as federally endangered and threatened, respectively.²⁰⁹ Permits issued by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) restrict grading during these birds' breeding seasons, which is from April 10 to August 31 for the Least Bell's Vireo²¹⁰ and from February 15 to August 31 for the Coastal California Gnatcatcher.²¹¹ Ideally storm water restrictions on grading would be during the rainy season from October 1 through April 30.²¹² Combined, these restrictions would limit construction grading to be during

²⁰⁸ State Water Board, 2004. Conference on Advanced Treatment at Construction Sites.

²⁰⁹ State of California, Department of Fish and Game, 2010. State and Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California.

²¹⁰ United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 2001. Least Bell's Vireo Survey Guidelines.

²¹¹ United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1997. Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) Presence/Absence Survey Guidelines.

²¹² San Diego Water Board, 2001. Order No. 2001-01, San Diego County MS4 Permit. Directive F.2.g.(2).

DRAFT

the month of September, which is infeasible. Section D.2.d of the Order still requires project proponents to minimize grading during the rainy season and coincide grading with seasonal dry weather periods to the extent feasible.

Section F.2.e (Inspections) establishes criteria for inspections based on risk factors including size, season, and location of the construction site. Modifications have been made to requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001 based on the experience of the Copermittees and San Diego Water Board construction programs.

The types of construction sites that must be inspected every two weeks during the rainy season have been changed from Order No. R9-2004-001. In general, because large construction sites (i.e. greater than 50 acres) have been closely scrutinized during the last permit period, they tend to be adequately implementing BMPs. Smaller construction sites (i.e. site with less than 50 acres), however, were not inspected as frequently and can pose a significant threat to water quality. The final rule recently promulgated by USEPA for construction sites²¹³ identified construction sites with 20 or more acres of land disturbed at one time as posing a significant threat to water quality during the rainy season. Thus, the San Diego Water Board recognized that smaller construction sites needed to be inspected more frequently. As with the construction inspection requirements that were recently adopted for the Orange County Phase I MS4s, this Order requires sites in active grading during the rainy season that are over 30 acres, rather than sites over 50 acres, be inspected every two weeks.

The Order also lowers the size of construction sites adjacent to or discharging directly to ESAs that receive scrutiny. Order No. R9-2004-001 requires such sites five acres and more to be inspected every two weeks during the rainy season. This Order requires such sites one acre and above and tributary to (i.e. with the same Hydrologic Subarea of) a CWA section 303(d) water body segment impaired for sediment; or within, directly adjacent to, or discharging directly to a receiving water within an ESA to be inspected every two weeks during the rainy season and once during August or September. The lower size threshold is consistent with Phase II storm water permits and the Construction General Permit, State Water Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ.

The Copermittees also have the discretion to define or identify other construction sites that are significant threats to water quality that must be inspected every two weeks. Several factors are provided that must be considered by each Copermittee in evaluating threat to water quality.

Finally, types of construction sites that must be inspected at least monthly during the rainy season have been changed from Order No. R9-2004-001. All construction sites with one acre or more of soil disturbance must be inspected monthly during the rainy season instead of just 3 times during the rainy season. This level of inspection is

DRAFT

necessary by the Copermittees to ensure adequate compliance with their grading, building, storm water or other water quality related orders and provisions.

This section also requires the Copermittees to track the number of inspections for each inventoried construction site. This requirement has been added to ensure that the Copermittees can demonstrate that construction sites are inspected at the minimum frequencies.

Section F.2.g requires the Copermittees to notify the San Diego Water Board when high level enforcement has been issued to a construction site as a result of storm water violations. The Copermittees will define the types of high level enforcement that will warrant a notification of the San Diego Water Board in their JRMPs. Copermittees are also required to annually notify the San Diego Water Board of construction sites that have alleged violations. This section was added to enhance San Diego Water Board and Copermittee communication and coordination in regulating construction sites.

F.3 Existing Development Component

F.3.a. Municipal

The following legal authority applies to section D.3.a:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(1) provides that the proposed management program include “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) provides that the proposed management program include “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 de-icing activities.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(4) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving water bodies 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.”

DRAFT

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(5) provides that the proposed management program include “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) provides that the proposed management program include “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.”

Section F.3.a.(2) (General BMP Implementation) requires the Copermittees to designate minimum BMPs for general municipal areas and activities, regardless of their threat to water quality. BMPs must also be designated for special events. The designated minimum BMPs required to be implemented at a site can be based on the sources or activities present at the site. Threat to water quality is used to determine inspection frequencies in section F.3.a.(8).

Section F.3.a.(3), F.3.a.(4), and F.3.a.(5) (BMP Implementation for Specific Categories) establishes requirements for specific categories of activities and areas. These are selected based on the CWA and findings of the Copermittees in annual reports and ROWD that identify these activities as warranting special attention.

Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers. 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(6) requires a description of a storm water program for pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers. In addition, water quality data demonstrates widespread presence of such pollutants in receiving waters and MS4 discharges. In response to similar requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001, the Copermittees have developed a specific Integrated Pest Management, Pesticides, and Fertilizer guidelines.

Flood Control Structures. In order to more closely meet the intent of the federal regulations and guidance, the requirement has been modified. 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 water bodies and that existing structural flood control devices have been evaluated to

DRAFT

determine if retrofitting the device to provide additional pollutant removal from storm water is feasible.” Retrofitting flood control devices can reduce storm water pollutants and improve water quality.

USEPA expands on the federal provision with the following information: "Storm water management devices and structures that focus solely on water quantity are usually not designed to remove pollutants, and may sometimes harm aquatic habitat and aesthetic values".²¹⁴ As flood control structures and other elements of the MS4 age and retrofitting becomes necessary, opportunities for water quality improvements arise.

Conveyance systems which take water quality consideration into account (such as grassed swales, vegetated detention ponds, etc.) can often cost less to construct than traditional concrete systems. Evaluation of the applicability of such systems during retrofitting must occur to ensure that pollutants in storm water runoff are reduced to the maximum extent practicable. USEPA supports utilizing BMPs for pollution reduction in flood management projects, stating that “The proposed management program must demonstrate that flood management projects take into account the effects on the water quality of receiving water bodies. [...] Opportunities for pollutant reduction should be considered”.²¹⁵

There are generally two types of retrofits for flood control structures. The first type involves adding an engineered device to an existing structure in order to treat or divert runoff. Examples include catch basin inlet filters/screens, ultraviolet disinfection facilities, hydrodynamic separators, and diversions to the sanitary sewer. The second type involves re-installing pervious or natural treatment features to facilities. Examples include removing concrete portions of conveyances to create pervious conveyances; and creating treatment wetlands within flood detention facilities. The later type of retrofit is preferred by the San Diego Water Board. They are likely more sustainable over the long-term because they may require less rigorous operation and maintenance than the former. They may also provide the additional benefit of providing significant or incidental opportunities for beneficial uses (e.g., recreation, wildlife, water supply).^{216,217}

Sweeping of Municipal Areas. Sweeping municipal areas would likely be done in the absence of the Order. However, in certain cases it is an important component of a jurisdictional runoff management program. The Order contains requirements to

²¹⁴ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. Washington D.C. EPA/833-B-92-002.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Burton, Carmen et al. 2005. Assessing Water Source and Channel Type as Factors Affecting Benthic Macroinvertebrate and Periphyton Assemblages in the Highly Urbanized Santa Ana River Basin, California. American Fisheries Society Symposium. Vol.47 pp.239-262.

²¹⁷ Stromberg, Juliet C. 2001. Restoration of Riparian Vegetation in the South-Western United States: the importance of flow regimes and fluvial dynamism. Journal of Arid Environments. Vol49, pp.17-34.

DRAFT

ensure that the use of street sweeping is optimized for runoff applications if it is to be used and reported as a BMP.

Section F.3.a.(6) (Operation and Maintenance of MS4 and Treatment Controls) requires the Copermittees to inspect and remove waste from their MS4s prior to the rainy season.

Maintenance is critical to the successful implementation of every storm water runoff management program. USEPA finds that “Lack of maintenance often limits the effectiveness of storm water structural controls such as detention/retention basins and infiltration devices. [...] The proposed program should provide for maintenance logs of, and identify specific maintenance activities for, each class of control, such as removing sediment from retention ponds every five years, cleaning catch basins annually, and removing litter from channels twice a year.

If maintenance activities are scheduled infrequently, inspections must be scheduled to ensure that the control is operating adequately. In cases where scheduled maintenance is not appropriate, maintenance should be based on inspections of the control structure or frequency of storm events. If maintenance depends on the results of inspections or if it occurs infrequently, the applicant must provide an inspection schedule. The applicant should also identify the municipal department(s) responsible for the maintenance program”.²¹⁸ The MS4 maintenance requirements are based on the above USEPA recommendations. This maintenance will help ensure that structural controls are in adequate condition to be effective year round, but especially at the beginning of and throughout the rainy season.

Two requirements have been added to the Order that were not within Order No. R9-2004-001. Subsection (iii) allows a decreased inspection frequency for facilities that are routinely clean, and subsection (iv) requires trash to be removed from open channels and detention basins in a timely manner. Typically, Copermittees have reported annual or semi-annual creek cleanups as significant BMPs. The large volumes of trash reported to be removed during these events demonstrates the significant amount of trash that accumulates in the channels. In order to reduce the effect of the trash, the Order requires that trash be removed more frequently.

Section F.3.a.(7) (Infiltration from Sanitary Sewer to MS4) requires the Copermittees to implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate sewage infiltration or seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to MS4s through thorough, routine preventive maintenance of the MS4.

²¹⁸ USEPA, 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part II of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. Washington D.C. EPA/833-B-92-002.

DRAFT

Sections F.3.a.(8) and F.3.a.(9) (Inspections and Enforcement) establishes a minimum set of municipal areas and activities for oversight and inspection by the Copermitees and requires that Copermitees properly enforce runoff requirements at municipal areas and activities.

Section F.3.a.(10) (Unpaved Roads Maintenance) requires the Copermitees to implement or require implementation of BMPs for erosion and sediment control during and after maintenance activities on unpaved roads, particularly in or adjacent to stream channels or wetlands. As discussed for Finding D.1c, source control BMPs for unpaved roads are needed to minimize the discharge of sediment to the MS4s and receiving waters. There are several guidance documents available (see Discussion for Finding D.1.c) that include BMPs that can be readily implemented by the Copermitees for the development of new unpaved roads. This requirement is necessary to ensure the Copermitees minimize the discharge of sediment from their unpaved roads used for their maintenance activities.

