

August 14, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Emel G. Wadhvani
Senior Staff Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
1001 I Street
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100
ewadhvani@waterboards.ca.gov

Re: SWRCB/OCC File A-2236(a) thru (kk) – Comment Letter Re State Water Board
Workshop on Receiving Water Limitations

Dear Ms. Wadhvani:

This Comment Letter is being submitted on behalf of the Cities of Duarte and Huntington Park (“Cities”), both of whom are Petitioners challenging portions of the 2012 Los Angeles Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (hereafter “LA Permit”). Consistent with the points and authorities set forth in their Petition to the State Board in connection with the LA Permit, the Cities herein submit these comments in response to the questions posed in your letter of July 8, 2013, regarding State Water Board policy on MS4 permittee compliance with receiving water limitations, discharge prohibitions and total maximum daily loads (“TMDLs”), including water quality based effluent limitations (“WQBELs”) related thereto (hereinafter, collectively, “Discharge Limitations”).

As explained further below (and discussed in the Cities’ Petition and supporting Points and Authorities), the Watershed Management and Enhanced Watershed Management program (hereafter “WMP/EWMP”) set forth in the LA Permit, although good in concept, as written is plainly inconsistent with State and federal law, and thus without modification, should *not* be adopted as new policy to replace State Board Resolution No. 99-05 to govern compliance with the various Discharge Limitation provisions within MS4 Permits throughout the State. Thus, the answer to the first question raised in your letter of July 8, 2013, is that although the WMP/EWMP process in the LA Permit provides for a solid foundation for new State Board policy, such process, as written, is in need of amendment to be both achievable and compliant with governing law.

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 2

In response to the second question raised in your July 8, 2013 letter, the Cities are hereby proposing revisions to the LA Permit WMP/EWMP approach, which proposed revisions are set forth in Attachment "A" to this Comment Letter. The primary issues of concern addressed by the revisions proposed in Attachment A ("Alternative Approach") are summarized as follows:

(1) Although the LA Permit requires Permittees to implement WMPs to ensure compliance with all interim and final limits, even if such limits can only be achieved through the use of technically or economically infeasible BMPs, the Alternative Approach would give Permittees the ability to seek approval from the Regional Board for the use of Alternative BMPs, in place of infeasible BMPs, and if the Regional Board approves the Alternative BMPs and approves the Permittee's overall program, the Permittee would be considered in compliance with such numeric limits;

(2) The only exception to actually meeting the final numeric limits in the LA Permit is through the use of an EWMP, which would only provide for deemed compliance for those drainage areas within a Permittee's jurisdiction where structural BMPs are installed that capture all non-storm water runoff and the 85th percentile design storm event. The Alternative Approach attached would similarly allow for compliance through the use of such design storm BMPs, but would also allow for deemed compliance through the use of other Alternative BMPs, where the 85th percentile design storm BMPs (and other BMPs necessary to meet the limits) are shown to be infeasible;

(3) Another concern with the LA Permit Approach involves the lack of a mechanism for a permittee to continue to be in compliance with the applicable numeric limits, where the targets or requirements set forth in the Permittee's approved WMP are not being met (including where any final limit is not being met). Under the Alternative Approach attached, where an approved WMP program is in place, but an exceedance of a final limit or a target or other requirement of the WMP occurs, a Permittee would still be considered in compliance with the subject numeric limit, so long it is following the iterative/adaptive management process to address the deficiency with its WMP. The LA Permit language does not appear to allow for such continued compliance.

(4) The Alternative Approach language would also make clear that a Permittees compliance with an approved WMP or EWMP program, including those that utilize Alternative BMPs, "shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with the receiving water limitations, Discharge Prohibitions, and TMDLs and related WQBEL provisions set forth in Parts V.A, III.A.1, and VI.E of this Order."

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 3

For the reasons set forth herein, the Cities believe that the proposed Attachment “A” revisions to the LA Permit represent necessary minimum revisions to the LA Permit in order to bring the WMP/EWMP provisions therein into compliance with governing law, and the Cities thus respectfully request that the Alternative Approach language be accepted by the State Board as the basis for new State policy, and that other necessary revisions be made to the LA Permit approach to incorporate the substance of the Alternative Approach (as indicated in Section 2 of the Alternative Approach).

A. Revisions To The LA Permit WMP/EWMP Program Are Necessary To Enable A Permittee To Be Considered In Compliance With Discharge Limitations Where The Permittee Is Acting In Good Faith And Implementing Technically and Economically Feasible BMPs.

As discussed further below, the WMP/EWMP approach, without substantive revisions to enable a Permittee to be considered in compliance with any specific Discharge Limitations through the use of technically and economically feasible BMPs, is an approach that is clearly inconsistent with applicable law. In short, because the WMP/EWMP approach does not provide a Permittee a compliance path that is consistent with the Maximum Extent Practical (“MEP”) standard, and instead requires strict compliance with Discharge Limitations, irrespective of the MEP standard, it is an approach that goes beyond what is required under the Clean Water Act (“CWA”), and thus is an approach that is not permitted under applicable State law, namely the Porter-Cologne Act (California Water Code [“CWC”], § 13000, et seq.).

Revisions are therefore necessary to the WMP/EWMP approach to bring it into compliance with governing law, and to provide a Permittee with the ability to implement alternative BMPs, where the only means by which it may actually meet interim or final Discharge Limitations is through the use of infeasible BMPs (defined in Attachment “A” as either being technically infeasible BMPs or BMPs that would otherwise result in a substantial hardship to the Permittee).

The Alternative Approach would thus enable a Permittee, where it demonstrates (to the satisfaction of the Regional Board at a public meeting) that it is unable to develop feasible BMPs to timely achieve compliance with any particular Discharge Limitation, to instead develop a Program for Regional Board approval that: (i) include necessary BMPs and a compliance schedule for all applicable Discharge Limitations believed to be achievable; (ii) contains a description of the Discharge Limitation determined by the Permittee to be unachievable, along with an analysis of why the necessary BMPs are considered to be “Infeasible BMPs” (defined as being technically infeasible BMPs, or BMPs which would otherwise result in a substantial hardship to the Permittee); and (iii) A description of the BMPs the Permittee is proposing to implement in place of the Infeasible BMPs (“Alternative BMPs”), along with a schedule of

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 4

compliance for their implementation and a schedule by which the Alternative BMPs are projected to result in achieving the subject Discharge Limitation. (See Attachment "A" hereto.)

The Alternative Approach would therefore provide a Permittee implementing an approved Program, including one that contains Alternative BMPs, to be considered in compliance with the Discharge Limitation requirements in the Permit.

Finally, the proposed language set forth in Attachment "A" would allow a Permittee the ability to cure a compliance deficiency through proposed modifications to the Program that address the deficiency through an adaptive management process. Without such a provision, again a Permittee would be subject to having to strictly comply with numeric limits, even if it is unable to do so through the use of feasible BMPs.

In short, for the reasons described further below, the existing WMP/EWMP approach in the LA Permit does not provide a compliance path forward for Permittees to legitimately meet all applicable interim and final Discharge Limitations, and thus is a program that goes beyond what is required under federal law, and beyond what is permitted under State law.

