

EXHIBIT “37”

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

ORDER WQ 2001-15

In the Matter of the Petitions of

**BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY
AND
WESTERN STATES PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION**

For Review Of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 2001-01
for Urban Runoff from San Diego County
[NPDES No. CAS0108758]

Issued by the
California Water Quality Control Board,
San Diego Region

SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1362, A-1362(a)

BY THE BOARD:

On February 21, 2001, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) issued a revised national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit in Order No. 2001-01 (permit) to the County of San Diego (County), the 18 incorporated cities within the County, and the San Diego Unified Port District. The permit covers storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) throughout the County. The permit is the second MS4 permit issued for the County, although the first permit was issued more than ten years earlier.¹

¹ NPDES permits generally expire after five years, but can be extended administratively where the Regional Water Board is unable to issue a new permit prior to the expiration date. As the record in this matter amply demonstrates, the Regional Water Board engaged in an extensive process of issuing draft permits, accepting comments, and holding workshops and hearings since at least 1995.

The permit includes various programmatic and planning requirements for the permittees, including construction and development controls, controls on municipal activities, controls on runoff from industrial, commercial, and residential sources, and public education. The types of controls and requirements included in the permit are similar to those in other MS4 permits, but also reflect the expansion of the storm water program since the first MS4 permit was adopted for San Diego County 11 years ago.²

On March 23, 2001, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board or Board) received petitions for review of the permit from the Building Industry Association of San Diego County (BIA) and from the Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA).³ The petitions are legally and factually related, and have therefore been consolidated for purposes of review.⁴ None of the municipal dischargers subject to the permit filed a petition, nor did they file responses to the petitions.

I. BACKGROUND

MS4 permits are adopted pursuant to Clean Water Act section 402(p). This federal law sets forth specific requirements for permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers. One of the requirements is that permits "shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum

² For a discussion of the evolution of the storm water program, consistent with guidance from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), see Board Order WQ 2000-11.

³ On March 23, the State Water Board also received brief letters from the Ramona Chamber of Commerce, the North San Diego County Association of Realtors, the San Diego County Apartment Association, the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, and the California Building Industry Association. All of these letters state that they are "joining in" the petition filed by BIA. None of the letters contain any of the required information for petitions, which is listed at Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, section 2050. These letters will be treated as comments on the BIA petition. To the extent the authors intended the letters be considered petitions, they are dismissed.

⁴ Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, section 2054.

extent practicable [MEP].” States establish appropriate requirements for the control of pollutants in the permits.

This Board very recently reviewed the need for controls on urban runoff in MS4 permits, the emphasis on best management practices (BMPs) in lieu of numeric effluent limitations, and the expectation that the level of effort to control urban runoff will increase over time.⁵ We pointed out that urban runoff is a significant contributor of impairment to waters throughout the state, and that additional controls are needed. Specifically, in Board Order WQ 2000-11 (hereinafter, LA SUSMP order), we concluded that the Los Angeles Regional Water Board acted appropriately in determining that numeric standards for the design of BMPs to control runoff from new construction and redevelopment constituted controls to the MEP.⁶

The San Diego permit incorporates numeric design standards for runoff from new construction and redevelopment similar to those considered in the LA SUSMP order.⁷ In addition, the permit addresses programmatic requirements in other areas. The LA SUSMP order was a precedential decision,⁸ and we will not reiterate our findings and conclusions from that decision.⁹

⁵ Board Order WQ 2000-11.

⁶ As explained in that Order, numeric design standards are not the same as numeric effluent limitations. While BIA contends that the permit under review includes numeric effluent limitations, it does not. A numeric design standard only tells the dischargers how much runoff must be treated or infiltrated; it does not establish numeric effluent limitations proscribing the quality of effluent that can be discharged following infiltration or treatment.

⁷ The San Diego permit also includes provisions that are different from those approved in the LA SUSMP Order, but which were not the subject of either petition. Such provisions include the inclusion of non-discretionary projects. We do not make any ruling in this Order on matters that were not addressed in either petition.

⁸ Government Code section 11425.60; State Board Order WR 96-1 (Lagunitas Creek), at footnote 11.

⁹ BIA restates some of the issues this Board considered in the LA SUSMP order. For instance, BIA contends that it is inappropriate for the permit to regulate erosion control. While this argument was not specifically addressed in our prior Order, it is obvious that the most serious concern with runoff from construction is the potential for increased erosion. It is absurd to contend that the permit should have ignored this impact from urban runoff.

