

C.6. Construction Site Control

Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to section C.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, D, E, and F) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv).

Specific Legal Authority: Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D) requires, "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) requires, "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) requires, "A description of requirements for nonstructural and structural best management practices."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(3) requires, "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) requires, "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 Permittee must demonstrate that it can control, "through ordinance, permit, contract, order or similar means, the contribution of pollutants to the municipal storm sewer by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and the quality of storm water discharged from site of industrial activity."

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, non-conventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute

to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.”

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.6.

- C.6-1** Vegetation clearing, mass grading, lot leveling, and excavation expose soil to erosion processes and increase the potential for sediment mobilization, runoff and deposition in receiving waters. Construction sites without adequate BMP implementation result in sediment runoff rates that greatly exceed natural erosion rates of undisturbed lands, causing siltation and impairment of receiving waters.
- C.6-2** Excess sediment can cloud the water, reducing the amount of sunlight reaching aquatic plants, clog fish gills, smother aquatic habitat and spawning areas, and impede navigation in our waterways. Sediment also transports other pollutants such as nutrients, metals, and oils and grease. Permittees are on-site at local construction sites for grading and building permit inspections, and also have in many cases dedicated construction stormwater inspectors with training in verifying that effective BMPs are in place and maintained. Permittees also have effective tools available to achieve compliance with adequate erosion control, such as *stop work* orders and citations.
- C.6-3** Mobilized sediment from construction sites can flow into receiving waters. According to the 2004 National Water Quality Inventory⁸⁴, States and Tribes report that sediment is one of the top 10 causes of impairment of assessed rivers and streams, next to pathogens, habitat alteration, organic enrichment or oxygen depletion, nutrients, metals, etc.. Sediment impairs 35,177 river and stream miles (14% of the impaired river and stream miles). Sources of sedimentation include agriculture, urban runoff, construction, and forestry. Sediment runoff rates from construction sites, however, are typically 10 to 20 times greater than those of agricultural lands, and 1,000 to 2,000 times greater than those of forest lands. During a short period of time, construction sites can contribute more sediment to streams than can be deposited naturally during several decades.⁸⁵

Specific Provision C.6 Requirements

Provision C.6.a. Legal Authority for Effective Site Management. Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A) requires that each Permittee demonstrate that it can control “through ordinance, permit, contract, order or similar means, the contribution of pollutants to the municipal storm sewer by storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and the quality of storm water discharged from site of industrial activity.” This section of the Permit requires each Permittee to have the

⁸⁴ http://www.epa.gov/owow/305b/2004report/2004_305Breport.pdf

⁸⁵ USEPA. December 2005. *Stormwater Phase II Final Rule Fact Sheet Series – Construction Site Runoff Control Minimum Control Measure*. EPA 833-F-00-008. Fact Sheet 2.6.

authority to require year-round, seasonally and phase appropriate effective erosion control, run-on and runoff control, sediment control, active treatment systems, good site management, and non stormwater management through all phases of site grading, building, and finishing of lots. All Permittees should already have this authority. Permittees shall certify adequacy of their respective legal authority in the 2010 Annual Report.

Inspectors should have the authority to take immediate enforcement actions when appropriate. Immediate enforcement will get the construction site's owner/operator to quickly implement corrections to violations, thereby minimizing and preventing threats to water quality. When inspectors are unable to take immediate enforcement actions, the threat to water quality continues until an enforcement incentive is issued to correct the violation. In its Phase II Compliance Assistance Guidance, USEPA says that, "Inspections give the MS4 operator an opportunity to provide additional guidance and education, issue warnings, or assess penalties."⁸⁶ To issue warnings and assess penalties during inspections, inspectors must have the legal authority to conduct enforcement.

Provision C.6.b. Enforcement Response Plan (ERP). This section requires each Permittee to develop and implement an escalating enforcement process that serves as reference for inspection staff to take consistent actions to achieve timely and effective corrective compliance from all public and private construction site owners/operators. Under this section, each Permittee develops its own unique ERP tailored for the specific jurisdiction; but all ERPs must make it a goal to correct all violations before the next rain event but no longer than 10 business days after the violations are discovered. In a few cases, such as slope inaccessibility, it may require longer than 10 days before crews can safely access the eroded area. The Permittees' tracking data need to provide a rationale for the longer compliance timeframe.

Water Board staff has noted deficiencies in the Permittees' enforcement procedures and implementation during inspections. The most common issues found were that enforcement was not firm and appropriate to correct the violation, and that repeat violations did not result in escalated enforcement procedures. USEPA supports enforcement of ordinances and permits at construction sites stating, "Effective inspection and enforcement requires [...] penalties to deter infractions and intervention by the municipal authority to correct violations."⁸⁷ In addition, USEPA expects permits issued to municipalities to address "weak inspection and enforcement."⁸⁸ For these reasons, the enforcement requirements in this section have been established, while providing sufficient flexibility for each Permittee's unique stormwater program.

Provision C.6.c. Best Management Practices Categories. This section requires all Permittees to require all construction sites to have year-round seasonally appropriate effective Best Management Practices (BMPs) in the following six categories: (1)

⁸⁶ USEPA. 2000. 833-R-00-002, Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide, P.4-31

⁸⁷ USEPA. 1992. Guidance 833-8-92-002. Section 6.3.2.3.

⁸⁸ *Federal Register*. Vol. 55, No. 222, Friday, November 16, 1990. Rules and Regulations. p. 48058.

erosion control, (2) run-on and runoff control, (3) sediment control, (4) active treatment systems, (5) good site management, and (6) non stormwater management. These BMP categories are listed in the State General NPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Construction Permit). The Water Board staff decided it was too prescriptive and inappropriate to require a specific set of BMPs that are to be applicable to all sites. Every site is different with regards to terrain, soil type, soil disturbance, and proximity to a waterbody. The General Construction Permit recognizes these different factors and requires site specific BMPs through the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that addresses the six specified BMP categories. This Permit allows Permittees the flexibility to determine if the BMPs for each construction site are effective and appropriate. This Permit also allows the Permittees and the project proponents the necessary flexibility to make immediate decisions on appropriate, cutting-edge technology to prevent the discharge of construction pollutants into stormdrains, waterways, and right-of-ways. Appropriate BMPs for the different site conditions can be found in different handbooks and manuals. Therefore, this Permit is consistent with the General Construction Permit in its requirements for BMPs in the six specified categories.

Vegetation clearing, mass grading, lot leveling, and excavation expose soil to erosion processes and increase the potential for sediment mobilization, runoff and deposition in receiving waters. Construction sites without adequate BMP implementation result in sediment runoff rates that greatly exceed natural erosion rates of undisturbed lands, causing siltation and impairment of receiving waters. This can even occur in conjunction with unexpected rain events during the so-called *dry-season*. Although rare, significant rains can occur in the San Francisco Bay Region during the dry season. Therefore, Permittees should ensure that construction sites have materials on hand for rapid rain response during the dry season.

Normally, stormwater restrictions on grading should be implemented during the wet season from October 1st through April 30th. Section C.6.c.ii.(1).d of the Permit requires, "project proponents to minimize grading during the wet season and scheduling of grading with seasonal dry weather periods to the extent feasible." If grading does occur during the wet season, Permittees shall require project proponents to (1) implement additional BMPs as necessary, (2) keep supplies available for rapid response to storm events, and (3) minimize wet-season, exposed, and graded areas to the absolute minimum necessary.

Slope stabilization is necessary on all active and inactive slopes during rain events regardless of the season, except in areas implementing advanced treatment. Slope stabilization is also required on inactive slopes throughout the rainy season. These requirements are needed because unstabilized slopes at construction sites are significant sources of erosion and sediment discharges during rainstorms. "Steep slopes are the most highly erodible surface of a construction site, and require special attention."⁸⁹ USEPA emphasizes the importance of slope stabilization when it states, "slope length

⁸⁹ Schueler, T., and H. Holland. 2000. *Muddy Water In—Muddy Water Out?* The Practice of Watershed Protection. p. 6.

and steepness are key influences on both the volume and velocity of surface runoff. Long slopes deliver more runoff to the base of slopes and steep slopes increase runoff velocity; both conditions enhance the potential for erosion to occur.”⁹⁰ In lieu of vegetation preservation or replanting, soil stabilization is the most effective measure in preventing erosion on slopes. Research has shown that effective soil stabilization can reduce sediment discharge concentrations up to six times, as compared to soils without stabilization.⁹¹ Slope stabilization at construction sites for erosion control is already the consensus among the regulatory community and is found throughout construction BMP manuals and permits. For these reasons, Permittees must ensure that slope stabilization is implemented on sites, as appropriate.

It is also necessary that Permittees ensure that construction sites are revegetated as early as feasible. Implementation of revegetation reduces the threat of polluted stormwater discharges from construction sites. Construction sites should permanently stabilize disturbed soils with vegetation at the conclusion of each phase of construction.⁹² A survey of grading and clearing programs found one-third of the programs without a time limit for permanent revegetation, “thereby increasing the chances for soil erosion to occur.”⁹³ USEPA states “the establishment and maintenance of vegetation are the most important factors to minimizing erosion during development.”⁹⁴

To ensure the MEP standard and water quality standards are met, advanced treatment systems may be necessary at some construction sites. In requiring the implementation of advanced treatment for sediment at construction sites, Permittees should consider the site’s threat to water quality. In evaluating the threat to water quality, the following factors shall be considered: (1) soil erosion potential; (2) the site’s slopes; (3) project size and type; (4) sensitivity of receiving waterbodies; (5) proximity to receiving waterbodies; (6) non-stormwater discharges; and (7) any other relevant factors. Advanced treatment is a treatment system that employs chemical coagulation, chemical flocculation, or electro coagulation in order to reduce turbidity caused by fine suspended sediment.⁹⁵ Advanced treatment consists of a three part treatment train of coagulation, sedimentation, and polishing filtration. Advanced treatment has been effectively implemented extensively in the other states and in the Central Valley Region of California.⁹⁶ In addition, Water Board’s inspectors have observed advanced treatment being effectively implemented at both large sites greater than 100 acres, and at small, 5-acre sites. Advanced treatment is often necessary for Permittees to ensure that discharges from construction sites are not causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

⁹⁰ USEPA. 1990. *Sediment and Erosion Control: An Inventory of Current Practices*. p. II-1.

⁹¹ Schueler, T., and H. Holland. 2000. “Muddy Water In—Muddy Water Out?” *The Practice of Watershed Protection*. p. 5.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid. p. 11.