B. The LA Permit WMP/EWMP Program Does Not Allow For Deemed Compliance Through Technically And Economically Feasible BMPs, And For This Reason Exceeds The CWA's Requirements For MS4 Permittees And Violates State Law And Policy.

Part V of the LA Permit entitled "Receiving Water Limitations" ("RWL") has been explained in past State Board rulings as being an "iterative process." It was initially included and developed based on State Board Order No. 98-01, as amended by State Board Order No. 99-05, and was designed to provide Permittees a means of complying with the RWL requirements where it provides that: "So long as the Permittees have complied with the procedures [the iterative process procedures] . . . and are implementing the revised SWMP, the Permittees do not have to repeat the same procedure for a continuing or recurring exceedances of the same receiving water limitations unless directed by the Regional Water Board to develop additional BMPs." (See State Board Order No. 99-05.)

In State Board Order No. 2001-15, the State Board confirmed that the process to be followed in municipal NPDES Permits for meeting the RWL requirements was to be an "iterative process," which focuses on timely improvements of BMPs:

We will generally not require 'strict compliance' with water quality standards through numeric effluent limitations and we continue to follow an iterative approach, which seeks compliance over time. The iterative approach is protective of water quality, but at the same time considers the difficulty of achieving full compliance

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 5

through BMPs that must be enforced throughout large and medium municipal storm sewer systems.

(State Board Order No. 2001-15, p. 8.) In fact, the permit that was the subject of State Board Order No. 2001-15 was a San Diego MS4 NPDES Permit, with the State Board finding that it was deficient because it did not make clear that the “iterative process” was to be applied to both the receiving water limitation language as well as the language concerning exceedances of water quality objectives. (*Id.*)

Similarly, in State Board Order No. 2001-12 DWQ, involving a general NPDES Permit for discharges of aquatic pesticides to surface waters, the State Board expressly provided that compliance with the “iterative process” set forth in State Board Order No. 99-05, was to constitute compliance with the RWL language. In particular, the Receiving Water Limitation language included in Order No. 2001-12 DWQ provided, in part, that: “***A discharger will not be in violation of receiving water limitation f.2 as long as the discharger has implemented the BMPs required by this general permit and the following procedure is followed:***” (See Order No. 2001-12 DWQ, p. 9.)

Moreover, there can be no legitimate dispute but that federal law does not otherwise compel the use of numeric effluent limits in municipal NPDES permits. For example, in *BIA of San Diego County v. State Board* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 874, the California Court of Appeal acknowledged that the CWA is to be applied differently to municipal stormwater dischargers than to industrial stormwater dischargers, finding as follows:

In 1987, Congress amended the Clean Water Act to add provisions that specifically concerned NPDES permit requirements for storm sewer discharges. [Citations.] In these amendments, enacted as part of the *Water Quality Act of 1987*, Congress distinguished between industrial and municipal storm water discharges With respect to *municipal* storm water discharges, Congress clarified that the EPA has the authority to fashion NPDES permit requirements to meet water quality standards without specific numeric effluent limits and instead to impose “controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable.”

(*Id.*, citing 33 USC § 1342 (p)(3)(B)(iii) and *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159, 1163 (“*Defenders*”) (bolding and underling added, italics in original).)

In *Defenders*, the Ninth Circuit recognized the different approach taken by Congress for municipal permits, finding that “***industrial discharges must comply strictly with state water-quality standards,***” while Congress chose “***not to include a similar provision for municipal storm-sewer discharges.***” (191 F.3d at 1165, emphasis added.) The Court found that “33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B) is not merely silent regarding whether municipal discharges must comply with

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 6

33 U.S.C. § 1311,” but instead section 1342(p)(3)(B)(iii) [of the CWA] “*replaces the requirements of § 1311 with the requirement that municipal storm-sewer dischargers ‘reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable.’*” The Court then held that “*the statute unambiguously demonstrates that Congress did not require municipal storm-sewer discharges to comply strictly with 33 U.S.C. § 1311(b)(1)(C).*” (*Id.* at 1165; *also see Divers’ Environmental Conservation Organization v. State Water Resources Control Board (Divers’ Environmental)* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 246, 256, emphasis added [*“In regulating stormwater permits the EPA has repeatedly expressed a preference for doing so by the way of BMPs, rather than by way of imposing either technology-based or water quality-based numerical limitations.”*].)

In the *Divers’ Environmental* case, the plaintiff brought suit claiming that an NPDES Permit issued to the United States Navy by the San Diego Regional Board was contrary to law because it did not incorporate waste load allocations (“WLAs”) from a TMDL as numeric effluent limits into the Navy’s permit. After discussing the relevant requirements of the Clean Water Act, as well as governing case authority, the Court of Appeal acknowledged that in regulating stormwater permits EPA “*has repeatedly expressed a preference for doing so by the way of BMPs, rather than by way of imposing either technology-based or water quality-based numerical limitations.*” (*Id.* at 256.) The Court went on to find that “*it is now clear that in implementing numeric water quality standards, such as those set forth in CTR, permitting agencies are not required to do so solely by means of a corresponding numeric WQBEL’s [water quality based effluent limit].*” (*Id.* at 262.)

Similarly, as discussed in part above, it has long since been the policy of the State of California not to require the use of strict numeric limits for stormwater (urban runoff) dischargers, but rather to apply the maximum extent practicable (“MEP”) standard through an iterative BMP process. (*See, e.g., State Board Order No. 91-04, p. 14* [*“There are no numeric objectives or numeric effluent limits required at this time, either in the Basin Plan or any statewide plan that apply to storm water discharges.”* p. 14]; *State Board Order No. 91-03, [“We . . . conclude that numeric effluent limitations are not legally required. Further, we have determined that the program of prohibitions, source control measures and ‘best management practices’ set forth in the permit constitutes effluent limitations as required by law.”*]; *State Board Order No. 96-13, p. 6* [*“federal laws does not require the [San Francisco Reg. Bd.] to dictate the specific controls.”*]; *State Board Order No. 98-01, p. 12* [*“Stormwater permits must achieve compliance with water quality standards, but they may do so by requiring implementation of BMPs in lieu of numeric water quality-based effluent limitations.”*]; *State Board Order No. 2000-11, p. 3* [*“In prior Orders this Board has explained the need for the municipal storm water programs and the emphasis on BMPs in lieu of numeric effluent limitations.”*]; *State Board Order No. 2001-15, p. 8* [*“While we continue to address water quality standards in municipal storm water permits, we also continue to believe that the iterative approach, which focuses on timely improvements of BMPs, is appropriate.”*]; *State Board Order*

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 7

No. 2006-12, p. 17 [*“Federal regulations do not require numeric effluent limitations for discharges of storm water”*]; *Stormwater Quality Panel Recommendations to The California State Water Resources Control Board – The Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities*, June 19, 2006, p. 8 [*“It is not feasible at this time to set enforceable numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs and in particular urban dischargers.”*]; and an April 18, 2008 letter from the State Board’s Chief Counsel to the Commission on State Mandates, p. 6 [*“Most NPDES Permits are largely comprised of numeric limitations for pollutants. . . . Stormwater permits, on the other hand, usually require dischargers to implement BMPs.”*].)