The petitioners make numerous contentions, mostly concerning requirements that they claim the dischargers will not be able to, or should not be required to, comply with. We note that none of the dischargers has joined in these contentions. We further note that BIA raises contentions that were already addressed in the LA SUSMP order. In this Order, we have attempted to glean from the petition issues that are not already fully addressed in Board Order Board Order WQ 2000-11, and which may have some impact on BIA and its members. WSPA restated the contentions it made in the petition it filed challenging the LA SUSMP order. We will not address those contentions again.¹⁰ But we will address whether the Regional Water Board followed the precedent established there as it relates to retail gasoline outlets.¹¹

¹⁰ On November 8, 2001, following the October 31 workshop meeting that was held to discuss the draft order, BIA submitted a "supplemental brief" that includes many new contentions raised for the first time. (Interested persons who were not petitioners filed comments on the draft order asking the State Water Board to address some of these.) The State Water Board will not address these contentions, as they were not timely raised. (Wat. Code § 13320; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, § 2050(a).) Specific contentions that are not properly subject to review under Water Code section 13320 are objections to findings 16, 17, and 38 of the permit, the contention that permit provisions constitute illegal unfunded mandates, challenges to the permit's inspection and enforcement provisions, objections to permit provisions regarding construction sites, the contention that post-construction requirements should be limited to "discretionary" approvals, the challenge to the provisions regarding local government compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and contentions regarding the term "discharge" in the permit. BIA did not meet the legal requirements for seeking review of these portions of the permit.

¹¹ On November 8, 2001, the State Water Board received eight boxes of documents from BIA, along with a "Request for Entry of Documents into the Administrative Record." BIA failed to comply with Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, section 2066(b), which requires such requests be made "prior to or during the workshop meeting." The workshop meeting was held on October 31, 2001. The request will therefore not be considered. BIA also objected in this submittal that the Regional Water Board did not include these documents in its record. The Regional Water Board's record was created at the time the permit was adopted, and was submitted to the State Water Board on June 11, 2001. BIA's objection is not timely.

II. CONTENTIONS AND FINDINGS¹²

Contention: BIA contends that the discharge prohibitions contained in the permit are “absolute” and “inflexible,” are not consistent with the standard of “maximum extent practicable” (MEP), and financially cannot be met.

Finding: The gist of BIA’s contention concerns Discharge Prohibition A.2, concerning exceedance of water quality objectives for receiving waters: “Discharges from MS4s which cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water quality objectives for surface water or groundwater are prohibited.” BIA generally contends that this prohibition amounts to an inflexible “zero contribution” requirement.

BIA advances numerous arguments regarding the alleged inability of the dischargers to comply with this prohibition and the impropriety of requiring compliance with water quality standards in municipal storm water permits. These arguments mirror arguments made in earlier petitions that required compliance with water quality objectives by municipal storm water permittees. (See, e.g., Board Orders WQ 91-03, WQ 98-01, and WQ 99-05.) This Board has already considered and upheld the requirement that municipal storm water discharges must not cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives in the receiving water. We adopted an iterative procedure for complying with this requirement, wherein municipalities must report instances where they cause or contribute to exceedances, and then must review and improve BMPs so as to protect the receiving

¹² This Order does not address all of the issues raised by the petitioners. The Board finds that the issues that are not addressed are insubstantial and not appropriate for State Water Board review. (See *People v. Barry* (1987) 194 Cal.App.3d 158 [239 Cal.Rptr. 349]; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 2052.) We make no determination as to whether we will address the same or similar issues when raised in future petitions.

waters. The language in the permit in Receiving Water Limitation C.1 and 2 is consistent with the language required in Board Order WQ 99-05, our most recent direction on this issue.¹³

While the issue of the propriety of requiring compliance with water quality objectives has been addressed before in several orders, BIA does raise one new issue that was not addressed previously. In 1999, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion addressing whether municipal storm water permits must require “strict compliance” with water quality standards.¹⁴ (*Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159.) The court in *Browner* held that the Clean Water Act provisions regarding storm water permits do not require that municipal storm-sewer discharge permits ensure strict compliance with water quality standards, unlike other permits.¹⁵ The court determined that: “Instead, [the provision for municipal storm water permits] *replaces* the requirements of [section 301] with the requirement that municipal storm-sewer dischargers ‘reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator . . . determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants’.” (191 F.3d at 1165.) The court further held that the Clean Water Act does grant the permitting agency discretion to determine what pollution controls are appropriate for municipal storm water discharges. (*Id.* at 1166.) Specifically, the court stated that U.S.