⁹⁴ USEPA. 1990. *Sediment and Erosion Control: An Inventory of Current Practices*. p. II-1.

⁹⁵ SWCRB. September 2, 2009. *NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities – Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ*.

⁹⁶ SWRCB. 2004. Conference on Advanced Treatment at Construction Sites.

Provision C.6.d. Plan Approval Process. This section of the Permit requires the Permittees to review project proponents' stormwater management plans for compliance with local regulations, policies, and procedures. USEPA states that it is often easier and more effective to incorporate stormwater quality controls during the site plan review process or earlier.⁹⁷ In the Phase I stormwater regulations, USEPA states that a primary control technique is good site planning.⁹⁸ USEPA goes on to say that the most efficient controls result when a comprehensive stormwater management system is in place.⁹⁹ 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."¹⁰⁰ 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."¹⁰¹

Provision C.6.e. (Inspections) The Water Board allows flexibility on the exact legal authority language, ERP, and BMPs required on a site. This section of the Permit pulls together the accountability of the whole Provision through regular inspections, consistent enforcement, and meaningful tracking. These three elements will help ensure that effective construction pollutant controls are in place in order to minimize construction polluted runoff to the stormdrain and waterbodies.

Currently, Annual Reports show that some Permittees provide no information on its construction inspection and enforcement programs; some Permittees only provide information on pre rainy season inspections; another group of Permittees conduct inspections through December and provide just the date each site was inspected; yet another group of Permittees provides a very brief summary of their respective overall inspection program; and there is a small group of Permittees who report meaningful inspection and enforcement information. Inspections of construction sites by Water Board staff have noted deficiencies in stormwater inspections and enforcement. Therefore, this section clearly identifies the level of effort necessary by all Permittees to minimize construction pollutant runoff into stormdrains and ultimately, waterbodies.

This section requires monthly inspections during the wet season of all construction sites disturbing one or more acre of land and at all high priority sites as determined by the Permittee or the Water Board as significant threats to water quality. Inspections shall focus on the adequacy and effectiveness of the site specific BMPs implemented for the six BMP categories. Permittees shall implement its ERP and require timely corrections of all actual and potential problems observed. All violations must be corrected in a timely manner with the goal of correcting them before the next rain event but no longer

⁹⁷ USEPA. 2000. *Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide*. EPA 833-R-00-002. Section 6.3.2.1.

⁹⁸ *Federal Register*. Vol. 55, No. 222, Friday, November 16, 1990. Rules and Regulations. p. 48034.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰⁰ USEPA. 2000. *Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide*. EPA 833-R-00-002. Section 4.6.2.4, pp. 4-30.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*. pp. 4-31.

than 10 business days after the violations are discovered. All inspections shall be recorded on a written or electronic inspection form, and also tracked in an electronic database or tabular format. The tracked information provides meaningful data for evaluating compliance. An example tabular format is included as Table 6 – Construction Inspection Data. Submittal of this Table is not required in each Annual Report but encouraged. Each Permittee will need to use the information in the electronic database or tabular format to compile its Annual Reports. The Executive Officer may require that the tracked information be submitted electronically or in a tabular format. When required, Permittees shall submit that data within 10-working days of the requirement. The recommended submittal format is in Table 6 – Construction Inspection Data.

Provision C.6.f. Staff Training. This section of the Permit requires Permittees to conduct annual staff trainings for municipal staff. These trainings have been found to be extremely effective means to educate inspectors and to inform them of any changes to local ordinances and state laws. Trainings provide valuable opportunity for Permittees to network and share strategies used for effective enforcement and management of erosion control practices.

Table 6 – Construction Inspection Data

Facility/Site Inspected	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Inches of Rain Since Last Inspection	Enforcement Response Level	Problem(s) Observed						Specific Problem(s)	Resolution			Comments/ Rationale for Longer Compliance Time		
					Erosion Control	Run-on and Runoff Control	Sediment Control	Active Treatment System	Good Site Management	Non Stormwater Management		Illicit Discharge	Problems Fixed	Need More Time		Escalate Enforcement	
Panoramic Views	9/30/08	Dry	0	Written Notice			x										
Panoramic Views	10/15/08	Dry	0.5									x					50' of driveway rocked.
Panoramic Views	11/15/08	Rain	3	Stop Work	x		x				x						Uncovered graded lots eroding; Sediment entering a stormdrain that didn't have adequate protection.
Panoramic Views	11/15/08	Drizzling	0.25									x					Lots blanketed. Storm drains pumped. Street cleaned.
Panoramic Views	12/1/08	Dry	4	Verbal Warning					x			x					Porta potty moved away from stormdrain.
Panoramic Views	1/15/08	Rain	3.25	Written Warning	x					x							Fiber rolls need maintenance; Tire wash water flowing into street
Panoramic Views	1/25/09	Dry	0									x					Fiber rolls replaced.

Facility/Site Inspected	Inspection Date	Weather During Inspection	Inches of Rain Since Last Inspection	Enforcement Response Level	Problem(s) Observed						Specific Problem(s)	Resolution			Comments/ Rationale for Longer Compliance Time				
					Erosion Control	Run-on and Runoff Control	Sediment Control	Active Treatment System	Good Site Management	Non Stormwater Management		Illicit Discharge	Problems Fixed	Need More Time		Escalate Enforcement			
Panoramic Views	2/28/09	Rain	2.4	Stop Work	x		x												
Panoramic Views	2/28/09	Rain	0.1											x					Fiber rolls replaced. Silt fences added. More stormdrains protected. Streets cleaned. Slope too soggy to access.
Panoramic Views	3/15/09	Dry	1	Citation with Fine						x		Paint brush washing not designated	x						Street and storm drains cleaned. Slopes blanketed.
Panoramic Views	4/1/09	Dry	0.5	Citation with Fine								Concrete washout overflowed; Evidence of illicit discharge							
Panoramic Views	4/15/09	Dry	0										x						Concrete washout replaced; Storm drain and line cleaned.

C.7. Public Information and Outreach

Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to section C.7:

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

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

Federal NPDES regulation 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(6) requires, "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."

Fact Sheet Finding in Support of Provision C.7.

- C.7-1** An informed and knowledgeable community is critical to the success of a stormwater program since it helps ensure greater support for the program as the public gains a greater understanding of stormwater pollution issues.
- C.7-2** An informed community also ensures 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.
- C.7-3** The public education programs 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.¹⁰²

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

- C.7-4** Target audiences should include (1) government agencies and official to achieve better communication, consistency, collaboration, and coordination at the federal, state, and local levels and (2) K-12/Youth Groups.¹⁰³
- C.7-5** Citizen involvement events should make every effort to reach out and engage all economic and ethnic groups.¹⁰⁴

Specific Provision C.7 Requirements

Provision C.7.a. Storm Drain Inlet Marking. Storm drain inlet marking is a long-established program of outreach to the public on the nature of the storm drain system, providing the information that the storm drain system connects directly to creeks and the Bay and does not receive treatment. Past public awareness surveys have demonstrated that this BMP has achieved significant impact in raising awareness in the general public and meets the MEP standard as a required action. Therefore, it is important to set a goal of ensuring that all municipally-maintained inlets are legible labeled with a no dumping message. If storm drain marking can be conducted as a volunteer activity, it has additional public involvement value.

Provision C.7.b. Advertising Campaigns. Use of various electronic and/or print media on trash/litter in waterways and pesticides. Advertising campaigns are long-established outreach management practices. Specifically, the Bay Area Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) already implements an advertising campaign on behalf of the Permittees. While the Permittees have been successful at reaching certain goals for its Public Information/Participation programs, it must continue to increase public awareness of specific stormwater issues. This Permit also requires a pre-campaign survey and a post-campaign survey. These two surveys will help identify and quantify the audiences' knowledge, trends, and attitudes and/or practices; and to measure the overall population awareness of the messages and behavioral changes.

Provision C.7.c. Media Relations. Public service media time is available and allows the Permittees to leverage expensive media purchases to achieve broader outreach goals.

Provision C.7.d. Stormwater Point of Contact. As the public has become more aware, citizens are more frequently calling their local jurisdictions to report spills and other polluting behavior impacting stormwater runoff and causing non-stormwater prohibited discharges. Permittees are required to have a centralized, easily accessible point of contact both for citizen reports and to coordinate reports of problems identified by Permittee staff, permitting follow-up and pollution cleanup or prevention. Often the follow-up, cleanup, and/or prevention provide the opportunity to educate the immediate neighborhood through established public outreach mechanisms such as distributing door hangers in the neighborhood describing the remedy for the problem discovered. Permittees already have existing published stormwater point of contacts.

¹⁰³ State Water Board. 1994. Urban Runoff Technical Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations. Nonpoint Source Management Program.

¹⁰⁴ USEPA. 2000. Storm Water Phase II Compliance Assistance Guide. EPA 833-R-00-002.

Provision C.7.e. Public Outreach Events. Staffing tables or booths at fairs, street fairs or other community events are a long-established outreach mechanism employed by Permittees to reach large numbers of citizens with stormwater pollution prevention information in an efficient and convenient manner. These have been ongoing in the Region for several municipal stormwater permit cycles and are MEP outreach actions. Permittees shall continue with such outreach events utilizing appropriate outreach materials, such as printed materials, newsletter/journal articles, and videos. Permittees shall also utilize existing community outreach events such as the Bringing Back the Natives Garden Tour.

Provision C.7.f. Watershed Stewardship Collaborative Efforts. Watershed and Creek groups are comprised of active citizens, but they often need support from the local jurisdiction and certainly need to coordinate actions with Permittees such as flood districts and cities.

Provision C.7.g. Citizen Involvement Events. Citizen involvement and volunteer efforts both accomplish needed creek cleanups and restorations, and serve to raise awareness and provide outreach opportunities. These have been ongoing in the Region for several municipal stormwater permit cycles and are MEP outreach actions.

In previous municipal stormwater permits, Public Information/Participation encompassed both Citizen Involvement Events and Public Outreach Events. Citizen Involvement Events are important because they provide the community opportunities to actively practice being good stewards of our environment. Therefore, this Permit separates out the Public Outreach Events from the Citizen Involvement Events to ensure that citizens in all Bay Area communities are given the opportunity to be involved. In addition, the Permit allows Permittees to claim both Public Outreach and Citizen Involvement credits if the event contains significant elements of both. The combined specified number of events for Public Outreach and Citizen Involvement are very close to current performance standards and/or level of effort for respective Public Information/Participation Programs.