F.3.b. Commercial / Industrial

The following legal authority applies to section F.3.b:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C) provides that the proposed management program include “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.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(C)(1) provides that the Copermitee must “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)(C)(2) provides that the proposed management program shall “Describe a monitoring program for storm water discharges associated with the industrial facilities identified in paragraph (d)(2)(iv)(C) of this section, to be implemented during the term of the permit, including the submission of quantitative data on the following constituents: any pollutants limited in effluent guidelines subcategories, where applicable; any pollutant listed in an existing NPDES permit for a facility; oil and grease, COD, pH, BOD₅, TSS, total phosphorus, total Kjeldhal nitrogen, nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen, and any information on discharges required under 40 CFR 122.21(g)(7)(iii) and (iv).”

DRAFT

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(ii) provides that the Copermittee “Provide an inventory, organized by watershed of the name and address, and a description (such as Standard Industrial Classification [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.”

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.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A) provides that each Copermittee 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.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) provides that the Copermittee develop a proposed management program which includes “A description of structural and source control measures to reduce pollutants from runoff from commercial and residential areas that are discharged from the municipal storm sewer system that are to be implemented during the life of the permit, accompanied with an estimate of the expected reduction of pollutant loads and a proposed schedule for implementing such controls.”

Section F.3.b.(1) (Source Identification) requires that botanical and zoological gardens and exhibits, building material retailers and storage, animal boarding facilities and kennels, mobile pet services, plumbing services, and power washing services be included in the Copermittees’ inventory of commercial sites/sources. These commercial or industrial sites and sources have been identified by the Copermittees and/or the San Diego Water Board as facilities that may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4. In cases where a particular type of facility is not present or known to operate within a Copermittee’s jurisdiction, there is no expectation that there would be any such facilities included in the inventory. If, however, that type of facility does become established or begins operating within a Copermittee’s jurisdiction during the period of this Order, the Copermittees are expected to identify those sites or sources and include them in their inventory of commercial or industrial facilities. This is not a significant change because Order No. R9-2004-001 requires that any commercial or industrial site or source determined by a Copermittee to contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4 be added to its inventory of commercial or industrial sites.

DRAFT

The inventory of commercial and industrial facilities is expected to be reviewed and, if necessary, updated at least annually and included in the Annual Report. The inventory is expected to include the prioritization of each facility to ensure the facility is inspected at the correct frequency. If changes are made to the prioritization for any facilities, justification for the changes is expected to be reported in the Annual Report. The inventory is the foundation for the tracking of BMP implementation, number and date(s) of inspections performed, inspection findings, violations, and enforcement actions for each commercial or industrial facility, all of which are expected to be included in the Annual Report.

Section F.3.b.(3) (Mobile Businesses Program) requires each Copermittee to develop and implement a program to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants from mobile businesses to the MEP and to prevent the discharge of non-storm water. Mobile businesses are service industries that travel to the customer to perform the service rather than the customer traveling to the business to receive the service. Examples of mobile businesses are power washing, mobile vehicle washers, carpet cleaners, port-a-potty servicing, pool and fountain cleaning, mobile pet groomers, plumbers, and landscapers. These mobile services produce waste streams that could potentially impact water quality if appropriate BMPs are not implemented.

Order No. R9-2004-001 also requires BMP implementation for certain mobile businesses (e.g., mobile vehicle washing and mobile carpet cleaning). These storm water requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001 are not significantly different from the existing requirements. The Order specifies the Copermittees must prevent non storm water dry weather flows from entering the MS4 (see section C.2.b). Special attention is required for mobile businesses because of the difficulty of controlling discharges from mobile businesses with existing programs.

Mobile businesses present a unique difficulty in storm water regulation. Due to the transient nature of the business, the regular, effective practice of unannounced inspections is difficult to implement. Also, tracking these mobile businesses is difficult because they are often not permitted or licensed and their services cross Copermittee jurisdictions. Mobile businesses that operate within a municipality may be based in another municipality or even outside the Region.

The Order takes into account the difficulties in regulating mobile businesses. The Copermittees may choose to cooperate in developing and implementing their programs for mobile businesses, including sharing of mobile business inventories, BMP requirements, enforcement action information, and education. Sharing information will allow the Copermittees to better identify and track mobile businesses operating in their jurisdictions.

Because BMPs have been developed already, but communication with mobile businesses may be difficult, the Order provides broad flexibility to the Copermittees for developing a targeted program within the Commercial portion of each JRMP.

DRAFT

Section F.3.b.(4) (Inspection of Industrial and Commercial Sites/Sources) includes requirements for inspections of industrial and commercial sites/sources. The Order is similar to the Order No. R9-2004-001 in requiring that inspections check for coverage under the General Industrial Permit; assessment of compliance with Copermittee ordinances and permits related to storm water and non-storm water runoff; assessment of BMP implementation, maintenance, and effectiveness; visual observations for non-storm water discharges, potential illicit connections, and potential discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff; and education and outreach on storm water pollution prevention.

The Order also requires that inspections include review of BMP implementation plans if the site uses or is required to use such a plan, and the review of facility monitoring data if the site monitors its runoff. If a facility is not required to have a BMP implementation plan or required to collect monitoring data, the inspection does not need to include a review of this information. BMP implementation plans and monitoring data are expected to be available for any facility that is covered under the General Industrial Permit. The BMP implementation plans and monitoring data can provide the inspector pertinent information that can be used during the visual inspection of the facility (e.g., BMPs implemented, maintenance records for BMPs, pollutants in storm water runoff). The Copermittees' inspectors have the discretion to determine the depth and detail of the review and use of the information in conducting the inspection.

Changes in the Order's requirements for inspection procedures mimic USEPA's guidance: "Site inspections should include (1) an evaluation of the pollution prevention plan and any other pertinent documents, and (2) an onsite visual inspection of the facility to evaluate the potential for discharges of contaminated storm water from the site and to assess the effectiveness of the pollution prevention plan."²¹⁹ In 1999, USEPA "recognized visual inspection as a baseline BMP for over 10 years," and "visual inspections are an effective way to identify a variety of problems. Correcting these problems can improve the water quality of the receiving water."²²⁰

Inspection frequencies in the Order have been modified from Order No. R9-2004-001. Order No. R9-2004-001 specifies frequencies for inspecting commercial/industrial sites based on threat to water quality and requires high priority sites to be inspected annually. For sites not identified as high priority, each site must be inspected at least once within a 5 year period.

An additional notification to the San Diego Water Board regarding industrial sites has been added. Copermittees are required to annually notify the San Diego Water Board of industrial sites that have suspected violations. This was added to enhance San Diego Water Board and Copermittee communication and coordination in regulating

²¹⁹ USEPA, 1992. Guidance 833-8-92-002, section 6.3.3.4 "Inspection and Monitoring".

²²⁰ USEPA, 1999. 832-F-99-046, "Storm Water Management Fact Sheet – Visual Inspection".

DRAFT

industrial sites. Information may be provided as part of the JRMP annual report if submitted prior to the rainy season.

Also, the option for implementing a third party certification program is included. To the extent that third party certifications are conducted to fulfill the inspection requirements for this section of this Order, the Copermittee will be responsible for conducting and documenting quality assurance and quality control of the third-party certifications. The Copermittees may propose a third party certification program that must receive approval from the San Diego Water Board Executive Officer prior to implementation. The Order includes several requirements that must be included in the third party certification program in order for it to be considered for approval by the San Diego Water Board.

F.3.c. Residential

The following legal authority applies to section F.3.c:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A) provides that the Copermittee develop a proposed management program which includes “A description of structural and source control measures to reduce pollutants from runoff from commercial and residential areas that are discharged from the municipal storm sewer system that are to be implemented during the life of the permit, accompanied with an estimate of the expected reduction of pollutant loads and a proposed schedule for implementing such controls.”

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.”

Section F.3.c.(4) (Common Interest Areas / Home Owner Association Areas / Mobile Home Parks) includes requirements for common interest areas / homeowners' associations and mobile home parks. Many residential neighborhoods and some commercial areas within the jurisdiction of the Copermittees are within common interest developments and are, therefore, subject to management of common areas by associations. The Declaration of the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) contains the ground rules for the operation of such an association. CC&Rs are an appropriate method for protecting the common plan of developments and to provide for a mechanism for financial support for the upkeep of common areas including roads, storm drains, and other components of storm water conveyance systems.

DRAFT

This Order interprets common interest areas as property subject to the codes and ordinance and enforcement mechanisms of the city or county in which it resides and, therefore, holds the local government responsible for the discharge of wastes from storm water conveyance systems located within these areas.

Section F.3.c.(5) (Privately Owned Unpaved Roads Maintenance) includes requirements for privately owned unpaved roads. The Copermittees must require implementation of BMPs for erosion and sediment control during maintenance activities on privately owned unpaved roads, particularly roads that are in or adjacent to receiving waters. As discussed for Finding D.1.c, BMPs for unpaved roads are needed to minimize the discharge of sediment to the MS4s and receiving waters. There are several guidance documents available (see Discussion for Finding D.1.c) that include design and source control BMPs that can the Copermittees can readily require to be implemented.

In addition, where the Copermittees identify illegal construction and maintenance grading activities on privately owned unpaved roads, the Copermittees must enforce their ordinances to prevent illicit discharges of sediment and other pollutants from privately owned unpaved roads to their MS4s and receiving waters.

Section F.3.d. Retrofitting Existing Development

The following legal authority applies to section F.3.d:

Legal Authority: The legal authority for retrofitting existing development is the same legal authority as that identified for municipal, industrial, commercial and residential development sections (See fact sheet discussion on those sections, F.3.a – c). In particular, CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), and CWC section 13377 give the Regional Water Board the legal authority to require retrofitting of existing development.

Section F.3.d has been added to require a plan for the retrofit of existing development (see Finding D.3.h and Discussion). This section contains specific requirements for a program to retrofit existing development. When appropriately applied as in this Order, retrofitting existing development meets MEP standards.

Existing BMPs are not sufficient, as evidenced by 303(d) listings and exceedances of Water Quality Objectives from the Copermittees monitoring reports. More advanced BMPs, including the retrofitting of existing development with LID, are part of the iterative process. Previous permits limited the requirement of treatment control BMPs to new development and redevelopment. Based on the current rate of redevelopment compared to existing BMPs, the use of LID only on new and redevelopment will not adequately address current water quality pollution and problems, including downstream hydromodification. Retrofitting existing development is practicable for a municipality through a systematic evaluation, prioritization and implementation plan focused on impaired water bodies, pollutants of concern, areas of downstream

DRAFT

hydromodification, feasibility and effective communication and cooperation with private property owners. The retrofitting requirements are based largely on guidance from the USEPA²²¹ and the Center for Watershed Protection.²²²

Section F.3.d.(1) requires the Copermittees to identify and inventory areas of existing development within their jurisdiction as candidates for retrofitting projects. The Copermittees are expected to examine the inventories that they are maintaining as required under sections F.3.a-c, inspection findings, and any other forms of data and information to identify the candidates for retrofitting projects. Several areas of existing development that must be identified as candidates for retrofitting projects are listed. Based in part on guidance developed by the Center for Watershed Protection, these areas of existing development are expected to provide the most immediate improvements for water quality through retrofitting. This list of areas that must be considered does not limit the Copermittees from identifying other areas within their jurisdiction that may be evaluated for retrofitting projects.