¹³ In addition to Discharge Prohibition A.2, quoted above, the permit includes Receiving Water Limitation C.1, with almost identical language: “Discharges from MS4s that cause or contribute to the violation of water quality standards (designated beneficial uses and water quality objectives developed to protect beneficial uses) are prohibited.” Receiving Water Limitation C.2 sets forth the iterative process for compliance with C.1, as required by Board Order WQ 99-05.

¹⁴ “Water quality objectives” generally refers to criteria adopted by the state, while “water quality standards” generally refers to criteria adopted or approved for the state by the U.S. EPA. Those terms are used interchangeably for purposes of this Order.

¹⁵ Clean Water Act § 301(b)(1)(C) requires that most NPDES permits require strict compliance with quality standards.

EPA had the authority either to require "strict compliance" with water quality standards through the imposition of numeric effluent limitations, or to employ an iterative approach toward compliance with water quality standards, by requiring improved BMPs over time. (*Id.*) The court in *Browner* upheld the EPA permit language, which included an iterative, BMP-based approach comparable to the language endorsed by this Board in Order WQ 99-05.

In reviewing the language in this permit, and that in Board Order WQ 99-05, we point out that our language, similar to U.S. EPA's permit language discussed in the *Browner* case, does not require strict compliance with water quality standards. Our language requires that storm water management plans be designed to achieve compliance with water quality standards. Compliance is to be achieved over time, through an iterative approach requiring improved BMPs. As pointed out by the *Browner* court, there is nothing inconsistent between this approach and the determination that the Clean Water Act does not mandate strict compliance with water quality standards. Instead, the iterative approach is consistent with U.S. EPA's general approach to storm water regulation, which relies on BMPs instead of numeric effluent limitations.

It is true that the holding in *Browner* allows the issuance of municipal storm water permits that limit their provisions to BMPs that control pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), and which do not require compliance with water quality standards. For the reasons discussed below, we decline to adopt that approach. The evidence in the record before us is consistent with records in previous municipal permits we have considered, and with the data we have in our records, including data supporting our list prepared pursuant to Clean Water Act section 303(d). Urban runoff is causing and contributing to impacts on receiving waters throughout the state and impairing their

beneficial uses. In order to protect beneficial uses and to achieve compliance with water quality objectives in our streams, rivers, lakes, and the ocean, we must look to controls on urban runoff. It is not enough simply to apply the technology-based standards of controlling discharges of pollutants to the MEP; where urban runoff is causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality standards, it is appropriate to require improvements to BMPs that address those exceedances.

While we will continue to address water quality standards in municipal storm water permits, we also continue to believe that the iterative approach, which focuses on timely improvement of BMPs, is appropriate. We will generally not require "strict compliance" with water quality standards through numeric effluent limitations and we will continue to follow an iterative approach, which seeks compliance over time.¹⁶ The iterative approach is protective of water quality, but at the same time considers the difficulties of achieving full compliance through BMPs that must be enforced throughout large and medium municipal storm sewer systems.¹⁷

We have reviewed the language in the permit, and compared it to the model language in Board Order WQ 99-05. The language in the Receiving Water Limitations is virtually identical to the language in Board Order WQ 99-05. It sets a limitation on discharges that cause or contribute to violation of water quality standards, and then it establishes an iterative approach to complying with the limitation. We are concerned, however, with the language in Discharge Prohibition A.2, which is

¹⁶ Exceptions to this general rule are appropriate where site-specific conditions warrant. For example, the Basin Plan for the Lake Tahoe basin, which protects an outstanding national resource water, includes numeric effluent limitations for storm water discharges.