C. The LA Permit Must Be Revised To Allow For A Deemed Compliance Approach Through The Use Of Technically And Economically Achievable BMPs.

Rather than providing municipal permittees the ability to comply with the LA Permit Discharge Limitation provisions through continued compliance with the adaptive management process/iterative process, the LA Permit makes clear that regardless of the MEP standard, various numeric Discharge Limitations in the LA Permit must be strictly complied with. In particular, the WMP/EWMP provisions in the LA Permit allow for deemed compliance with final Discharge Limitations only where the area in question is addressed by an EWMP. Under the LA Permit, an EWMP requires the use of BMPs to retain “all non-storm water runoff” and “all storm water runoff from the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for the drainage areas tributary to the projects.” (LA Permit, p. 48.) Given these EWMP BMP requirements, there can be no dispute but that an EWMP is not a viable program for a majority of the drainage areas within any given city, and instead can only be implemented to cover a fraction of such city. In short, even with an approved EWMP in place, a municipal permittee under the LA Permit will need to strictly comply with the final numeric limits for a majority of the drainage areas within its jurisdiction.

WMPs, moreover, provide no deemed compliance with final Discharge Limitation requirements and only allow for compliance with interim Discharge Limitations where the Permittee first provides “reasonable assurances” that such interim Discharge Limitations will be met by the applicable deadlines. In such instance, the WMP would constitute deemed compliance with the interim Discharge Limitations, but no compliance with the final Discharge Limitations. Further, if “reasonable assurances” cannot legitimately be provided (that the WMP will meet the interim Discharge Limitations), there is similarly no deemed compliance with even the interim Discharge Limitations. Accordingly, under the LA Permit, where a Permittee cannot genuinely develop technically and economically feasible BMPs to meet the numeric Discharge Limitations, whether interim or final, it will be in violation of these numeric requirements.

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 8

Yet, imposing numeric limits on municipalities that cannot be achieved through the use of technically and economically feasible BMPs, in lieu of allowing for deemed compliance through the iterative/adaptive management process, is a significant change in MS4 permit-writing policy in California, and is a change that ignores the reality that iterative BMPs are the only means by which municipal permittees actually have to comply with Discharge Limitations. It also ignores the reality that requiring compliance with numeric limits will not in any way alter a Permittee's ability to achieve those limits or improve water quality.

In short, municipalities have no means of attempting to achieve compliance with numeric Discharge Limitations, other than by complying in good faith with an iterative/adaptive management process. The LA Permit, which demands that the Permittees do more, is simply not feasible and will only result in more litigation and wasted resources, without any benefit to the public.

The LA Permit approach further ignores the true limitations municipalities face when attempting to reduce the discharge of pollutants from their respective MS4 systems. There can be no dispute that municipal dischargers do not have the luxury of ceasing operations or installing a single or a series of filtration or treatment systems to eliminate pollutants from urban runoff. Municipal Permittees do not generate a vast majority of the urban runoff from their city, and cannot close a valve to prevent the rain from falling or runoff from entering their expansive storm drain systems. Accordingly, to, in effect, conclude that municipalities must develop and implement whatever BMPs will be necessary to meet numeric limits, is to require municipalities to develop and implement infeasible BMPs, which are, by definition, BMPs that exceed the MEP standard.

The LA Permit includes a definition of the term "maximum extent practicable" or "MEP." (Permit, Attachment A, p. A-11.) This definition is based on a February 11, 1993 Memorandum issued by the State Board's Office of Chief Counsel, subject "Definition of Maximum Extent Practicable" (hereafter "Chief Counsel Memo"), and provides as follows:

"In selecting BMPs which will achieve MEP, it is important to remember that municipalities will be responsible to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable. **This means choosing effective BMPs, and rejecting applicable BMPs only where other effective BMPs will serve the same purpose, the BMPs would not be technically feasible, or the cost would be prohibitive.** The following factors may be useful to consider:

Effectiveness: Will the BMP address a pollutant of concern?

Regulatory Compliance: Is the BMP in compliance with storm water regulations as well as other environmental regulations?

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 9

Public acceptance: Does the BMP have public support?

Cost: Will the cost of implementing the BMP have a reasonable relationship to the pollution control benefits to be achieved?

Technical Feasibility: Is the BMP technically feasible considering soils, geography, water resources, etc.?"

(LA Permit, p. A-11, emphasis added.) Moreover, as noted in the Chief Counsel Memo, the term "MEP" as used by Congress was intended to include a requirement "*to reduce the discharge of pollutants, rather than totally prevent such discharge,*" and Congress presumably applied an MEP standard, rather than a strict numeric standard with the "*knowledge that it is not possible for municipal discharges to prevent the discharge of all pollutants in storm water.*" (Chief Counsel Memo, p. 2, emphasis added.)

Both the definition of MEP in the LA Permit and in the Chief Counsel Memo acknowledge the need to consider both "technical feasibility" and "cost," including specifically asking: "*Will the cost of implementing the BMP have a reasonable relationship to the pollution control benefits to be achieved.*" In short, both the Memorandum and the LA Permit's definition of MEP confirm that the imposition of "impracticable" BMPs, whether technically or economically impracticable, to achieve a numeric effluent limit are requirements that go beyond what is required under the Clean Water Act, and are, in effect, terms that are not suitable for imposition on municipal dischargers.

In the June 2006 report prepared by the Expert Storm Water Quality Numeric Effluent limits Panel, a panel commissioned by the State Water Board, and entitled, "*Storm Water Feasibility of Numeric Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated With Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities,*" the Panel concluded that: "*It is not feasible at this time to set enforcement numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs in particular for urban discharges.*" (*Id.* at p. 8.) Similarly, in a November 22, 2002 US EPA Memorandum entitled "*Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm Water Sources as NPDES Permit Requirements based on those WLAs,*" EPA commented as follows: "*EPA's policy recognizes that because storm water discharges are due to storm events that are highly variable in frequency and duration and are not easily characterized, only in rare cases will it be feasible or appropriate to establish numeric limits for municipal and small construction storm water dischargers. ... Therefore, EPA believes that in these situations, permit limits typically can be expressed as BMPs and that numeric limits will be used only in rare instances.*." (EPA November 22, 2002 Guidance Memo, p. 4.)

The ultimate outcome of imposing numeric effluent limits on municipalities will not be to improve water quality, but instead to increase litigation and attorneys fees in fighting

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 10

enforcement actions and citizen suits (*see, e.g., NRDC v. County of Los Angeles*, 673 F.3d 880 (9th Cir. 2011)), and, as well, will only subject municipalities to unnecessary penalty claims, including mandatory minimum penalties. (*See* LA Permit, p. 45-46, citing CWC § 13385.) In a second Ninth Circuit Opinion in the case of *NRDC v. County of Los Angeles* ___ F3d __ (9th Cir., filed August 8, 2013), the Ninth Circuit went so far as to hold that “the pollution exceedance detected at the County Defendants’ monitoring stations are sufficient to establish the County Defendants’ liability for NPDES permit violations as a matter of law.” (Slip Opinion, p. 5.) Although this second Ninth Circuit Opinion was just announced (on August 8), and as of this date is not yet final, it nonetheless clearly illustrates the uncertainty created by the existing State Board RWL policy language and the importance of providing municipal permittees with a path of complying with numeric limits through an iterative/adaptive management process.