Section F.3.d.(2) requires each Copermittee to evaluate the candidates identified under section F.3.d.(1) and rank them based on several criteria. One or more types of retrofit source control or treatment control BMPs may be evaluated for each candidate. Landowner cooperation is among the criteria to evaluate and prioritize retrofitting. For example, retrofitting projects on publicly owned properties are likely and expected to be feasible with sufficient funding secured.

Section F.3.d.(4) requires each Copermittee to cooperate with private property owners to encourage the implementation of site specific retrofitting projects. Because the Copermittees have limited authority to directly require retrofitting projects on private property, the Copermittees must encourage private property owners to implement retrofitting projects through indirect programs and incentives. Several programs and incentives that have been successful in other areas are provided in the Order for the Copermittees consideration in developing their practices to encourage private property owners to retrofit their sites. This list, however, does not limit the Copermittees from identifying and considering other practices that may be effective in encouraging private property owners to implement retrofitting projects on their sites.

Section F.3.d.(5) requires retrofit BMPs that are implemented to be tracked in accordance with section F.1.f. The retrofit BMPs must also be inspected. Retrofit BMPs on publicly owned properties must be inspected per section F.1.f. Privately owned retrofit BMPs must be inspected as needed to ensure proper operation and maintenance. Tracking and inspecting retrofit BMPs is necessary for the Copermittee to ensure that the retrofit BMPs are not removed and are maintained to remain effective. Inspections can also provide the Copermittee useful information on the effectiveness of individual retrofit BMPs. For retrofit BMPs on publicly owned

²²¹ USEPA , MS4 Permit Improvement Guide, EPA 833-R-10-001 , April, 2010.

²²² USEPA , MS4 Permit Improvement Guide, EPA 833-R-10-001 , April, 2010.

DRAFT

properties, tracking and inspection will correct any problems with the BMPs as soon as a problem arises and will ensure proper maintenance.

For retrofit BMPs on privately owned properties, retrofit BMPs are expected to be implemented and maintained by the property owner on a voluntary basis. The retrofit BMPs must be tracked by the Copermittees, but their inspections are required less frequently due to access issues (i.e. on an as-needed basis). Voluntary retrofitting projects do not warrant frequent Copermittee inspections due to the property owner's willingness to retrofit. Periodic inspections may be performed to ensure the site owner has not removed the retrofit BMPs. Periodic inspections would also ensure that the retrofit BMPs remain effective by providing an opportunity for the inspector to educate the original and subsequent site owner(s) if the retrofit BMP is not operating effectively and requires some maintenance.

F.4. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination

The following legal authority applies to section F.4:

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: Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) provides that the proposed management program "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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program "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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program "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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program "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."

DRAFT

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “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) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “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)(6) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “a description of educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials.”

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(7) provides that the Copermittee include in its proposed management program “a description of controls to limit infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to municipal separate storm sewer systems where necessary.”

Section F.4.a (Prevent and Detect Illicit Discharges and Connections) requires the Copermittees to implement a program to actively seek and eliminate IC/IDs. Additional wording has been added to this section to clarify and ensure that all appropriate municipal personnel (i.e. field personnel) are utilized in the program to observe and report these illicit discharges and connections.

Section F.4.b (Maintain MS4 Map) requires each Copermittee to maintain an updated map of its entire MS4 and the corresponding drainage areas within its jurisdiction. The Order specifies that the map must include the segments of the storm sewer system owned, operated, and maintained by the Copermittee, and include locations of all known inlets, access points (i.e. manholes), connections with other MS4s, and outfalls to the Copermittee’s MS4. Knowing where their inlets, access points, connections with other MS4s, and outfalls are located will allow the Copermittees to better track, identify, and eliminate IC/IDs. The use of a geographic information system (GIS) by the Copermittees is strongly encouraged for the MS4 map. The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) currently maintains a GIS layer that is a compilation of all the Copermittee MS4 maps. Although an individual Copermittee may not have GIS capabilities, each Copermittee has agreements with RCFCD for providing updated MS4 maps to the RCFCD to update this GIS layer and subsequent submittal to the San Diego Water Board.

Section F.4.e (Investigation / Inspection and Follow-Up) requires the Copermittees to conduct follow up investigations and inspect portions of the MS4 for illicit discharges and connections, based on dry weather effluent analytical monitoring results. The

DRAFT

section also requires the Copermittees to establish criteria for triggering follow up investigations. Additional language has been added to this section to clarify the minimum level of effort and timeframes for follow up investigations when dry weather limitations are exceeded. This section requires the Copermittees to include and evaluate the specified action levels in their response criteria and to develop response criteria for pollutants without action levels.

Timely investigation and follow up of exceedances is necessary to identify sources of illicit discharges, especially since many of the discharges are transitory. The requirements for immediate response to obvious illicit discharges and a 2 business day minimum response time when field screening action levels are exceeded is necessary to ensure timely response by the Copermittees. When analytical data indicate an exceedance of action levels, the Copermittee(s) have 5 business days to confirm the need to initiate an investigation to identify the source of the exceedance. The Copermittees are expected to investigate for potential sources of the pollutant(s) that may have caused the exceedance of action levels upstream of the collection point and collect additional analytical and field data as necessary. If the quality of the data is confirmed to be unreliable or inaccurate and the investigation indicates there were no sources of the pollutant that could have caused an exceedance of the applicable action level, then further investigation is no longer warranted and should be documented in the Annual Report.

Section F.4.f (Elimination of Illicit Discharges and Connections) requires the Copermittee(s) to take immediate action to initiate steps necessary to eliminate illicit discharges, illicit discharge sources, and illicit connections that have been detected as a result of the investigations required under section F.4.e. The steps necessary to eliminate the illicit discharge or connection are typically initiated with identifying and contacting the person responsible for the illicit discharge or connection. The Copermittee(s) are expected to eliminate the detected illicit discharges and connections as soon as possible after they are able to contact the person responsible for the illicit discharge or connection. The steps expected and/or necessary to eliminate illicit discharges and connections under different scenarios and for different sources should be developed and implemented by the Copermittee(s). These steps may be outlined by the Copermittee(s) in their JRMPs.

In some cases, the Copermittee(s) may determine that one of the necessary steps is to contact the San Diego Water Board to assist in resolving and eliminating illicit discharges and connections. The Copermittee(s), however, are expected to exhaust all of their available administrative and enforcement authorities and mechanisms for addressing and eliminating illicit discharges and connections before contacting the San Diego Water Board for assistance.

Section F.4.h (Prevent and Response to Sewage Spills and Other Spills) requires each Copermittee to implement measures to prevent and respond to spills into its MS4. These requirements are consistent with Order No. R9-2004-001 and based on

DRAFT

federal regulations at 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4). Those federal NPDES regulations clearly require that owners and operators of MS4s have procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer.

The Order includes sewage and non-sewage spills in the requirement for spill prevention and response. Federal regulations clearly define sewage as an illicit discharge that must be addressed by municipalities (see Phase II Final Rule, p.68758). Sewage is an illicit discharge to the MS4 that threatens public health. As such, the Copermittees must implement measures to prevent sewage from entering the MS4 system and must respond to illicit discharges that have entered the system. This section has been revised to clarify that management measures and procedures must be implemented to prevent, respond to, and cleanup spills. In addition to the management measures and procedures, a mechanism for the Copermittees to be notified of spills is necessary in order for those management measures and procedures to be implemented as soon as possible after a spill has occurred. The facilitation of public reporting of illicit discharges required by section F.4.c, in addition to regular and open communication with other agencies (e.g., sanitary sewer districts), may also serve as a mechanism for notifying the Copermittees of spills within their jurisdiction.

Section F.3.a.(7) of the Order includes requirements for measures that must be taken to prevent sewage spills. Examples of measures being implemented by Copermittees include inspections of fats, oils, and grease management at restaurants. Other preventative measures can be implemented during routine planning efforts for new development and redevelopment projects. Similarly, building permit inspections should be used to verify the integrity of the sanitary and storm sewer infrastructure and ensure that cross-connections between the two are avoided.

F.5. Public Participation Component

The following legal authority applies to section F.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, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

No significant changes from Order No. R9-2004-001 have been made to this section of the Order.

DRAFT

F.6. Education Component

The following legal authority applies to section F.6:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(6) provides that the proposed management program include “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 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(6) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(4) provides that the proposed management program include “A description of appropriate educational and training measures for construction site operators.”

Section F.6 (Education Component) includes an introductory paragraph that is the same as in Order No. R9-2004-001, except for the addition of New Development / Redevelopment Project Applicants, Developers, Contractors, Property Owners, and other Responsible Parties to the list of target communities.

Section F.6.a (General Requirements) includes education topics that are required for the education programs developed and implemented for the target communities. The Copermittees can choose how and to what degree to address these topics. Some topics may be more important for certain target communities.

The requirement for educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials has been moved to this section from the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination section.

Section F.6.b (Specific Requirements) includes requirements for specific target communities, which are in addition to the general requirements. The education and training requirements previously included in other sections of Order No. R9-2004-001 (i.e. Development Planning, Construction, Existing Development) have been removed and consolidated under this section. Specific education requirements are included for:

DRAFT

1) the Copermittees' departments and personnel (i.e. staff and contractors, and Planning Boards and Elected Officials, if applicable), 2) new development / redevelopment and construction sites, 3) commercial and industrial sites/sources, and 4) residential and general public communities.

Section F.6.b.(1) (Copermittee Departments and Personnel) requires the Copermittees to implement an education program for their staff and contractors. Education is required at all levels of municipal staff and contractors. Education is especially important for the staff responsible for planning and development review, oversight, inspection and enforcement of construction activities, selecting and implementing BMPs for Copermittee areas, inspection and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities, and other Copermittee activities which might result in discharges of pollutants if proper BMPs are not used.

Education of Copermittee departments and personnel may be conducted with joint and/or individual training programs (i.e. on a regional and/or jurisdictional scale), and may include both formal and informal training. The Copermittees may choose the scale and methods for educating their departments and personnel.

The annual training required for construction, building, code enforcement, grading review staffs, inspectors, and other responsible construction staff requires the training to occur annually, prior to the rainy season.

Section F.6.b.(2) (New Development / Redevelopment and Construction Sites) requires the Copermittees to educate parties responsible for a project (i.e. project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties) about storm water issues and BMPs. Different levels of training will be needed for planning groups, owners, developers, contractors, and construction workers, but all should get a general education of storm water requirements. Education of all construction workers can prevent unintentional discharges, such as discharges by workers who are not aware that they are not allowed to wash things down the storm drains. Training for BMP installation workers is imperative because the BMPs will fail if not properly installed and maintained. Training for field level workers can be formal or informal tail-gate format.