Provision C.7.h. School-Age Children Outreach. Outreach to school children has proven to be a particularly successful program with an enthusiastic audience who are efficient to reach. School children also take the message home to their parents, neighbors, and friends. In addition, they are the next generation of decision makers and consumers.

Provision C.7.i. Outreach to Municipal Officials. It is important for Permittee staff to periodically inform Municipal Officials of the permit requirements and also future planning and resource needs driven by the permit and stormwater regulations.

C.8. Water Quality Monitoring

Legal Authority

Broad Legal Authority: CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii-iii); CWC section 13377; Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)

Specific Legal Authority: Permittees must conduct a comprehensive monitoring program as required under Federal NPDES regulations 40 CFR 122.48, 40 CFR 122.44(i), 40 CFR 122.26.(d)(1)(iv)(D), and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(ii)-(iv).

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.8

C.8-1 In response to questions regarding the type of water quality-based effluent limitations that are most appropriate for NPDES stormwater permits, and because of the nature of stormwater discharges, USEPA established the following approach to stormwater monitoring:

Each storm water permit should include a coordinated and cost-effective monitoring program to gather necessary information to determine the extent to which the permit provides for attainment of applicable water quality standards and to determine the appropriate conditions or limitations for subsequent permits. Such a monitoring program may include ambient monitoring, receiving water assessment, discharge monitoring (as needed), or a combination of monitoring procedures designed to gather necessary information.¹⁰⁵

According to USEPA, the benefits of stormwater runoff monitoring include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Providing a means for evaluating the environmental risk of stormwater discharges by identifying types and amounts of pollutants present;
- Determining the relative potential for stormwater discharges to contribute to water quality impacts or water quality standard violations;
- Identifying potential sources of pollutants; and
- Eliminating or controlling identified sources more specifically through permit conditions.¹⁰⁶

C.8-2 Provision C.8 requires Permittees to conduct water quality monitoring, including monitoring of receiving waters, in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44(i) and 122.48. One purpose of water quality monitoring is to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Permittees' stormwater management

¹⁰⁵ USEPA. 1996. Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Stormwater Permits. Sept. 1, 1996. <http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/swpol.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ USEPA. 1992. NPDES Storm Water Sampling Guidance Document. EPA/833-B-92-001.

actions pursuant to this Permit and, accordingly, demonstrate compliance with the conditions of the Permit. Other water quality monitoring objectives under this Permit include:

- Assess the chemical, physical, and biological impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters;
- Characterize stormwater discharges;
- Assess compliance with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) in impaired waterbodies;
- Assess progress toward reducing receiving water concentrations of impairing pollutants;
- Assess compliance with numeric and narrative water quality objectives and standards;
- Identify sources of pollutants;
- Assess stream channel function and condition, as related to urban stormwater discharges;
- Assess the overall health and evaluate long-term trends in receiving water quality; and
- Measure and improve the effectiveness of the Permittees' urban runoff control programs and the Permittees' implemented BMPs.

C.8-3 Monitoring programs are an essential element in the improvement of urban runoff 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, also called the "continuous improvement" approach, used to meet the MEP standard. When water quality data indicate that water quality standards or objectives are not being met, particular pollutants, sources, and drainage areas can be identified and targeted for urban runoff management efforts. The iterative process in Provision C.1, Water Quality Standards Exceedances, could potentially be triggered by monitoring results. Ultimately, the results of the monitoring program must be used to focus actions to reduce pollutant loadings to comply with applicable WLAs, and protect and enhance the beneficial uses of the receiving waters in the Permittees' jurisdictions and the San Francisco Bay.

C.8-4 Water quality monitoring requirements in previous permits were less detailed than the requirements in this Permit. Under previous permits, each program could design its own monitoring program, with few permit guidelines. A decision by the California Superior Court¹⁰⁷ regarding two of the programs' permits stated:

Federal law requires that all NPDES permits specify "[r]equired monitoring including type, intervals, and frequency sufficient to yield

¹⁰⁷ San Francisco Baykeeper vs. Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, Consolidated Case No. 500527, filed Nov. 14, 2003.

data which are representative of the monitored activity.” 40 C.F.R. § 122.48(b). Here, there is no monitoring program set forth in the Permit. Instead, an annual Monitoring Program Plan is to be prepared by the dischargers to set forth the monitoring program that will be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Stormwater Management Plan. This does not meet the regulatory requirements that a monitoring program be set forth including the types, intervals, and frequencies of the monitoring.

The water quality monitoring requirements in Provision C.8 comply with 40 CFR 122.44(i) and 122.48(b), and the Superior Court decision.

C.8-5 The Water Quality Monitoring Provision is intended to provide answers to five fundamental management questions, outlined below. Monitoring is intended to progress as iterative steps toward ensuring that the Permittees’ can fully answer, through progressive monitoring actions, each of the five management questions:

- Are conditions in receiving waters protective, or likely to be protective, of beneficial uses?
- What is the extent and magnitude of the current or potential receiving water problems?
- What is the relative urban runoff contribution to the receiving water problem(s)?
- What are the sources of urban runoff that contribute to receiving water problem(s)?
- Are conditions in receiving waters getting better or worse?

C.8-6 On April 15, 1992, the Water Board adopted Resolution No. 92-043 directing the Executive Officer to implement the Regional Monitoring Program for San Francisco Bay. Subsequent to a public hearing and various meetings, Board staff requested major permit holders in the Region, under authority of CWC section 13267, to report on the water quality of the Estuary. These permit holders, including the Permittees, responded to this request by participating in a collaborative effort through the San Francisco Estuary Institute. This effort has come to be known as the San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances (RMP). The RMP involves collection and analysis of data on pollutants and toxicity in water, sediment and biota of the Estuary. The Permittees are required to continue to report on the water quality of the Estuary, as presently required. Compliance with the requirement through participation in the RMP is considered to be adequate compliance.

C.8-7 The Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) is a statewide monitoring effort, administered by the State Water Board, designed to assess the conditions of surface waters throughout California. One purpose of SWAMP is to integrate existing water quality monitoring activities of the State Water Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards, and to coordinate with other monitoring programs. Provision C.8 contains a

framework, referred to as a regional monitoring collaborative, within which Permittees can elect to work cooperatively with SWAMP to maximize the value and utility of both the Permittees' and SWAMP's monitoring resources.

- C.8-8** In 1998 BASMAA published *Support Document for Development of the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Strategy*,¹⁰⁸ a document describing a possible strategy for coordinating the monitoring activities of BASMAA member agencies. The document states:

BASMAA's member agencies are connected not only by geography but also by an overlapping set of environmental issues and processes and a common regulatory structure. It is only natural that the evolution of their individual stormwater management programs has led toward increasing amounts of information sharing, cooperation, and coordination.

This same concept is found in the optional provision for Permittees to form a regional monitoring collaborative. Such a group is meant to provide efficiencies and economies of scale by performing certain tasks (e.g., planning, contracting, data quality assurance, data management and analysis, and reporting) at the regional level. Further benefits are expected from closer cooperation between this group, the Regional Monitoring Program, and SWAMP.

- C.8-9** This Permit includes monitoring requirements to verify compliance with adopted TMDL WLAs and to provide data needed for TMDL development and/or implementation. This Permit incorporates the TMDLs' WLAs adopted by the Water Board as required under CWA section 303(d).
- C.8-10** SB1070 (California Legislative year 2005/2006) found that there is no single place where the public can go to get a look at the health of local waterbodies. SB1070 also states that all information available to agencies shall be made readily available to the public via the Internet. This Permit requires water quality data to be submitted in a specified format and uploaded to a centralized Internet site so that the public has ready access to the data.

Specific Provision C.8 Requirements

Each of the components of the monitoring provision is necessary to meet the objectives and answer the questions listed in the findings above. Justifications for each monitoring component are discussed below.

Provision C.8.a. Compliance Options. Provision C.8.a. provides Permittees options for obtaining monitoring data through various organizational structures, including use of data obtained by other parties. This is intended to

¹⁰⁸ EcoAnalysis, Inc. & Michael Drennan Assoc., Inc., *Support Document for Development of the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Strategy*, prepared for Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association, March 2, 1998.

- Promote cost savings through economies of scale and elimination of redundant monitoring by various entities;
- Promote consistency in monitoring methods and data quality;
- Simplify reporting; and
- Make data and reports readily publicly available.

In the past, each Stormwater Countywide Program has conducted water quality monitoring on behalf of its member Permittees, and some data were collected by wider collaboratives, such as the Regional Monitoring Program. In this Permit, all the Stormwater Countywide Programs are encouraged to work collaboratively to conduct all or most of the required monitoring and reporting on a region-wide basis. For each monitoring component that is conducted collaboratively, one report would be prepared on behalf of all contributing Permittees; separate reports would not be required from each Program. Cost savings could result also from reduced contract and oversight hours, fewer quality assurance/quality control samples, shared sampling labor costs, and laboratory efficiencies.

Provision C.8.b. San Francisco Estuary Receiving Water Monitoring. The San Francisco Estuary is the ultimate receiving water for most of the urban runoff in this region. For this reason and because of the high value of its beneficial uses, Provision C.8.b requires focused monitoring on the Estuary to continue. Since the mid-1990s, Permittees have caused this monitoring to be conducted by contributing financially and with technical expertise, to the San Francisco Estuary Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances. Provision C.8.b requires such monitoring to continue.

Provisions C.8.c. & C.8.e.ii. Status Monitoring and Long-Term Monitoring. Status Monitoring and Long-Term Monitoring serve as surrogates to monitoring the discharge from all major outfalls, of which the Permittees have many. By sampling the sediment and water column in urban creeks, the Permittees can determine where water quality problems are occurring in the creeks, then work to identify which outfalls and land uses are causing or contributing to the problem. In short, Status and Long-Term Monitoring are needed to identify water quality problems and assess the health of streams; they are the first step in identifying sources of pollutants and an important component in evaluating the effectiveness of an urban runoff management program.