Accordingly, establishing sound State Board policy, consistent with prior State Board policy, that compliance with applicable water quality standards is met through compliance with an iterative/adaptive management process, “in lieu of numeric effluent limitations” (State Board Order No. 2000-11, p. 3), is essential at this time in order to avoid the floodgate of litigation that will surely ensue against municipal permittees absent State Board intervention.

Moreover, to avoid such litigation, any State Board RWL policy must genuinely recognize the technical and economic realities of attempting to reduce the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff to meet a numeric limit, and that Discharge Limitations can, in truth, only ever be achieved through an adaptive management process implemented over time, which, at its heart, involves the development and implementation of technically and economically feasible BMPs. ***Requiring more will not result in more.***

It has long been recognized by the State Board, as well as the courts and US EPA, that the use of iterative BMPs, which are technically and economically available, is in fact the only means by which municipalities actually have to comply with MS4 permit terms. Requiring strict compliance with numeric Discharge Limitations is, therefore, neither realistic nor consistent with state policy or State law (as discussed below).

D. The LA Permit Terms Requiring Compliance With Discharge Limitations, Irrespective Of Whether Such Is Technically Or Economically Achievable, Are Contrary To The Requirements Of CWC §§ 13000, 13263 And 13241.

As discussed above, federal law only requires that municipal storm sewer dischargers “reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable,” and specifically does not require that such dischargers comply with numeric effluent limits. (*See, e.g. Defenders, supra*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1165; *also see Divers’ Environmental, supra*, 145 Cal.App.4th 246, 256, where the court found that: ***“In regulating stormwater permits the EPA has repeatedly expressed a preference for doing so by the way of BMPs, rather than by way of imposing either***

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 11

technology-based or water quality-based numerical limitations.”) As such, any attempt to impose strict Discharge Limitations on municipal permittees, requires compliance with the California Porter-Cologne Act, namely, CWC sections 13263, 13241 and 13000.

CWC sections 13241, 13263 and 13000 all directly or indirectly require a consideration of “economics,” as well as whether the permit term in question is “reasonable achievable,” including a balancing of the benefits of the requirement, e.g., “*the total values involved, beneficial and detrimental, economic and social, tangible and intangible*” (CWC § 13000), the “*water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area*” (CWC § 13241), and the need to “take into consideration the beneficial uses to be protected” and the “*water quality objectives reasonably required for that purpose*” (CWC § 13263(a).)

Moreover, under the California Supreme Court’s holding in *Burbank v. State Board* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 613 (“*Burbank*”), a regional water board must consider the factors set forth in sections 13263, 13241 and 13000 when adopting an NPDES Permit, unless consideration of those factors “would justify including restrictions that do not comply with federal law.” (*Id.* at 627.) As stated by the *Burbank* Court: “*Section 13263 directs Regional Boards, when issuing waste discharge requirements, to take into account various factors including those set forth in Section 13241.*” (*Id.* at 625, emphasis added.)

Specifically, the *Burbank* Court held that to the extent the NPDES Permit provisions in that case were not compelled by federal law, the Boards there were required to consider their “economic” impacts on the dischargers themselves, with the Court finding that such requirement means that the Water Boards must analyze the “*discharger’s cost of compliance.*” (*Id.* at 618.)

The Court in *Burbank* thus interpreted the need to consider “economics” as requiring a consideration of the “cost of compliance” on the cities involved in that case. (*Id.* at 625 [“The plain language of *Sections 13263 and 13241* indicates the Legislature’s intent in 1969, when these statutes were enacted, that a regional board *consider the costs of compliance when setting effluent limitations in a waste water discharge permit.*”].) The Court further recognized that the goals of the Porter-Cologne Act as provided for under Section 13000 are to “attain the highest water quality *which is reasonable*, considering all demands being made and to be made on those waters *and the total values involved, beneficial and detrimental, economic and social, tangible and intangible.*” (*Id.* at 618, citing § 13000.)

Moreover, under section 13263(a), waste discharge requirements developed by the Regional Board: “shall implement any relevant water quality control plans that have been adopted, and take into consideration the beneficial uses to be protected, the water quality objectives *reasonably required for that purpose*, other waste discharges, the need to prevent nuisance, *and the provisions of Section 13241.*” (§ 13263(a).)

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 12

In addition, CWC section 13241 compels the Boards to consider the following factors when developing NPDES Permit terms:

- “(a) Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water.
- (b) Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto.
- (c) Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area.
- (d) Economic considerations.
- (e) The need for developing housing in the region.
- (f) The need to develop and use recycled water.”

(§ 13241.) In a concurring opinion in the *Burbank* case, Justice Brown made several significant points regarding the importance of considering “economics” in particular, and the section 13241 factors in general, when adopting an NPDES Permit that includes terms not required by federal law:

“Applying this federal-state statutory scheme, it appears that throughout this entire process, the Cities of Burbank and Los Angeles (Cities) were unable to have economic factors considered because the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Board) – the body responsible to enforce the statutory framework – failed to comply with its statutory mandate.

For example, as the trial court found, the Board did not consider costs of compliance when it initially established its basin plan, and hence the water quality standards. The Board thus failed to abide by the statutory requirements set forth in Water Code section 13241 in establishing its basin plan. Moreover, the Cities claim that the initial narrative standards were so vague as to make a serious economic analysis impracticable. Because the Board does not allow the Cities to raise their economic factors in the permit approval stage, they are effectively precluded from doing so. As a result, the Board appears to be playing a game of “gotcha” by allowing the Cities to raise economic considerations when it is not practical, but precluding them when they have the ability to do so.”

(*Id* at 632, J. Brown, concurring; emphasis added.)

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 13

Justice Brown went on to find that:

“Accordingly, the Board has failed its duty to allow public discussion – including economic considerations – at the required intervals when making its determination of proper water quality standards. What is unclear is why this process should be viewed as a contest. State and local agencies are presumably on the same side. The costs will be paid by taxpayers and the Board should have as much interest as any other agency in fiscally responsible environmental solutions.” (*Id* at 632-33.)

In light of the above, the LA Permit terms that go beyond a maximum “practicability” standard will, by definition go beyond what a water board has the authority to impose under California law. In essence, as a matter of law, MS4 permit terms that go beyond “maximum practicability” are terms that go beyond the balancing, reasonableness and economic considerations, and other considerations, required before any such permit terms can lawfully be imposed under California law. Here, because, as the courts have found, the imposition of numeric limits in a municipal storm water permit go beyond what is required under federal law, *i.e.*, go beyond the MEP standard, as discussed above, by definition they also go beyond the Regional and the State Board’s authority under State law. (See CWC §§ 13241, 13263 and 13000.)

E. Conclusion.

In light of the foregoing, it is clear that the WMP/EWMP provisions within the LA Permit, as presently written, do not comport with the requirements of State and federal law because they require a municipal permittee to show that their proposed WMP will meet the interim discharge limits, regardless of technical feasibility or cost, and because, with the limited exception of where an EWMP is viable, said Permittee must strictly comply with all final Discharge Limitations and must provide reasonable assurances it will meet all interim numeric limits, even if it is not able to do so through the use of reasonably feasible BMPs. As such, without modification, the LA Permit WMP/EWMP approach cannot and should not be used as a model for MS4 permits throughout California.