Section F.6.b.(3) (Commercial and Industrial Sites / Sources) requires the Copermittees to notify the owner/operator of each of their inventoried commercial and industrial sites/sources of the BMP requirements applicable to the site/source at least twice during the five-year period of the Order. Notification of BMP requirements may be fulfilled during the business license application/renewal process and/or during site inspections. Notifying commercial and industrial sites/sources of the BMP requirements will ensure the business owners are aware of the appropriate BMPs to implement that prevent discharges of pollutants from these sites/sources.

DRAFT

Section F.6.b.(4) (Residential and General Public) requires the target audiences for residential and general public communities to include underserved target audiences (e.g., disadvantaged communities), residents and managers of Common Interest Areas / Homeowner Associations, and owners and residents of mobile home parks. These communities are frequently neglected or underserved by most water quality education programs, but can be significant sources of pollutants. Thus, it is important for the residential and general public education programs to reach out to and educate these communities on their potential impacts to water quality.

DRAFT

G. Watershed Water Quality Workplan

The following legal authority applies to section G:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(a)(3)(ii) states: “The Director may [...] issue distinct permits for appropriate categories of discharges [...] including, but not limited to [...] all discharges within a system that discharge to the same watershed [...]”

Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(a)(3)(v) states: “Permits for all or a portion of all discharges from large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems that are issued on a system-wide, jurisdiction-wide, watershed, or other basis may specify different conditions relating to different discharges covered by the permit, including different management programs for different drainage areas [watersheds] which contribute storm water to the system.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(a)(5) states: “The Director may issue permits for municipal separate storm sewers that are designated under paragraph (a)91)(v) of this section on a system-wide basis, a jurisdiction-wide basis, watershed basis, or other appropriate basis.”

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) states: “Proposed programs may impose controls on a system-wide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls.”

Section G requires Copermittees to continue implementation of their watershed runoff management program (WRMP), however the implementation approach has changed. Order No. R9-2004-001 required a Watershed SWMP that included a collaborative strategy to abate the sources and reduce the discharges causing high priority water quality problems. This strategy was to guide each watershed Copermittee’s selection and implementation of Watershed Activities, so that the activities selected and implemented would remove that pollutant contribution responsible for the identified high priority water quality problem. Outcomes of these requirements were not able to demonstrate improvements to water quality.

Revised language in Order No. R9-2010-0016 attempts to focus each watershed Copermittee’s efforts and resources on addressing the highest water quality problems in the watershed by focusing attention on the health of the receiving water body and the most efficient use of the watershed Copermittee’s time and resources. Order No. R9-2010-0016 requires the watershed Copermittees to develop and follow a workplan

DRAFT

approach towards assessing receiving water body conditions, prioritizing the highest priority water quality problems, implementing effective BMPs, and measuring water quality improvement in the receiving water.

Section G.1. (Watershed Workplan Components) requires the watershed Copermittees to develop a workplan that will implement a collective watershed strategy to assess and prioritize the water quality problems, and identify, address, and mitigate the highest priority water quality issues/pollutants within the Upper Santa Margarita watershed's receiving waters. This section specifies the minimum components that must be included in the Watershed Workplan. Development of a workplan rather than watershed activities will allow the Copermittees flexibility to iteratively modify their watershed strategy over the course of future planning years as priorities change.

Section G.2 (Watershed Workplan Implementation) requires the Copermittee's to begin implementing the Watershed Workplan within 90 days of submittal unless otherwise directed by the San Diego Water Board. The Watershed Workplan must meet the requirements of the Order. The San Diego Water Board expects that implementing the Watershed Workplan, which will coordinate the Copermittees' efforts in the watershed, will result in water quality improvements sooner than later. If there are deficiencies in the Watershed Workplan, the San Diego Water Board will provide guidance to remedy those deficiencies as appropriate.

Section G.3 (Copermittee Collaboration) requires the Copermittees to collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Workplan. Watershed Copermittee collaboration must include frequent regularly scheduled meetings. Because there are several other agencies with MS4s in the Upper Santa Margarita watershed that the Copermittees have indicated in the ROWD are a source of pollutants that may discharge into the MS4 systems of the Copermittees, the Copermittees are also required to pursue interagency agreements, or similar cooperative efforts, with non-Copermittee owners of the MS4 (such as Caltrans, Native American tribes, and school districts) to control the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the shared MS4. In addition, the Copermittees are required, as appropriate, to participate in watershed management efforts to address water quality issues within the entire Santa Margarita Watershed (such as the County of San Diego and United States Marine Corps Camp Pendleton).

Section G.4 (Public Participation) requires the Copermittees to implement a watershed-specific public participation mechanism within each watershed. A required component of the watershed-specific public participation mechanism must be a minimum 30-day public review of the Watershed Workplan. Opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Watershed Workplan must occur before the workplan is implemented.

DRAFT

Section G.5 (Watershed Workplan Review and Updates) requires the Copermitees to review and update the Watershed Workplan annually to identify needed changes to the prioritized water quality problem(s) listed in the workplan. This section requires the Copermitees to review and update their workplan each year to incorporate changing priorities and evolving watershed strategies.

Section G.6 (Pyrethroid Toxicity Reduction Evaluation) requires the Copermitees to incorporate the pyrethroid pollutant reduction program into the Watershed Workplan, as described in the ROWD.

DRAFT

H. Fiscal Analysis

The following legal authority applies to section H:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(vi) provides that “[The Copermittee must submit] for each fiscal year to be covered by the permit, a fiscal analysis of the necessary capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to accomplish the activities of the programs under paragraphs (d)(2)(iii) and (iv) of this section. Such analysis shall include a description of the source of funds that are proposed to meet the necessary expenditures, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.”

Section H has been expanded in order to develop more useful and meaningful fiscal reporting. A revamped fiscal reporting strategy will provide the San Diego Water Board and the Copermittees with better capability to manage performance of the programs.

The Copermittees’ effort is expected to provide standardization of reporting so that figures between Copermittees are comparable, which is one of many types of information which can be used by the San Diego Water Board to better understand Copermittee program implementation. Standardization and comparison of fiscal analysis reporting is supported by the State Water Board funded NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey, which finds that “standards for reporting costs and storm water activities are needed to allow accurate cost comparisons to be made between storm water activities.”²²³ This document also provides guidance regarding categorization of expenditures for tracking and reporting.

The Order establishes a criterion for when Copermittees must add narrative evaluations to the tables. This will address some of the variability in reporting and will provide the public and San Diego Water Board with improved understanding of how resources are shifted in response to annual assessments. This will also help ensure that projected annual costs adequately reflect planned program modifications described in the annual reports.

The San Diego Water Board has chosen not to require a description of fiscal benefits realized from implementation of the storm water protection program. This is a recommendation from the National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management

²²³ Currier, et al., 2005. *NPDES Storm Water Cost Survey Final Report*. Prepared for California State Water Resources Control Board by Office of Water Programs, California State University, Sacramento. P. 63.

DRAFT

Agencies.²²⁴ For instance, the current fiscal assessment does not address city-wide fiscal benefits of protection (e.g., public health, tourism, property values, economic activity, beneficial uses, etc.), even though many costs currently reported to the San Diego Water Board are for related activities. This type of assessment may help Copermittees improve the allocation of resources and it may help the Copermittees secure adequate funding for the program. Finally, it will provide a clearer picture of the storm water and non-storm water runoff program to the public and San Diego Water Board. However, qualitative assessments could be overly subjective and most Copermittees likely lack the ability to provide accurate quantitative assessments. The San Diego Water Board encourages Copermittees to consider means for conducting assessments of fiscal benefits derived from the programs. Such assessments could be conducted on a regional scale similar to studies of program costs conducted by the State Water Board.²²⁵

Currently, each Riverside County municipality's annual report includes a table based on a template developed by the principal Copermittee. The template was meant to facilitate reporting consistency among the Copermittees. The annual report table contains estimates of spending during the reported period and estimates of the next year's spending.

Review of the fiscal analysis tables included in the annual reports has not been as straightforward as expected, and the value of the information is moderate. The reviews indicate that cities do not use consistent methods to fill in the tables because they use different accounting and budgeting processes, and certain storm water program expenditures are not easily categorized into the table formats. Furthermore, storm water permit-related activities involve several departments, which makes it difficult for the storm water manager to gather and decipher actual costs.

These issues also make it difficult for the Copermittees to accurately compartmentalize expenditures within the format. As a result, the current financial reporting provides estimates at best and cannot be reliably used to compare program implementation among most municipalities.

²²⁴ National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies. 2006. *Guidance for Municipal Stormwater Funding*. Prepared under a grant provided by the USEPA.

²²⁵ State Water Board, 2005. NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey.

DRAFT

I. Total Maximum Daily Loads

The following legal authority applies to section I:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA section 303(d)(1)(A) and (C), and Federal regulations 40 CFR 130.2(i), 40 CFR 130.7(b)(1) and 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B) requires that NPDES permit requirements incorporate water quality based effluent limitations that must be consistent with the requirements and assumptions of wasteload allocations (WLAs) assigned to the MS4 as part of the calculated TMDLs.

Section I.1. is a placeholder for the requirements and WLAs assigned to the Copermitees' MS4 discharges of any future TMDLs that are adopted by the San Diego Water Board.

Section I.2 includes, by reference to Santa Ana Water Board Order No. R8-2010-0033 (and subsequent revisions), the requirements and WLAs assigned to the MS4s for the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake (San Jacinto Watershed) Nutrient TMDLs that are being implemented for the Santa Ana Water Board. Because the San Jacinto Watershed is within the boundaries of the Santa Ana Water Board's region, the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs and its requirements must be implemented by the Cities of Murrieta and Wildomar for the areas within their jurisdictions located in the Santa Ana Region (Region 8).

DRAFT

J. Program Effectiveness Component

The following legal authority applies to section J:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(v) provides that the Copermittees must include “Estimated reductions in loadings of pollutants from discharges of municipal storm sewer constituents from municipal storm sewer systems expected as the result of the municipal storm water quality management program. The assessment shall also identify known impacts of storm water controls on ground water.” Under Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.42(c) applicants must provide annual reports on the progress of their storm water management programs.

Section J.1 (Program Effectiveness Assessments) of the Order requires the Copermittees to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of their jurisdictional, watershed, and monitoring programs and activities. The Riverside County Storm Water Program is supportive of the CASQA effort, and use of CASQA assessment techniques is consistent with the methodology proposed in the ROWD.^{226,227}

This section requires the Copermittees to establish assessment measures or methods for each of the six outcome levels described by CASQA that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) and Watershed Workplan implementation at (1) reducing the discharge of storm water pollutants from its MS4 to the MEP; (2) prohibit non-storm water discharges; and (3) preventing runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

The effectiveness assessment measures or methods must be established and included as part of the updated JRMPs and Watershed Workplan that are due on or before June 30, 2012. Beginning with the Annual Report due in 2013, the Copermittees are required to annually perform the assessments using the established assessment measures or methods.