Provisions C.8.c.i. and C.8.e.iii. Parameters and Methods

Status & Long-Term parameters and methods reflect current accepted practices, based on the knowledge and experience of personnel responsible for water quality monitoring, including state and Regional SWAMP managers, Permittee representatives, and citizen monitors. Many Status and Long-Term Monitoring parameters are consistent with parameters the Permittees have been monitoring to date. The following parameters are new for some of the Permittees:

- Biological Assessment—to provide site-specific information about the health and diversity of freshwater benthic communities within a specific reach of a creek, using standard procedures developed and/or used by the State Water

Resources Control Board Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program.¹⁰⁹ It consists of collecting samples of benthic communities and conducting a taxonomic identification to measure community abundance and diversity, which is then compared to a reference creek to assess benthic community health. This monitoring can also provide information on cumulative pollutant exposure/impacts because pollutant impacts to the benthic community accumulate and occur over time.

- Chlorine—to detect a release of potable water or other chlorinated water sources, which are toxic to aquatic life.
- Nutrients—recent monitoring data indicate nutrients, which can increase algal growth and decrease dissolved oxygen concentrations, are present in significant concentrations in Bay area creeks.
- Toxicity and Pollutants in Bedded Sediment—to determine the presence of, and identify, chemicals and compounds that bind to sediment in a creek bed and are toxic to aquatic life.
- Pathogen Indicators—to detect pathogens in waterbodies that could be sources of impairment to recreational uses at or downstream of the sampling location.
- Stream Survey (stream walk and mapping)—to assess the overall physical health of the stream and to gain information potentially useful in interpreting monitoring results.

In consideration of economic impacts to Permittees, the minimum number of Status & Long-Term samples (“Minimum # Sample Sites” columns in Tables 8.1 and 8.3) reflects the Programs’ populations, not waterbody size. Permittees must select exact sample locations that will yield adequate information on the status of their waterbodies; in some cases, additional sampling above the minimum might be necessary.

Provisions C.8.c.ii. and C.8.e.iii. Frequency

Status Monitoring continues to be an annual requirement for the Permittees, except for two much smaller Permittees, Fairfield-Suisun and Vallejo. In considering costs, the frequency of Status Monitoring is established at twice per Permit term for Fairfield-Suisun, and once per Permit term for Vallejo. It is common for Permit terms to be extended through a lengthy Permit reissuance process. Thus, these frequencies are considered the minimum; costs are minimized while data necessary for successful stormwater management are obtained.

Long-Term Monitoring is required every second year (biennially), rather than annually, in order to balance data needs and Permittee costs. To further reduce costs, the Fairfield-Suisun and Vallejo Permittees have no Long-Term Monitoring requirements.

Provisions C.8.c.iii. and C.8.e.ii. Locations

Status Monitoring is to be conducted on a rotating-watershed basis, in similar fashion to the Statewide SWAMP. Provision C.8.c.iii. identifies the major waterbodies, and Permittees are to select which of these waterbodies will be sampled during the Permit

¹⁰⁹ Ode, P.R. 2007. Standard Operating Procedures for Collecting Macroinvertebrate Samples and Associated Physical and Chemical Data for Ambient Bioassessments in California, California State Water Resources Control Board Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP), as subsequently revised.

term. The exact sample locations within each waterbody are critical in terms of determining the monitoring program's effectiveness. If correctly sited, the stations are expected to be very useful in answering the monitoring program's management questions and meeting its goals. For this reason, Provision C.8.c.iii. requires sample locations to be based on surrounding land use, likelihood of urban runoff impacts, existing data gaps, and similar considerations. This will help maximize the utility of the sample locations, while also providing the Permittees with adequate flexibility to ultimately choose practical Status Monitoring locations.

Long-Term Monitoring is to be conducted at fixed stations, which are intended to be lower reaches of urban creeks. This monitoring is intended to help assess progress toward reducing receiving water concentrations of impairing pollutants, among other purposes. Provision C.8.e.ii. establishes the waterbodies on which to locate fixed stations, and suggests that fixed stations be co-located with SWAMP fixed stations so that Permittees can use SWAMP data to fulfill some of their monitoring requirements. However, Permittees may select alternate locations based on their knowledge of such factors as site access and stream characteristics and provided that similar data types, data quality, and data quantity are collected.

Provision C.8.d. Monitoring Projects. Monitoring Projects are necessary to meet several water quality monitoring objectives under this Permit, including characterize stormwater discharges; identify sources of pollutants; identify new or emerging pollutants; assess stream channel function and condition; and measure and improve the effectiveness of Stormwater Countywide Programs and implemented BMPs. In consideration of economic impacts to Permittees, the number of Monitoring Projects required reflects the Permittees' populations.

Provision C.8.d.i. Stressor/Source Identification

Minimizing sources of pollutants that could impair water quality is a central purpose of urban runoff management programs. Monitoring which enables the Permittees to identify sources of water quality problems aids the Permittees in focusing their management efforts and improving their programs. In turn, the Permittees' programs can abate identified sources, which will improve the quality of urban runoff discharges and receiving waters. This monitoring is needed to address the management question, "What are the sources to urban runoff that contribute to receiving water problems?"

When Status or Long-Term Monitoring results indicate an exceedance of a water quality objective, toxicity threshold, or other "trigger", Permittees must identify the source of the problem and take steps to reduce any pollutants discharged from or through their municipal storm sewer systems. This requirement conforms to the process, outlined in Provision C.1., of complying with the Discharge Prohibition and Receiving Water Limitations. If multiple "triggers" are identified through monitoring, Permittees must focus on the highest priority problems; a cap on the total number of source identification projects conducted within the Permit term is provided to cap Permittees' potential costs.

Provision C.8.d.ii. BMP Effectiveness Investigation

U.S. EPA's stated approach to NPDES stormwater permitting uses BMPs in first-round permits, and expanded or better-tailored BMPs in subsequent permits, where necessary, to provide for the attainment of water quality standards.¹¹⁰ The purpose of this monitoring project is to investigate the effectiveness of one currently in-use BMP to determine how it might be improved. Permittees may choose the particular stormwater treatment or hydromodification control BMP to investigate. As with other monitoring requirements, Permittees may work collaboratively to conduct one investigation on a region-wide basis, or each stormwater countywide program may conduct an investigation.

Provision C.8.d.iii. Geomorphic Project

The physical integrity of a stream's bed, bank and riparian area is integral to the stream's capacity to withstand the impacts of discharged pollutants, including chemical pollutants, sediment, excess discharge volumes, increased discharge velocities, and increased temperatures. At present, various efforts are underway to improve geomorphic conditions in creeks, primarily through local watershed partnerships. In addition, local groups are undertaking *green stormwater projects* with the goal of minimizing the physical and chemical impacts of stormwater runoff on the receiving stream. Such efforts ultimately seek to improve the integrity of the waterbodies that receive urban stormwater runoff.

The purpose of the Geomorphic Project is to contribute to these ongoing efforts in each Stormwater Countywide Program area. Permittees may select the geomorphic project from three categories specified in the Permit.

C.8.e. Pollutants of Concern¹¹¹ Monitoring. Federal CWA section 303(d) TMDL requirements, as implemented under the CWC, require a monitoring plan designed to measure the effectiveness of the TMDL point and nonpoint source control measures and the progress the waterbody is making toward attaining water quality objectives. Such a plan necessarily includes collection of water quality data. Provision C.8.e. establishes a monitoring program to measure of the effectiveness of TMDL control measures in progressing toward WLAs. Locations, parameters, methods, protocols, and sampling frequencies for this monitoring are specified. A sediment delivery estimate/budget is also required to improve the Permittees' estimates of their loading estimates. In addition, a workplan is required for estimating loads and analyzing sources of emerging pollutants, which are likely to be present in urban runoff, in the next Permit term.

C.8.f. Citizen Monitoring and Participation. CWA section 101(e) and 40 CFR Part 25 broadly require public participation in all programs established pursuant to the CWA, to foster public awareness of environmental issues and decision-making processes. Provision C.8.f. is intended to do the following:

¹¹⁰ USEPA. 1996. *Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Stormwater Permits*. Sept. 1, 1996. <http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/swpol.pdf>

¹¹¹ See section C.9, C.11, C.12, and C.13 of this Fact Sheet for more information on Pollutants of Concern.

- Support current and future creek stewardship efforts by providing a framework for citizens and Permittees to share their collective knowledge of creek conditions; and
- Encourage Permittees to use and report data collected by creek groups and other third-parties when the data are of acceptable quality.

C.8.g. Reporting. CWC section 13267 provides authority for the Water Board to require technical water quality reports. Provision C.8.g. requires Permittees to submit electronic and comprehensive reports on their water quality monitoring activities to (1) determine compliance with monitoring requirements; (2) provide information useful in evaluating compliance with all Permit requirements; (3) enhance public awareness of the water quality in local streams and the Bay; and (4) standardize reporting to better facilitate analyses of the data, including for the CWA section 303(d) listing process.

C.9. – C.14. Pollutants of Concern including Total Maximum Daily Loads

Provisions C.9 through C.14 pertain to pollutants of concern, including those for which TMDLs are being developed or implemented.

Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to provisions C.9 through C.14:

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 122.44(d)(1) requires municipal stormwater 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 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.”

Basin Plan Requirements: Section 4.8 of the Region’s Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) requires that stormwater permits include requirements to prevent or reduce discharges of pollutants that cause or contribute to violations of water quality objectives. In the first phase, the Water Board requires implementation of technically and economically feasible control measures to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the MEP. If this first phase does not result in attainment of water quality objectives, the Water Board will consider permit conditions that might require implementation of additional control measures. For example, the control measures required as a result of TMDLs may go beyond the measures required in the first phase of the program.

General Strategy for Sediment-Bound Pollutants (Mercury, PCBs, legacy pesticides, PBDEs)

The control measures for mercury are intended to implement the urban runoff requirements stemming from TMDLs for this pollutant. The control measures required for PCBs are intended to implement those that are consistent with control measures in the PCBs TMDL implementation plan that has been approved by the Water Board and is pending approval by the State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. The urban runoff management requirements in the PCBs TMDL implementation plan call for permit-term requirements based on an assessment of controls to reduce

PCBs to the MEP, and that is the intended approach of the required provisions for all pollutants of concern. Many of the control actions addressing PCBs and mercury will result in reductions of a host of sediment-bound pollutants, including legacy pesticides, mercury, PBDEs, and PCBs. The strategy for these pollutants is to use PCBs control guide decisions concerning where to focus effort, but implementation of the control efforts would taken into account the benefits for controlling other pollutants of concern. Further, because many of the control strategies addressing these pollutants of concern are relatively untested, the Water Board will implement control measures in the following modes:

1. Full-scale implementation throughout the region.
2. Focused implementation in areas where benefits are most likely to accrue.
3. Pilot-testing in a few specific locations.
4. Other: This may refer to experimental control measures, Research and Development, desktop analysis, laboratory studies, and/or literature review.

