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PETITION FOR REVIEW TO STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
I.

INTRODUCTION

The City of Arcadia, California ("City" or "Petitioner") hereby submits this Petition for Review ("Petition") to the California State Water Resources Control Board ("State Board") pursuant to section 13320(a) of the California Water Code ("Water Code"), requesting that the State Board review an action by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region ("Regional Board"). Specifically, Petitioner seeks review of the Regional Board’s November 8, 2012 Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System ("MS4") Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0175, reissuing NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 ("Permit").

Petitioner requests that this Petition be held in abeyance at this time pursuant to Section 2050.5, subdivision (d) of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations. Petitioner further reserves the right to supplement the legal arguments and authorities raised herein with additional memoranda of points and authorities if and when the Petition is activated. As an initial matter, Petitioner has every intention in abiding by the Permit in good faith and is genuinely optimistic about working with the Regional Board to assess and implement the strategies and requirements necessary for compliance. Nevertheless, the Permit contains significant issues that concern Petitioner, and other aspects that the Petitioner believes are flawed. Thus, while Petitioner has every hope that it will not need to request that the State Board act on any of the issues raised herein, as a matter of prudence and protection against the uncertainty of such a momentous and unprecedented Permit and other potential legal challenges that may ultimately alter the Permit, the Petitioner wishes to file this Petition and have it held in abeyance until such time as Petitioner requests the State Board to act on the Petition.
II.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF PETITIONER

Dominic Lazzaretto  
City Manager  
City of Arcadia  
240 West Huntington Drive  
P.O. Box 60021  
Arcadia, CA 91006  
Telephone (626) 574-5400  
Facsimile (626) 574-5401

Tom Tait  
Director of Public Works Services  
City of Arcadia  
240 West Huntington Drive  
P.O. Box 60021  
Arcadia, CA 91066  
Telephone (626) 305-1386  
Facsimile (626) 359-7028

With copies to Petitioner’s Counsel:

Shawn Hagerty  
J.G. Andre Monette  
Rebecca Andrews  
Best Best & Krieger, LLP  
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Email: Andre.Monette@bbklaw.com  
Telephone: (619) 525-1300  
Facsimile: (613) 233-6118

III.

ACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD UPON WHICH REVIEW IS Sought

By this Petition, the City is challenging the Regional Board’s November 8, 2012 adoption of the “Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges Within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County, Except those Discharges
Originating from the City of Long Beach MS4,” Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0175, reissuing NPDES Permit No. CAS 004001.

IV.

THE DATE OF THE REGIONAL BOARD’S ACTION

The Regional Board approved the challenged Permit on November 8, 2012.

V.

STATEMENT OF THE REASONS THE ACTION WAS IMPROPER

The Permit generally embodies a workable approach to improving water quality in the County, while reflecting the work the permittees have initiated during the prior permit terms and the work they have committed to perform in the future. However, several provisions of the Permit, including the imposition of numeric standards in the Receiving Water Limitations provisions, the manner of the incorporation of various Total Maximum Daily Loads (“TMDL”) and numeric Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (“WQBEL”), the monitoring requirements, the Permit’s lack of economic considerations, joint liability, and certain minimum control measures, are inappropriate or improper in that, among other things, they impose obligations on Petitioner that are not mandated or supported by the Clean Water Act (“CWA”), the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (“Porter-Cologne”), or other applicable law. A more detailed discussion of these issues is provided in the Statement of Points and Authorities below.

VI.

THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONER HAS BEEN AGGRIEVED

Petitioner is a permittee under the Permit. It, along with the other permittees, is responsible for compliance with the Permit. Failure to comply with the Permit exposes Petitioner to administrative liability under the CWA and Porter-Cologne and potential lawsuits by the Regional Board and third parties under the CWA’s citizen suit provision. To the extent that certain provisions in the Permit are improper or inappropriate, Petitioner should not be subject to such actions.
VII.

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED OF THE STATE BOARD WITH THIS PETITION

The issues raised in this Petition may be resolved or rendered moot by actions to be taken by the permittees, Regional Board staff actions, amendment of the Permit, and/or developments in other jurisdictions. Accordingly, Petitioner requests the State Board hold this Petition in abeyance at this time pursuant to Section 2050.5, subdivision (d) of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations. Petitioner further reserves the right to supplement the legal arguments and authorities raised herein with additional memoranda of points and authorities if and when the Petition is activated. Depending on the outcome of these actions, Petitioner will, if necessary, request the State Board to act on all or some of the issues raised in the Petition and schedule a hearing. Petitioner will provide a complete list of specific actions requested if and when the Petitioner requests the State Board to act on this Petition.