Section J.2 (Respond to Assessments) of the Order requires the Copermittees to improve jurisdictional and watershed activities or BMPs when they are found to be ineffective or when water quality impairments are continuing. This requirement fulfills the purpose of conducting effectiveness assessments – to improve and refine the

²²⁶ The Riverside County Copermittees proposed an assessment strategy based on the CASQA Municipal Stormwater Program Effectiveness Assessment Guidance in section 6.1.2.1 of the ROWD.

²²⁷ CASQA 2007. Municipal Stormwater Program Effectiveness Assessment Guidance.

DRAFT

Copermittees' programs. The requirement is consistent with USEPA's Phase II regulations, which state: "If the permittee determines that its original combination of BMPs are not adequate to achieve the objectives of the municipal program, the MS4 should revise its program to implement BMPs that are adequate [...]."²²⁸

Each Copermittee must update the effectiveness assessment work plan and schedule to address any program modifications and improvements in response to the findings of their assessment. The updates to the work plan and schedule must be incorporated into the applicable Annual Report.

Section J.3 (Assessment and Response Reporting) of the Order describes the information required to be submitted in the Annual Report pertaining to program effectiveness assessments, review, and response. A summary of the effectiveness assessments, responses to the effectiveness assessments, and any steps implemented to improve the Copermittee's ability to assess program effectiveness must be included with the Annual Report. The reporting will demonstrate whether Copermittees have appropriately responded to the effectiveness assessments.

²²⁸ Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 8, 1999 / Rules and Regulations. P. 68762.

DRAFT

K. Reporting

The following legal authority applies to section K:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.42(c) requires that “The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system or a municipal separate storm sewer system that has been designated by the director under § 122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such system. The report shall include: (1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions; (2) Proposed changes to the storm water management program that are established as permit condition. Such proposed changes shall be consistent with § 122.26(d)(2)(iii) of this part; (3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit application under § 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and (d)(2)(v) of this part; (4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year; (5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report; (6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs; (7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation.”

CWC section 13267 provides that “the Regional Board may require than any person who has discharged [...] shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring reports which the regional board requires.”

Section K.1 (Runoff Management Plans) outlines the process and due dates for submitting JRMPs and Watershed Workplan. The information to be included in the Jurisdictional and Watershed plans must be sufficient to demonstrate the capacity to implement the requirements of section F and G, respectively, of the Order.

In many cases, the requirements of the Order should not necessitate a complete rewrite of the plans, as was basically done in 2005. Only sections of the Order which are new or have been significantly changed should warrant rewriting of plans' sections. The San Diego Water Board plans to work with the Copermittees and provide guidance regarding where JRMPs and Watershed Workplan must be updated in accordance with the Order. This will help ensure that rewriting, reporting, and review efforts are minimized.

Section K.2 (Other Required Reports and Plans) include requirements for information to be included in the SSMP update, the HMP, and the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for the next permit reissuance. The Order requires submittal of an updated

DRAFT

SSMP on or before June 30, 2012; a draft HMP on or before June 30, 2013; and a ROWD 180 days in advance of the expiration of this Order. The section also identifies the minimum information to be included in the ROWD, based on USEPA's May 17, 1996 guidance "Interpretive Policy Memorandum on Reapplication Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems."

Section K.3 (Annual Reports) outlines the process and roles of the Copermittees for developing and submitting the JRMP Annual Report. Information to be included in the Annual Reports is described in section K.3.a.(3).

Each Copermittee is required to maintain records demonstrating that Permit activity requirements have been met, which allows the San Diego Water Board to confirm compliance as needed, such as via inspections, program audits, or requests for information per CWC sections 13225 and 13267.

Reporting requirements in the Order focus on results and responses to the effectiveness assessments conducted by the Copermittees. This will allow the San Diego Water Board to determine how appropriately municipalities adapt and tailor their programs to findings from activities and monitoring results. Assessment of progress toward meeting the objectives is possible because the data collected by the Copermittees under Order No. R9-2004-001 can be used to establish baseline conditions. Compared to activity-based reporting, this will greatly enhance the ability of the San Diego Water Board, Copermittees, and the public to determine whether the programs are successful.

The Order reduces the amount of program activity-based reporting from Order No. R9-2004-001. Under the CASQA assessment model, activity-based reporting includes primarily outcomes that document compliance with permit requirements (Level 1 outcomes), rather than being indicators of the impact of activity implementation.²²⁹ This approach is consistent with guidance from the USEPA, which notes that annual reports should highlight program effectiveness as well as describing activities.²³⁰ This emphasis is also consistent with recommendations from the National Academy of Public Administration in its report to USEPA on Evaluating Environmental Progress, which suggest that reviewing activities data provides limited value when evaluating the effectiveness of programs and resulting environmental conditions.²³¹

The Order maintains some reporting requirements for certain activity-based outcomes. These are mostly focused on activities that establish or revise municipal processes related to storm water runoff and management. The processes required by the Order

²²⁹ Level 1 outcomes under the CASQA guidance include documentation that required activities have been implemented.

²³⁰ USEPA 2007. *MS4 Program Evaluation Guidance*. USEPA Office of Wastewater Management EPA-833-R-07-003. January 2007 field test version.

²³¹ National Academy of Public Administration 2001. *Evaluating Environmental Progress: How EPA and the States Can Improve the Quality of Enforcement and Compliance Information* (June 2001). <http://www.napawash.org>

DRAFT

are especially important in situations where sustaining water quality improvements may require activities that extend beyond the five-year period of the NPDES permit.

In addition, the Order maintains many activity-based reporting requirements related to enforcement of local requirements, with an emphasis on the results from such activities. This is intended to facilitate review of the contributions that inspection and enforcement activities have made toward meeting the goals of the Order. Reporting of these types of activities is supported by recommendations from the National Academy of Public Administration in its report to the USEPA: *Evaluating Environmental Progress: How EPA and the States Can Improve the Quality of Enforcement and Compliance Information* (June 2001).²³² Other activity-based reporting has been reduced to selected items based on consideration of program priorities.

Another source of prioritization for activity-based reporting is the *Storm Water Panel Recommendations to the California State Water Resources Control Board The Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities* (June 19, 2006). In particular, the panel highlighted needs to improve the design, maintenance, and inspections of best management practices.

Section K.4 (Interim Reporting Requirements) specifies that the JRMP Annual Reports must be submitted in accordance with the requirements of Order No. R9-2004-001 prior to submittal of the JRMPs required under section K.1 a.

²³² The National Academy of Public Administration report is available on-line at <http://www.napawash.org>

DRAFT

L. Modification of Programs

The following legal authority applies to section L:

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).

Section L of the Order provides a process for the Copermitees to modify their runoff management programs. This process will be useful so that the Copermitees can continue to refine and improve their programs based on the findings of their annual program effectiveness assessments. The process allows for minor modifications to the Copermitees' programs where the Copermitees can exhibit that the modifications meet or exceed existing legal requirements under the Order. Such a process avoids lengthy and time consuming formal approvals of proposed modifications before the San Diego Water Board, while still ensuring compliance with applicable legal standards and the Order. The process included in the Order is based on a process utilized by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (San Francisco Bay Water Board) in their MS4 permit for Alameda County.²³³

²³³ San Francisco Bay Water Board, 2003. Order No. R2-2003-0021. P. 45.

DRAFT

M. Principal Permittee Responsibilities

The following legal authority applies to section M:

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: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(a)(3)(iii)(C) provides that "A regional authority may be responsible for submitting a permit application."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(D) provides that "[The Copermitttee must demonstrate that it can control] through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system."

No significant changes were made to this section.

DRAFT

N. Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program

The following legal authority applies to section N:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA sections 402, 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: Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii) and 122.44 require the Copermitees to conduct a comprehensive monitoring program.

See section T of this Fact Sheet/Technical Report for a discussion of changes to the Receiving Waters Monitoring and Reporting Program.

DRAFT

O. Standard Provisions, Reporting Requirements, And Notifications

The following legal authority applies to section O:

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: Standard provisions, reporting requirements, and notifications are consistent to all NPDES permits and are generally found in Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.41.

Section O.2 of the Order has been changed to remove the statement that all plans and reports submitted in compliance with the Order are an enforceable part of the Order. This statement has been removed because it is unnecessary. The Order itself contains sufficient detailed requirements to ensure that compliance with discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, non-storm water action levels and the narrative standard of MEP for storm water are achieved. Implementation by the Copermittees of programs in compliance with the Order's requirements, prohibitions, and receiving water limitations is the pertinent compliance standard to be used under the Order, as opposed to assessing compliance by reviewing the Copermittees' implementation of their plans alone.

Rather than being substantive components of the Order itself, the Copermittees' management plans are simply descriptions of their runoff management programs required under the Order. These plans serve as procedural correspondence which guides program implementation and aids the Copermittees and San Diego Water Board in tracking implementation of the programs. In this manner, the plans are not functional equivalents of the Order. For these reasons, the Copermittees' runoff management plans need not be an enforceable part of the Order.

DRAFT

P. Attachment A – Basin Plan Prohibitions

The following legal authority applies to Attachment A:

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: CWC section 13243 provides that “A regional 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.”

CWC section 13263(a) provides that waste discharge requirements prescribed by the San Diego Water Board implement the Basin Plan.

No significant changes were made to this attachment.

DRAFT

Q. Attachment B – Standard Provisions

The following legal authority applies to Attachment B:

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: Standard provisions, reporting requirements, and notifications are consistent to all NPDES permits and are generally found in Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.41.

Attachment B includes Standard Provisions which have been developed by the State Water Board. These Standard Provisions ensure that NPDES permits are consistent and compatible with USEPA's federal regulations. Some Standard Provisions sections specific to publicly owned sewage treatment works are not included in Attachment B.

DRAFT

R. Attachment C – Definitions

The following legal authority applies to Attachment C:

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).

Attachment C contains definitions for terms found in the Order. In addition, definitions for terms previously defined in Order No. R9-2004-001 Attachment C, but which are not found in the current Order, have been deleted.

An additional section which includes acronyms and abbreviations has been added. This is to ensure clarity and prevent confusion of terms. Definitions have been added for new terms used in the permit to provide a clear understanding of their meaning and use.

DRAFT

S. Attachment D – Summary of Submittals

The following legal authority applies to Attachment D:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii), CWC section 13377, 13383, and Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B, C, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and 122.44(i).

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.42(c) requires that “The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system or a municipal separate storm sewer system that has been designated by the director under § 122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such system. The report shall include: (1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions; (2) Proposed changes to the storm water management program that are established as permit condition. Such proposed changes shall be consistent with § 122.26(d)(2)(iii) of this part; (3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit application under § 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and (d)(2)(v) of this part; (4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year; (5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report; (6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs; (7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation.”