The logic of such categorization is that, as actions are tested and confidence is gained regarding level of experience and confidence in the control measure's effectiveness, the control measure may be implemented with a greater scope. For example, an untested control measure for which the effectiveness is uncertain may be implemented as a pilot project in a few locations during this permit term. If benefits result, and the action is deemed effective, it will be implemented in subsequent permit terms in a focused fashion in more locations or perhaps fully implemented throughout the Region, depending upon the nature of the measure. On the other hand there may be some control measures in which there is sufficient confidence, on the basis of prior experience, that the control action should be implemented in all applicable locations and/or situations. By conducting actions in this way and gathering information about effectiveness and cost, we will advance our understanding and be able to perform an updated assessment of the suite of actions that will constitute MEP for the following permit term. In fact, in addition to implementing control measures, gathering the necessary information about control measure effectiveness is a vital part of what needs to be accomplished by Permittees during this permit term. In the next permit term, control measures will be implemented on the basis of what we learn in this term, and we will, thus, achieve iterative refinement and improvement through time.

Background on Specific Provisions: Provisions C.9 through C.14 contain both technology-based requirements to control pollutants to the MEP and water quality based requirements to prevent or reduce discharges of pollutants that may cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. Provisions C.9 and C.11 of the Permit incorporate requirements for the two TMDLs that have been fully approved and are effective for the Permittees. These TMDLs are for pesticide-related toxicity in urban creeks and mercury in San Francisco Bay. Additionally, Provision C.12 contains measures that address PCBs. The Regional Water Board has adopted a PCB TMDL, but it is still pending approval by State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. This PCBs TMDL includes requirements that would be consistent with this

provision. Finally, Provision C.13 contains measures to implement the copper site-specific objective in San Francisco Bay.

Where a TMDL has been approved, NPDES permits must contain effluent limitations and conditions consistent with the requirements and assumptions in the TMDL.¹¹² Effluent limitations are generally expressed in numerical form. However, USEPA recommends that for NPDES-regulated municipal and small construction stormwater discharges, effluent limitations should be expressed as BMPs or other similar requirements rather than as numeric effluent limitations.¹¹³ Consistent with USEPA's recommendation, this section implements WQBELs expressed as an iterative BMP approach capable of meeting the WLAs in accordance with the associated compliance schedule. The Permit's WQBELs include the numeric WLA as a performance standard and not as an effluent limitation. The WLA can be used to assess if additional BMPs are needed to achieve the TMDL Numeric Target in the waterbody.

¹¹² 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)

¹¹³ USEPA, 2002. Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm Water Sources and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on Those WLAs. P. 4.

C.9. Pesticides Toxicity Control

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.9.

- C.9-1** This Permit fulfills the Basin Plan amendments the Water Board adopted that establish a Water Quality Containment Strategy and TMDL for diazinon and pesticide-related toxicity for Bay Area urban creeks on November 16, 2005, and approved by the State Water Board on November 15, 2006. The Water Quality Containment Strategy requires urban runoff management agencies to minimize their own pesticide use, conduct outreach to others, and lead monitoring efforts. Control measures implemented by urban runoff management agencies and other entities (except construction and industrial sites) shall reduce pesticides in urban runoff to the MEP.
- C.9-2 (Allocations):** The TMDL is allocated to all urban runoff, including urban runoff associated with MS4s, Caltrans facilities, and industrial, construction, and institutional sites. The allocations are expressed in terms of toxic units and diazinon concentrations.

Specific Provision C.9 Requirements

C.9 provisions fully implement the TMDL for Urban Creeks Pesticide Toxicity. All C.9 provisions are stated explicitly in the implementation plan for this TMDL. Permittees are encouraged to coordinate activities with the Urban Pesticide Pollution Prevention Project, the Urban Pesticide Committee, and other agencies and organizations. The Urban Pesticide Pollution Prevention (UP3) Project has been funded by a grant from the State Water Board and its goal is to prevent water pollution from urban pesticide use. The Urban Pesticides Committee serves as an information clearinghouse and as a forum for coordinating pesticide TMDL implementation.

The UP3 Project provides resources and information on integrated pest management (IPM) and tools to municipalities to support their efforts to reduce municipal pesticide use and to conduct outreach to their communities on less-toxic methods of pest control. In addition, it provides technical assistance to municipalities to encourage the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to prevent water quality problems from pesticides. It also maintains and manages the Urban Pesticides Committee, a statewide network of agencies, nonprofits, industry, and other stakeholders that are working to solve water quality problems from pesticides.

Specific tools provided by the UP3 Project that relate to permit requirements include:

- Guidance and resources to help agencies create contracts and bid documents for structural pest management services that help them meet their integrated pest management goals
- IPM policies and ordinances
- IPM training workshops and materials

- Outreach program design resources
- Resources for evaluating effectiveness

Provisions C.9.a through C.9.d are designed to insure that integrated pest management (IPM) is adopted and implemented as policy by all municipalities. IPM is a pest control strategy that uses an array of complementary methods: natural predators and parasites, pest-resistant varieties, cultural practices, biological controls, various physical techniques, and pesticides as a last resort. If implemented properly, it is an approach that can significantly reduce or eliminate the use of pesticides. The implementation of IPM will be assured through training of municipal employees and the requirement that municipalities only hire IPM-certified contractors.

Provision C.9.e requires that municipalities (through cooperation or participation with BASMAA) track and participate in pesticide regulatory processes like the USEPA pesticide evaluation and registration activities related to surface water quality, and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) pesticide evaluation activities. The goal of these efforts is to encourage both the state and federal pesticide regulatory agencies to accommodate water quality concerns within the pesticide regulation or registration process. Through these efforts, it could be possible to prevent pesticide-related water quality problems from happening by affecting which products are brought to market.

Provision C.9.g is critical to the success of municipal efforts to control pesticide-related toxicity. Future permits must be based on an updated assessment of what is working and what is not. With every provision comes the responsibility to assess its effectiveness and report on these findings through the permit. The particulars of assessment will depend on the nature of the control measure.

Provision C.9.h directs the municipalities to conduct outreach to consumers at point of purchase and provide targeted information on proper pesticide use and disposal, potential adverse impacts on water quality, and less toxic methods of pest prevention and control. One way in which this can be accomplished is for the Permittees to participate in and provide resources for the "Our Water, Our World" program (www.ourwaterourworld.org) or a functionally equivalent pesticide use reduction outreach program. The "Our Water, Our World" program has developed a Web site with many resources, "to assist consumers in managing home and garden pests in a way that helps protect" the environment.

C.10. Trash Load Reduction

Legal Authority

The following legal authority applies to section C.10:

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

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

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

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

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

San Francisco Bay Basin Plan, Chapter 4 – Implementation, Table 4-1 Prohibitions, Prohibition 7, which is consistent with the State Water Board’s Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Policy, Resolution 95-84, prohibits the discharge of rubbish, refuse, bark, sawdust, or other solid wastes into surface waters or at any place where they would contact or where they would be eventually transported to surface waters, including flood plain areas. This prohibition was adopted by the Water Board in the 1975 Basin Plan, primarily to protect recreational uses such as boating.

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.10

- C.10-1** Trash and litter are a pervasive problem near and in creeks and in San Francisco Bay. Controlling trash is one of the priorities for this Permit reissuance not only because of the trash discharge prohibition, but also because trash and litter cause particularly major impacts on our enjoyment of creeks and the Bay. There are also significant impacts on aquatic life and habitat in those waters and eventually to the global ocean ecosystem, where plastic often floats, persists in the environment for hundreds of years, if not

forever, concentrates organic toxins, and is ingested by aquatic life. There are also physical impacts, as aquatic species can become entangled and ensnared and can ingest plastic that looks like prey, losing the ability to feed properly.

For the purposes of this provision, trash is defined to consist of litter and particles of litter. Man made litter is defined in California Government Code section 68055.1 (g): *Litter* means all improperly discarded waste material, including, but not limited to, convenience food, beverage, and other product packages or containers constructed of steel, aluminum, glass, paper, plastic, and other natural and synthetic materials, thrown or deposited on the lands and waters of the state, but not including the properly discarded waste of the primary processing of agriculture, mining, logging, sawmilling, or manufacturing.

C.10-2 Data collected by Water Board staff using the SWAMP Rapid Trash Assessment (RTA) Protocol,¹¹⁴ over the 2003–2005 period,¹¹⁵ suggest that the current approach to managing trash in waterbodies is not reducing the adverse impact on beneficial uses. The levels of trash in the waters of the San Francisco Bay Region are alarmingly high, considering the Basin Plan prohibits discharge of trash and that littering is illegal with potentially large fines. Even during dry weather conditions, a significant quantity of trash, particularly plastic, is making its way into waters and being transported downstream to San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean. On the basis of 85 surveys conducted at 26 sites throughout the Bay Area, staff have found an average of 2.93 pieces of trash for every foot of stream, and all the trash was removed when it was surveyed, indicating high return rates of trash over the 2003–2005 study period. There did not appear to be one county within the Region with higher trash in waters—the highest wet weather deposition rates were found in western Contra Costa County, and the highest dry weather deposition was found in Sonoma County. Results of the trash in waterbodies assessment work by staff show that rather than adjacent neighborhoods polluting the sites at the bottom of the watershed, these areas, which tend to have lower property values, are subject to trash washing off with urban stormwater runoff cumulatively from the entire watershed.

C.10-3 A number of key conclusions can be made on the basis of the trash measurement in streams:

- Lower watershed sites have higher densities of trash.
- All watersheds studied in the San Francisco Bay Region have high levels of trash.
- There are trash source hotspots, usually associated with parks, schools, or poorly kept commercial facilities, near creek channels, that appear to contribute a significant portion of the trash deposition at lower watershed sites.