¹⁷ While BIA argues that the permit requires "zero contribution" of pollutants in runoff, and "in effect" contains numeric effluent limitations, this is simply not true. The permit is clearly BMP-based, and there are no numeric effluent limitations. BIA also claims that the permit will require the construction of treatment plants for storm water similar to the publicly-owned treatment works for sanitary sewage. There is no basis for this contention; there is no requirement in the permit to treat all storm water. The emphasis is on BMPs.

challenged by BIA. This discharge prohibition is similar to the Receiving Water Limitation, prohibiting discharges that cause or contribute to exceedance of water quality objectives. The difficulty with this language, however, is that it is not modified by the iterative process. To clarify that this prohibition also must be complied with through the iterative process, Receiving Water Limitation C.2 must state that it is also applicable to Discharge Prohibition A.2. The permit, in Discharge Prohibition A.5, also incorporates a list of Basin Plan prohibitions, one of which also prohibits discharges that are not in compliance with water quality objectives. (See, Attachment A, prohibition 5.) Language clarifying that the iterative approach applies to that prohibition is also necessary.¹⁸

BIA also objects to Discharge Prohibition A.3, which appears to require that treatment and control of discharges must always occur prior to entry into the MS4: "Discharges into and from MS4s containing pollutants which have not been reduced to the [MEP] are prohibited."¹⁹ An NPDES permit is properly issued for "discharge of a pollutant" to waters of the United States.²⁰ (Clean Water Act § 402(a).) The Clean Water Act defines "discharge of a pollutant" as an "addition" of a pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source. (Clean Water Act section 502(12).) Section 402(p)(3)(B) authorizes the issuance of permits for discharges "from municipal storm sewers."

¹⁸ The iterative approach is not necessary for all Discharge Prohibitions. For example, a prohibition against pollution, contamination or nuisance should generally be complied with at all times. (See, Discharge Prohibition A.1.) Also, there may be discharge prohibitions for particularly sensitive water bodies, such as the prohibition in the Ocean Plan applicable to Areas of Special Biological Significance.

¹⁹ Discharge Prohibition A.1 also refers to discharges into the MS4, but it only prohibits pollution, contamination, or nuisance that occurs "in waters of the state." Therefore, it is interpreted to apply only to discharges to receiving waters.

²⁰ Since NPDES permits are adopted as waste discharge requirements in California, they can more broadly protect "waters of the state," rather than being limited to "waters of the United States." In general, the inclusion of "waters of the state" allows the protection of groundwater, which is generally not considered to be "waters of the United States."

We find that the permit language is overly broad because it applies the MEP standard not only to discharges “from” MS4s, but also to discharges “into” MS4s. It is certainly true that in most instances it is more practical and effective to prevent and control pollution at its source. We also agree with the Regional Water Board’s concern, stated in its response, that there may be instances where MS4s use “waters of the United States” as part of their sewer system, and that the Board is charged with protecting all such waters. Nonetheless, the specific language in this prohibition too broadly restricts all discharges “into” an MS4, and does not allow flexibility to use regional solutions, where they could be applied in a manner that fully protects receiving waters.²¹ It is important to emphasize that dischargers into MS4s continue to be required to implement a full range of BMPs, including source control. In particular, dischargers subject to industrial and construction permits must comply with all conditions in those permits prior to discharging storm water into MS4s.

Contention: State law requires the adoption of wet weather water quality standards, and the permit improperly enforces water quality standards that were not specifically adopted for wet weather discharges.

Finding: This contention is clearly without merit. There is no provision in state or federal law that mandates adoption of separate water quality standards for wet weather conditions. In arguing that the permit violates state law, BIA states that because the permit applies the water quality

²¹ There are other provisions in the permit that refer to restrictions “into” the MS4. (See, e.g., Legal Authority D.1.) Those provisions are appropriate because they do not apply the MEP standard to the permittees, but instead require the permittees to demand appropriate controls for discharges into their system. For example, the federal regulations require that MS4s have a program “to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff from construction sites to the municipal storm sewer system” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D).)

objectives that were adopted in its Basin Plan, and those objectives were not specifically adopted for wet weather conditions only, the Regional Water Board violated Water Code section 13241. These allegations appear to challenge water quality objectives that were adopted years ago. Such a challenge is clearly inappropriate as both untimely, and because Basin Plan provisions cannot be challenged through the water quality petition process. (See Wat. Code § 13320.) Moreover, there is nothing in section 13241 that supports the claim that Regional Water Boards must adopt separate wet weather water quality objectives. Instead, the Regional Water Board's response indicates that the water quality objectives were based on all water conditions in the area. There is nothing in the record to support the claim that the Regional Water Board did not in fact consider wet weather conditions when it adopted its Basin Plan. Finally, Water Code section 13263 mandates the Regional Water Board to implement its Basin Plan when adopting waste discharge requirements. The Regional Water Board acted properly in doing so.