CWC section 13267 provides that “the regional board may require than any person who has discharged [...] shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring reports which the regional board requires.”

Attachment D to the Order provides a table summary of scheduled submittals required by the Order. Unscheduled submittals are no longer added to the table, since there is no proper due date for such submittals. A task summary has not been created for the Order, since the previous task summary was found to be redundant, repeating information found in the submittal summary and elsewhere in the Order.

A Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) Annual Report Checklist has been added to the reporting requirements. This addition is to determine and ensure that all requirements of the permit are being met. A Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) Annual Report Checklist has been added to the reporting requirements. This addition is to determine and ensure that all requirements of the permit are being met.

DRAFT

T. Attachment E - Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program

The following legal authority applies to the Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program:

Broad Legal Authority: CWA sections 402, 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), 122.44 and 122.45.

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii) requires the Copermittees to conduct a comprehensive monitoring program.

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.42(c) requires that “The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system or a municipal separate storm sewer system that has been designated by the director under § 122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such system. The report shall include: (1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions; (2) Proposed changes to the storm water management program that are established as permit condition. Such proposed changes shall be consistent with § 122.26(d)(2)(iii) of this part; (3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit application under § 122.26(d)(2)(iv) and (d)(2)(v) of this part; (4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year; (5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report; (6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs; (7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation.”

CWC section 13267 provides that “the regional board may require than any person who has discharged [...] shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring reports which the regional board requires.”

I. Purpose

According to USEPA, the benefits of sampling data include, but are not limited to:

1. Providing a means for evaluating the environmental risk of storm water discharges by identifying types and amounts of pollutants present;
2. Determining the relative potential for storm water discharges to contribute to water quality impacts or water quality standard violations;
3. Identifying potential sources of pollutants; and

DRAFT

4. Eliminating or controlling identified sources more specifically through permit conditions.²³⁴

Equally important, monitoring programs are an essential link in the improvement of storm water management efforts. Data collected from monitoring programs can be assessed to determine the effectiveness of management programs and practices, which is vital for the success of the iterative approach used to meet the MEP standard for storm water. When water quality data indicate that water quality standards or objectives are being exceeded, particular pollutants, sources, and drainage areas can be identified and targeted for specific management efforts. When data indicate that a particular BMP or program component is not effective, improved efforts can be selected and implemented.

Considering the benefits described above, the Receiving Waters Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) has been designed to determine impacts to receiving water quality and beneficial uses from storm water runoff and to use the results to refine the Copermitees' storm water runoff management programs for the reduction of storm water pollutant loadings to the MEP. For non-storm water discharges, monitoring has been designed to identify and eliminate prohibited illicit discharges and to determine appropriate actions to take in response to dry weather non-storm water action levels. Additionally, the results from dry weather non-storm water monitoring can be used to evaluate exempted non-storm water discharges as a source or conveyance of pollutants. The primary goals of the MRP include:

1. Assess compliance with Order No. R9-2010-0016;
2. Measure and improve the effectiveness of the Copermitees' runoff management programs;
3. Assess the chemical, physical, and biological impacts of receiving waters from MS4 discharges;
4. Characterize storm water runoff discharges;
5. Identify sources of specific pollutants;
6. Prioritize drainage and sub-drainage areas that need management actions;
7. Detect and eliminate illicit discharges and illicit connections to the MS4;
8. Assess the overall health of receiving waters; and
9. Provide information to implement required BMP improvements

Each of the components of the MRP is necessary to meet the objectives listed above. In addition, the MRP has been designed in accordance with the guidance provided by the Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition's Model Monitoring Technical Committee in its August 2004 "Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California." This guidance document was developed in response to Senate Bill 72 (Kuehl), which addressed the standardization of sampling and analysis protocols in municipal storm water monitoring programs. The

²³⁴ USEPA, 1992. NPDES Storm Water Sampling Guidance Document. EPA/833-B-92-001.

DRAFT

technical committee which developed the guidance included representatives from Southern California Regional Water Boards (including the San Diego Water Board), municipal storm water Copermittees (including Riverside County Flood Control District), Heal the Bay, and the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project.

As its title suggests, the guidance essentially developed a model municipal storm water monitoring program for use in Southern California. The model program is structured around five fundamental management questions, outlined below. The MRP is designed as an iterative step towards ensuring that the Copermittees' monitoring program can fully answer each of the five management questions.

1. Are conditions in receiving waters protective, or likely to be protective, of beneficial uses?
2. What is the extent and magnitude of the current or potential receiving water problems?
3. What is the relative storm water runoff contribution to the receiving water problem(s)?
4. What are the sources of storm water runoff that contribute to receiving water problem(s)?
5. Are conditions in receiving waters getting better or worse?

The three MS4 NPDES permits within San Diego Water Board jurisdiction each have very similar core monitoring requirements that include receiving water monitoring, effluent monitoring, and special studies (see Finding E.12 and Discussion). The justifications for each component of the monitoring program are discussed below.


II. Monitoring Program

The Monitoring Program has been organized into distinct sections and includes receiving water monitoring, MS4 effluent monitoring, a monitoring program in high priority inland aquatic habitat, and special studies. Each monitoring program is expected to answer specific questions and achieve goals outlined in section I. Some of these questions require the linkage of both receiving water monitoring and MS4 discharge monitoring that is required in the Order. As such, the Monitoring Program has been written to allow the Copermittees to utilize the same data and/or sampling effort where monitoring requirements overlap. For example, the Copermittees may elect to develop a Trash Special Study where the sampling is done at the same location and time as stream assessment monitoring. The Copermittees may evaluate the goals and questions of the Monitoring Program when evaluating how required monitoring programs may overlap.

Section II.A.1 (Mass Loading Station Monitoring) of the MRP requires mass loading and toxicity monitoring at monitoring stations located at the bottom of the Riverside County portion of the Santa Margarita watershed (see figure below).

DRAFT

Locations of Mass Loading Stations (MLS) under Order No. R9-2004-0001



The intent of current mass loading monitoring as conducted by the Copermittees under Order No. R9-2004-001 is to use water chemistry data from storm events and dry weather flows to calculate pollutant loads and to assess water quality with respect to applicable acute and chronic toxicity criteria from the California Toxics Rule (CTR) and bioassessment as part of the triad monitoring approach.²³⁵ The mass loading monitoring that is required by the Order will provide data representing event mean concentrations of pollutants, total pollutant loadings, and toxicity conditions from specific drainage areas. Mass loading monitoring stations are recommended by the Model Monitoring Technical Committee in order to answer management questions 1, 2, and 5.²³⁶ The stations are also expected to contribute towards meeting MRP goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8. The locations of the mass loading monitoring stations are not changed from Order No. R9-2004-001. The MRP, however, retains flexibility to allow the Copermittees to propose changing the location of a mass loading station. The

²³⁵ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge, section 6.4 .

²³⁶ Model Monitoring Technical Committee, 2004. Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California. Chapter 5.

DRAFT

Copermittees may also propose additional mass loading stations should they determine more are needed. The Copermittees will identify a permanent mass loading reference station for the permit term.

Some revisions to the required list of constituents to be monitored at mass loading stations have been made. The changes are made to be compatible with the federal NPDES regulations and in response to data collected during the current permit term. Audits of the Copermittees' monitoring program and reviews of annual reports during the last permit term have found consistent shortcomings in the Copermittees' monitoring programs. As a result, some changes have been made to the monitoring requirements. The changes include:

1. All events must now include: Biological Oxygen Demand, 5-day Chemical Oxygen Demand, Total Organic Carbon, Dissolved Organic Carbon. These are specifically required by 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii)(B), but were omitted from collection and reporting required by Order No. R9-2004-001.
2. Carbamate and Pyrethroid pesticides must be monitored. Pyrethroid pesticides were identified from TIEs conducted in response to toxicity observed during sampling as part of the triad approach at Temecula and Murrieta Creek. Long term monitoring of pesticide presence is critical to evaluate Copermittees BMP efforts and program effectiveness. Carbamate pesticides are utilized in residential, agricultural and commercial applications, and have been shown to have negative direct and indirect impacts on aquatic invertebrates and vertebrates, as well as associated riparian species.²³⁷ In addition, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a Biological Opinion in 2009 that concluded pesticide products containing carbaryl and carbofuran are likely to jeopardize 22 listed salmonids, including Southern California Steelhead.²³⁸
3. Impaired water body pollutants. Specific pollutants have been added in response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency approval of California's 2004-2006 and the San Diego Water Board approval of the 2008 303(d) List.
4. A requirement to collect a grab sample for total petroleum hydrocarbons whenever a sheen is observed has been added based upon results from IC/ID programs in existing southern California NPDES MS4 permits.

²³⁷ See:

Boone and James. 2003. Interactions of an insecticide, herbicide, and natural stressors in amphibian community mesocosms. *Ecological Applications*: 13(3) pp. 829-841.

Hanazato. 2001. Pesticide effects on freshwater zooplankton: an ecological perspective. *Environmental Pollution*: 112 pp. 1-10.

USGS. 1999. Field Manual of Wildlife Diseases: General Field Procedures and Diseases of Birds. Chapter 39. California Department of Pesticide Regulation. 2010. Urban Pesticide Monitoring in Northern and Southern California. <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/surfwtr/presentations.htm>

²³⁸ NMFS. 2009. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion: Environmental Protection Agency Registration of Pesticides Containing Carbaryl, Carbofuran, and Methomyl.

DRAFT

5. The required organisms for toxicity testing have changed from the previous order to be consistent with USEPA guidance.²³⁹ *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (water flea) has been replaced with *Pimephales promelas* (fathead minnow) to provide at least three test species from different phyla. *Hyalella azteca* has been retained as a test organism due to sensitivity to pyrethroid pesticides.
6. A constituent-specific table has been added to provide clarity to the list of pollutants that are required to be monitored as part of the triad approach.
7. More prescriptive reporting requirements have been added in the event the Copermittees fail to monitor the required number of mass loading events.

Section II.A.2 (Stream Assessment Monitoring) of the MRP requires the Copermittees to conduct bioassessment monitoring using a multiple lines of evidence approach which includes collection of benthic macroinvertebrates and algae, a full physical habitat assessment, water chemistry sampling, and toxicity testing. Bioassessment monitoring is a cost-effective tool that measures the effects of water quality over time.²⁴⁰ It is an important indicator of stream health and impacts from storm water and non-storm water runoff. It can detect impacts that chemical and toxicity monitoring alone cannot. USEPA encourages permitting authorities to consider requiring biological monitoring methods in conjunction with chemical and toxicity testing to fully characterize the nature and extent of impacts from runoff.²⁴¹ Therefore, the San Diego Water Board commonly requires bioassessment monitoring in MS4 and other types of discharge permits.