Without providing Permittees a path forward, consistent with the substance of the approach set forth in Attachment “A” hereto, the adoption of a new State Board Policy based on the approach set forth in the LA Permit is not legally supportable. The Cities therefore respectfully request that the State Board consider revising the WMP/EWMP approach under the LA Permit to include the additions/modifications set forth in Attachment “A” hereto, as State Board policy for MS4 Permits in California.

Emel G. Wadhvani
August 14, 2013
Page 14

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input to the State Board in connection with this very important matter. The Cities stand ready to answer any questions or provide the State Board with any additional information it may request in this regard.

Sincerely,

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP



Richard Montevideo

RM:pj

Enclosure

cc: Attached Service List
Jeannette L. Bashaw, Esq., Legal Analyst
Darrell George, City of Duarte, City Manager
Desi Alvarez, City of Huntington Park
Dan Slater, Esq., City Attorney, City of Duarte
Todd Litfin Esq., City Attorney, City of Huntington Park

PROPOSED ADDITIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO
WMP/EWMP APPROACH IN LA MS4 2012
PERMIT

AUGUST, 2013

Attachment A

SECTION 1: ADDITIONS TO PART VI.C.1 TO LA MS4 2012 PERMIT.

h. Any Watershed Management Program, including an EWMP (collectively, "Program") proposed by a Permittee shall describe all significant BMPs to be implemented to achieve compliance with the applicable Receiving Water Limitations, Discharge Prohibitions and interim and final WQBELs derived from waste load allocations in adopted TMDLs (collectively, "Discharge Limitations"), and shall include a schedule of compliance for the development and implementation of the proposed BMPs, as well as the projected dates for the achievement of the Discharge Limitations. Where a Permittee demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Regional Board at a public meeting that it is unable to develop sufficient BMPs to timely achieve compliance with any particular Discharge Limitation or Limitations because the necessary BMPs would be either technically infeasible or would otherwise result in a substantial hardship to the Permittee ("Infeasible BMPs"), then the Program shall include: (i) the necessary BMPs and compliance schedule for all Discharge Limitations achievable through feasible BMPs; (ii) a description of the Discharge Limitation determined by the Permittee to be unachievable and an analysis of why the necessary BMPs are considered to be Infeasible BMPs; and (iii) a description of the BMPs the Permittee is proposing to implement in place of the Infeasible BMPs ("Alternative BMPs"), along with a schedule of compliance for their implementation and a schedule by which the Alternative BMPs are projected to result in achieving the subject Discharge Limitation.

i. A Permittee's compliance with an approved Program, including a Program utilizing Alternative BMPs, shall constitute a Permittee's compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations, Discharge Prohibitions and TMDL and related WQBEL provisions set forth in Parts V.A, III.A.1 and VI.E of this Order.

j. If a Permittee fails to meet a requirement or date for its achievement in an approved Program, the Permittee shall cure the compliance deficiency as soon as reasonably possible, or if it is unable to do so, propose a modification to its Program to the Executive Officer that follows an adaptive management process to address the deficiency. So long as the Permittee has timely cured the deficiency or is otherwise developing and thereafter following an approved adaptive management process to cure the deficiency, the Permittee shall continue to be considered in compliance with the subject requirement, including where the deficiency involves an exceedance of an applicable Discharge Limitation.

k. A Permittee may request an extension of any deadline in the Program by making such a request in writing to the Executive Officer as soon as the Permittee determines an extension will be necessary. Extensions shall become effective only after approval by the Regional Water Board or the Executive Officer.

SECTION 2: FURTHER REVISIONS TO INCORPORATE LANGUAGE IN SECTION 1 INTO LA 2012 MS4 PERMIT

[The above proposed additions/revisions to the LA 2012 MS4 Permit will require additional language modifications throughout the Order to ensure internal consistencies and avoid ambiguity within the WMP/EWMP provisions on the issue of a Permittee's deemed compliance with applicable Discharge Limitations.]

**SWRCB/OCC FILE NOS. A-2236(a) through (kk)
PETITIONERS AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD CONTACT LIST
EXHIBIT A**

City of San Marino [A-2236(a)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of San Marino
c/o Mr. John Schaefer, City Manager
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108
jschaefer@cityofsanmarino.org

City of Rancho Palos Verdes [A-2236(b)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
c/o City Manager
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

City of South El Monte [A-2236(c)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of South El Monte
c/o City Manager
1415 N. Santa Anita Avenue
South El Monte, CA 91733

City of Norwalk [A-2236(d)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Norwalk
c/o Mr. Michael J. Egan, City Manager
12700 Norwalk Boulevard
Norwalk, CA 90650

City of Artesia [A-2236(e)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Artesia
c/o Interim City Manager
18747 Clarkdale Avenue
Artesia, CA 90701

City of Torrance [A-2236(f)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Torrance
c/o Mr. LeRoy J. Jackson, City Manager
3031 Torrance Boulevard, Third Floor
Torrance, CA 90503
ljackson@torranceca.gov

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Torrance
c/o Mr. Robert J. Beste, Public Works Director
20500 Madrona Avenue
Torrance, CA 90503
rbeste@torranceca.gov

City of Beverly Hills [A-2236(g)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Beverly Hills
c/o City Manager
455 N. Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
jkolin@beverlyhills.org

City of Hidden Hills [A-2236(h)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Hidden Hills
c/o City Manager
6165 Spring Valley Road
Hidden Hills, CA 91302
staff@hiddenhillscity.org

City of Claremont [A-2236(i)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Shawn Hagerty, Esq.
J.G. Andre Monette, Esq.
Rebecca Andrews, Esq.
Best Best & Krieger, LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
andre.monette@bbklaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Claremont
c/o Mr. Brian Desatnik
Director of Community Development
207 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711
bdesatnik@ci.claremont.ca.us

City of Arcadia [A-2236(j)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Shawn Hagerty, Esq.
J.G. Andre Monette, Esq.
Rebecca Andrews, Esq.
Best Best & Krieger, LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
andre.monette@bbklaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Arcadia
c/o Mr. Dominic Lazzaretto, City Manager
240 West Huntington Drive
P.O. Box 60021
Arcadia, CA 91066
dlazzaretto@ci.arcadia.ca.us

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Arcadia
c/o Mr. Tom Tait
Director of Public Works Services
240 West Huntington Drive
P.O. Box 60021
Arcadia, CA 91066
ttait@ci.arcadia.ca.us

Cities of Duarte and Huntington Beach [A-2236(k)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Richard Montevideo, Esq.
Joseph Larsen, Esq.
Rutan & Tucker, LLP
611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
rmontevideo@rutan.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Duarte
c/o Mr. Darrell George, City Manager
1600 Huntington Drive
Duarte, CA 91010
georged@accessduarte.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Huntington Park
c/o Mr. René Bobadilla, City Manager
6550 Miles Avenue
Huntington Park, CA 90255