BIA points to certain federal policy documents that authorize states to promulgate water quality standards specific to wet-weather conditions.²² Each Regional Water Board considers revisions to its Basin Plan in a triennial review. That would be the appropriate forum for BIA to make these comments.

Contention: BIA contends that the permit improperly classifies urban runoff as "waste" within the meaning of the Water Code.

²² These documents do not support the claim that U.S. EPA and the Clinton Administration indicated that the absence of such regulations "is a major problem that needs to be addressed," as claimed in BIA's Points and Authorities, at page 18.

Finding: BIA challenges Finding 2, which states that urban runoff is a waste, as defined in the Water Code, and that it is a “discharge of pollutants from a point source” under the federal Clean Water Act. BIA contends that the legislative history of section 13050(d) supports its position that “waste” should be interpreted to exclude urban runoff. The Final Report of the Study Panel to the California State Water Resources Control Board (March, 1969) is the definitive document describing the legislative intent of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. In discussing the definition of “waste,” this document discusses its broad application to “current drainage, flow, or seepage into waters of the state of harmful concentrations” of materials, including eroded earth and garbage.

As we stated in Board Order WQ 95-2, the requirement to adopt permits for urban runoff is undisputed, and Regional Water Boards are not required to obtain any information on the impacts of runoff prior to issuing a permit. (At page 3.) It is also undisputed that urban runoff contains “waste” within the meaning of Water Code section 13050(d), and that the federal regulations define “discharge of a pollutant” to include “additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channeled by man.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.2.) But it is the waste or pollutants in the runoff that meet these definitions of “waste” and “pollutant,” and not the runoff itself.²³ The finding does create some confusion, since there are discharge prohibitions that have been incorporated into the permit that broadly prohibit the discharge of “waste” in certain circumstances.

²³ The Regional Water Board is appropriately concerned not only with pollutants in runoff but also the volume of runoff, since the volume of runoff can affect the discharge of pollutants in the runoff. (See Board Order WQ 2000-11, at page 5.)

(See Attachment A to the permit.) The finding will therefore be amended to state that urban runoff contains waste and pollutants.

Contention: BIA contends that the Regional Water Board violated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Finding: As we have stated in several prior orders, the provisions of CEQA requiring adoption of environmental documents do not apply to NPDES permits.²⁴ BIA contends that the exemption from CEQA contained in section 13389 applies only to the extent that the specific provisions of the permit are required by the federal Clean Water Act. This contention is easily rejected without addressing whether federal law mandated all of the permit provisions. The plain language of section 13389 broadly exempts the Regional Water Board from the requirements of CEQA to prepare environmental documents when adopting “any waste discharge requirement” pursuant to Chapter 5.5 (§§ 13370 et seq., which applies to NPDES permits).²⁵ BIA cites the decision in *Committee for a Progressive Gilroy v. State Water Resources Control Board* (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 847. That case upheld the State Water Board’s view that section 13389 applies only to NPDES permits, and not to waste discharge requirements that are adopted pursuant only to state law. The case did not concern an NPDES permit, and does not support BIA’s argument.

Contention: WSPA contends that the Regional Water Board did not follow this Board’s precedent for retail gasoline outlets (RGOs) established in the LA SUSMP order.

²⁴ Water Code section 13389; see, e.g., Board Order WQ 2000-11.

²⁵ The exemption does have an exception for permits for “new sources” as defined in the Clean Water Act, which is not applicable here.

Finding: In the LA SUSMP order, this Board concluded that construction of RGOs is already heavily regulated and that owners may be limited in their ability to construct infiltration facilities. We also noted that, in light of the small size of many RGOs and the proximity to underground tanks, it might not always be feasible or safe to employ treatment methodologies. We directed the Los Angeles Regional Water Board to mandate that RGOs employ the BMPs listed in a publication of the California Storm Water Quality Task Force. (*Best Management Practice Guide – Retail Gasoline Outlets* (March 1997).) We also concluded that RGOs should not be subject to the BMP design standards at this time. Instead, we recommended that the Regional Water Board undertake further consideration of a threshold relative to size of the RGO, number of fueling nozzles, or some other relevant factor. The LA SUSMP order did not preclude inclusion of RGOs in the SUSMP design standards, with proper justification, when the permit is reissued.