Bioassessment is the direct measurement of the biological, chemical, and physical condition, and attainment of beneficial uses of receiving waters (typically using benthic macroinvertebrates, periphyton, and fish). Bioassessment monitoring integrates the effects of both water chemistry (including toxicity) and physical habitat impacts (e.g., sedimentation or erosion) of various discharges on the biological community native to the receiving waters. Moreover, bioassessment is a direct measurement of the impact of cumulative, sub-lethal doses of pollutants that may be below reasonable water chemistry detection limits, but that still have biological affects.

Because bioassessment focuses on communities of living organisms as integrators of cumulative impacts resulting from water quality or habitat degradation, it defines the ecological risks resulting from storm water and non-storm water MS4 runoff. Bioassessment not only identifies that an impact has occurred, but also measures the effect of the impact and tracks recovery when control or restoration measures have been taken. These features make bioassessment a powerful tool to assess

²³⁹ USEPA, 1991. Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control. EPA 505-2-90-001.

²⁴⁰ California Department of Fish and Game, 2002. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region 2002 Biological Assessment Report: Results of May 2001 Reference Site Study and Preliminary Index of Biotic Integrity.

²⁴¹ USEPA, 1999. Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Wadeable Streams and Rivers. EPA 841-B-99-002. P. 2-5.

DRAFT

compliance, evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs, and to track both short and long-term trends (MRP goals 1, 2, 3, and 8). Bioassessment can also help answer management questions 1, 2, and 5.

The Order also identifies the most current established protocol to be used in identifying bioassessment reference stations. The protocol referenced in the Order is specified because it provides a qualitative and repeatable method for identifying reference sites. Moreover, the protocol is well established, since it has been peer reviewed and published.

The Order includes four significant modifications to the bioassessment monitoring required under Order No. R9-2004-001. These changes include:

1. Bioassessment monitoring must be consistent with the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) as amended.²⁴²
2. Bioassessment monitoring is to include an assessment of periphyton (algae).²⁴³ Advantages of bioassessment using periphyton include: (1) they have rapid reproduction rates and very short life cycles, making them valuable indicators of short-term impacts; (2) as primary producers, they are most directly affected by physical and chemical factors; (3) sampling is easy and inexpensive; and (4) algal assemblages are sensitive to some pollutants which may not visibly affect other aquatic assemblages.²⁴⁴ Future bioassessment must use algal IBI scores, when developed.
3. The number of bioassessment stations has been increased from three to six. The Copermittees currently conduct bioassessment monitoring at one reference station and at the two mass loading stations at Temecula and Murrieta Creek. The increase in required sampling is needed to evaluate more localized impacts higher in the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit (HU) in conjunction with SAL and NAL monitoring, as well as to evaluate any impacts that occur from hydromodification. The additional required reference station will aid in detecting any differences in bioassessment scores over time that may be independent of MS4 discharges.
4. The bioassessment section title has been changed to Stream Assessment Monitoring. This was done to prevent confusion by the Copermittees in understanding sampling differences between mass loading stations and bioassessment sites. Under Order No. 2004-0001 all bioassessment sites were

²⁴² SWAMP February 2007 (amended September 2008). Standard Operating Procedures for Collecting Benthic Macroinvertebrate Samples and Associated Physical and Chemical Data for Ambient Bioassessments in California

²⁴³ SWAMP June 2009. Standard Operating Procedures for Collecting Stream Algae Samples and Associated Physical Habitat and Chemical Data for Ambient Bioassessments in California.

²⁴⁴ USEPA, 1999. Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Wadeable Streams and Rivers. EPA 841-B-99-002. P. 3-3.

DRAFT

co-located with mass loading stations. Thus, the collection of water chemistry and toxicity data was done simultaneously for mass loading and bioassessment purposes, which prevented duplicative water chemistry and toxicity testing. For new “Stream Assessment Monitoring” sites not located at mass loading stations, the nomenclature for monitoring has been changed to prevent possible misinterpretation of the term “bioassessment” to mean only the collection of benthic macroinvertebrates and physical habitat data.

Section II.A.3 (Follow-up Analysis and Actions) of the MRP requires the Copermittees to use the results of the receiving water monitoring to determine if impacts from MS4 discharges are occurring and when follow-up actions are necessary. The triad approach allows a wide range of measurements to be combined to more efficiently identify pollutants, their sources, and appropriate follow-up actions. Results from the three types of monitoring must be assessed to evaluate the extent and causes of pollution in receiving waters and to prioritize management actions to eliminate or reduce the sources. The framework provided is to be used to determine conclusions from the data and appropriate follow-up actions. The framework is proposed by the Copermittees and derived from the Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California.²⁴⁵ These follow-up actions are expected to primarily help answer management questions 2 and 4, as well as address MRP goals 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

When, based on the framework in Table 3 of the MRP, data indicates the presence of toxic pollutants in runoff, the Copermittees are required to conduct a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE). A TIE is a set of procedures used to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity to aquatic organisms. When discharges are toxic to a test organism, a TIE must be conducted to confirm potential constituents of concern and rule out others, therefore allowing Copermittees to determine and prioritize appropriate management actions. If a sample is toxic to more than one species, it is necessary to determine the toxicant(s) affecting each species. If the type and source of pollutants can be identified based on the data alone and an analysis of potential sources in the drainage area, a TIE is not necessary.

When a TIE identifies a pollutant associated with MS4 discharge as a cause of toxicity, it is then necessary to conduct follow-up actions to identify the causative agents of toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. Follow-up actions should analyze all potential source(s) causing toxicity, potential BMPs to eliminate or reduce the pollutants causing toxicity, and suggested monitoring to demonstrate that toxicity has been removed.

Section II.A.4 (Regional Monitoring Programs) of the MRP identifies that the San Diego Water Board recognizes the importance of regional monitoring efforts to answer

²⁴⁵ Model Monitoring Technical Committee, 2004. Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California. P. 5-61.

DRAFT

monitoring questions and/or address problems that may not be specific to only the Santa Margarita hydrologic unit (see Finding E.12 and Discussion). Additionally, the Copermittees' jurisdiction does not encompass the entire Santa Margarita hydrologic unit, as portions of the hydrologic unit include, but are not limited to, San Diego County, tribal lands, the Cleveland National Forest, and Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton.

Section II.B (Wet Weather MS4 Discharge Monitoring) of the MRP requires the Copermittees to develop and implement a program, in accordance with 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii), to monitor and characterize pollutants in discharges of storm water effluent from major MS4 outfalls. Currently the Copermittees do not monitor the discharge of storm water from the MS4 outfalls. As a result, a substantial amount of information regarding the quality of MS4 effluent is unknown, and in-stream stations monitored under R9-2004-001 have not accurately characterized MS4 effluent data during the permit term.²⁴⁶ The collection of wet-weather MS4 effluent data will enable the Copermittees to assess the effectiveness of existing storm water BMP measures, estimate cumulative annual pollutant loads from MS4 storm water discharges, and estimate seasonal pollutant loads from individual major outfalls. This data can be used to more effectively target storm water management program efforts. The MRP also requires compliance with section D of the Order for Storm Water Action Levels.

The monitoring of outfalls is expected to be used to identify storm drains that are discharging pollutants in concentrations that may pose a threat to receiving waters. Source investigations are expected to be conducted as a response to the data. The Copermittees are required to monitor for those pollutants in 40CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iii)(B); for 303(d) listed pollutants for the Santa Margarita Hydrologic Unit; and for pollutants with Storm Water Action Levels.

The MRP provides the Copermittees great flexibility in assigning stations and sampling frequency for wet-weather monitoring. Copermittees are to propose the number and frequency of monitoring stations, thus proposing the overall cost of their program. The San Diego Water Board will review the proposed program to ensure it will comply with Federal regulations and section D of the Order for Storm Water Action Levels.

The monitoring requirements also include a requirement to measure receiving water hardness when comparing storm water MS4 discharge data to Storm Water Action Levels for priority pollutants (e.g. metals). The effect of these constituents upon receiving waters will vary depending upon the hardness of receiving waters.

Section II.B.2 (Source Identification Monitoring) requires the Copermittees to develop and implement a program to identify sources of discharges of pollutants causing the high priority water quality problems within each hydrologic subarea. The current source identification monitoring program conducted by the Copermittees has not been

²⁴⁶ Riverside County Copermittees. 2009. Report of Waste Discharge, section 5.1.

DRAFT

demonstrated to be effective due to the continued receiving water monitoring that documents persistent exceedances of water quality objectives for 303(d) listed pollutants, as well as the listing of new water bodies and pollutants (see Finding C.7). Furthermore, all monitoring conducted under Order R9-2004-001 focused on receiving water conditions rather than MS4 effluent discharges. Outside of required toxicity identification and reduction evaluations, little to no source identification was conducted for observed exceedances of water quality standards in receiving waters.

Identification of sources causing high priority water quality problems is a central purpose of storm water runoff management programs. Monitoring which enables the Copermittees to identify sources of water quality problems aids the Copermittees in focusing their management efforts, improving their programs and choosing additional and/or better BMPs. In turn, the Copermittees' programs can abate identified sources, which will improve the quality of storm water runoff discharges and receiving waters. This monitoring is needed to address management questions 3 and 4, in addition to ensuring that pollutants in storm water discharges from the MS4 are reduced to the MEP. Moreover, in its review of the San Diego County Copermittees' monitoring proposal, Tetra Tech, Inc. finds that "after some years of assessment monitoring, it is time to look more systematically at determining the relative urban contributions and the sources of urban runoff that contribute to identified receiving water problems."²⁴⁷

Section II.C (Non-Storm Water Dry Weather Action Levels) of the MRP describes the monitoring to be conducted by the Copermittees to determine compliance with dry weather, non-storm water action levels.

The section for Dry Weather Non-Storm Water Action Level Monitoring has taken the place of Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Monitoring under the previous Order. This change is required to assess compliance with action levels for non-storm water discharges from the MS4 into receiving waters while the Copermittees simultaneously conduct Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination activities. The prior Order did not require the testing of non-storm water MS4 effluent prior to discharge into receiving waters, and thus Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Monitoring was conducted in receiving waters that were technically considered part of the MS4 but did not necessarily contain solely MS4 effluent. Discussions between the San Diego Water Board and Copermittees identified this shortcoming, which is reflected in the Copermittees Annual Reports (2007-08 and 2008-09), and the Copermittees have requested the point of monitoring for non-storm water be changed to sample MS4 effluent.²⁴⁸ The required sampling frequency has great flexibility and allows Copermittees to sample a representative number of discharge points while the sampling methodology continues to be grab sampling. Additionally, the selection of representative outfalls or other identified stations has been clarified to ensure that those selected are consistent with federal requirements under 40 CFR 122.26(d) and section C of the Order.

²⁴⁷ Tetra Tech Inc., 2006. Review of San Diego County MS4 Monitoring Program.

²⁴⁸ Riverside County Copermittees ROWD, January 2009. Section 7.8.2.