VIII.

STATEMENT OF AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION

The following is a brief discussion of the issues Petitioner raises in this Petition. In addition to the issues discussed below, to the extent not addressed or inadequately addressed by the Regional Board in its responses to comments, Petitioner also seeks review of the Permit on the grounds raised in Petitioner’s previous written comments, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit “A.” Petitioner will submit to the State Board a complete statement of points and authorities in support of this Petition, as necessary, if and when Petitioner requests the State Board to take the Petition out of abeyance and act upon it.

A. The Permit Should Be Revised To Be Consistent with the Maximum Extent Practicable Standard and State Policy by Allowing Compliance Through an Iterative Management Process and Not Require Strict Adherence to Numeric Standards in Receiving Waters and for WQBELs

Consistent with both State and Federal standards, and in particular the Federal Maximum Extent Practicable (“MEP”) standard applicable to municipal storm water permits, permittees should be able to achieve compliance with the entire Permit through good faith adherence to a
best management practice ("BMP")-based iterative approach. Contrary to controlling State and
Federal standards, the Permit appears to require adherence to strict numeric standards in receiving
water bodies and for WQBELs.

The Federal MEP standard for MS4 Permits is a BMP-based, iterative process that does
not require adherence to strict numeric standards. (See Permit, Attachment A, p. A-11; 2003 EPA
Memo, "Guidance on Definition of Maximum Extent Practicable"; Defenders of Wildlife v.
Browner, 191 F.3d 1159, 1165 (9th Cir. 1999); Divers Environmental Conservation Organization
Board Memorandum, "Definition of Maximum Extent Practicable.") Accordingly, the Permit’s
imposition of numeric standards exceeds the Federal MEP, which has numerous legal
ramifications discussed further below.

Under a regime of enforceable numeric standards, even if the permittees act in good faith
to implement required BMPs, they can still be held in violation of the Permit, for reasons that are
entirely beyond their control. The MS4 is too large, too complicated, and lacks a model to assess
and track the movement of pollutants into, through, and out of it. Holding permittees in violation
of standards, which they cannot meet is unfair, and contrary to law. (BIA, supra, 124 Cal.App.4th
at 889 [MEP standard requires showing of technical and economic feasibility]; Hugley v. JMS
Dev. Corp., 78 F.3d 1523, 1529-30 (11th Cir. 1996) [The CWA does not require permittees to
achieve the impossible].) Accordingly, numeric standards are simply inappropriate at this time.

1. The Receiving Water Limitations Language’s Numeric Standards

The Receiving Water Limitation ("RWL") provisions of the Permit improperly require
strict adherence to the numeric water quality standards in receiving waters, regardless of whether
a permittee adheres to a BMP-based iterative approach in good faith. (See, e.g., Permit, part
V.A.1; Fact Sheet pp. F-36-37.) In prior permits, the RWL standard, despite having similar (but
not identical) language, was understood to be an iterative process where compliance would not be
measured according to numeric water quality exceedances, but through a BMP-based iterative
process. (See State Board Order No. 99-05; State Board Order No. 2001-15.)
The RWL language in the Permit is inconsistent with State Board Water Quality Order No. 99-05 and other prior precedents and Orders. State Board Water Quality Order No. 99-05 unequivocally requires compliance with storm water management plans as a means of complying with receiving water limitations and, therewith, water quality standards. In State Water Quality Order No. 2001-15, the State Board affirmed the iterative approach in stating that “we will generally not require ‘strict adherence’ with water quality standards through numeric effluent limitations and we continue to follow an iterative approach.” (State Board Order No. 2001-15, p. 8.) Finally, most recently, the State Board, on September 7, 2012, found that “[i]t is not feasible at this time to set enforceable numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs and in particular urban discharges.” (See Fact Sheet for NPDES Permit and Waste Discharges Requirements for State of California Department of Transportation, NPDES Permit No. CAS000003, Order No. 2012-XX-DWG.)

Although these latter items regard numeric effluent limitations, the same logic is even more applicable to receiving water limitations, over which individual permittees maintain even less control. Imposing numeric standards for the receiving water body is thus infeasible, unachievable, and will require the development of BMPs that violate and exceed the requirements of law. (See Permit, Attachment A, p. A-11 [the Permit’s own definition of MEP states that BMP’s must be effective, have public support, exhibit reasonable relationship between cost and benefit achieved, and be technically feasible].)