The permit adopted by the Regional Water Board did not comply with the directions we set forth in the LA SUSMP order for the regulation of RGOs. The permit contains no findings specific to the issues discussed in our prior order regarding RGOs, and includes no threshold for inclusion of RGOs in SUSMPs. Instead, the permit requires the dischargers to develop and implement SUSMPs within one year that include requirements for “Priority Development Project Categories,” including “retail gasoline outlets.” While other priority categories have thresholds for their inclusion in SUSMPs, the permit states: “Retail Gasoline Outlet is defined as any facility engaged in selling gasoline.”²⁶

²⁶ Permit at F.1.b(2)(a)(x).

The Regional Water Board responded that it did follow the directions in the LA SUSMP order. First, it points to findings that vehicles and pollutants they generate impact receiving water quality. But the only finding that even mentions RGOs is finding 4, which simply lists RGOs among the other priority development project categories as land uses that generate more pollutants. The Regional Water Board staff also did state some justifications for the inclusion of RGOs in two documents. The Draft Fact Sheet explains that RGOs contribute pollutants to runoff, and opines that there are appropriate BMPs for RGOs. The staff also prepared another document after the public hearing, which was distributed to Board Members prior to their vote on the permit, and which includes similar justifications and references to studies.²⁷ The LA SUSMP order called for some type of threshold for inclusion of RGOs in SUSMPs. The permit does not do so. Also, justifications for permit provisions should be stated in the permit findings or the final fact sheet, and should be subject to public review and debate.²⁸ The discussion in the document submitted after the hearing did not meet these criteria. There was some justification in the "Draft Fact Sheet," but the fact sheet has not been finalized.²⁹ In light of our concerns over whether SUSMP sizing criteria should apply to RGOs, it was incumbent on the Regional Water Board to justify the inclusion of RGOs in the permit findings or in a final fact sheet, and to consider an appropriate threshold, addressing the concerns we stated. The Regional Water Board also responded that when the dischargers develop the SUSMPs, the dischargers

²⁷ See "Comparison Between Tentative Order No. 2001-01 SUSMP Requirements and LARWQCB SUSMP Requirements (as Supported by SWRCB Order WQ 2000-11)."

²⁸ See 40 C.F.R. sections 124.6(e) and 124.8.

²⁹ U.S. EPA regulations require that there be a fact sheet accompanying the permit. (40 C.F.R. § 124.8.) The record contains only a draft fact sheet, which was never published or distributed in final form. The Regional Water Board should finalize the fact sheet, accounting for any revisions made in the final permit, and publish it on its web site as a final document.

might add specific BMPs and a threshold as directed in the LA SUSMP order. But the order specifically directed that any threshold, and the justification therefore, should be included in the permit. The Regional Water Board did not comply with these directions.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, the Board concludes that:

1. The Regional Water Board appropriately required compliance with water quality standards and included requirements to achieve reduction of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The permit must be clarified so that the reference to the iterative process for achieving compliance applies not only to the receiving water limitation, but also to the discharge prohibitions that require compliance with water quality standards. The permit should also be revised so that it requires that MEP be achieved for discharges "from" the municipal sewer system, and for discharges "to" waters of the United States, but not for discharges "into" the sewer system.

2. The Regional Water Board was not required to adopt wet-weather specific water quality objectives.

3. The Regional Water Board inappropriately defined urban runoff as "waste."

4. The Regional Water Board did not violate the California Environmental Quality Act.

5. The permit will be revised to delete retail gasoline outlets from the Priority

Development Project Categories for Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans. The Regional Water Board may consider adding retail gasoline outlets, upon inclusion of appropriate findings and a threshold describing which outlets are included in the requirements.

IV. ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Urban Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems in San Diego County (Order No. 2001-01) are revised as follows:

1. Part A.3: The words "into and" are deleted.
2. Part C.2: Throughout the first paragraph, the words ", Part A.2, and Part A.5 as it applies to Prohibition 5 in Attachment A" shall be inserted following "Part C.1."
3. Finding 2: Revise the finding to read: **URBAN RUNOFF CONTAINS "WASTE" AND "POLLUTANTS"**: Urban runoff contains waste, as defined in the California Water Code, and pollutants, as defined in the federal Clean Water Act, and adversely affects the quality of the waters of the State.
4. Part F.1.b(2)(a): Delete section "x."

In all other respects the petitions are dismissed.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, Clerk to the Board, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the State Water Resources Control Board held on November 15, 2001.

AYE: Arthur G. Baggett, Jr.
 Peter S. Silva
 Richard Katz

NO:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

/ s/

Maureen Marché
Clerk to the Board