¹¹⁴ SWAMP Rapid Trash Assessment Protocol, Version 8

¹¹⁵ SWAMP S.F. Bay Region Trash Report, January 23, 2007

- Dry season deposition of trash, associated with wind and dry season runoff, contributes measurable levels of trash to downstream locations.
 - The majority of trash is plastic at lower watershed sites where trash accumulates in the wet season. This suggests that urban runoff is a major source of floatable plastic found in the ocean and on beaches as marine debris.
 - Parks that have more evident management of trash by city staff and local volunteers, including cleanup within the creek channel, have measurably less trash pieces and higher RTA scores.
- C.10-4** The ubiquitous, unacceptable levels of trash in waters of the San Francisco Bay Region warrant a comprehensive and progressive program of education, warning, and enforcement, and certain areas warrant consideration of structural controls and treatment.
- C.10-5** Trash in urban waterways of coastal areas can become *marine debris*, known to harm fish and wildlife and cause adverse economic impacts.¹¹⁶ Trash is a regulated water pollutant that has many characteristics of concern to water quality. It accumulates in streams, rivers, bays, and ocean beaches throughout the San Francisco Bay Region, particularly in urban areas.
- C.10-6** Trash adversely affects numerous beneficial uses of waters, particularly recreation and aquatic habitat. Not all litter and debris delivered to streams are of equal concern with regards to water quality. Besides the obvious negative aesthetic effects, most of the harm of trash in surface waters is imparted to wildlife in the form of entanglement or ingestion.^{117,118} Some elements of trash exhibit significant threats to human health, such as discarded medical waste, human or pet waste, and broken glass.¹¹⁹ Also, some household and industrial wastes can contain toxic batteries, pesticide containers, and fluorescent light bulbs that contain mercury. Large trash items such as discarded appliances can present physical barriers to natural stream flow, causing physical impacts such as bank erosion. From a management perspective, the persistent accumulation of trash in a waterbody is of particular concern, and signifies a priority for prevention of trash discharges. Also of concern are trash *hotspots* where illegal dumping, littering, and/or accumulation of trash occur.
- C.10-7** The narrative water quality objectives applicable to trash are Floating Material (Waters shall not contain floating material, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely

¹¹⁶ Moore, S.L., and M.J. Allen. 2000. Distribution of anthropogenic and natural debris on the mainland shelf of the Southern California Bight. *Mar. Poll. Bull.* 40:83-88.

¹¹⁷ Laist, D. W. and M. Liffmann. 2000. *Impacts of marine debris: research and management needs*. Issue papers of the International Marine Debris Conference, Aug. 6-11, 2000. Honolulu, HI, pp. 16-29.

¹¹⁸ McCauley, S.J. and K.A. Bjorndahl. 1998. Conservation implications of dietary dilution from debris ingestion: sublethal effects in post-hatchling loggerhead sea turtles. *Conserv. Biol.* 13(4):925-929.

¹¹⁹ Sheavly, S.B. 2004. *Marine Debris: an Overview of a Critical Issue for our Oceans*. 2004 International Coastal Cleanup Conference, San Juan, Puerto Rico. The Ocean Conservancy.

affect beneficial uses), Settleable Material (Waters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses), and Suspended Material (Waters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses).

- C.10-8** The Water Board, at its February 11, 2009 hearing, adopted a resolution proposing that 26 waterbodies in the region be added to the 303(d) list for the pollutant trash. The adopted Resolution and supporting documents are contained in Attachment 10.1 – 303(d) Trash Resolution and Staff Report Feb 2009.

Specific Provision C.10 Requirements

Provision C.10. Permittees shall demonstrate compliance with Discharge Prohibition A.2 and trash-related Receiving Water Limitations through the timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce trash loads from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) by 40% by 2014, 70% by 2017, and 100% by 2022 as further specified below.

C.10.a.i. Short-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan

The Short-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan is intended to describe actions to incrementally reduce trash loads toward the 2014 requirement of a 40% reduction and eventual abatement of trash loads to receiving waters.

C.10.a.ii. Baseline Trash Load and Trash Load Reduction Tracking Method

In order to achieve the incremental trash load reductions in an accountable manner, the Permittees will propose Baseline Trash Loads and a Trash Load Reduction Tracking Method. The Tracking will account for additional trash load reducing actions and BMPs the Permittees implement. Permittees are also able to propose, with documentation, areas for exclusion from the Tracking Method accounting, by demonstrating that these areas already meet the Discharge Prohibition A.2 and have no trash loads.

C.10.a.iii. Minimum Full Trash Capture

Installation of full trash capture systems to prevent trash loads through the MS4 is MEP as demonstrated by the significant implementation of these systems occurring in the Los Angeles region. The minimum full trash capture installation requirements in this permit represent a moderate initial step toward employing this tool for trash load reduction.

C.10.b.i, ii. Trash Hot Spot Selection and Clean Up

Trash Hot Spots must be cleaned up as an interim measure until complete abatement of trash loads occurs. Eventually, with adequate source controls and trash loading abatement, trash hot spots will not occur in the receiving waters. In addition, Permittees will be credited for trash volume removed from hot spots in the trash load reduction tracking.

C.10.b.iii. Hot Spot Assessments

Trash Hot Spot assessments have been simplified and streamlined. Rather than counting individual trash items, which can vary in size from small plastic of glass particles to shopping carts, volume of material removed is measured, along with dominant types of trash removed. Photographs are recorded both before and after cleanup, to add to the record and verify cleanup.

C.10.c. Long Term Trash Load Reduction

Each Permittee will submit a Plan to achieve the incremental progress of 70% trash load reduction by 2017 during the following permit term, and the 100% reduction of trash loading by 2022.

C.10.d. Reporting

This sub-provision sets forth the reporting required in this provision, including the specific submittals and reports, and the annual reporting requirements.

Costs of Trash Control

Costs for either enhanced trash management measure implementation or installation and maintenance of trash capture devices are significant, but when spread over several years, and when viewed on a per-capita basis, are reasonable. Also, Trash capture devices have been installed by cities in California and in the Bay Region.

Trash and litter are costly to remove from our aquatic resource environments. Staff from the California Coastal Commission report that the Coastal Cleanup Day budget statewide: \$200,000-250,000 for staff Coastal Commission staff, and much more from participating local agencies. The main component of this event is the 18,000 volunteer-hours which translates to \$3,247,200 in labor, and so is equivalent to \$3,250,000-3,500,000 per year to clean up 903,566 pounds of trash and recyclables at \$3.60 to \$3.90 per pound. This is one of the most cost-effective events because of volunteer labor and donations. The County of Los Angeles spends \$20 million per year to sweep beaches for trash, according to Coastal Commission staff.

In Oakland, the Lake Merritt Institute is currently budgeted at \$160,000 per year, with trash and litter removal from the Lake as a major task. The budget has increased from about \$45,000 in 1996 to current levels. In the period of 1996-2005 the Lake Merritt Institute staff, utilizing significant volunteer resources, and accomplishing other education tasks, removed 410,859 pounds of trash from the Lake at cost of \$951,725 at \$2.3 per pound.

The City of Oakland reports that installation of two vortex and screen separators, titled by their brand name of CDS units, which cost, according to the table below, \$821,000 for installations that treat tributary catchments of 192 acres before discharge to Lake Merritt at \$4,276 per acre.

City of Oakland—CDS Unit Overview 9-07

Existing CDS unit location	Outfall number	Treatment area (acres)	Cost of implementation	Sizing	Maintenance requirements	Comments
Intersection of 27 th and Valdez Streets	56*	71	\$203,000 to contractor; plus ~\$100,000 City costs	73 cfs peak flow; 36" stormdrain; Unit sizing: 18'6'6" box with 10'11" diam x 9'6" long cylinder	Visually inspect CDS Unit; remove trash and debris with Hydro Flusher bi-monthly	Installed in 2006. Required relocation of electrical conduit. Water main and gas line were also in the way; the box was adjusted to accommodate these conflicts.
Intersection of 22 nd and Valley Streets	56*	121	\$368,000 to contractor; plus ~\$150,000 City costs	115 cfs peak flow; 54" stormdrain; Unit sizing: 18'8.5'6" box with 12' diam x 9'6" long cylinder	Visually inspect CDS Unit; remove trash and debris with Hydro Flusher bi-monthly	Installed in 2006. Installation costs were higher than anticipated. Sewer lines and PGE facilities were exposed that were not known before. Unit had to be modified and poured-in-place.

* The city is treating 192 acres or 72 percent of the 252 acres draining to outfall 56.

Mr. Morad Sedrak, the TMDL Implementation Program Manager, Bureau of Sanitation, Department of Public Works, City of Los Angeles, reports that the City plans to invest \$72 million dollars for storm drain catch basin based capture device installation primarily, for a City of 4 million population, for a per-capita cost of \$18 dollars. This effort is occurring over a span of over five years, for an annual per-capita cost of under \$4.

Mr. Sedrak reports that O&M costs are not anticipated to increase, as the City of L.A. is already budgeted for 3 catch basin cleanings per year. He also states that catch basin inserts installed inside the catch basin in front of the lateral pipe, which have been certified by the Los Angeles Regional Water Board as total capture trash control devices, cost approximately \$800 to \$3,000 depending on the depth of the catch basin. The price quoted includes installation and the insert is made of Stainless Steel 316.

Furthermore, the price for catch basin opening screen covers, which are designed to retain trash at the street level for removal by sweepers, and also to open if there is a potential flooding blockage, ranges roughly from \$800 to \$4,500, depending on the opening size of the catch basin.

The City of Los Angeles has currently spent 27 million dollars on a retrofit program to install catch basin devices in approximately 30% of its area, with either inserts or screens

or both. Mr. Sedrak states that Los Angeles plans to spend \$45 million over the next 3 years to retrofit the remaining catch basins within the City. The total number of catch basins within the City is approximately 52,000.

Here are some links to information about the Los Angeles trash control approach:

<http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/program/TMDLs/trashtmdl.htm>

http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/download/pdfs/general_info/Request-Certification-10-06.pdf

http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/download/pdfs/general_info/Request-Certification-10-06.pdf
http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/program/poll_abate/cbscreens.htm

http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/program/poll_abate/cbinserts.htm

http://www.lastormwater.org/Siteorg/program/poll_abate/cbscreens.htm

Additional cost information on various trash capture devices are included in the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP) BMP Trash Toolbox (July 2007). The Toolbox contains cost information for both trash capture devices and enhanced trash management measure implementation, covers a broad range of options and also discusses operation and maintenance costs. Catch basin screens are included with an earlier estimate by the City of Los Angeles of \$44 million over 10 years to install devices in 34,000 inlets.

Litter booms are also discussed with an example from the City of Oakland. The Damon Slough litter boom or sea curtain cost \$36,000 for purchase and installation, including slough side access improvements for maintenance and trash removal. Annual maintenance costs have been \$77,000 for weekly maintenance, which includes use of a crane for floating trash removal.

The costs of the full trash capture device installation required in the Order is significantly less than the previous tentative orders requirements for trash capture, as set forth in the table below.