DRAFT

Section II.C.2 (Source Identification Monitoring) requires the Copermitees to develop and implement a program to identify the sources of pollutants in non-storm water discharges. The section provides clarification that the program must utilize action levels pursuant to section C of the Order as a source identification response criteria. The source identification monitoring program is required under sections C, F.4.d, and F.4.e of the Order and to comply with 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B), which requires the Copermitees have a program to detect and remove illicit discharges into the MS4.

Section II.D (High Priority Inland Aquatic Habitat) of the MRP describes required monitoring to be done in order to assess if MS4 storm water and/or non-storm water discharges are affecting high priority aquatic and/or riparian species. The existing monitoring program does almost all monitoring at or near mass loading stations, which are located at and below the confluence of multiple major hydrologic subareas. While this approach may estimate cumulative loadings and impacts from entire hydrologic areas, it provides little information regarding localized impacts to receiving waters subject to MS4 discharges, especially for high priority habitats. This approach is also recommended by the Southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition's Model Monitoring Technical Committee as an integral part of a storm water monitoring program. The Model Monitoring Technical Committee, which includes a member from RCFCD, recommends the use of "site-specific stations focused on the status of high-priority inland habitats of concern, with monitoring based primarily on the Triad approach for dry weather sampling and on chemistry and toxicity for wet weather."²⁴⁹

The monitoring of MS4 discharges into high-priority inland habitats is of special importance to the species which rely on the habitat subject to the discharge. The Santa Margarita River, and its tributaries, has been designated with BIOL, WARM, COLD, RARE and WILD beneficial uses, in part due to the presence of threatened and endangered species.²⁵⁰ Portions of the Santa Margarita HU also include areas designated as critical habitat by state and Federal agencies. Federal and State threatened and endangered species are particularly susceptible to negative direct and indirect effects of MS4 discharges because the habitat available to them has already been reduced, restricted, and/or degraded, and their populations have already been reduced to low levels.²⁵¹ Therefore, short-term or chronic degradation of habitat or exposure to pollutants caused by MS4 discharges results in a proportionally high level of negative impact to already impacted beneficial uses. Threatened or endangered species with reduced habitat availability may be restricted from avoiding pollutants associated with MS4 discharges,²⁵² and any reproductive impacts from pollutants would likely have significant negative effects on already low population sizes.

²⁴⁹ Model Monitoring Technical Committee, 2004. Model Monitoring Program for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in Southern California.

²⁵⁰ See Federal Register 50 CFR 71.11 and the California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 670.5.

²⁵¹ Carroll, R., Augspurger, C., Dobson, A., Franklin, J., Orians, G., Reid, W., Tracy, R., Wilcove, D. and J. Wilson. 1996. Strengthening the use of science in achieving the goals of the Endangered Species Act: An Assessment by the Ecological Society of America. *Ecological Applications*. 6(1) pp. 1-11.

²⁵² For example, see National Marine Fisheries Service Draft Southern Steelhead Recovery Plan, July 2009.

DRAFT

Information regarding the extent of environmentally-sensitive habitats is available from sources familiar to the Copermittees.²⁵³ Examples include the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Santa Margarita HU assessments conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and California Department of Fish and Game Ecological Reserves. Therefore, a relatively small level of effort will be required to collect information to determine high priority inland aquatic habitats. In addition, the Copermittees already are required to have updated inventories of inland MS4 outfall locations. As a result, a monitoring plan can be developed within 36 months to address the new requirement.

Section II.E.2 (Sediment Toxicity Study) includes a requirement that the Copermittees conduct a sediment toxicity special study. This study has been added to the Monitoring and Reporting requirements to assess the quality of stream sediments and possible contamination due to runoff from the MS4. Toxicity tests focusing on aqueous toxicity may not account for the full toxicity of receiving waters if constituents, such as heavy metals or pesticides, are bound to sediments. Southern California studies have shown that stream sediments can exhibit significant levels of toxic metals and pesticides, including pyrethroids.^{254,255} Additionally, the Copermittees have identified the presence of aqueous toxicity at both mass loading stations due to pyrethroid pesticides, but their presence in sediments is unknown.

Section II.E.3 (Trash and Litter Investigation) includes a requirement that the Copermittees conduct a Trash and Litter Investigation (see Finding C.8 and Discussion). The objective of the study is to evaluate the quantity, type, and source(s) of trash and litter in receiving waters (see Finding E.12 and Discussion regarding regional efforts). Although trash can impair beneficial uses, the amount and type of trash discharged into receiving waters from the Copermittee(s) MS4 is unknown. Thus, the Copermittees have largely been unable to assess the effectiveness of their BMPs that target trash as a pollutant. The special study requires the Copermittees to utilize previously developed protocols to determine the source of trash and litter in receiving waters, assess BMP effectiveness, and implement additional BMPs if needed according to the requirements of the Order. Qualitative and quantitative protocols for trash assessment have already been developed for San Diego County and the San Francisco Bay Region. These protocols are required to be used in the development of the special study, are expected to reduce Copermittee costs, and promote regional consistency in trash and litter assessments.

²⁵³ See Riverside County Copermittees ROWD, January 2009. Section 4.3.3.

²⁵⁴ Holmes, R.W., Anderson, B.S., Phillips, B.M., Hunt, J.W., Crane, D.B., Mekebri, A. and V. Connor. 2008. Statewide Investigation of the Role of Pyrethroid Pesticides in Sediment Toxicity in California's Urban Waterways. *Environmental Science Technology* 42: 7003-7009.

²⁵⁵ Crane, D.B. and C. Younghans-Haug. 1992. Oxadiazon residue concentrations in sediment, fish, and shellfish from a combined residential/agricultural area in Southern California. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*. Volume 48, no. 4.

DRAFT

Section II.E.4 (Agricultural, Federal and Tribal Input Study) includes a requirement for the Copermittees to draft and subsequently conduct a special study to determine the water quality of storm water flows which are entering their MS4 from agricultural, federal and tribal areas. The objective of the study is to determine the type, quantity and estimated loading of pollutants in these discharges. In the ROWD, the Copermittees specifically state their concern regarding the quality of storm water which is discharged into their MS4 from such areas, and state that these discharges may affect overall water quality, primarily in the Murrieta and Temecula Creek watersheds.²⁵⁶ However, no data, information, or analyses were presented or identified on the level of pollutants in such flows into their MS4. The special study has been designed with sampling frequency and parameter requirements that lend flexibility to the Copermittees. The minimum requirements are limited to grab samples for pollutants expected to be present in storm water discharges and at a number of representative sites chosen by the Copermittees. The special study requires testing to be source specific (e.g. only sampling discharge into from one of the three sources) and does not allow for sampling to be done on co-mingled flows within the MS4. Additionally, the Copermittees may elect to conduct composite sampling, toxicity testing, more targeted sites, or a combination thereof.

Section II.E.5 (MS4 and Receiving Water Maintenance Study) includes a requirement that the Copermittees investigate impacts to Beneficial Uses from routine removal of vegetation from portions of the MS4 that are also receiving waters (see Finding D.3.c and Discussion). The objective of the study is to determine if there are short-term or long-term in-stream water quality impacts from maintenance activities and to assess if the activities exacerbate the impairment of receiving waters 303(d) listed as impaired wholly or partially from MS4 discharges. Receiving waters within the Copermittees jurisdiction have been routinely cleared of vegetation by the Copermittees as part of their MS4 maintenance programs without mitigation efforts. The in-stream modification of vegetation may result in changes in water quality and Beneficial Uses from changes in nutrient cycling, the storage of organic matter, infiltration, flow attenuation, temperature and erosion potential.^{257,258,259} The relative contribution, if any, of maintenance activities to CWA 303(d) water quality impairments is unknown. The program is also expected to work in conjunction with other permit requirements of the Order. For example, the Copermittees may choose to utilize study results when implementing the HMP, LID, and retrofitting programs.

Section II.E.6 (Intermittent and Ephemeral Stream Perennial Conversion Study) includes a study to assess specifically exempted non-storm water discharges²⁶⁰ into

²⁵⁶ Riverside County Copermittees ROWD, January 2009. Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

²⁵⁷ Fischenich, J.C. and R.R. Copeland. 2001. Environmental Considerations for Vegetation in Flood Control Channels. US Army Corps of Engineers.

²⁵⁸ Shade et al. 2005. Hydrologic exchange and N uptake by riparian vegetation in an arid-land stream. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*. 24(1):19–28.

²⁵⁹ Warner, R.E. and K.M. Hendrix. 1984. California Riparian Systems: Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management. pp. 160-189. University of California Press.

²⁶⁰ See Finding C.15 of the Order for discussion of exempted non-storm water discharges.

DRAFT

surface waters and discharges into MS4s covered under a separate NPDES permit in order to determine if the exempted discharges and/or separate NPDES discharges to the MS4 are causing or contributing to a condition of pollution, contamination or nuisance. For ephemeral and intermittent inland surface waters, modification of flows may impact beneficial uses through modification of in-stream ecology including, but not limited to, sediment transport, biogeochemical functioning, water temperature, non-native species presence and exclusion of native species.^{261,262} The objective of the study is to determine if the alteration of natural in-stream hydrologic regimes from intermittent or ephemeral to perennial due to exempted non-storm water discharges has modified the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The evaluation includes both qualitative and quantitative measurements of parameters which will help the Copermittees determine if exempted discharges and/or separate NPDES discharges into the MS4 are causing a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance. Such a determination would potentially require an action to be taken by the Copermittee(s) (i.e. prohibition of an exempted discharge), permit modification for a separate NPDES permit, and/or an action by the San Diego Water Board.

Section II.F (Monitoring Provisions) of the MRP includes monitoring provisions which are standard requirements for all municipal storm water permits.

III. Reporting Program

Section III of the MRP discusses submittal of the Planned Monitoring Program, the Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring Annual Reports, and Interim Reporting Requirements. For the purposes of Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program, required reviews and approvals by the San Diego Water Board of draft monitoring plans, proposals or protocols shall be conducted by the San Diego Water Board Executive Officer.

Section III.C (Table of Reporting Requirements) has been added to the MRP to provide a quick reference for all required reporting dates found in the MRP

²⁶¹ Naiman, R.J., Bunn, S.E., Nilsson, C., Petts, G.E., Pinay, G., and L.C. Thompson. 2002. Legitimizing Fluvial Ecosystems as Users of Water: An Overview. *Environmental Management*. 30(4) pp. 455-467.

²⁶² Marchetti, M.P., Light, T., Moyle, P.B. and J.H. Viers. 2004. Fish Invasions in California Watersheds: Testing Hypotheses Using Landscape Patterns. *Ecological Applications*. 14(5) pp. 1507-1525.

DRAFT

U. Attachment F - Source Data

Attachment F contains data utilized for the development of Storm Water Action Levels and Non-storm Water Action Levels.