2. Required Adherence to Numeric WQBELs Exceeds Federal Requirements and Violates State and Federal Law and Policy

a. The Permit’s WQBELs Were Improperly Formulated

The Regional Board failed to provide adequate justification for incorporating numeric water quality based effluent limitations (“WQBELs”) in the Permit for each of the thirty-three (33) incorporated Total Maximum Daily Loads (“TMDL”) to which they apply. A WQBEL is an enforceable translation in an MS4 permit for attaining compliance with a TMDL WLA, which serves to protect beneficial uses of a receiving water. (40 C.F.R. § 130.2.) The Permit fails to establish that an adequate requisite Reasonable Potential Analysis (“RPA”) has been conducted.
The Permit fails to establish if discharges from any individual permittee’s MS4 have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any “[s]tate water quality standard including [s]tate narrative criteria for water quality.” (See EPA’s November 12, 2010 Revisions to the November 22, 2002 Memorandum “Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm Water Sources and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on those WLAs” (“EPA Memorandum”).) The EPA Memorandum states:

Where the NPDES authority determines that MS4 discharges have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a water quality excursion, EPA recommends that, where feasible, the NPDES permitting authority exercise its discretion to include numeric effluent limitations as necessary to meet water quality standards.

EPA Memorandum, p. 2 (emphasis added).

There are two generally accepted approaches to conducting an RPA. According to USEPA guidance, “A permit writer can conduct a reasonable potential analysis using effluent and receiving water data and modeling techniques, as described above, or using a non-quantitative approach.” (NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual, September 2010, page 6-23.)

Neither the administrative record nor the Permit’s fact sheet contains any evidence of the Regional Board having performed an RPA in accordance with either of the two foregoing approaches. Regarding the first approach, such an analysis would have been impossible to perform given that no outfall (“effluent”) monitoring has been required for any Los Angeles County MS4 permit since the MS4 program began in 1990. No modeling appears to have been conducted either. Furthermore, the absence of any reference to WQBELs or RPA in any of the Regional Board’s TMDLs counters its assertion that the TMDL development process satisfied the RPA requirement for establishing a numeric WQBEL in this instance.

Beyond this the Regional Board’s failure to conduct an RPA to determine if an excursion above a water quality standard is appropriate, federal regulations also require that the storm water discharge be measured against an “allowable” ambient concentration. (40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(iii).) Incomplete and partial wet and dry weather monitoring data relative to some TMDLs cannot singularly serve to determine an excursion above a TMDL. Outfall monitoring
data would have to have been evaluated against in-stream generated ambient (dry weather) data to make such a determination. The Regional Board, however, did not base the Permits WQBELs on any such data.

As for the second, non-quantitative approach, the Regional Board also failed to provide information in the Permit, its accompanying documents, or the administrative record indicating that it had performed a non-quantitative analysis based on recommended criteria described in USEPA guidance. In lieu of conducting either a quantitative or non-quantitative RPA, the Regional Board concluded that reasonable potential can be demonstrated in several ways, one of which is through the TMDL development process. (Fact Sheet, p. F-34.) No citation to any authority was provided for this proposition. In essence, the Regional Board appears to claim that the same analysis it used to establish a TMDL constitutes a type of RPA. The logic it used to arrive at this conclusion is, however, faulty. A WQBEL is a means of attaining a TMDL WLA, a translation of a WLA into prescribed actions or limits which has in the past been typically expressed as a BMP. Before a WQBEL can be developed, however, a need for it must be established. As the Writers’ Manual points out:

The permit writer should always provide justification for the decision to require WQBELs in the permit fact sheet or statement of basis and must do so where required by federal and state regulations. A thorough rationale is particularly important when the decision to include WQBELs is not based on an analysis of effluent data for the pollutant of concern.

(NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual, September 2010, page 6-23 (emphasis added).)

The Regional Board provided no such “thorough rationale,” which in the absence of effluent data derived from outfall monitoring, is absolutely necessary to justify the need for a numeric WQBEL. It is possible that outfall monitoring could demonstrate that existing BMPs implemented through a MS4 permittee’s storm water management plan is already meeting a TMDL WLA, thereby obviating the need for any WQBELs. But that was not done, and simply translating a TMDL WLA directly into a numeric WQBEL without the requisite analysis is a clear violation of permit-writing standards, applicable law and good practice.
Finally, the EPA Memorandum is clear that reliance on numerics should be coupled with the “disaggregation” of different storm water sources within permits. (See EPA Memorandum at pp. 3-4.) The Permit fails to adequately disaggregate storm water sources within applicable TMDLs regarding numeric WQBELs and for receiving water limitations, further making the imposition of numeric standards inappropriate.