Trash Capture Cost Estimates – Final TO versus previous TOs

Trash Capture Device Requirement	Acres of Capture	Cost for Trash Capture Installation	Percent of Retail/Wholesale Commercial (ABAG 2005)	Per capita \$, Population = 4,533,634
Final TO: Implemented in Year 4 – 30% of Retail/Wholesale Commercial	5527	\$ 27,635,000	30%	\$6.06
Previous TOs: Implement in Year 4, 5% of Urban/suburban land	0.05 X 529,712 = 26,485 (BASMAA) or ABAG 0.05 X 655,015 = 32,750	\$132,425,000 or \$163,750,000	5% of Urban/suburban land	\$29 or \$36

30% X 18,426 acres = 5527 acres X \$5000/acre = **\$27,635,000** for four counties for installation; maintenance will add an additional cost. The Permittees may work cooperatively to achieve this capture installation requirement, and there is the potential for Regional revenue development. The previous requirement was 5% of (.05 X 655,015) (529,712 by BASMAA's count) acres of urban land (from ABAG 2005 table) = 32,750 acres, ((26,486 according to BASMAA) X \$5000 = \$132,000,000).

C.11. Mercury Controls

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.11

- C.11-1** On August 9, 2006, the Water Board adopted a Basin Plan amendment including a revised TMDL for mercury in San Francisco Bay, two new water quality objectives, and an implementation plan to achieve the TMDL. The State Water Board has approved this Basin Plan amendment, and USEPA approval is pending. C.11-2 through C.11-6 are components of the Mercury TMDL implementation plan relevant to implementation through the municipal stormwater permit.
- C.11-2** The 2003 load of mercury from urban runoff is 160 kg/yr, and the aggregate WLAs for urban runoff is 80 kg/yr and shall be implemented through the NPDES stormwater permits issued to urban runoff management agencies and Caltrans. The urban stormwater runoff allocations implicitly include all current and future permitted discharges, not otherwise addressed by another allocation, and unpermitted discharges within the geographic boundaries of urban runoff management agencies (collectively, *source category*) including, but not limited to, Caltrans roadway and non-roadway facilities and rights-of-way, atmospheric deposition, public facilities, properties proximate to stream banks, industrial facilities, and construction sites.
- C.11-3** The allocations for this source category shall be achieved within 20 years, and, as a way to measure progress, an interim loading milestone of 120 kg/yr, halfway between the current load and the allocation, should be achieved within 10 years. If the interim loading milestone is not achieved, NPDES-permitted entities shall demonstrate reasonable and measurable progress toward achieving the 10-year loading milestone.
- C.11-4** The NPDES permits for urban runoff management agencies shall require the implementation of BMPs and control measures designed to achieve the allocations or accomplish the load reductions derived from the allocations. In addition to controlling mercury loads, BMPs or control measures shall include actions to reduce mercury-related risks to humans and wildlife. Requirements in the permit issued or reissued and applicable for the term of the permit shall be based on an updated assessment of control measures intended to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff to the MEP and remain consistent with the section of this chapter titled, *Surface Water Protection and Management—Point Source Control—Stormwater Discharges*.
- C.11-5** The following additional requirements are or shall be incorporated into NPDES permits issued or reissued by the Water Board for urban runoff management agencies.
- a. Evaluate and report on the spatial extent, magnitude, and cause of contamination for locations where elevated mercury concentrations exist;
 - b. Develop and implement a mercury source control program;

- c. Develop and implement a monitoring system to quantify either mercury loads or loads reduced through treatment, source control, and other management efforts;
- d. Monitor levels of methylmercury in discharges;
- e. Conduct or cause to be conducted studies aimed at better understanding mercury fate, transport, and biological uptake in San Francisco Bay and tidal areas;
- f. Develop an equitable allocation-sharing scheme in consultation with Caltrans (see below) to address Caltrans roadway and non-roadway facilities in the program area, and report the details to the Water Board;
- g. Prepare an Annual Report that documents compliance with the above requirements and documents either mercury loads discharged, or loads reduced through ongoing pollution prevention and control activities; and
- h. Demonstrate progress toward (a) the interim loading milestone, or (b) attainment of the allocations shown in Individual WLAs (see Table 4-w of the Basin Plan amendment), by using one of the following methods:
 - (1) Quantify the annual average mercury load reduced by implementing
 - i. Pollution prevention activities, and
 - ii. Source and treatment controls. The benefit of efforts to reduce mercury-related risk to wildlife and humans should also be quantified. The Water Board will recognize such efforts as progress toward achieving the interim milestone and the mercury-related water quality standards upon which the allocations and corresponding load reductions are based. Loads reduced as a result of actions implemented after 2001 (or earlier if actions taken are not reflected in the 2001 load estimate) may be used to estimate load reductions.
 - (2) Quantify the mercury load as a rolling 5-year annual average using data on flow and water column mercury concentrations.
 - (3) Quantitatively demonstrate that the mercury concentration of suspended sediment that best represents sediment discharged with urban runoff is below the suspended sediment target.

C.11-6 Urban runoff management agencies have a responsibility to oversee various discharges within the agencies' geographic boundaries. However, if it is determined that a source is substantially contributing to mercury loads to the Bay or is outside the jurisdiction or authority of an agency, the Water Board will consider a request from an urban runoff management agency that may include an allocation, load reduction, and/or other regulatory requirements for the source in question.

Specific Provision C.11 Requirements

The C.11 provisions implement the mercury TMDL and follow the general approach for sediment-bound pollutants discussed above where we seek to build our understanding and level of certainty concerning control actions by implementing actions in a phased approach. We then expand implementation of those actions that prove effective, and perhaps scale back or discontinue those that are not effective. Accordingly, there are some provisions that will be implemented throughout the Region, some that will be tested on a limited basis first before making the decision to expand region-wide in the next permit term. Some of the measures are companion measures for efforts targeting PCBs.

Provision C.11.a. Mercury is found in a wide variety of consumer products (e.g., fluorescent bulbs) that are subject to recycling requirements. These recycling efforts are already happening throughout the Region, and Provision C.11.a requires promotion, facilitation and/or participation in these region-wide recycling efforts to increase effectiveness and public participation.

Provision C.11.b. The remand resolution of the SF Bay Mercury TMDL made it clear that methyl mercury monitoring must be required of all NPDES Permittees. Methyl mercury is the most toxic form of mercury, and there is very little information, if any, regarding the concentrations of methyl mercury found in urban runoff. The purpose of the monitoring required through this provision is to obtain seasonal information and to assess the magnitude and spatial/temporal patterns of methylmercury concentrations in urban runoff.

Provisions C.11.c through Provision C.11.f relate to identical C.12 Provisions for PCBs. For each of these, sites for pilot studies will primarily be chosen on the basis of the potential for reducing PCB loads, but consideration will be given to mercury removal in the final design and implementation of the studies. For more information, see the fact sheet discussions for Provisions C.12.c, d, e, and f and Provision C.2.g.

Provision C.11.g implements the TMDL requirement that Permittees measure mercury loads and loads reduced from program activities. There are three options for accomplishing this requirement: quantifying mercury loads reduced through implemented control measures, quantify mercury loading into the Bay from urban runoff, or demonstrating that the concentration of mercury on suspended sediment particles is below the sediment target of 0.2 ppm. It is likely that the first option will be chosen, and this will require development of an accounting system to establish what load reductions result from program activities. This will not be difficult for those measures that involve capture and measurement of mercury-containing sediment, but it will be more challenging for efforts that do not involve direct measurement.

Provision C.11.h is equivalent to Provision C.12.h for PCBs and is motivated by the same remaining technical uncertainties.

Provision C.11.i requires actions that manage human health risk due to mercury and PCBs. These may include efforts to communicate the health risks of eating Bay fish and other efforts aimed at high risk-communities.

Provision C.11.j requires an allocation sharing scheme to be developed in cooperation with Caltrans. The urban runoff TMDL allocation implicitly includes loads from Caltrans facilities.

C.12. PCBs Controls

The C.12 provisions are consistent with the regulatory approach and implementation plan of the San Francisco Bay PCBs TMDL adopted by the Water Board. They follow the general approach for sediment-bound pollutants discussed above where we seek to build our understanding and level of certainty concerning control actions by implementing actions in a phased approach. We then expand implementation of those actions that prove effective, and perhaps scale back or discontinue those that are not effective. Accordingly, there are some provisions that will be implemented throughout the region, some that will be tested on a limited basis first before making the decision to expand region-wide in the next permit term.

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.12

C.12-2 On February 13, 2008, the Water Board adopted a Basin Plan amendment establishing a TMDL for PCBs in San Francisco Bay and an implementation plan to achieve the TMDL. Approval by the State Water Board and USEPA is pending. The following excerpts from the TMDL implementation plan are relevant to implementation of the municipal stormwater permit.

“Stormwater runoff wasteload allocations shall be achieved within 20 years and shall be implemented through the NPDES stormwater permits issued to stormwater runoff management agencies and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The urban stormwater runoff wasteload allocations implicitly include all current and future permitted discharges, not otherwise addressed by another allocation, and unpermitted discharges within the geographic boundaries of stormwater runoff management agencies including, but not limited to, Caltrans roadway and non-roadway facilities and rights-of-way, atmospheric deposition, public facilities, properties proximate to stream banks, industrial facilities, and construction sites.

Requirements in each NPDES permit issued or reissued shall be based on an updated assessment of best management practices and control measures intended to reduce PCBs in urban stormwater runoff. Control measures implemented by stormwater runoff management agencies and other entities (except construction and industrial sites) shall reduce PCBs in stormwater runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Control measures for construction and industrial sites shall reduce discharges based on best available technology economically achievable. All permits shall remain consistent with Section 4.8 - Stormwater Discharges.

In the first five-year permit term, stormwater Permittees will be required to implement control measures on a pilot scale to determine their effectiveness and technical feasibility. In the second permit term, stormwater Permittees will be required to implement effective control measures, that will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts, in strategic locations, and to develop a plan to fully implement control measures that will result in

attainment of allocations, including an analysis of costs, efficiency of control measures and an identification of any significant environmental impacts. Subsequent permits will include requirements and a schedule to implement technically feasible, effective and cost efficient control measures to attain allocations. If, as a consequence, allocations cannot be attained, the Water Board will take action to review and revise the allocations and these implementation requirements as part of adaptive implementation.