City of Glendora [A-2236(l)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

D. Wayne Leech, Esq.
City Attorney, City of Glendora
Leech & Associates
11001 E. Valley Mall #200
El Monte, CA 91731
wayne@leechlaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Glendora
c/o Mr. Chris Jeffers, City Manager, and
Mr. Dave Davies, Director of Public Works
116 East Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741-3380
city_manager@ci.glendora.ca.us
ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us

NRDC, Heal the Bay and Los Angeles Waterkeeper [A-2236(m)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Steve Fleischli, Esq.
Noah Garrison, Esq.
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
1314 Second Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
sfleischli@nrdc.org
ngarrison@nrdc.org

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Liz Crosson, Esq.
Tatiana Gaur, Esq.
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
120 Broadway, Suite 105
Santa Monica, CA 90401
liz@lawaterkeeper.org
tgaur@lawaterkeeper.org

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Kirsten James, Esq.
Heal the Bay
1444 9th Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
kjames@healthebay.org

City of Gardena [A-2236(n)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Cary S. Reisman, Esq.
Assistant City Attorney
City of Gardena
Wallin, Kress, Reisman & Kranitz, LLP
2800 28th Street, Suite 315
Santa Monica, CA 90405
cary@wkrklaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Gardena
c/o Mr. Mitch Lansdell, City Manager
1700 West 162nd Street
Gardena, CA 90247
mlansdell@ci.gardena.ca.us

City of Bradbury [A-2236(o)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Cary S. Reisman, Esq.
City Attorney
City of Bradbury
Wallin, Kress, Reisman & Kranitz, LLP
2800 28th Street, Suite 315
Santa Monica, CA 90405
cary@wkrklaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Bradbury
c/o Ms. Michelle Keith, City Manager
600 Winston Avenue
Bradbury, CA 91008
mkeith@cityofbradbury.org

City of Westlake Village [A-2236(p)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Westlake Village
c/o City Manager
31200 Oak Crest Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361
ray@wlv.org
beth@wlv.org

City of La Mirada [A-2236(q)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of la Mirada
c/o City Manager
13700 La Mirada Boulevard
La Mirada, CA 90638
citycontact@cityoflamirada.org

City of Manhattan Beach [A-2236(r)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Manhattan Beach
c/o City Manager
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
cm@citymb.info

City of Covina [A-2236(s)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Covina
c/o City Manager
125 East College Street
Covina, CA 91273
vcastro@covinaca.gov

City of Vernon [A-2236(t)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Vernon
c/o City Manager
4305 South Santa Fe Avenue
Vernon, CA 90058
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

City of El Monte [A-2236(u)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Ricardo Olivarez, Esq.
City Attorney
City of El Monte
11333 Valley Boulevard
El Monte, CA 91734-2008
rolivarez@ogplaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of El Monte
c/o Mr. Dayle Keller, Interim City Manager
11333 Valley Boulevard
El Monte, CA 91731
dkeller@ci.el-monte.ca.us

City of Monrovia [A-2236(v)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Monrovia
c/o City Manager
415 South Ivy Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016
cityhall@ci.monrovia.ca.us

City of Agoura Hills [A-2236(w)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Agoura Hills
c/o City Manager
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

City of Pico Rivera [A-2236(x)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Anthony Marinaccio, Esq.
Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin
13181 Crossroads Parkway North
West Tower, Suite 400
City of Industry, CA 91746
amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Pico Rivera
c/o Mr. Ron Bates, City Manager
and Mr. Arturo Cervantes,
Director of Public Works
6615 Passons Boulevard
Pico Rivera, CA 90660
rbates@pico-rivera.org
acervantes@pico-rivera.org

City of Carson [A-2236(y)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

William W. Wynder, Esq., City Attorney
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 475
El Segundo, CA 90245
wwynder@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel
Wesley A. Miliband, Esq., Special Counsel
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
dboyer@awattorneys.com
wmiliband@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Carson
c/o Mr. David C. Biggs, City Manager
701 E. Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
dbiggs@carson.ca.us

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Carson
c/o Mr. Farrokh Abolfathi, P.E.
Principal Civil Engineer
701 E. Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
fabolfathi@carson.ca.us

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Carson
c/o Ms. Patricia Elkins
Storm Water Quality Programs Manager
701 E. Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
pelkins@carson.ca.us

City of Lawndale [A-2236(z)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Tiffany J. Israel, Esq.
City Attorney, City of Lawndale
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
tisrael@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel
Wesley A. Miliband, Esq., Special Counsel
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
dboyer@awattorneys.com
wmiliband@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Lawndale
c/o Mr. Stephen Mandoki, City Manager
14717 Burin Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260
smandoki@lawndalecity.org

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Lawndale
c/o Mr. Nasser Abbaszadeh
Director of Public Works
14717 Burin Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260
nabbaszadeh@lawndalecity.org

City of Commerce [A-2236(aa)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Commerce
c/o Mr. Jorge Rifa, City Administrator
2535 Commerce Way
Commerce, CA 90040
jorger@ci.commerce.ca.us

City of Pomona [A-2236(bb)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Andrew L. Jared, Esq.
Anthony Marinaccio, Esq.
Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin
13181 Crossroads Parkway North
West Tower, Suite 400
City of Industry, CA 91746
andrew@agclawfirm.com
amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Pomona
c/o Ms. Linda Lowry, City Manager
and Ms. Julie Carver,
Environmental Programs Coordinator
P.O. Box 660
505 S. Garey Avenue
Pomona, CA 91766

City of Sierra Madre [A-2236(cc)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Teresa L. Highsmith, Esq., City Attorney
Holly O. Whatley, Esq.
Colantuono & Levin, PC
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2700
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3137
thighsmith@cllaw.us
hwhatley@cllaw.us

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Sierra Madre
c/o Ms. Elaine Aguilar, City Manager
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard
Sierra Madre, CA 91024

City of Downey [A-2236(dd)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Downey
c/o Yvette M. Abich Garcia, Esq.
City Attorney
11111 Brookshire Avenue
Downey, CA 90241
ygarcia@downeyca.org

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Downey
c/o Mr. Jason Wen, Ph.D., P.E.
Utilities Superintendent
9252 Stewart and Gray Road
Downey, CA 90241
jwen@downeyca.org

City of Inglewood [A-2236(ee)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Inglewood
c/o City Manager
One Manchester Boulevard
Inglewood, CA 90301
lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org
brai@cityofinglewood.org
latwell@cityofinglewood.org
jalewis@cityofinglewood.org
csaunders@cityofinglewood.org
afields@cityofinglewood.org

City of Lynwood [A-2236(ff)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Fred Galante, Esq., City Attorney
David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel
Wesley A. Miliband, Esq., Special Counsel
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
dboyer@awattorneys.com
wmiliband@awattorneys.com
fgalante@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Lynwood
c/o Mr. Josef Kekula and Mr. Elias Saikaly
Public Works Department
11330 Bullis Road
Lynwood, CA 90262
jkekula@lynwood.ca.us
esaikaly@lynwood.ca.us

City of Irwindale [A-2236(gg)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Fred Galante, Esq., City Attorney
David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel
Wesley A. Miliband, Esq., Special Counsel
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
dboyer@awattorneys.com
wmiliband@awattorneys.com
fgalante@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Irwindale
c/o Mr. Kwok Tam, City Engineer
Public Works Department
5050 North Irwindale Avenue
Irwindale, CA 91706
ktam@ci.irwindale.ca.us