b. The Permit’s Numeric WQBELs Violate the Requirements of Law Because They Are Infeasible

The Regional Board’s numeric WQBELs violate state and federal law and policy because they are not feasible. The 2010 EPA Memorandum recommends “where feasible, the NPDES permitting authority exercise its discretion to include numeric effluent limitations as necessary to meet water quality standards.” (EPA Memorandum, p. 2 (emphasis added)). This position is based on 40 CFR §122.44(k), which authorizes the use of BMPs “when numeric limitations are infeasible.” In 1991, the State Board concluded that “numeric effluent limitations are infeasible as a means of reducing pollutants in municipal storm water discharges, at least at this time.” (State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order 91-03, page 49.)

Although this determination was made over twenty years ago, the State Board’s position on this issue has not changed since then, as evidenced by its adoption of the Caltrans MS4 permit in September of 2012. Citing the fact sheet for the Caltrans MS4 permit, the State Board affirmed that “it is not feasible at this time to set enforceable numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs and in particular urban discharges.” (Fact Sheet for NPDES Permit and Waste Discharges Requirements for State of California Department of Transportation, NPDES Permit No. CAS000003, Order No. 2012-XX-DWG, September 7, 2012, page 9.)

The Caltrans MS4 permit’s fact sheet also supports the use of BMP-based WQBELs as a means of meeting TMDLs and other water quality standards. The Caltrans MS4 permit is also subject to TMDLs adopted by the Regional Board and USEPA. If this aspect of the Permit is not corrected, Los Angeles County MS4 permittees will be compelled to comply strictly with numeric WQBELs and receiving water limitations while Caltrans need only implement WQBEL BMPs to achieve compliance with the same TMDLs. This inconsistency lacks any justification.
Moreover, the Permit allows the use of BMPs to meet federal TMDLs. Having two
different compliance standards, one for State adopted TMDLs that require meeting numeric
WQBELs and one for USEPA adopted TMDLs that require BMP-based WQBELs is improper
and inappropriate. While the State may impose requirements more stringent than federal
regulations, it must provide a justification and conduct required analysis that has not been done in
the Permit, its accompanying documents, or elsewhere in the administrative record. (Water Code
§ 13241; City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd., 35 Cal. 4th 613, 618, 627
(2005).)

B. TMDLs and TMDL Requirements Incorporated into the Permit Are Contrary to
State and Federal Law and Policy

The Permit improperly requires in-stream monitoring to determine compliance with
TMDL WLAs (dry and wet weather) in receiving waters, contrary to federal storm water
regulations and State Law. Examples include, but are not limited to, the Metals TMDLs for the
Los Angeles River adopted by the State, the Metals TMDL for the San Gabriel River adopted by
USEPA, the Los Angeles River Bacteria TMDL and the Dominguez Channel and Greater Los
Angeles and Long Harbor Waters Toxic Pollutants.

Federal regulations only require two types of monitoring for compliance: (1) effluent
(outfall) and (2) ambient (natural concentration of water quality constituents prior to mixing of
either point or nonpoint source load of contaminants). (See 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(viii)(B); see
also EPA Glossary of Terms (http://water.epa.gov/scitech/datait/tools/warsss/glossary.cfm).)
TMDLs and other water quality standards are supposed to be ambient standards, as the noted in a
USEPA commissioned report: “EPA is obligated to implement the Total Maximum Daily Load
(TMDL) program, the objective of which is attainment of ambient water quality standards
through the control of both point and nonpoint sources of pollution.”1 Attainment of WLAs,
however, should be determined by outfall monitoring.

---

1 National Research Council, Assessing the TMDL Approach to Water Quality Management Committee
to Assess the Scientific Basis of the Total Maximum Daily Load Approach to Water Pollution
Reduction, Water Science and Technology Board, page 12.
Some TMDLs specify ambient monitoring, such as the Los Angeles River Metals and Bacteria TMDLs, the Regional Board has misunderstood ambient monitoring to be a form of in-stream compliance monitoring, along with TMDL effectiveness monitoring. For example, the Los Angeles River Metals TMDL requires Los Angeles County MS4 permittees and Caltrans to submit a Coordinated Monitoring Plan ("CMP"), which includes both "TMDL effectiveness monitoring and ambient monitoring."²

The CMP that was submitted to and approved by the Regional Board proposed a monitoring plan that essentially treats TMDL effectiveness monitoring and ambient monitoring as being one of the same, and which collectively serve the purpose of determining compliance with dry and wet weather WLAs based on in-stream monitoring.