In addition, stormwater Permittees will be required to develop and implement a monitoring system to quantify PCBs urban stormwater runoff loads and the load reductions achieved through treatment, source control and other actions; support actions to reduce the health risks of people who consume PCBs-contaminated San Francisco Bay fish; and conduct or cause to be conducted monitoring, and studies to fill critical data needs identified in the adaptive implementation section.

Stormwater runoff management agencies have a responsibility to oversee various discharges within the agencies' geographic boundaries. However, if it is determined that a source is substantially contributing to PCBs loads to the Bay or is outside the jurisdiction or authority of an agency the Water Board will consider a request from an stormwater runoff management agency which may include an allocation, load reduction, and/or other regulatory requirements for the source in question."

- C.12-3 Some PCB congeners have dioxin-like properties.** Dioxins are persistent, bioaccumulative, toxic compounds that are produced from the combustion of organic materials in the presence of chlorine. Dioxins enter the air through fuel and waste emissions, including diesel and other motor vehicle exhaust fumes and trash incineration, and are carried in rain and contaminate soil. Dioxins bioaccumulate in fat, and most human exposure occurs through the consumption of animal fats, including those from fish. Therefore, the actions targeting PCBs will likely have the simultaneous benefit of addressing a portion of the dioxin impairment resulting from dioxin-like PCBs.

Specific Provision C.12 Requirements

Provision C.12.a. PCBs were used in a variety of electrical devices and equipment, some of which still can be found during industrial inspections. Provision C.12.a requires the stormwater management agencies to ensure that industrial inspectors can identify PCBs or PCB-containing equipment during their inspections and make sure appropriate agencies are notified if they are found. There is enough experience and/or background knowledge about the presence of such PCB-containing equipment that this measure should be implemented region-wide during this permit term.

Provision C.12.b. PCBs are used in a variety of building materials like caulks and adhesives. PCBs contained in such materials can be liberated and transported in runoff during and after demolition and renovation activities. At this point, it is not known how extensive this type of PCB contamination is in the region. Therefore, the expectation for

this permit term is that Permittees conduct pilot studies (Provision C.12.b) that includes evaluation of the presence of PCBs in such materials, sampling and analysis, and BMP development to prevent PCBs in these materials from being released into the environment during demolition and renovation. Conducting these pilot tests and reporting results will help determine if control measures for PCBs from these sources should be implemented in a more widespread fashion in the next permit term.

Provisions C.12.c and C.12.d form the core of PCB-related efforts for this permit term, and these efforts are crucial for the iterative development of effective control measures for PCBs and other sediment-bound pollutants in future permit terms. The overarching purpose of these two provisions is to conduct five comprehensive pilot studies in locations known to contain high levels of PCBs. The pilot studies will involve a combination of efforts including abatement of the on-land PCB contamination (Provision C.12.c) as well as exploration of sediment management practices (C.12.d) that can be implemented by municipalities to control migration of the PCBs away from the source of contamination. We expect that a suite of control measures will be applied in these five pilot regions to determine the optimum suite of measures for controlling PCB contamination and preventing its transport through the storm drain system. The lessons learned through these pilot efforts will inform the direction of future efforts targeting contaminated zones throughout the Region in subsequent permit terms.

Provision C.12.e. One promising management practice for addressing a wide range of sediment-bound contaminants, including PCBs is on-site treatment. Provision C.12.e requires selection of 10 locations for pilot studies spanning treatment types as described in the Provision. This effort can be conducted in conjunction with Provision C.12.d such that on-site treatment efforts conducted as part of C.12.d can be counted toward accomplishing C.12.e requirements.

Provision C.12.f. Another promising management practice is the diversion of certain flows to the sanitary sewers to be treated by the local POTWs. Provision C.12.f requires an evaluation of locations for diversion pilot studies and implementation of pilot studies at five pump stations. This effort can be conducted in conjunction with Provision C.12.d such that POTW diversion efforts conducted as part of C.12.d can be counted toward accomplishing C.12.f requirements. Also see discussion under Provision C.2.g.

Provision C.12.g requires, consistent with the approach taken in the PCBs TMDL, development of a monitoring system to quantify PCBs loads and loads reduced through source control, treatment and other management measures. This monitoring system will be used to determine progress toward meeting TMDL load allocations. This system should establish the baseline loading or loads reduced against which to compare future loading and load reductions.

Provision C.12.h. There are still uncertainties surrounding the magnitude and nature of PCBs reaching the Bay in urban runoff and the ultimate fate of such PCBs, including biological uptake. Provision C.12.h requires that Permittees ensure that fate and transport studies of PCBs in urban runoff are completed.

Provision C.12.i. requires actions that manage human health risk due to mercury and PCBs. These may include efforts to communicate the health risks of eating Bay fish and other efforts aimed at high risk-communities.

C.13. Copper Controls

Chronic and acute site-specific objectives (SSOs) for dissolved copper have been established in all segments of San Francisco Bay. The plan to implement the SSOs and ensure the achievement and ongoing maintenance of the SSOs in the entire Bay includes two types of actions for urban runoff management agencies. These actions from the SSO implementation are implemented through this permit as provisions to control urban runoff sources of copper as well as measures to resolve remaining technical uncertainties for copper fate and effects in the Bay.

The control measures for urban runoff target significant sources of copper identified in a report produced in 2004 for the Clean Estuary Partnership.¹²⁰ This report updated information on sources of copper in urban runoff, loading estimates and associated level of uncertainty, and summarized feasible control measures and priorities for further investigation. Accordingly, the permit provisions target major sources of copper including vehicle brake pads, architectural copper, copper pesticides, and industrial copper use.

Fact Sheet Findings in Support of Provision C.13.

- C.13-1** Urban runoff is a conveyance mechanism by which copper reaches San Francisco Bay.
- C.13-2** Copper has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of copper water quality standards in San Francisco Bay.
- C.13-3** Site specific water quality objectives for dissolved copper have already been adopted for South San Francisco Bay will soon be adopted for the rest of the Bay.
- C.13-4** The Permit requirements to control copper to the MEP are necessary to implement and support ongoing achievement of the site-specific water quality objectives.

Specific Provision C.13. Requirements

Provision C.13.a. Copper is used as an architectural feature in roofs, gutters and downspouts. When these roofs are cleaned with aggressive cleaning solutions, substantial amounts of copper can be liberated. The provision C.13.a for architectural copper involves a variety of strategies ranging from BMPs to prohibition against discharge of these cleaning wastes to the storm drain.

¹²⁰ TDC (TDC Environmental). 2004. *Copper Sources in Urban Runoff and Shoreline Activities*. Prepared for the Clean Estuary Partnership.

Provision C.13.b. Copper is commonly used as an algaecide in pools, spas, and fountains. The provision C.13.b prohibits discharge to the storm drain of copper-containing wastewater from such amenities.

Provision C.13.c. Vehicle brake pads are a large source of copper to the urban environment. There are cooperative efforts (e.g., the Brake Pad Partnership) evaluating the potential effects of brake wear debris on water quality. This cooperative effort could result in voluntary actions to reduce the amount of copper in automobile brake pads. However, this voluntary reduction is uncertain, and some aftermarket brake pads are possibly unaffected by the voluntary action. Moreover, the benefits of copper content reduction might be slowly realized because there is a great deal of wear debris already deposited on watersheds, and this wear debris will continue to be deposited as long as copper-containing brake pads are in use. Therefore, there might need to be additional measures addressing copper-containing wear debris on the part of urban stormwater management agencies. Provision C.13.c requires ongoing participation in the cooperative efforts of the Partnership.

Provision C.13.d Some industrial facilities likely use copper or have sources of copper (e.g., plating facilities, metal finishers, auto dismantlers). This control measure requires municipalities to include these facilities in their inspection program plans.

The most recent Staff Report¹²¹ for the SSOs north of the Dumbarton Bridge also describes several areas of remaining technical uncertainty, and **Provision C.13.e** requires studies to address these uncertainties. Two of these areas are of particular concern, and urban runoff management agencies are required to conduct or cause to be conducted studies to help resolve these two uncertainties.

The first uncertainty concerns copper's tendency, even at low concentrations, to cause a variety of sublethal (not resulting in death, but in impaired function) effects. The studies documenting such effects have, so far, been conducted in the laboratory in experiments modeling freshwater systems, and many of them have not yet been published. A number of uncertainties need to be resolved before interpretation and extension to marine or estuarine systems can be attempted.¹²²

The second uncertainty is that surface sediment samples have exhibited toxicity to test organisms at a number of sites throughout the Bay. Research has shown that sediment toxicity to bivalve embryos is caused by "elevated concentrations of divalent cations....with copper as the most probable cause of toxicity." Additional studies are needed to further examine whether water and sediment toxicity tests used in the RMP are accurate predictors of impacts on the Bay's aquatic and benthic communities.

¹²¹ SFBRWQCB (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board). 2007. *Copper Site-Specific Objectives in San Francisco Bay: Proposed Basin Plan Amendment and Draft Staff Report*. June.

¹²² Ibid.

C.14. Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers (PBDE), Legacy Pesticides and Selenium

This section is predicated on the fact that legacy pesticides, PBDEs, and selenium are either known to impair or potentially impair Bay and tributary beneficial uses. Further, urban stormwater is a likely or potential cause or contributor to such impairment. The requirements for this permit term are primarily information gathering consistent with Provision C.1. Namely, this provision requires that Permittees gather information on a number of pollutants of concern (e.g., PBDEs, DDT, dieldrin, chlordane, selenium) for which TMDLs are planned or are in the early stages of development.

The goals of the provisions in this section are the following: One goal is to determine the concentrations and distribution of these pollutants and if urban runoff is a conveyance mechanism associated with their possible impairment of San Francisco Bay.

A second goal is to gather and provide information to allow calculation of PBDEs, legacy pesticides, and selenium loads to San Francisco Bay from urban runoff conveyance systems. A third goal is to identify control measures and/or management practices to eliminate or reduce discharges of PBDEs, legacy pesticides, or selenium conveyed by urban runoff conveyance systems. The Permittees are encouraged to work with the other municipal stormwater management agencies in the Bay Region to implement a plan to identify, assess, and manage controllable sources of these pollutants in urban runoff. The control actions initiated for PCBs will form the core of initial actions targeting sediment bound pollutants like these. It is very likely that some of these PCB control measures (see Provision C.12) warrant consideration for the control of sediment bound pollutants like PBDEs, legacy pesticides, and possibly others as well.