City of Culver City [A-2236(hh)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Culver City
c/o Mr. John Nachbar, City Manager
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232
john.nachbar@culvercity.org

City of Signal Hill [A-2236(ii)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

David J. Aleshire, Esq., City Attorney
David D. Boyer, Esq., Special Counsel
Wesley A. Miliband, Esq., Special Counsel
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
Irvine, CA 92612
daleshire@awattorneys.com
dboyer@awattorneys.com
wmiliband@awattorneys.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of Signal Hill
c/o Mr. Kenneth Farfsing, City Manager
2175 Cherry Avenue
Signal Hill, CA 90755
kfarfsing@cityofsignalhill.org

City of Redondo Beach [A-2236(jj)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Lisa Bond, Esq.
Candice K. Lee, Esq.
Andrew J. Brady, Esq.
Richards, Watson & Gershon
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
lbond@rwglaw.com
clee@rwglaw.com
abrady@rwglaw.com

[via U.S. Mail only]

City of Redondo Beach
c/o Mr. Bill Workman, City Manager
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

City of West Covina [A-2236(kk)]:

[via U.S. Mail and email]

Anthony Marinaccio, Esq.
Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin
13181 Crossroads Parkway North
West Tower, Suite 400
City of Industry, CA 91746
amarinaccio@agclawfirm.com

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of West Covina
c/o Mr. Andrew Pasmant, City Manager
1444 West Garvey Avenue, Room 305
West Covina, CA 91790
andrew.pasmant@westcovina.org

[via U.S. Mail and email]

City of West Covina
c/o Ms. Shannon Yauchzee
Director of Public Works
1444 West Garvey Avenue
West Covina, CA 91790
shannon.yauchzee@westcovina.org

Additional Interested Party By Request:

[via U.S. Mail only]

Andrew R. Henderson, Esq.

General Counsel

Building Industry Legal Defense Foundation

17744 Sky Park Circle, Suite 170

Irvine, CA 92614

ahenderson@biasc.org

**EXHIBIT B
MS4 DISCHARGERS
MAILING LIST**

City of Agoura Hills
c/o Ken Berkman, City Engineer
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
kberkman@agoura-hills.ca.us

City of Alhambra
c/o David Dolphin
111 South First Street
Alhambra, CA 91801-3796
ddolphin@cityofalhambra.org

City of Arcadia
c/o Vanessa Hevener
Environmental Services Officer
11800 Goldring Road
Arcadia, CA 91006-5879
vhevener@ci.arcadia.ca.us

City of Artesia
c/o Maria Dadian
Director of Public Works
18747 Clarkdale Avenue
Artesia, CA 90701-5899
mdadian@cityofartesia.ci.us

City of Azusa
c/o Carl Hassel, City Engineer
213 East Foothill Boulevard
Azusa, CA 91702
chassel@ci.azusa.ca.us

City of Baldwin Park
c/o David Lopez, Associate Engineer
14403 East Pacific Avenue
Baldwin Park, CA 91706-4297
dlopez@baldwinpark.com

City of Bell
c/o Terry Rodrigue, City Engineer
6330 Pine Avenue
Bell, CA 90201-1291
trodrigue@cityofbell.org

City of Bell Gardens
c/o John Oropeza, Director of Public Works
7100 South Garfield Avenue
Bell Gardens, CA 90201-3293

City of Bellflower
c/o Bernie Iniguez
Environmental Services Manager
16600 Civic Center Drive
Bellflower, CA 90706-5494
biniguez@bellflower.org

City of Beverly Hills
c/o Vincent Chee, Project Civil Engineer
455 North Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
kgettler@beverlyhills.org

City of Bradbury
c/o Elroy Kiepeke, City Engineer
600 Winston Avenue
Bradbury, CA 91010-1199
mkeith@cityofbradbury.org

City of Burbank
c/o Bonnie Teaford, Public Works Director
P.O. Box 6459
Burbank, CA 91510
bteaford@ci.burbank.ca.us

City of Calabasas
c/o Alex Farassati, ESM
100 Civic Center Way
Calabasas, CA 91302-3172
afarassati@cityofcalabasas.com

City of Carson
c/o Patricia Elkins
Building Construction Manager
P.O. Box 6234
Carson, CA 90745
pelkins@carson.ca.us

City of Cerritos
c/o Mike O'Grady, Environmental Services
P.O. Box 3130
Cerritos, CA 90703-3130
mogradyc@cerritos.us

City of Claremont
c/o Brian Desatnik
Director of Community Development
207 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-4719
bdesatnik@ci.claremont.ca.us

City of Commerce
c/o Gina Nila
2535 Commerce Way
Commerce, CA 90040-1487
gnila@ci.commerce.ca.us

City of Compton
c/o Hien Nguyen, Assistant City Engineer
25 South Willowbrook Avenue
Compton, CA 90220-3190

City of Covina
c/o Vivian Castro
Environmental Services Manager
125 East College Street
Covina, CA 91723-2199
vastro@covinaca.gov

City of Cudahy
c/o Hector Rodriguez, City Manager
P.O. Box 1007
Cudahy, CA 90201-6097
hrodriguez@cityofcudahy.ca.us

City of Culver City
c/o Damian Skinner, Manager
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232-0507

City of Diamond Bar
c/o David Liu, Director of Public Works
21825 East Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4177
dliu@diamondbarca.gov

City of Downey
c/o Jason Wen, Ph.D., P.E.
Utilities Superintendent
9252 Stewart and Gray Road
Downey, CA 90241
jwen@downeyca.org

City of Duarte
c/o Steve Esbenshades
Engineering Division Manager
1600 Huntington Drive
Duarte, CA 91010-2592

City of El Monte
c/o James A. Enriquez
Director of Public Works
P.O. Box 6008
El Monte, CA 91731

City of El Segundo
c/o Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245-3895
skatsouleas@elsegundo.org

City of Gardena
c/o Ron Jackson
Building Maintenance Supervisor
P.O. Box 47003
Gardena, CA 90247-3778
jfelix@ci.gardena.ca.us

City of Glendale
c/o Maurice Oillataguerre
Senior Environmental Program Scientist
Eng. Section, 633 East Broadway, Rm. 209
Glendale, CA 91206-4308
moillataguerre@ci.glendale.ca.us

City of Glendora
c/o Dave Davies
Deputy Director of Public Works
116 East Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741
ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us

City of Hawaiian Gardens
c/o Joseph Colombo
Director of Community Development
21815 Pioneer Boulevard
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716
jcolombo@ghcity.org

City of Hawthorne
c/o Arnold Shadbeh
Chief General Service and Public Works
4455 West 126th Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250-4482
ashadbeh@cityofhawthorne.org

City of Hermosa Beach
c/o Homayoun Behboodi
Associate Engineer
1315 Valley Drive
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-3884
hbehboodi@hermosabch.org

City of Hidden Hills
c/o Kimberly Colberts
Environmental Coordinator
6165 Spring Valley Road
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

City of Huntington Park
c/o Craig Melich
City Engineer and City Official
6550 Miles Avenue
Huntington Park, CA 90255

City of Industry
c/o Mike Nagaoka
Director of Public Safety
P.O. Box 3366
Industry, CA 91744-3995