It is unclear why the Regional Board established two compliance standards, one of which (viz., wet weather WLAs) is clearly not authorized under federal law. More recently adopted TMDLs, such as the Machado Lake Nutrients TMDL, do not require compliance in the receiving water, but instead compliance at the outfall. The Regional Board improperly requires some TMDLs to comply at the outfall while others required to comply in the receiving water.

C. The Regional Board Failed to Adequately Consider Economic Impacts Pursuant to Water Code Section 13241

The Regional Board’s failure to adequately consider the economic impacts of the Permit, as required by Water Code Sections 13000, 13241 and 13623 render the Permit invalid. The Regional Board incorrectly asserts that consideration of economics is not required in this Permit. (See Permit, p. 26.) Because the Permit requires exceeds the Federal MEP standard for storm water permits in numerous key regards, consideration of economic factors is necessary. (City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd., 35 Cal. 4th 613, 618, 627 (2005).)

The alleged facts in the economic consideration section of the Fact Sheet misrepresent the permittees’ data and fail to consider the economic impact of new, costly aspects of the Permit. The Permit’s economic analysis uses the 2001 permit as its basis. Accordingly, the Permit fails to

take into account 33 new TMDLs, new Minimum Control Measures ("MCMs"), Watershed Management Programs, and the loss of the County of Los Angeles as principal permittee, among other factors.

The Regional Board prematurely and improperly assumes that permittees will obtain funding from proposed ballot measures and other sources of funding which have not even been approved, much less voted on by the public. See Permit, Fact Sheet, p. F-153. If the Regional Board wants to rely on initiatives, such as the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's Water Quality Funding Initiative, as sources of funding to offset the costs of storm water management, it should have delayed its public hearing and approval of the Permit until after the voters have actually voted on such initiatives. Otherwise, if such initiatives fail to pass, the co-permittees will be left to implement the Permit's requirements without these much-needed funds. Even if the Water Quality Funding Initiative is approved by the voters, the funds generated by the Initiative would not even be available until 2014—well after the deadline for certain compliance deadlines set forth in the Permit. Moreover, the Water Quality Initiative will not cover all the costs imposed on all permittees by the Permit.

D. The Permit’s Monitoring Program Exceeds the Requirements of Law

The Permit’s Receiving Water Monitoring Program improperly exceeds the scope of monitoring authorized under Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383. Water Code Section 13383 states, in relevant part:

(a) The ... regional board may establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements ... for any person who discharges, or proposes to discharge, to navigable waters....

(b) The ... the regional boards may require any person subject to this section to establish and maintain monitoring equipment or methods, including, where appropriate, biological monitoring methods, sample effluent as prescribed, and provide other information as may be reasonably required.

The Regional Board's failure to conduct and communicate the requisite cost-benefit analysis pursuant to the monitoring requirements in the Permit constitutes an abuse of discretion. Water Code §§ 13267 and 13225(c). The Permit goes far beyond a requirement that a permittee
“monitor” the effluent from its own storm drains. The Permit’s Receiving Water Monitoring Program seems to require a complete hydrogeologic model found in the receiving water body, which will in many cases be miles away from many of the individual permittees’ jurisdictions. To the extent the Permit requires individual permittees to compile information beyond their jurisdictional control, they are unauthorized. Although Water Code Section 13383(b) permits the Regional Board to request “other information[,]” such requests can only be “reasonably” imposed. (Water Code § 13383(b).) The Permit requires co-permittees to analyze discharges and make assumptions regarding factors well beyond their individual boundaries. This is not reasonable, and is therefore not permitted under Water Code Sections 13225, 13267, and 13383. It is equally unreasonable to require the monitoring of authorized or unknown discharges. (See Permit at p. 108.) The monitoring program also exceeds federal requirements which, in line with state requirements, do not require monitoring beyond the MS4. (See 40 C.F.R. §122.26.)

E. Provisions in the Permit Imposing Joint or Joint and Several Liability for Violations are Contrary to Law

The Permit improperly imposes joint liability and joint and several liability for water quality based effluent limitations and receiving water exceedances. The Permit states that “Permittees with co-mingled MS4 discharges are jointly responsible for meeting the water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations assigned to MS4 discharges in this Order.” (Permit, p. 23.) The Permit then states that permittees are responsible for implementing programs within their jurisdictions “to meet the water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations assigned to such commingled MS4 discharges.” (Ibid.)

It is unlawful and inequitable to make a permittee liable for the actions of other permittees over which it has no control. A party to an MS4 Permit is responsible only for its own discharges or those over which it has control. (Jones v. E.R. Shell Contractor, Inc., 333 F. Supp. 2d 1344, 1348 (N.D. Ga. 2004).) Because the City cannot prevent another permittee from failing to comply with the Permit, the Regional Board cannot, as a matter of law, hold the City jointly or jointly and severally liable with another permittee for violations of water quality standards in...
receiving water bodies or for TMDL violations. Under the Water Code, the Regional Board issues waste discharge requirements to "the person making or proposing the discharge." (Water Code § 13263(f).) Enforcement is directed towards "any person who violates any cease and desist order or cleanup and abatement order . . . or . . . waste discharge requirement." (Water Code § 13350(a).) In similar fashion, the CWA directs its prohibitions solely against the "person" who violates the requirements of the Act. (33 U.S.C. § 1319.) Thus, there is no provision for joint or joint and several liability under either the Water Code or the CWA.

Furthermore, joint liability is proper only where joint tortfeasors act in concert to accomplish some common purpose or plan in committing the act causing the injury, which will generally never be the case regarding prohibited discharges. (Kesmodel v. Rand, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1144 (2004); Key v. Caldwell, 39 Cal. App. 2d 698, 701 (1940).) For any such discharge, it would be unlawful to impose joint liability and especially joint and several liability. Furthermore, the issue of imposing liability for contributions to "commingled discharges" of certain constituents, such as bacteria, is especially problematic because there is no method of determining the elements or amounts each entity has contributed to an exceedance.

Permittees should not be required to prove they did not contribute to another permittee's exceedance, when the Regional Board has failed to raise even a rebuttable presumption that the contamination results from a particular permittee's actions. Yet, by stating that the Permit "allows a Permittee to clarify and distinguish their individual contributions and demonstrate that its MS4 discharge did not cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations," that is precisely what the Permit does. (Permit, p. 24.) Such a reversed burden of proof is contrary to law, and illicitly creates a presumption of "guilty until proven innocent." (Evid. Code § 500; Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp., 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1667-1668 (2003).)

The Regional Board has the burden of proof to establish a CWA violation, and requiring permittees to prove a negative in the case of a commingled discharge is unfair and unlawful. (Rapanos v. United States, 547 U.S. 715, 745 (2006); Sacket v. EPA., 622 F.3d 1139, 1145-47 (9th Cir. 2010)) ["We further interpret the CWA to require that penalties for noncompliance with a
compliance order be assessed only after the EPA proves, in district court, and according to traditional rules of evidence and burdens of proof, that the defendants violated the CWA in the manner alleged in the compliance order.”

F. The Permit Improperly Intrudes on Permittees’ Local Land Use Authority

To the extent that this Permit relies on federal authority under the CWA to impose land use regulations and dictate specific methods of compliance, it violates the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Furthermore, to the extent the Permit requires a municipal permittee to modify its city ordinances in a specific manner, it also violates the Tenth Amendment. According to the Tenth Amendment, “[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

Article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution guarantees municipalities the right to “make and enforce within [their] limits all local police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” (See also City of W. Hollywood v. Beverly Towers, 52 Cal. 3d 1184, 1195 (1991).) The United States Supreme Court has held that the ability to enact land use regulations is delegated to municipalities as part of their inherent police powers to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of its residents. (See Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26, 32-33 (1954).) Neither the CWA nor the Porter-Cologne Act provisions regarding NPDES permitting indicate that the Legislature intended to preempt local land use authority. (Sherwin Williams Co. v. City of Los Angeles, 4 Cal. 4th 893 (1993); California Rifle & Pistol Assn. v. City of West Hollywood, 66 Cal. App. 4th 1302, 1309 (1998) [Preemption of police power does not exist unless “Legislature has removed the constitutional police power of the City to regulate” in the area]; see also Water Code §§ 13374 and 13377 and 33 U.S.C. § 1342 (b)(1)(B).) Because they are constitutionally conferred powers, land use powers cannot be overridden by a regulatory permit.

The Permit, however, essentially establishes the Regional Board as a “super municipality” responsible for setting zoning policy and requirements throughout Los Angeles County. The Regional Board asserts that “the permit does not impose land use regulations, nor does it restrict
or control local land-use decision-making authority.” (Responses to Comments H-53.) However, the permit improperly imposes numerous mandatory land use requirements, including but not limited to the adoption of low impact development (“LID”) ordinances. (See, e.g., Ex. A at pp. 96-115 (Planning and Land Development Program).)

G. The Permit Exceeds the Regional Board’s Authority by Requiring the City to Enter Into Contracts and Coordinate With Other Co-permitees

The Regional Board improperly requires the City to enter into agreements and coordinate with other co-permitees. The requirements that permittees engage in interagency agreements (Permit at p. 39) and coordinate with other co-permitees as part of their storm water management program (Permit at p. 56-58) are unlawful and exceed the authority of the Regional Board. The Regional Board lacks the statutory authority to mandate the creation of interagency agreements and coordination between permittees in an NPDES Permit. (See Water Code §§ 13374 and 13377.) The Permit creates the potential for City liability in circumstances where the permittee cannot ensure compliance due to the actions of third party state and local government agencies over which the City has no control. Such requirements are not reasonable regulations, and thus violate state law. (Communities for a Better Environment v. State Water Resources Control Bd., 132 Cal. App. 4th 1313, 1330 (2005) [regulation pursuant to NPDES program must be reasonable].)

H. Non-Stormwater Discharge Provisions Are Inconsistent with Federal Law and Contrary to State Law

The Permit improperly prohibits “non-storm water discharges through the MS4 to receiving waters ...” (Permit, p. 27.) The previous 2001 permit, however, required MS4 permittees to “effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges into the MS4.” The previous Permit also provided for several exceptions of non-stormwater discharges that could be legally discharged to the MS4. Non-stormwater discharges that were not exempted were deemed illicit discharges. The adopted Permit, on the other hand, revises the non-stormwater discharge prohibition by replacing “to” the MS4 with “through” the MS4 and in the case of TMDL discharges “from the MS4” to a receiving water.
The Regional Board’s revised non-stormwater provision is not authorized under Federal
storm water regulations. Nevertheless, the Regional Board attempts to rely on 40 C.F.R.
§122.26(a)(3)(iv) to assert that an MS4 permittee is only responsible for discharges of storm
water and non-storm water from the MS4. The Regional Board’s citation mentions nothing about
permittees being responsible for storm water and non-stormwater from the MS4. Instead, it states
that co-permittees need only comply with permit conditions relating to discharges from the
municipal separate storm sewer system. But the term “discharges” as used in the regulation refers
to storm water discharges only.

Section 402(p)(B)(ii) of the CWA contradicts the Regional Board’s position and clearly
specifies that MS4 permits “shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater
discharges into the storm sewers.” Nothing in this section or anywhere else in the CWA
authorizes a prohibition of non-stormwater discharges “through” or “from” the MS4. In fact, the
Regional Board cites no legal authority either in the Permit or the Fact Sheet to support changing
the discharge prohibition from “to” or “into” the MS4 to “through” or “from” the MS4. By doing
do, the Regional Board has illicitly expanded the non-stormwater discharge requirements beyond
their permissible or reasonable scope, and beyond the MEP standard.

Additionally, the Permit improperly defines non-stormwater to expansively include all
dry-weather runoff. This is contrary to State and Federal definitions of storm water, which
include “surface runoff,” “drainage,” and “urban runoff.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(13); see also
State Water Board Order No. 2001-15, pp. 7-8.) This further expansion of the non-stormwater
provisions exceeds the Federal requirements and places an additional, unfair burden on permittees
to prohibit these discharges.

I. The Timing and Procedures of the Permit Adoption Were Contrary to Law and
Deny the Permittees’ Due Process Rights

The period provided to review and comment on the Permit was unreasonably short given
the breadth of the Permit. Furthermore, the “dual” procedure the Regional Board adopted
whereby part of the Permit could be discussed on October 4 and 5, 2012, without the benefit of
seeing a revised draft tentative Permit or responses to comments, and then only allowing
comments on “changes” to the Permit at the November 8, 2012 hearing, unreasonably limited the
ability of the permittees to comment on the Permit as a whole based on the changes to the
permittees’ original comments. (See Regional Board 9/26/12 “Order on Proceedings.”) By
denying the permittees a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on a Permit that so
drastically affects the permittees’ rights and finances, the Regional Board has denied the
permittees due process rights under state and federal law. (See Spring Valley Water Works v. San
Francisco, 82 Cal. 286 (1890) [reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard are essential
elements of “due process of law,” whatever the nature of the power exercised].) Furthermore,
under the CWA, a reasonable and meaningful opportunity for stakeholder participation is
mandatory. (See, e.g., Arkansas Wildlife Fed’n v. ICI Ams., 29 F.3d 376, 381 (8th Cir. 1994)
[“the overall regulatory scheme affords significant citizen participation, even if the state law does
not contain precisely the same public notice and comment provisions as those found in the federal
CWA.”]).

J. The Regional Board’s Forced Recusal of Board Member Mary Ann Lutz was
Improper and Prejudiced the Municipal Permittees

Ms. Lutz was, at the time of the hearings, the Board member appointed to reflect the
perspective of municipal governments. She was improperly forced by the Regional Board to
recuse herself from the proceedings. By improperly forcing her recusal, the Regional Board staff
and counsel purposefully and unduly prejudiced the municipal permittees by denying the Board,
the permittees, and the public Ms. Lutz’ valuable perspective as a municipal representative,
public servant and Mayor.

K. The Permit as a Whole Constitutes an Unfunded State Mandate, Which Is Not
Permitted by the California Constitution Unless Funding is Provided by the State

The Permit contains mandates imposed at the Regional Board’s discretion that are
unfunded and exceeds the specific requirements of the CWA and the USEPA’s regulations
implementing the CWA, and thus exceeds the MEP standard. Accordingly, these aspects of the
Permit constitute non-federal state mandates. (See City of Sacramento v. State of California, 50
Cal. 3d 51, 75-76 (1990).) Indeed, the Court of Appeal has previously held that NPDES permit
requirements imposed by the Regional Board under the Clean Water and Porter-Cologne Acts can constitute state mandates subject to claims for subvention. (County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates, 150 Cal.App.4th 898, 914-16 (2007).)

i. The Permit’s Minimum Control Measure Program is an Unfunded State Mandate

The Permit’s Minimum Control Measure program ("MCM Program") qualifies as a new program or a program requiring a higher level of service for which State funds must be provided. The particular elements of the MCM Program that constitute unfunded mandates are:

- The requirements to control, inspect, and regulate non-municipal permittees and potential permittees;
- The public information and participation program;
- The industrial/commercial facilities program;
- The public agency activities program; and
- The illicit connection and illicit discharge elimination program.

(See Permit, p. 69-143.)

The MCM Program requirement that the permittees inspect and regulate other, non-municipal NPDES permittees is especially problematic and clearly constitutes an unfunded mandate. (See, e.g., Permit at pp. 38-40.) These are unfunded requirements which entail significant costs for staffing, training, attorney fees, and other resources. Notably, the requirement to perform inspections of sites already subject to the General Construction Permit is clearly excessive. Permittees would be required to perform pre-construction inspections, monthly inspections during active construction, and post-construction inspections. The Regional Board is requiring a higher level of service in this Permit than required by federal law.

Furthermore, there are no adequate alternative sources of funding for inspections. User fees will not fully fund the program required by the Permit. (Gov’t Code, § 17556(d).) NPDES permittees already pay the Regional Water Quality Control Boards fees that cover such inspections in part. It is inequitable to both cities and individual permittees for the Regional
Board to charge these fees and then require cities to conduct and pay for inspections without providing funding.

ii. Imposition of Numeric Standards Render are an Unfunded Mandate

If strict compliance with numeric state water quality standards is required in the form of WQBELs and Receiving Water Limitations, as discussed above, the entire Permit will constitute an unfunded mandate because such a requirement clearly exceeds both the Federal standard and the requirements of prior permits, despite the fact no funding will be provided to help meet targets. (See Building Industry Assn. of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd., 124 Cal. App. 4th 866, 873, 884-85 (2004) [though the State and Regional Boards may require compliance with California state water quality standards pursuant to the CWA and state law, these requirements exceed the Federal Maximum Extent Practicable standard].)

IX

STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE REGIONAL BOARD

A copy of this Petition is being served upon the Executive Officer of the Regional Board, and upon all other permittees to the Permit.

X

STATEMENT THAT ISSUES/OBJECTIONS WERE RAISED BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD

The substantive issues raised in this Petition were raised to the Regional Board before the Regional Board acted on November 8, 2012.

XI

SERVICE OF PETITION

This Petition is being served upon the following parties via electronic mail, facsimile, or U.S. Mail:
XII

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Petitioner has been aggrieved by the Regional Board’s action in adopting the Permit. Issues raised in this Petition, however, may be resolved or rendered moot by Regional Board actions or developments in other jurisdictions. Accordingly, until such time as Petitioner requests the State Board to consider this Petition, Petitioner requests the State Board hold this Petition in abeyance.

Dated: December __, 2012

By: ___________________________

DOMINIC LAZZARETTO
CITY MANAGER

City of Arcadia