City of Inglewood
c/o Lauren Amimoto
Senior Administrative Analyst
1 W. Manchester Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Inglewood, CA 90301-1750
lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org

City of Irwindale
c/o Kwok Tam
Director of Public Works
5050 North Irwindale Avenue
Irwindale, CA 91706
ktam@ci.irwindale.ca.us

City of La Canada Flintridge
c/o Edward G. Hitti
Director of Public Works
1327 Foothill Boulevard
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-2137
ehitti@lcf.ca.gov

City of La Habra Heights
c/o Shauna Clark, City Manager
1245 North Hacienda Boulevard
La Habra Heights, CA 90631-2570
shaunac@lhcity.org

City of La Mirada
c/o Steve Forster
Public Works Director
13700 La Mirada Boulevard
La Mirada, CA 90638-0828
sforster@cityoflamirada.org

City of La Puente
c/o John DiMario
Director of Development Services
15900 East Marin Street
La Puente, CA 91744-4788
jdimario@lapuente.org

City of La Verne
c/o Daniel Keesey
Director of Public Works
3660 "D" Street
La Verne, CA 91750-3599
dkeesey@ci.la-verne.ca.us

City of Lakewood
c/o Konya Vivanti
P.O. Box 158
Lakewood, CA 90714-0158
kvivanti@lakewoodcity.org

City of Lawndale
c/o Marlene Miyoshi
Senior Administrative Analyst
14717 Burin Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260

City of Lomita
c/o Tom A. Odom, City Administrator
P.O. Box 339
Lomita, CA 90717-0098
d.tomita@lomitacity.com

City of Los Angeles
c/o Shahram Kharanghani
Program Manager
1149 S. Broadway, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90015

City of Lynwood
c/o Josef Kekula
11330 Bullis Road
Lynwood, CA 90262-3693

City of Malibu
c/o Jennifer Brown
Environmental Program Analyst
23825 Stuart Ranch Road
Malibu, CA 90265-4861
jbrown@malibucity.org

City of Manhattan Beach
c/o Brian Wright, Water Supervisor
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795
bwright@citymb.info

City of Maywood
c/o Andre Dupret, Project Manager
4319 East Slauson Avenue
Maywood, CA 90270-2897

City of Monrovia
c/o Heather Maloney
415 South Ivy Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016-2888
hmaloney@ci.monrovia.ca.gov

City of Montebello
c/o Cory Roberts
1600 West Beverly Boulevard
Montebello, CA 90640-3970
croberts@aaeinc.com

City of Monterey Park
c/o Amy Ho or John Hunter, Consultant
320 West Newmark Avenue
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2896
amho@montereypark.ca.gov
jhunter@jhla.net

City of Norwalk
c/o Daniel R. Garcia, City Engineer
P.O. Box 1030
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030
dgarcia@norwalkca.gov

City of Palos Verdes Estates
c/o Allan Rigg, Director of Public Works
340 Palos Verdes Drive West
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
arigg@pvestates.org

City of Paramount
c/o Christopher S. Cash
Director of Public Works
16400 Colorado Avenue
Paramount, CA 90723-5091
ccash@paramountcity.com

City of Pasadena
c/o Stephen Walker
P.O. Box 7115
Pasadena, CA 91109-7215
swalker@cityofpasadena.net

City of Pico Rivera
c/o Art Cervantes
Director of Public Works
P.O. Box 1016
Pico Rivera, CA 90660-1016
acervantes@pico-rivera.org

City of Pomona
c/o Julie Carver
Environmental Programs Coordinator
P.O. Box 660
Pomona, CA 91769-0660
julie_carver@ci.pomona.ca.us

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
c/o Ray Holland
Interim Public Works Director
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
clehr@rpv.com

City of Redondo Beach
c/o Mike Shay
Principal Civil Engineer
P.O. Box 270
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-0270
mshay@redondo.org

City of Rolling Hills
c/o Greg Grammer
Assistant to the City Manager
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199
ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov

City of Rolling Hills Estates
c/o Greg Grammer
Assistant to the City Manager
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
ggrammer@rollinghillsestatesca.gov

City of Rosemead
c/o Chris Marcarello
Director of Public Works
8838 East Valley Boulevard
Rosemead, CA 91770-1787

City of San Dimas
c/o Latoya Cyrus
Environmental Services Coordinator
245 East Bonita Avenue
San Dimas, CA 91773-3002
lcyrus@ci.san-dimas.ca.us

City of San Fernando
c/o Ron Ruiz
Director of Public Works
117 Macneil Street
San Fernando, CA 91340
[rruiz@sfcity.org](mailto:r Ruiz@sfcity.org)

City of San Gabriel
c/o Daren T. Grilley, City Engineer
425 South Mission Drive
San Gabriel, CA 91775

City of San Marino
c/o Chuck Richie
Director of Parks and Public Works
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, CA 91108-2691
criche@cityofsanmarino.org

City of Santa Clarita
c/o Travis Lange
Environmental Services Manager
23920 West Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

City of Santa Fe Springs
c/o Sarina Morales-Choate
Civil Engineer Assistant
P.O. Box 2120
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-2120
smorales-choate@santafesprings.org

City of Santa Monica
c/o Neal Shapiro
Urban Runoff Coordinator
1685 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401-3295
nshapiro@smgov.net

City of Sierra Madre
c/o James Carlson, Management Analyst
232 West Sierra Madre Boulevard
Sierra Madre, CA 91024-2312

City of Signal Hill
c/o John Hunter
2175 Cherry Avenue
Signal Hill, CA 90755
jhunter@jlha.net

City of South El Monte
c/o Anthony Ybarra, City Manager
1415 North Santa Anita Avenue
South El Monte, CA 91733-3389

City of South Gate
c/o John Hunter
8650 California Avenue
South Gate, CA 90280
jhunter@jlha.net

City of South Pasadena
c/o John Hunter
1414 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030-3298
jhunter@jlha.net

City of Temple City
c/o Joe Lambert or John Hunter
9701 Las Tunas Drive
Temple City, CA 91780-2249
jhunter@ilha.net

City of Torrance
c/o Leslie Cortez
Senior Administrative Assistant
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503-5059

City of Vernon
c/o Claudia Arellano
4305 Santa Fe Avenue
Vernon, CA 90058-1786

City of Walnut
c/o Jack Yoshino
Senior Management Assistant
P.O. Box 682
Walnut, CA 91788

City of West Covina
c/o Samuel Gutierrez
Engineering Technician
P.O. Box 1440
West Covina, CA 91793-1440
sam.gutierrez@westcovina.org

City of West Hollywood
c/o Sharon Perlstein, City Engineer
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069-4314
sperlstein@weho.org

City of Westlake Village
c/o Joe Bellomo
Stormwater Program Manager
31200 Oak Crest Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361
jbellomo@willdan.com

City of Whittier
c/o David Mochizuki
Director of Public Works
13230 Penn Street
Whittier, CA 90602-1772
dmoichizuki@cityofwhittier.org

County of Los Angeles
c/o Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy
Director, Division Engineer
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803
ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov

Los Angeles County Flood Control District
c/o Gary Hildebrand, Assistant Deputy
Director, Division Engineer
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803
ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov