## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.5.6:</td>
<td>The contractor shall ensure that construction crews and work vessel crews are briefed daily on the potential for sea turtles and marine mammals to be present and provided with identification characteristics of sea turtles, seals, sea lions, and dolphin. The project marine biologist shall periodically confirm that this measure is implemented and include verification in a monthly monitoring report.</td>
<td>Contractor and Project Marine Biologist, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout dredging operations and application of clean sand cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.5.7:</td>
<td>The contractor shall ensure that all construction activity be temporarily stopped if a sea turtle or marine mammal is sighted within 100 meters of the construction zone until the sea turtle or marine mammal is safely outside the outer perimeter of project activities. The biological monitor, who will be on site periodically during dredging activities, shall have the authority to halt construction operation and shall determine when construction operations can proceed. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) shall verify implementation of this mitigation measure.</td>
<td>Contractor and Project Marine Biologist, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout dredging operations and application of clean sand cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.5.8:</td>
<td>The biological monitor shall prepare an incident report of any green sea turtle or marine mammal activity in the project area and shall inform the contractor to have his/her crews be aware of the potential for additional sightings. The report shall be provided within 24 hours to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). In the event a sea turtle, pinniped, or cetacean is injured or killed as consequence of a collision, the vessel operator and the appointed shipyard safety personnel shall be required to immediately notify the NMFS (Southwest Division) and shall submit a written, follow-up report within 24 hours of the incident. Any injured sea turtle or marine mammal shall be transported to an agency-approved treatment facility. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) shall verify implementation of this mitigation measure.</td>
<td>Project Marine Biologist, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Upon sighting or green sea turtle or marine mammal during dredging operations and application of clean sand cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.5.9:</td>
<td>A qualified biologist familiar with the California least tern and other special-status seabirds and waterfowl shall be retained and be on site to assess the roosting and foraging behavior of special-status seabirds and waterfowl at the Shipyard Sediment Site and selected staging area(s) immediately prior to and during the initial start-up phase of dredging and clean sand cover placement activities. Once it has been determined that activities are not adversely affecting seabirds and waterfowl, the biologist shall not be required to be on site continuously; however, monitoring shall</td>
<td>Project Biologist, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Prior to and ongoing throughout dredging operations and application of clean sand cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.5.10:</td>
<td>Shipyards and San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Prior to initiation of dredging operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure 4.5.10: If Staging Area 5 is selected, prior to initiation of dredging and during final design, the contractor shall endeavor to restrict dewatering and treatment activities to within the western and northern portions of the staging area to the extent feasible. To the extent practicable, activities shall be conducted in locations where existing buildings obstruct sensitive habitat areas from noise sources. The staging area layout shall be submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) (and to the resource agencies, if required) for review and approval.

Mitigation Measure 4.5.11: If Staging Area 5 is selected, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) shall be notified not less than 30 days in advance and shall be given the opportunity to provide recommended measures to minimize impacts from increased noise and human activity to species in the Sweetwater Marsh Unit of the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). All agency-recommended measures (or agency-approved substitute measures, if recommended measures are infeasible) shall be implemented throughout the duration of project activities in Staging Area 5. At a minimum, the applicant shall conduct pre-activity nesting bird surveys within 300 feet of all noise-intensive activities if such activities will be initiated within the breeding season for special-status species (conservatively February 1 through August 31). If nesting birds are identified within 300 feet of activities, a qualified (and, if appropriate based on the species, agency-permitted) biological monitor shall be present on site to observe the behavior of the nesting birds during initiation of...
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.1: The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that dredging, treatment, and haul activities are timed so as not to interfere with peak-hour traffic and to minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site. If necessary, a flag person shall be retained by the construction supervisor to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, treatment and haul activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.2: During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew. These specifications shall be included in the proposed project’s construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of a construction permit.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.3: During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall ensure that on-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of a construction permit.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.4:</strong> During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall ensure that all on-site roads are paved. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.5:</strong> During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall adhere to San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rule 55 to ensure that all material excavated or graded is sufficiently watered to prevent airborne dust from being visible beyond the property line. Watering with complete coverage, and/or surfactants shall be applied to stockpiles of dirt, inactive construction areas, and construction roads if and as necessary. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.6:</strong> During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall ensure that all earthmoving activities cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 mph averaged over 1 hour). Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.7:</strong> During dredging and dewatering activities, the contractor shall ensure that all material transported off site is either sufficiently wet or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. In addition, per San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rule 55, the construction contractor shall ensure that visible roadway dust from track-out/carry-out be minimized. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging, treatment and haul activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.8: The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that all diesel-powered equipment used are retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalysts) to the extent that they are readily available in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.9: The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at the project site use low oxides of nitrogen (NOx) diesel fuel to the extent that it is readily available and cost effective (up to 125 percent of the cost of California Air Resources Board [ARB] diesel) in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). (This does not apply to diesel-powered trucks traveling to and from the project site.) Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.10: The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) are utilized to the extent 1) that the equipment is readily available and 2) if such equipment is available in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), it is also cost effective. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 4.6.11: The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that construction equipment engines are maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Water Board</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.12:</strong> The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, is turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.13:</strong> The contractor shall be required by contract specifications to ensure that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dewatering and treatment operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.14:</strong> The contractor shall utilize alternative-fueled construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible. All diesel-powered construction equipment shall meet or exceed Tier III standards, or shall be equipped with ARB-verified oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filter emission controls, using the greatest control efficiency for the specific category of equipment where feasible. The construction contractor shall demonstrate that these verified/certified technologies are available to be used at the time of project dredging and dewatering activities. These specifications shall be included in the proposed project’s construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to issuance of a construction permit. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 4.6.15:</strong> To accelerate the decomposition process and reduce odor impacts, the contractor shall apply a mixture of Simple Green and water (a ratio of 10:1) to the dredged material to the extent odor issues arise with respect to particular portions of the dredged material. Contract specifications shall be</td>
<td>Contractor, as verified by the San Diego Water Board</td>
<td>Ongoing during dredging and dewatering operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing for Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (San Diego Water Board) prior to the issuance of construction permits. The San Diego Water Board shall verify implementation of this measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Global Climate Change

There are no additional mitigation measures for this topic.

A turion is a specialized overwintering bud produced by aquatic herbs.
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WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
NATIONAL STEEL AND SHIPBUILDING COMPANY
BAE SYSTEMS SAN DIEGO SHIP REPAIR, INC.
SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT
UNITED STATES NAVY
SAN DIEGO BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND – NORTH
SAN DIEGO BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND – SOUTH

July 10, 2013
This report was prepared under the direction of

David T. Barker, P.E., Supervising WRC Engineer, Surface Water Basins Branch
Eric Becker, P.E. Senior Water Resource Control Engineer, Southern Watershed Unit

by

Jody Ebsen, P.G. Engineering Geologist
**COMMENT:** The Waste Discharge Requirements cannot legally list the San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Funds as dischargers. The Waste Discharge Requirements list both the San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund North and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund South as dischargers. Tentative Order No. R9-2013-0093 § II(F) at 7. These funds are not "persons" subject to regulation under the Clean Water Act or the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. See 33 U.S.C. § 1362(5); Cal. Water Code Div. 7 § 13050(c). Including these funds as dischargers creates the possibility of confusing who is actually responsible for doing the cleanup—which are the Responsible Parties under the Cleanup and Abatement Order. The Responsible Parties cannot be shielded from liability for having to clean up the Shipyard site in a way that protects water quality by creating "funds" that apply for the permit. Unless the funds' trustee agrees to be listed as a discharger and accepts liability for the cleanup, the funds should not be listed as dischargers.

**RESPONSE:** The San Diego Water Board named the San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund North and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund South are dischargers where the entities submitted and are named in the Reports of Waste Discharge and the fund signatories will be the same entities which are named Dischargers in the Cleanup and Abatement Order. Water Code Section 13050(c) does not provide an exhaustive definition of the term "person." As suggested by the term "includes", Section 13050(c) is not intended to provide a complete list of what is a "person" under this division of the Water Code. "Person" is construed broadly under the Water Code to include corporations, general partnerships, limited partnerships, trusts, estates, and individuals or corporations "doing business as" an unincorporated business. Therefore, San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund North and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund South are considered "persons" as construed under the Water Code.

It is not the intent of the San Diego Water Board to shield the Dischargers named in the Cleanup and Abatement Order from the responsibility of sediment remediation at the Shipyard Site. The Tentative Order names the Dischargers with the ownership and control of the Shipyard Sediment Remediation Project, namely NASSCO, BAE Systems, and the Restoration Funds as primarily responsible. The San Diego Water Board has the discretion to name the Port District and the Navy as secondarily responsible. The San Diego Water Board may seek enforcement against all or any of these entities for violations of the Tentative Order. Additionally, all Dischargers named in the Cleanup and Abatement Order are accountable for compliance.
with the Cleanup and Abatement Order, and the San Diego Water Board may pursue enforcement against any or all of these entities as well.

13 **COMMENT:** The Waste Discharge Requirements should list the City of San Diego, San Diego Gas & Electric, and San Diego Marine Construction Company, Campbell Industries as dischargers. The Waste Discharge Requirements recognize that the City of San Diego, San Diego Gas & Electric, and Campbell Industries are responsible parties under the Cleanup and Abatement Order. See Tentative Order § II(F) at 7. However, the Waste Discharge Requirements fail to include these responsible parties as dischargers. See Tentative Order at 1, 4. Listing all responsible parties as dischargers increases accountability and ensures that the cleanup proceeds in an efficient and effective manner.

**RESPONSE:** The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act requires all persons discharging waste to file a report of a waste discharge:\(^1\). BAE Systems, NASSCO and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund North and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund South filed Reports of Waste Discharges for the Shipyard Sediment Remediation Project to address sediment cleanup including the dredging of sediment, the dewatering and solidification of the dredged materials, and the transport and removal of material to an appropriate landfill for disposal. As the entities proposing to discharge waste attributable to the Project, BAE Systems, NASSCO and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund North and San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund South are all persons named as Discharger(s) in the Tentative Order and responsible to comply with the waste discharge requirements of the Tentative Order. The Tentative Order does not name as permittees any entities that did not file a Report of Waste Discharge in application for waste discharge requirements for the Shipyard Sediment Remediation Project. The San Diego Regional Board recognizes the City of San Diego, San Diego Gas & Electric and Campbell Industries are all dischargers responsible for the cleanup.

---

\(^1\) Wat. Code, § 13260 (*)(a) All of the following persons shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of the discharge, containing the information which may be required by the regional board: \(\) (1) Any person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state [emphasis added].
## The Background Station Should Be Located Upstream Of The Remedial Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong> The Waste Discharge Requirements note that the background station will be located 1,000 feet from the dredging activity in the direction of the head of the bay and beyond the influence of construction activities. See Tentative Order § VII(B)(2)(c) at 26. But in the Receiving Water Monitoring Diagram, the station is located south, or downstream, of the remedial footprint. See Tentative Order Attachment C. Because an accurate background measurement is vital to the success of water quality monitoring, the background station must be upstream of the remedial footprint and beyond the influence of construction activities.</td>
<td><strong>RESPONSE:</strong> While the narrative description in the Tentative Order and the Remedial Monitoring Plan described in Attachment C of the RAP both correctly describe the required location of the background station, Attachment C, Figure 1 of the Tentative Order depicts the background station in error. The actual position of the background monitoring station will be located 1,000 feet toward the head of the Bay from the remedial footprint and beyond the influence of dredging. This figure will be corrected and included in the Revised Tentative Order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Port District Objects To Being Named As A Discharger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong> The Port District is not the party proposing to make the discharges for which the WDRs are being issued, nor is it the operator of any of the facilities on which the discharges are proposed to be made; it is merely the non-operating landlord and public trustee of the subject tidelands under the San Diego Unified Port District Act (Harb. &amp; Nav. Code, App. 1).</td>
<td><strong>RESPONSE:</strong> Various State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Orders and policy memoranda clearly establish that the San Diego Water Board has the discretion to name the Port District as a “Discharger” in the Tentative Order even though it will not be involved in or controlling the day to day operations of the Project, subject to certain considerations. In Order No. WQ.90-3 the State Water Board held that the Port District may properly be named as a “Discharger” in waste discharge requirements (WDRs) under the California Water Code with the provision that 1) the WDRs should not hold the Port District responsible for the day to day operation of the regulated facilities or for monitoring requirements and 2) the WDRs must provide the Port District with the opportunity to attain tenant compliance prior to San Diego Water Board enforcement action against the Port District. The inclusion of the Port District as a “Discharger” in the Tentative Order, under these circumstances, is discretionary. This being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
said, it is not the customary practice of the San Diego Water Board to name the Port District as primarily responsible in WDRs or NPDES permits issued to its tenants. Moreover, the Port District, in its comment letter, offered its assistance in maintaining the Project applicants' compliance with the Tentative Order as well as its independent assistance in enforcing the Coastal Development Permits as necessary. Based on these considerations the Tentative Order will be revised to remove the Port District as a Discharger. The San Diego Water Board may exercise its discretion during these proceedings to name the Port District as a Discharger which is secondarily liable for permit obligations under the Tentative Order.

In applying similar reasoning, the Tentative Order will be revised to also exclude the U.S. Navy as a Discharger. The Tentative Order also includes the U.S. Navy as a "Discharger" based on its ownership of the S-Lane parcel where sediment dewatering and stockpiling operations are scheduled to occur. As with the Port District, the U.S. Navy is a "non-operating" landowner and will not be engaged with the day to day operations of the Project at the S-Lane parcel. The inclusion of the U.S. Navy as a "Discharger" in the Tentative Order, under these circumstances is not mandatory. Based on these considerations the Tentative Order will be revised to remove the U.S. Navy as a Discharger. The San Diego Water Board may exercise its discretion during these proceedings to name the U.S. Navy as a Discharger which is secondarily liable for permit obligations under the Tentative Order.

| 40 | **COMMENT:** Consistent with the 1990 agreement between the State Water Board, the Regional Board, and the Port District, the Regional Board's long-standing business practice has been not to name the Port District as primarily liable in WDRs issued for work to be performed by or on behalf of its tenants and there is no reason to depart from that practice in connection with these WDRs. | **RESPONSE:** See response to comment 39. | Commenter: San Diego Unified Port District |
| 41 | **COMMENT:** In no event can the Port District be liable for any proposed activities or WDRs issued with respect to the "S Lane," which is owned by the United States Navy, and over which the Port District has no jurisdictional authority. | **RESPONSE:** Comment noted. Persons who own land on which a discharge is occurring can properly be included as "dischargers" in waste discharger requirements under the California | Commenter: San Diego Unified Port District |
Water Code. This principle is based on three elements: ownership of the land, knowledge of the activity and the ability to control it where the source of the discharge is the land and the activities on the land. The application of these general principles to the S-Lane parcel would support the Port District's position that it should not be held accountable as a public trustee for discharges from the S-Lane parcel over which it has no jurisdiction with the possible exception of discharges from the S-Lane Parcel into a municipal separate storm water (MS4) conveyance system owned or operated by the Port District.
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component to improving water quality in San Diego Bay. At this time staff recommends adoption of the revised order. And as some housekeeping, as Chairman Morales indicated, there are a couple of errata sheets floating around, both for the tentative order and for the response to comments document. Copies have been passed out, and there are copies available on the back table.

So if you have questions?

MR. MORALES: Okay.

MS. EBSEN: Thank you.

MR. MORALES: Thank you.

MR. BARKER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. For the record, my name is David Barker. I just wanted to add on a little to what Ms. Ebsen concerning the naming of the dischargers in the order.

As you can probably read in the Executive Officer's summary report, the staff removed the Port District and the U.S. Navy as primarily responsible parties under the order. However, in the Executive Officer's report, we explained that it is within the Board's discretion to name the Port District and the Navy as a secondarily liable party in the order subject to certain conditions. And staff is open to listening to the testimony on this matter and may have recommendations for you after that.
that SDG&E and BAE attempt to work those out.

But in no way has the Port been in any way an
obstructionist at all. And we look forward to adopting
the CDPs at our next meeting and having the work go
forward.

And I'm happy to address the concerns or
questions that any staff or Board members may have.

Thank you.

MR. ABARBANEL: Does the Port dispute its being named
as discharger under the CAO?

MS. GROSS: Yes. Board member, as you know, we do
name -- we have disputed and filed a petition with the
State Board along with all of the other dischargers on
various grounds.

MR. ABARBANEL: Yes? Okay. Thank you. The Port is a
public agency; isn't it?

MS. GROSS: Yes, it is.

MR. ABARBANEL: Don't you think it ought to be a good
citizen?

MS. GROSS: Yes, and I believe it is.

MR. ABARBANEL: So you have said that you have not
obstructed conversations between SDG&E and BAE?

MS. GROSS: No. We have not obstructed access to the
property, sir.

MR. ABARBANEL: Pardon me?
MS. GROSS: Well, we could get third-party claims, or we could get enforcement proceedings from you all separate and apart from CAO enforcement proceedings because there are different requirements in the WDRs that are in addition to and on top of the regulatory and compliance measures in the CAO.

MR. ABARBANEL: I wonder if I can ask Sharon's question and the Chairman's question in another way.

MR. MORALES: Sure you can.

MR. ABARBANEL: As I understand it from you, you were named as a discharger. You have CDP authority through the Coastal Commission. And you're the landlord. You're intimately connected with the success or failure of the San Diego Bay cleanup project.

Why doesn't the Port stand up as a good citizen, drop the argument that you are not a discharger, acquire the control that you say that you don't have by joining the cleanup, and stop acting as a bad representative of me? Why not?

MS. GROSS: Well, I --

MR. ABARBANEL: I know you don't have the authority to do that. I'm asking you to convey that to the Port commissioners who do have the authority and are the representatives of the people who will benefit from the cleanup of San Diego Bay, which is everyone in this room.
MS. GROSS: Well, with all due respect, member of the Board, naming us on the WDRs is not going to get the cleanup done any --

MR. ABARBANEL: I'm not asking you about that. I'm asking you to rise above, in my opinion, the irresponsible position that the Port has taken and take responsibility for this beneficial act for the citizens of San Diego. Why cannot the Port do that?

MS. GROSS: Well, I respectfully disagree with your --

MR. ABARBANEL: You may do so. I'm asking you to convey that to the Port Commission, not on behalf of the Board. They are not going to vote on that. Just on behalf of the 3 million people who live in San Diego County.

MS. GROSS: All right.

MR. ABARBANEL: They count, too.

MS. GROSS: Is there any other questions?

MR. STRAWN: I have a question, but I'm not going to address it to you. I'd like staff to basically step in here.

In your recommendation --

MS. KALEMKAARIAN: We all agree with your question that you haven't asked yet, Gary.

MR. STRAWN: Well, I was hearing two things. And I'm going, "What? Why? What am I" -- can you answer the
operating the dredging project, but they own the land on which that activity is occurring. And so the State Board order indicated that the regional boards had the discretion to name the Port District in the order subject to two stipulations.

One was that the Board not hold the Port District accountable for day-to-day operations of the project or for submission of monitoring reports. And the second condition was that the Board would not take action against the Port District for any incidents of non-compliance with the order until the Port had been given the opportunity to gain compliance from its tenants. And those two actions are described in the EO report.

And right now, it's not the standard practice of the Regional Board on San Diego Bay permits to name the Port District as a secondarily liable party, although we have the discretion to do so as I explained. And so kind of based on those considerations, we just removed the Port District from the order. But I know there's special considerations on this cleanup, and that -- so I left open the possibility that during these proceedings and after hearing the testimony, the Board could name the San Diego Unified Port District as a secondarily liable party in the order as a discharger.

And so that's basically staff's rationale. And
as I mentioned earlier this morning, we have some proposed language available that would accomplish that.

MR. ABARBANEL: I wonder if I may ask Gary's question another way both to you, Dave, and anybody else on the staff.

MR. MORALES: Actually, you can't ask it. Oh, we can at this point.

MR. ABARBANEL: I'll ask Ether (phonetic).

MR. MORALES: Whoever can answer -- the cloud. We don't know what --

MR. ABARBANEL: After only a decade of contentious adversarial and finally agreeable conversations, cleanup and abatement order was issued in 2012 for the San Diego Bay.

MR. MORALES: Two decades.

MR. ABARBANEL: Two decades? I'm sorry. What's a decade here or there? You know, why rush?

And dischargers were named. They may contend that they shouldn't be named. That's their privilege.

But they were named.

Why isn't every discharger who was named a responsible party for every aspect of the cleanup?

MR. BARKER: Well, in answer to that, the Board has a straight pathway to take enforcement against any party that violates any aspect of the cleanup and abatement
order irrespective of what parties are named in this order. This order is regulating discharges from a remediation project that is intended to implement the requirements of the CAO. And so we have named in this order the parties that applied for the permit and are going to be serving as the project operators. But that --

MR. ABARBANEL: I understand.

MR. BARKER: Yeah. Okay.

MR. ABARBANEL: I'm not arguing that anybody is violating the order -- the CAO.

MR. BARKER: Yeah.

MR. ABARBANEL: What I'm trying to say -- isn't the simplest position that this Board could take is that all parties named as dischargers are responsible for the implementation of the CAO? The one that's in front of us now? The ones that would be in front of us over the new few years? And as this cleanup maybe actually gets started?

MR. MORALES: Could I maybe try and ask it a different way?

MR. ABARBANEL: Of course.

MR. MORALES: Well, you know, why are we creating, like, a Venn diagram where there's, like, not overlap? In other words, I think Henry is asking rather than give people a reason to make a claim that, "Hey, we're
responsible over here but not over here" -- if everybody
in the circle is responsible here, here, here, and here,
 nobody can be pointing fingers that it relates to
 something else.

MR. ABARBANEL: That's it. Yes.
MS. HAGAN: May I offer a clarification?
MR. MORALES: Yeah.
MS. HAGAN: Nothing that you do today affects the
decision that you made to name the parties to the cleanup
and abatement order.

MR. MORALES: Right.
MR. ABARBANEL: Understood.
MS. HAGAN: Nothing you do today --
MR. MORALES: We're not revisiting that.
MS. HAGAN: Failure to comply -- failure to implement
the dredging that's proposed in a timely fashion subjects
everybody named on the cleanup order to potential
enforcement for not complying with the cleanup order. In
my view, the waste discharge requirements are a mechanism
to implement -- to permit the activity that's required to
comply with the cleanup and abatement order.

But waste discharge requirements are usually
issued to first the entities who applied for them who will
actually conduct the activities and, in some instances, to
the landowner. Because the landowner, if they're not the
discharger themselves conducting the activity, has
ownership of the land, ability to control access to the
land, ability to regulate the activity occurring on the
land. So they have a special position that some of the
other named entities in the cleanup order do not have
unless they are also a landowner in the location where the
dredging is actually occurring.

MR. MORALES: Am I missing something, or is that
arguing in favor of having more people? And
particularly --

MS. HAGAN: No. I'm just trying to clarify that I
don't think you have --

MR. MORALES: No. I know you're not arguing --

MS. HAGAN: Yeah.

MR. MORALES: -- the position. I want to be clear.

MS. HAGAN: The legal basis I think is tenuous for
naming all of the parties to the cleanup order to these
waste discharge requirements because they don't have --
unless they are all part of the group that's actually out
there every day doing the work, they don't have a direct
role in it in how the waste discharge requirements and the
activities it permits are implemented.

MR. MORALES: Except that they would still be
responsible under the CAO for what was done by the people
that are --
speakers -- apologies to those of you who have given us green cards. We will break for lunch at that point. So we'll hear from public after a brief lunch break.

MR. SILVERSTEIN: Okay. But you do want to hear some brief comments from the Navy; right?

MR. MORALES: Brief is good.

MR. SILVERSTEIN: Brief. Brief. Okay. This is Dave Silverstein. I'm here for the Navy.

We weren't going to say very much about this because we would like you to adopt WDRs because we're anxious that this project goes forward, too. We don't want to miss -- we don't want to miss any deadlines under the CAO.

I'm a little interested, let's say, in this idea of adding -- of just adding everybody who's in the CAO to the WDRs. I think that what's going on here is that the reason the attention is on the Port is because the Port hasn't cooperated in this process. Other parties like the Navy has cooperated. The Navy has cooperated a great deal.

The Navy hasn't said, "We're not a party. You know, you need to throw us out of here. We're cooperating." We're going to -- we're doing our best to make land available for sediment management so this thing can go forward. And I don't think you gain anything from
MR. MORALES: That's fine. Now, before we close, staff?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. At this time staff would recommend adopting the tentative order with the four errata sheets as described. Thank you. That's it.

MS. KALEMKIARIAN: Staff isn't changing its recommendation then as to the Port?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have -- not at this time.

MS. KALEMKIARIAN: Okay. Just asking so that we know. So you're leaving that to us? To our discretion?

MR. MORALES: That's why we make the big bucks.

MS. KALEMKIARIAN: Exactly.

MR. YOUNG: This is Vanessa Young. I just wanted to clarify -- as David Barker said, we do have and have prepared additional language. But it was our original intention kind of in narrowing the scope of those who we named in the WDRs. And that we do have that language at this time if the Board would like to add it.

I did have one clarifying question I wanted to ask Ms. Hagan, if possible, on Errata 3. And it was just a question in regards to the last sentence. Just in terms of the last sentence starting with, "Nothing in this order shall be construed as a finding" --

MR. MORALES: Oh, that's 4.
the project site excluding the S-Lane parcel is also
responsible for compliance with this order subject to" --
and then what we have as footnote 1 -- Order Number WQ903,
et cetera, et cetera, to the end of that paragraph. So
that captures the limitations from the prior State Board
agreement or order.

Would that work?

MS. HAGAN: I do want to point out you are not bound
to -- if you choose to name the Port because they are also
named on the cleanup and abatement order --

MR. MORALES: We don't have to?

MS. HAGAN: You are not bound by the secondary
responsibility statements in the Order 90-3 --

MR. MORALES: Oh, even better.

MS. HAGAN: I don't believe the Board is bound in any
way by that particular agreement or understanding in that
precedential order. So I wanted to make -- I may not have
made that clear. I did a little more research over the
lunchtime, and so I wanted to point that out to you.

MR. MORALES: In that case, I would strike that entire
portion in that I guess it becomes just a single sentence
almost.

Is the remainder of the language --

MS. KALEMKIARIAN: Well, I mean, we're simply --

Mr. Chair, we just put them back in. I mean, that's the
is responsible.

So that will change elements of each of the three errata, I believe. But our intention is just to put the Port District back in, to leave the deletion of the Navy, and then to adjust the other errata as necessary to be in compliance with that intention.

MR. ABARBANEL: I'll second that. Time for discussion?

MR. MORALES: Discussion.

MR. ABARBANEL: Okay. I have to say I second the motion, and I will vote for it. But I wanted to make some comments because a lot of today was discovering that certain parties -- in particular, BAE and NASSCO -- understood what the goal of the CAO was from last year. And while I think some of the other parties probably understood it, not all of them were here, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

I would have been most proud of the Port had they come in and demanded to do what this motion does so that they would be a responsible part of our government, and they didn't. I'm sorry that we have to do it for you. I don't understand why.

But maybe you, Port -- aren't very many Port people here still. Maybe the Port should think over what it means to be responsible and the benefit that they and
other people achieve by cleaning up the bay after -- I
learned only 20 years of discussion -- we figured out how
to do. I would really appreciate that.

I don't think they should keep coming back here
and tell us they don't want to play. That's done. And to
say it again, it's not part of this motion but part of my
comments. Doesn't matter what I say now.

I really think that after 20 years of discussion,
there was a decision made. It was a community decision.
I came in on the end of it. Tomas and I had the privilege
of discussing it and voting on it but also the privilege
of not having to spend weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks
of listening to testimony to get to where we've gotten to.
We made that decision.

There is a real benefit for everybody for
cleaning up the San Diego Bay. Let's just get to it. And
instead of dissecting who's responsible for what micro
part of it, that everybody accept that they're all
responsible for all of it. And that we should, in our
future pieces of action whether they're WDRs or ABCs or
the PQLs or whatever labels they are -- everybody should
say, "Let's all get together and do it." I hope that will
be the case.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: I was just going to comment in that the
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absolutely right.

SDG&E has made repeated statements regarding the deflection of responsibility and testimony regarding the role of the shipyards as sources of the primary pollutants of concern, yet the shipyards have not disputed their role or their dischargers. Indeed, they have owned them here at this podium. It is SDG&E, in my view and the cleanup team's view, that has not owned its responsibility in this matter. It is not a choice for you, as Board members, between SDG&E. The cleanup team asserts it is, in fact -- they are both responsible.

With regard to the naming of the Port as a primary responsible party, I will personally own that I had personal misgivings about naming the Port as a primary responsible party, and that Mr. Carrigan has properly and accurately described his position and his recommendations from -- on that question from the very day he arrived and started working on the cleanup team.

But for all of the reasons provided in the Draft Technical Report, the Cleanup and Abatement Order, the CUT stands by its recommendation.

I do note, however -- and I warmly share Mr. Brown's assertion that -- in his opening remarks, that the Port is the Water Board's best friend, maybe its only friend -- to quote him -- in this and future cleanups in...
Attachment F
Pursuant to California Water Code Section 13320 of California Water Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Section 2050, the San Diego Unified Port District (Port) petitions the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review and modify the final decision of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Regional Board) in adopting Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R9-2012-0024 (CAO or Order), with its supporting Technical Report (TR). The CAO and TR improperly identify the Port as a
primarily liable discharger. A copy of the adopted CAO and relevant portions of the TR are attached as Attachments A and B respectively.

A review of the record confirms that this decision was motivated entirely by improper considerations, an incorrect application of the proper legal standard and an absence of evidence to support critical factual findings. While the Port strongly supports the remedial efforts reflected in the CAO and remains committed to providing appropriate support, the Regional Board’s decision to name the Port as a primary discharger is untenable. The Port requests the opportunity to submit additional briefing or evidence in reply to the Regional Board’s or other interested parties’ responses to this petition.¹

I.

NAMES AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PETITIONER

The name and address of the Port is:

San Diego Unified Port District
Celia Brewer, Port Attorney
Ellen Gross, Deputy Port Attorney
P.O. Box 120488
San Diego, CA 92112-0488

The Port can be contacted through its legal counsel:

Brown & Winters
William D. Brown
120 Birmingham Drive, Suite 110
Cardiff, CA. 92007
Telephone: (760) 633-4485
E-mail: bbrown@brownandwinters.com

II.

SPECIFIC ACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD TO BE REVIEWED

The Port requests that the State Board review the Regional Board’s determination in Regional Board Order No. R9-2012-0024 that the Port should be named 1) a primarily liable discharger as a non-discharging public entity landlord for contamination attributable to its

¹ The full administrative record in this matter is voluminous. To assist the State Board’s review of the most pertinent evidence and information, the Port is submitting excerpts from this administrative record as attachments to its petition. This is without prejudice to the Port’s reliance upon or citation to other documents in the administrative record as and when appropriate.
tenants’ discharges within the Shipyard Sediment Site; and 2) a discharger as the owner and
operator of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) that discharges to the Shipyard
Sediment Site at outfalls SW4 and SW9. The Port requests the State Board determine that both
findings are improper as an abuse of the Regional Board’s discretion and without any supporting
substantial evidence.²

III.

DATE ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED

IV.

STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY THE REGIONAL BOARD’S ACTIONS
WERE INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER
The Port is a non-discharging public entity landlord entitled to secondary, rather than
primary, liability. The process leading to the CAO and TR spanned several years. Through most
of that time, multiple drafts of the CAO and related TR³ acknowledged that under the law and
facts of this matter, the Port should not be designated a primary discharger because the Port was
a non-discharging landlord and the primary dischargers were cooperating and able to perform the
cleanup.⁴ Late in this process, with no change in facts or law, the Cleanup Team⁵ (CUT)
abruptly switched the Port to a primary discharger. At this same time, again with no change in

² The adopted CAO also removed Star & Crescent Boat Company as a named primary
discharger. In the event any interested party files a petition challenging this aspect of the
CAO, the Port notes that it would join in such a petition.

³ Mirroring the terms used through this process, the petition will refer to prior CAO drafts with
the acronym “TCAO [Tentative Cleanup and Abatement Order] and prior TR drafts with the

⁴ There have been numerous prior iterations of the TCAO which can be located in the
Shipyard Administrative Record [SAR] or on the Regional Board’s website. The previous
iterations include: 1) April 29, 2005 (SAR 156322–156355; 2) August 24, 2007
(http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/san_diego/water_issues/programs/shipyards_sediment/2005
0126cut.shtml); 3) April 4, 2008 (SAR 375752–375779); 4) December 22, 2009 (SAR
378622–378660/Attachment C); 5) September 15, 2010 (SAR 382474–382519/Attachment
D); and 6) September 15, 2011 TCAO.

⁵ CUT served as the advocate for the Regional Board position and had responsibility for
presenting evidence to the Regional Board and developing the various versions of the
TCAOs and corresponding DTRs.
any facts or law, CUT added a new justification for Port liability -- discharges from the MS4 at
two outfalls within the Shipyard Sediment Site. These revisions by CUT were ultimately
approved by the Regional Board in the adopted CAO and TR.

When asked to explain the inexplicable about face, CUT claimed the Port was non-
cooperative and withdrew from a voluntary mediation process the Port had initiated. The Port
rebutted these claims of non-cooperation with compelling evidence prior to and during the
administrative trial that demonstrated the Port’s cooperation and support. Faced with this
evidence and lacking any actual evidence to support its position, CUT then changed its story and
claimed that the primary motivation for the change was prior counsel’s misunderstanding of the
law. CUT’s decision to name the Port as a primary discharger was motivated and justified by
improper considerations. The Regional Board ultimately adopted and ratified this improper
decision in approving the CAO and TR. These decisions were an arbitrary and capricious
exercise of CUT and the Regional Board’s power and were an abuse of its discretion.

Furthermore, the newly offered justification for the change is equally unpersuasive and
without support in the record. Neither CUT nor the Regional Board ever articulated how the
detailed factual and legal analysis regarding the Port’s secondary liability in the prior TCAOs
and DTRs was erroneous. Rather, the CAO’s approach is contrary to numerous State Board
Orders and the Regional Board’s own practices in which a non-discharging landlord is
responsible for conducting a cleanup when the primary dischargers fail to comply with the CAO.
Here, the record confirms that the primary dischargers have been cooperative and have pledged
continued cooperation. Placing the Port in a position of primary liability prior to actual
noncompliance violates the legal authorities and reserves the Port’s secondary liability for an
undisclosed time in the future when it will serve no meaningful purpose. This approach to the
well-established principles of secondary liability is both arbitrary and capricious and
unsupported by any substantial evidence in the record.

Finally, the CAO incorrectly imposes liability upon the Port as an owner and operator of
MS4 facilities. This basis of liability was newly added for the first time in conjunction with the
arbitrary decision to reclassify the Port’s liability and is thus tainted by the same improper
motivations. Further, the undisputed evidence in the record is that the City of San Diego (City)
owns and operates the MS4 in question, directly contrary to the CAO findings. Finally, neither CUT nor the Regional Board ever tested at the point of discharge to support the conclusion that the MS4 discharges are in violation of the permit, contrary to directly applicable law. These reasons and the legal authority supporting the Port’s position shall be discussed in greater detail in Section VII, below.

V.

MANNER IN WHICH PORT IS AGGRIEVED

If the CAO’s arbitrary and capricious findings of Port primary liability as a non-discharging public entity landlord are not reversed, the Port will be subjected to significant costs of compliance and regulatory oversight that should properly be borne by the primary dischargers. If the CAO’s arbitrary and capricious findings of Port liability for the MS4 discharges are not reversed, the Port will be subjected to significant costs of maintaining, upgrading and monitoring systems the Port does not own, operate or control. Additionally, absent reversal of these findings, there is an increased risk the Port will be repeatedly subjected to similar error in the future at other sites.

VI.

REQUESTED STATE BOARD ACTION

Pursuant to Water Code section 13320(c), the Port requests that the State Board find CUT and the Regional Board abused its discretion and acted arbitrarily and capriciously by naming the Port as a primary discharger and by naming the Port as a discharger with respect to the MS4 discharges. The Port requests on this basis that the State Board amend the CAO and TR as follows: (1) to delete the determination of Port primary liability in section 11 of the CAO and TR; (2) to designate the Port as secondarily liable with responsibility for compliance with the CAO only upon notice to the Port by the Regional Board that the primary dischargers have failed to comply with the CAO obligations; (3) to delete the determination in section 11 of the CAO and TR finding that the Port is a discharger based on MS4 discharges; and (4) to delete any associated requirements in the CAO Directives A.3-A.5 that require the Port to conduct the MS4 investigation, monitoring and reporting.
VII.

STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES

The TR acknowledges that "[t]here is no evidence in the record that the Port of San Diego initiated or contributed to the actual discharge of waste to the Shipyard Sediment Site."

(Attachment B [TR] at p. 11-4.) Yet, the CAO improperly imposes primary liability upon the Port on two stated bases. Specifically, the CAO concludes:

The San Diego Water Board has the discretion to name the Port District in its capacity as the State's trustee as a "discharger" and does so in the Shipyard Sediment site CAO. The Port District asserts that its status as a lessor and State's trustee as well as other factors should only give rise to secondary and not primary liability as a discharger under this Order. Allocation of responsibility has not been determined and there is insufficient evidence to establish that present and former Port District tenants at the Site each have sufficient financial resources to perform all of the remedial activities required by this Order. In addition, cleanup is not underway at this time. Under these circumstances, it is not appropriate to accord the Port District secondary liability status it seeks.

The Port District also owns and operates a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) through which it discharges waste commonly found in urban runoff to San Diego Bay subject to the terms and conditions of an NPDES Storm Water Permit. The San Diego Water Board finds that the Port District has discharged urban storm waste containing waste directly or indirectly to San Diego Bay at the Shipyard Sediment Site. ....

The urban storm water containing waste that has discharged from the on-site and off-site MS4 has contributed to the accumulation of pollutants in the marine sediments at the Shipyard Sediment Site to levels, that cause, and threaten to cause, conditions of pollution, contamination and nuisance by exceeding applicable water quality objectives for toxic pollutants in San Diego Bay. Based on these considerations the San Diego Unified Port District is referred to as "Discharger(s)" in this CAO.

(Attachment A [CAO] at pp.7-8.)

As set forth fully below, the Regional Board's adoption of the CAO and these findings was an arbitrary and capricious decision. The evidence developed through the administrative process confirms irrefutably that the decision to name the Port a primarily liable, rather than secondarily liable, discharger was not grounded in any proper factual basis but animated solely by improper bias. Further, the justification offered in the CAO for the Port's primary liability is
also unsupported by the facts and law, and also constitutes an arbitrary and capricious decision. Finally, the determination of Port liability for the MS4 discharges is unsupported by any substantial evidence. (*Petition of ExxonMobil*, WQ 85-7 [substantial evidence requires credible and reasonable evidence which indicates the named party has responsibility].)

A. **The Regional Board Abused its Discretion in Naming the Port as a Primarily Responsible Discharger**

The adopted CAO was the culmination of a process in which CUT prepared numerous TCAOs and DTRs. From April 2005 to December 2009, CUT issued four draft CAOs and draft TRs (see, footnote 4, *supra*), each of which conducted a thorough analysis of the law and facts pertinent to the issue of the Port’s liability. Specifically, the DTR cited the following facts relevant to secondary liability:

1) The absence of “evidence in the record that the Port ... initiated or contributed to the actual discharge of waste” (*Petition of Prudential Insurance Company*, Order WQ 87-6, p. 3 [noting petitioner “did not in any way initiate or contribute to the actual discharge of waste”]; *Petition of Wenwest*, WQ 92-13, p. 6 [party had “nothing to do with the activity” that resulted in discharges]; *Petition of ALCOA*, WQ 93-9, p. 12 fn. 8 [discussing secondary liability authority and noting application to non-discharging landlords]);

2) The absence of evidence in the record that the Port’s tenants had “insufficient financial resources” to clean up the site (*Petition of Wenwest*, WQ 92-13, p. 9 [concluding non-discharging landlords “should be required to perform the cleanup only in the event of default by [the primary dischargers]” when primary dischargers are “capable of ... undertaking the cleanup”];

3) The fact “[t]he major [site] investigation to determine the extent of pollution at the [site] were satisfactorily completed” by the primarily responsible parties (*Petition of Prudential Insurance Company*, WQ 87-6, p. 3 [noting site investigation and cleanup “proceeding well”]; *Petition of Wenwest*, WQ 92-13, p. 9 [concluding non-discharging landlords “should be required to perform the cleanup only in the event of default by [the primary dischargers]” when primary dischargers are “willing to undertake the cleanup”]);

4) The fact the Port is a “responsible public agency that is well equipped under its lease agreements to coordinate or require compliance of its tenants with the cleanup and abatement orders issued by the Regional Board” (*Petition of Forest Service*, WQ 87-5, p. 5 [deeming that “it would be unwise to seek enforcement of the waste discharge requirements against the Forest Service until it becomes clear that [the primary discharger] will not comply” because Forest Service was a “responsible public agency which is well equipped to require compliance of the [primary discharger]”; and
5) The fact that naming the Port as a primarily responsible party “may create an additional adversarial situation and hinder cooperation with the Regional Board in a cleanup that is already highly contested by other dischargers” (Petition of Forest Service, WQ 87-5, p. 4 [noting as valid consideration that naming a non-discharging public entity landlord “may regretfully create an adversarial situation and hinder cooperation”].)

(Attachment C [2009 DTR] at p. 10-4.)

Based on these legally pertinent facts, CUT consistently concluded that the Regional Board should not name the Port as a primary discharger since “at this time it would be inconsistent with previous State Water Board orders which direct naming non-operating public agencies in cleanup and abatement orders only in the event there are no other viable responsible parties.” (Attachment C [2009 DTR] at p. 10-3 [emphasis added].) Rather, the TCAO and DTR recommended the Port be secondarily liable, responsible for performing the tasks in the CAO only in the event of the primary discharger’s noncompliance. (Id.; Attachment AA [2009 TCAO] at pp. 6-7.)

1. CUT’s Decision to Move the Port from Secondary Liability to Primary Liability, and the Regional Board’s Approval of that Decision, was an Arbitrary and Capricious Decision Based on Improper Motivations and Bias

Suddenly, in September 2010, CUT issued a TCAO and DTR that recited the same facts and legal analysis as the prior TCAOs and DTRs, but inexplicably reached the opposite conclusion by naming the Port as primarily responsible. (Attachment D [2010 TCAO] at pp. 6-7 and Attachment E [2010 TR] at pp. 11-11-11-3.) In response to this unexplained and unsupported change in position, the Port questioned CUT through administrative discovery about the reason for this sudden change. CUT’s response was that the Port’s liability position changed because the Port had been non-cooperative, a fact not mentioned in the September 2010 draft CAO and DTR.

For example, David Gibson and Craig Carlisle both testified at their deposition that the Port’s decision to withdraw from the mediation process was a basis for naming the Port primarily liable. (Attachment R [Gibson Deposition] at 33:9-22; Attachment P [Carlisle Deposition] at 110:20-23.) Mr. Gibson and David Barker also testified that the Port was not cooperating in providing technical assistance to the Regional Board, was not supportive of the remedial
footprint and refused to work with the Regional Board to identify areas for dewatering dredged sediments. (Attachment Q [Barker Deposition] at 520:7-21, 521:23-522:24; Attachment R [Gibson Deposition] at 33:9-22.) CUT's responses to the Port's written discovery demanding an explanation for the change in the Port's liability position likewise cited these allegations. (Attachment W [CUT's Responses to Discovery] at pp. 29-30.) Finally, at trial Mr. Gibson testified that he had cited the Port's decision to withdraw from the mediation process as a motivation for the change in the Port's liability position. (Attachment G [11/14/11 Hearing] at 75:8-76:7.)

The Port presented detailed written comments and supporting evidence to rebut these unfounded assertions. (Attachment K [Port 5/11 Comments].) The Port cited its lengthy history of working cooperatively with the Regional Board on a number of sites throughout the San Diego Bay. (Attachment K [Port 5/11 Comments] at pp. 4-7.) The Port also confirmed that its experts supported the remedial approach and that the Port was in fact working cooperatively with the Regional Board to resolve issues at the Shipyard Sediment Site. (Attachment M [Johns Declaration] at paras. 8 and 9.) The Port presented similar evidence at the administrative trial, confirming its history of cooperation and testifying strongly in support of the remedial approach proposed by the TCAO and DTR. (Attachment F [11/9/11 Hearing] at 95:21-96:12, 98:8-99:1; Attachment H [11/15/11 Hearing] at 124:11-125:24, 134:20-142:17.) In fact, at the conclusion of the administrative trial, Mr. Gibson concurred with the Port's assertion that it was the Regional Board's "best, and sometimes only, friend." (Attachment I [11/16/11 Hearing] at 155:24-25.) The Port continues to support the remedial effort and will necessarily continue to be involved and providing appropriate support, even in a position of secondary liability. (Attachment F [11/9/11 Hearing] at 100:5-25; Attachment CC [3/14/12 Hearing] at 52:53:11.)

Tellingly, no one – CUT, the Regional Board or any of the other interested parties – has challenged the Port's evidence forcefully rebutting the explanation CUT provided for altering the Port's liability position in the September 2010 TCAO and DTR. This confirms the absence of
any substantial evidence supporting this change in the Port’s liability position. Further, the explanation CUT offered is not a relevant consideration in assessing a non-discharging public entity landlord’s liability position. In short, the Port’s liability was not assessed on legally pertinent facts, but personal bias and animus reflecting an abuse of discretion. By adopting a CAO finding born of these improper considerations, the Regional Board ratified and perpetuated the error.

It matters not that CUT later offered a different explanation for its actions. While the newly minted explanation amounts to an abuse of discretion given its inconsistency with the facts and the law, it is unquestionably unfair and contrary to basic due process for the Port to be placed in a position of secondary liability in numerous TCAOs and DTRs based on a proper and thorough assessment of the facts and legal authorities, have this decision change without explanation, have CUT provide an improper justification for the change in this position, and then have that impermissible justification – but not the associated change in position -- abandoned after forceful factual rebuttal of this unfounded charge. The Port is entitled to a far more transparent process.

In sum, CUT was given an opportunity to explain the September 2010 TCAO and DTR’s inexplicable change. CUT and its witnesses repeatedly recited the true reason and justification for placing the Port in a position of primary liability – an alleged lack of Port cooperation and its withdrawal from a voluntary mediation process. The consistency of these accusations belies any present argument that the decision to name the Port as primarily liable discharger had any other basis or justification. Neither CUT nor the Regional Board can sanitize this improper use of its authority by now offering a different justification that it deems more legally and factually palatable.

///

///

6 In fact, at the administrative trial Mr. Gibson candidly testified that he had “personal misgivings about naming the Port as a primary responsible party.” (Attachment I [11/16/11 Hearing] at 155:12-18.)
2. CUT’s Decision to Move the Port from Secondary Liability to Primary Liability, and the Regional Board’s Approval of that Decision, is an Abuse of Discretion Because it is Without Evidentiary Support and Contrary to the Established Legal Authorities Governing the Application of Secondary Liability to a Non-Discharging Public Entity Landlord

As noted, after CUT claimed that the Port should be primarily liable because of its non-cooperation, the Port produced compelling and undisputed evidence to the contrary, culminating in Mr. Gibson’s acknowledgement that the Port was the Regional Board’s best, and sometimes only, friend. (Attachment I [11/16/11 Hearing] at 155:22-25.) Rather than defend this admission as a factually or legally tenable basis for its actions, CUT again reversed field. For example, in its response to the Port’s pre-hearing comments on the September 2010 TCAO and DTR, CUT for the first time offered the following explanation:

Because some former Port District Tenants may not have sufficient financial resources to account for their fair shares of cleanup costs, and because the cleanup is not progressing and a number of named dischargers are contesting the TCAO, the Port District should remain a primarily—not a secondarily—responsible party. (Attachment N [CUT’s 8/11 Response to Comments] at p. 11-30.)

Similarly, during the administrative trial, CUT’s counsel stated that the “bottom line” as to why the Port was not named as a primary discharger before was because “the previous legal analysis was flawed. (Attachment G [11/14/11 Hearing] at 75:6-19.) The adopted CAO also states that the Port should be considered a primarily liable discharger because “[a]llocation of responsibility has not been determined and there is insufficient evidence to establish that present and former Port District tenants at the Site each have sufficient financial resources to perform all of the remedial activities required by this Order.” (Attachment A [CAO] at p. 8.)

These justifications fail any principled review of the law and facts. In fact, the CAO cites no new evidence on which CUT or the Regional Board could rationally support a change of view. The prior TCAOs and DTRs expressly note that there was in fact no evidence on which to conclude that the named dischargers were unable to perform the tasks in the CAO. (Attachment C [2009 TR] at p. 10-4.) Likewise, these TCAOs and DTRs confirmed that the named

7 This explanation was not provided in the administrative discovery responses when the Port asked CUT to explain its new position.
dischargers were conducting the investigation required of them. (Id.; Attachment Q [Barker Deposition] at 489:20-490:14.) The CAO cites no evidence that the named dischargers are presently unable or unwilling to perform the tasks in the CAO or that the named primary dischargers’ resources changed in the interim. Indeed, to the extent any evidence on this point was presented, it supported the conclusion that the current primary dischargers are willing and able to perform the CAO tasks. (Attachment I [11/16/11 Hearing] at 45:19-46:9 and 166:7-168:11 [NASSCO comments of support], 75:11-14 [BAE comments of support], 82:21-83:19 [Navy comments of support]; Attachment F [11/9/11 Hearing] at 83:15-84:24.)

Similarly, despite CUT counsel’s assertion that prior counsel simply got the law wrong, neither CUT nor the Regional Board ever cited any new or different legal authority to support their directly contrary conclusion. (Attachment G [11/14/11 Hearing] at 75:6-19.) In fact, the CAO has the law wrong. The unmistakably clear lesson of numerous State Board Orders regarding primary and secondary liability is that a non-discharging public entity landlord should not be placed in a position of primary liability unless and until the named primary dischargers have failed to comply with the tasks in the CAO, as stated in prior TCAOs and DTRs. Indeed, the Regional Board’s own prior recent dealings with the Port on issues of tenant compliance confirm that the Regional Board understands this to be the correct approach.

a. Under State Board Orders and Regional Board Practice, a Non-discharging Public Entity Landlord Should only Be Primarily Liable At Such Time when the Named Dischargers have Failed to Comply with the Tasks in the CAO

The CAO’s analysis of the Port’s primary liability is directly contrary to the State Board orders discussing secondary liability. The long established policy of the State Board is that non-discharging landlords should be secondarily liable and responsible for compliance only after the dischargers fail or default on their compliance:

- Non-discharging landlords “should be required to perform the cleanup only in the event of default by [dischargers]” (Petition of Wenwest, WQ 92-13, p. 9 [emphasis added]);
- Order placed “primary cleanup and abatement responsibility on [discharger’s] shoulders and specifically requires [non-discharging landlords] to assume the burden only upon [discharger’s] failure to perform” (Petition of Schmidl, WQ 89-1, p. 4 [emphasis added]);
- Regional Board instructed to “only look to the [non-discharging landlord] regarding enforcement should [discharger] fail to comply” (Petition of Forest Service, WQ 87-5, p. 5: [emphasis added]);
- Regional Board ordered to modify order to provide that non-discharging landlord required to comply with order only upon “determination and actual notice to [the non-discharging landlord] that [the dischargers] have failed to comply” (Petition of Prudential Insurance Company, WQ 87-6, p. 5 [emphasis added]);
- Non-discharging landlord responsible for cleanup “only if the other named dischargers did not timely complete these tasks” (Petition of Spitzer, WQ 89-8, p. 6).

No State Board order approves the approach taken by the CAO and TR – deferring secondary liability of a non-discharging landlord to a later date after discharger compliance is demonstrated. In fact, the CAO’s approach renders secondary liability illusory. Proof of compliance will only be achieved at the completion of the tasks in the CAO, at which point redesignating the Port’s liability would be meaningless. Thus, the correct approach is the one followed by the prior TCAOs and DTRs – the Port should be designated secondarily liable under the CAO now and become primarily liable only in the event of noncompliance. (Attachment C [2009 TR] at §10.2 and Attachment AA [2009 TCAO] at p. 7 (“may do so in the future if the Port’s former and/or current tenants fail to comply with the Order”).)

The Regional Board’s prior practices dealing with the Port and some of these same tenants stand in stark contrast to the position taken in the CAO. Specifically, a dispute arose

---

8 While Petition of Forest Service involved waste discharge requirements rather than a cleanup and abatement order, the secondary liability analysis is the same in both contexts. (Petition of Schmidl, WQ 89-1, p. 4 [citing Petition of Forest Service as instructive on secondary liability analysis].)
regarding the Port’s position of responsibility as discharger under waste discharge requirements for six boat and shipyards, including NASSCO’s facility. The matter came before the State Board. (Petition of San Diego Unified Port District, WQ 90-3.) The State Board concluded that the Regional Board intended the Port to be in a position of secondary liability and remanded to have this clarified in the WDRs. Thereafter, the Port and the Regional Board reached an agreement regarding the language to be used in the WDR:

The Regional Board will notify the Port District of any violation by [the tenant] of any permit conditions, for the purpose of obtaining the assistance of the Port District in attempting to obtain compliance by [the tenant]. The Port District is not primarily responsible for compliance with the permit requirements. The Regional Board will not take enforcement action against the Port District for violations by [the tenant] unless there is a continued failure to comply by [the tenant] after the Port District has been given notice of the violations, and until after the Regional Board has issued against [the tenant] either a cleanup and abatement order, cease and desist order, or complaint for administrative civil liabilities.

(Attachment J [Port’s 2004 Correspondence to Regional Board] at p. 8, SAR158816.9)

This language was then inserted in WDR permits issued to BAE’s predecessor and NASSCO. (See Attachment S [Southwest Marine 2002 WDR] at p. 3; Attachment T [NASSCO 2003 WDR] at p. 4; Attachment CC [3/14/12 Hearing] at 50:4-51:23 (discussing history of prior agreement and inconsistency with CAO findings).) Accordingly, the Regional Board cannot credibly claim that its approach to the naming of the Port in the CAO is consistent with the clear legal direction of the State Board Orders or its own prior conduct.

b. **The CAO’s Secondary Liability Analysis Requires a Liability Allocation Out of Place in this Context**

In an effort to evade the plain direction of the legal authorities, the Regional Board found that Port should not be secondarily liable because “allocation of responsibility has not been determined” and because “there is insufficient evidence to establish that present and former Port

---

9 The Port presented this evidence directly to the Regional Board during the final hearing.
District tenants *each* have sufficient financial resources to perform all of the remedial activities
required by this Order.” (See Attachment A [CAO] at pp. 7-8; Attachment N [CUT’s 8/11
Response to Comments] at pp. 11-30 – 11-32.) Similarly, CUT previously claimed concerns
over “potential gaps” in the primary dischargers’ financial resources and concerns that some
prior Port tenants may not have the financial resources “to satisfy their respective fair shares of
responsibility.” *(Id.)* These justifications for naming the Port primarily liable are contrary to the
law and the facts.

The absence of a liability allocation is not relevant to, much less an obstacle to,
secondary liability. This is because no State Board legal authority contemplates or even
authorizes a regional board to impose liability on the basis of “fair shares.” Rather, the authority
is unanimously to the contrary – dischargers are jointly and severally liable to the regional board
for the entire cleanup. *(Petition of Union Oil Company of California, WQ 90-2; Petition of
Ultramar, Inc., WQ 09-001-UST, p. 7 fn. 12.)* If the named dischargers are concerned about fair
shares of liability, this issue must be taken up among those parties in a court of law. *(Id.)*

Tellingly, neither the Regional Board nor CUT has ever offered any legal authority
supporting their view on this point. In its briefing, CUT cited *Petition of Aluminum Company of
America* to support the proposition apparently accepted by the Regional Board that a non-
discharging landlord is primarily liable for “orphaned liability” attributable to an absent tenant
discharger. *(Attachment N [CUT’s 8/11 Response to Comments] at p. 11-31.)* Yet, *Petition of
Aluminum Company of America* does not refer to “orphaned liability,” much less establish that
such liability can be the basis for imposing primary liability on a non-discharging landlord. In
short, because the primary dischargers are jointly and severally liable for the entire remediation
required under a CAO, secondary liability is not contingent upon a regional board first taking a
roll call of all potential primary dischargers to make sure they are all present.

c. The CAO’s Secondary Liability Analysis Imposes an Improper
Evidentiary Burden on the Non-Discharging Landlord Regarding the
Primary Dischargers’ Ability to Perform

None of the State Board orders cited in the CAO or TR requires a non-discharging
landlord to produce detailed factual evidence of the dischargers’ financial assets. *Petition of*
Wenwest, the only cited authority that even references this factor, limits its analysis on this point to a comment that the dischargers in that case were “capable” of undertaking the cleanup. 

(Petition of Wenwest, WQ 92-13, p. 9.) Here, the primary dischargers are capable of performing any cleanup required by the order. These dischargers include NASSCO, BAE Systems, SDG&E and the United States Navy, financially robust parties with significant resources who have never asserted that they lack the resources to perform the tasks in the CAO. (See, e.g., Attachment Y [BAE Stipulation]; Attachment Z [NASSCO Stipulation].) Because each primary discharger is legally liable under a CAO for the entire remedial obligations, no greater showing of ability is required.

Likewise, there is no credible evidence that the primary dischargers will not comply with the CAO. While the TR states that “no cleanup is taking place” (Attachment B [TR] at p. 11-1), the obvious response is that no cleanup was required prior to the adoption of the CAO. The far more relevant observation is the one made in the prior draft CAOs and TRs -- that “the major site investigation to determine the extent of pollution” at the site had been “satisfactorily completed” by the primary dischargers. (Attachment C [2009 TR] at p. 10-4.) Mr. Gibson similarly testified under oath that the process has been “proceeding cooperatively.” (Attachment H [11/15/11 Hearing] at 489:20-490:14.) In closing, Mr. Gibson echoed his pleasure with the primary dischargers’ willingness to undertake the remediation. (Attachment I [Consequently, until the primary dischargers have “defaulted,” “failed to comply” or “failed to perform” (Petition of Wenwest, WQ 92-13, p. 9; Petition of Schmidt, WQ 89-1, p. 4; Petition of Forest Service, WQ 87-5, p. 5; Petition of Prudential Insurance Company, WQ 87-6, p. 5; Petition of Spitzer, WQ 89-8, p. 6), there is no legitimate or necessary basis to name the Port, a non-discharging public entity landlord, as a primary discharger in the CAO.

B. The Regional Board’s Finding that the Port is a Discharger Based on MS4 Discharges is Arbitrary and Capricious and an Abuse of Discretion

As noted above, the September 2010 draft CAO and TR for the first time contained a finding that the Port should be liable as a discharger because of the MS4 facilities that discharge to outfalls SW4 and SW9 within the Shipyard Sediment Site. This recently-constructed basis for Port liability constitutes an arbitrary and capricious decision for three reasons. First, it arose at
the same time as the shift in Port liability from primary to secondary and was motivated by the same improper animus. Second, there is no substantial evidence in the record to support the conclusion that the Port is the owner or operator of the MS4 facilities that discharge to the Shipyard Sediment Site—instead, the evidence confirms the contrary conclusion. Third, the CAO and TR lack the necessary testing data indispensable to a finding of liability.

1. **The Port’s Alleged MS4 Liability is Not Based in Fact or Law but Motivated by Improper Considerations**

As discussed above, there were a number of draft CAOs and TRs preceding the September 2010. While these draft CAOs and TRs discussed the purported role of the MS4 outfalls within the Shipyard Sediment Site, none of these draft documents assigned any liability to the Port for the MS4 facilities. (See Attachment C [2009 TR] at pp. 10-1 – 10-4.) In September 2010, the draft CAO and TR inexplicably concluded that the Port should be liable for these facilities. (Attachment D [2010 TCAO] at 7 and Attachment E [2010 TR] at §11.) As discussed in greater detail above, it became clear from CUT’s explanation that the change of Port liability in the September 2010 draft CAO and TR was the result of CUT’s displeasure with the Port’s decision to withdraw from mediation process, not any legitimate legal or factual basis. Given the absence of any facts to support the Port’s purported MS4 liability, discussed in greater detail directly below, it is equally clear that this improper consideration was the motivation behind the decision to assign the Port liability under the MS4 theory as well. For this reason alone, the finding in the CAO and TR that the Port is liable for MS4 discharges is arbitrary and capricious and an abuse of discretion.

2. **There is no Evidence the Port Owns or Operates the MS4 that Discharges to the Shipyard Sediment Site**

There is another fundamental flaw in the CAO’s conclusion that the Port is a discharger based upon the MS4 discharges. The CAO states that the Port “owns and operates” MS4 “through which it discharges waste commonly found in urban runoff to San Diego Bay subject to the terms and conditions of an NPDES Storm Water Permit.” (Attachment A [CAO] at p. 8.) Yet the record contains no evidence to support this statement.

This liability theory first emerged in the September 15, 2010 TCAO and DTR, which
simply assumed that the Port owned and operated the MS4 facilities that discharge to SW4 and SW9. (Attachment E [2010 DTR] at 11-5, §11.3 [referring to the Port’s liability for pollutants allegedly discharged “through its SW4 … and SW9 … conduit pipes” (emphasis added)].)

However, CUT later acknowledged that these conduit pipes are owned and operated by the City. (Attachment W [CUT’s Responses to Discovery] at pp. 94-100 and Attachment X [CUT’s Responses to Requests for Admissions] at p. 10.)

The City has similarly acknowledged that it owns and operates these facilities.

(Attachment BB [City’s Complaint]10 at 7:5-8; Attachment DD [2004 City Report] at SAR 158791 [acknowledging that City “storm drain system enters the NASSCO leasehold at the foot to 28th Street and terminates at the southeasterly corner” where it “discharges into Chollas Creek” at the SW9 outfall”]) The Port further offered into evidence records confirming the City’s ownership and operation of the relevant MS4 facilities. (Attachment U [City Easement] (City’s easement for the MS4 facilities that terminate at the SW4 outfall); Attachment V [Conveyance] (City easements for “all water …drainage facilities”).) This evidence clearly demonstrates that the MS4 facilities are under the City’s control.

At the administrative trial, again the Port presented evidence that the City, not the Port, maintains easements and owns and operates the MS4 facilities in the relevant outfalls, SW4 and SW9. (Attachment H [11/15/11 Hearing] at 150:23-151:19; Attachment BB [Depiction of SW4 and SW9].) Although the City attempted to dispute its ownership of the subject MS4 facilities, the City’s witness admitted she had not reviewed the easement documents presented by the Port which establish otherwise. (Attachment H [11/15/11 Hearing] at 198:8-20) Because the Port is not the owner or operator of the MS4 facilities that discharge to SW4 and SW9, the finding of Port liability lacks any substantial evidence.

Any contrary suggestion by the Regional Board that the Port is liable for MS4 discharges

10 Water Code section 13320(b) provides that “[t]he evidence before the state board shall consist of the record before the regional board, and any other relevant evidence which, in the judgment of the state board, should be considered to effectuate and implement the policies of this division,” (emphasis added.) These admissions by the City are plainly relevant evidence that should be considered by the State Board in connection with the Port’s Petition. See also Cal. Evid. Code § 452(d), which permits judicial notice to be taken of records of any court of the state or United States.
simply by virtue of its position as a co-permittee under the NPDES permit is untenable. The CAO states that the Port’s liability is premised on its ownership and operation of the MS4 facilities, not a more general basis. Likewise, the CAO cites no provision in the NPDES permit to support a vague co-permittee liability theory. Finally, this approach is inconsistent with the federal regulations governing NPDES permits. The Clean Water Act defines “copermittee” as “a permittee to an NPDES permit that is only responsible for permit conditions relating to the discharge for which it is operator.” (40 Code of Federal Regulations §122.6(b)(1) [emphasis added].) In short, absent any permit language to support Because CUT and the Regional Board have not cited any actual permit language to the contrary, the conclusion that the Port is liable for discharges from MS4 facilities that it does not own or operate lacks legal or factual support and cannot be upheld. 11

3. There is No Evidence of Testing at the Discharge Point Required to Impose Liability for Violation of an NPDES Permit

Recently established law confirms that liability for MS4 facility discharges under a NPDES permit requires testing at the point of discharge. (National Resources Defense Council v. County of Los Angeles Flood Control District (9th Cir. 2011) 636 F.3d 1235 (NRDC).) Here, the CAO cites no evidence of testing at the outfall points SW4 or SW9. This alone defeats the inclusion of the Port as a discharger based upon alleged MS4 discharges.

In NRDC, the claimant alleged the co-permittees on an NPDES permit governing MS4 facilities had discharged pollutants in violation of the permit. The claimant argued initially that the “measured exceedances in the Watershed Rivers ipso facto establish Permit violations by Defendants.” (NRDC, supra, at 1251.) In response, the Ninth Circuit noted that “the Clean

11 In fact, if CUT’s view of MS4 permit liability is sound, all of the co-permittees would face the same liability. Other co-permittees such as City of Lemon Grove and City of La Mesa have facilities that connect to the MS4 facilities that discharge to SW4 as well. (Attachment O [2007 NPDES Permit] p. 2; Attachment H [11/15/11 Hearing] at 153:17-154:25.) Neither CUT nor the Regional Board has ever offered any defensible explanation for why the Port alone should by the only co-permittee responsible for MS4 facilities that it does not own or operate. The decision to single out the Port in this fashion adds further support to the inescapable conclusion that the decision to assign the Port this liability is not the product of any principled exercise of discretion it may have, but an abuse of that discretion intended to punish the Port for improper reasons.
Water Act does not prohibit "undisputed" exceedances." (Id.) Rather, the Clean Water Act "prohibits 'discharges' that are not in compliance with the Act (which means in compliance with the NPDES)." (Id. [emphasis in original]) Consequently, the Ninth Circuit concluded, "responsibility for those exceedances requires proof that some entity discharged a pollutant." (Id.)

Against this backdrop, the Ninth Circuit found that "the primary factual dispute between the parties is whether the evidence shows any addition of pollutants by Defendants" to the waterways. (NRDC, supra, at 1251 [emphasis in original,].) The claimant asserted that because "the monitoring stations are downstream from hundreds of miles of storm drains which have generated the pollutants being detected" it was "irrelevant which of the thousands of storm drains were the source of polluted stormwater -- as holders of the Permit, Defendants bear responsibility for the detected exceedances." (Id., at 1251-1252.) The Ninth Circuit found this view unsatisfactorily simplistic as it "did not enlighten the district court with sufficient evidence for certain claims and assumed it was obvious to anyone how stormwater makes its way from a parking lot in Pasadena into the MS4, through a mass-emissions station, and then to a Watershed River." (Id., at 1252.)

Ultimately, the Ninth Circuit found adequate evidence of discharges for two of the rivers, where mass emissions stations detecting the exceedances were located in a portion of the MS4 "owned and operated" by the defendant in question. (Id., at 1253-1254.) In contrast with that conclusion, the Ninth Circuit found that "it is not possible to mete out responsibility for exceedances detected" in other waterways where it was "unable to identify the relationship between the MS4 and these mass-emissions stations" and where it "appear[ed] that both monitoring stations are located within the rivers themselves." (Id., at 1253.) As to these waterways, the Ninth Circuit concluded that "[i]t is highly likely, but on this record nothing more than assumption, that polluted stormwater exits the MS4 controlled by the [defendants], and flows downstream in these rivers past the mass-emissions stations." (Id.) However, the Ninth Circuit found this assumption inadequate because the claimant was "obligated to spell out this process for the district court's consideration and to spotlight how the flow of water from an MS4 'contributed' to a water-quality exceedance detected at the Monitoring Stations." (Id., at 1254.)
The clear message of NRDC is that liability for violation of an NPDES permit such as an MS4 permit requires evidence the co-permittee "discharged" pollutants from an MS4 facility that the co-permittee owns or operates. Testing or monitoring taken from the affected waterway, rather than from the MS4 system, is not adequate. This is so regardless of how "probable" or "likely" the assumption is that the defendant may have discharged pollutants. Here, the CAO and TR contain no testing of the actual MS4 discharges to SW4 or SW9. In fact, the TR acknowledges that "no monitoring data is available" for either SW4 or SW9. (Attachment B [TR] at p. 11-13 [SW4], p. 11-15 [SW9].) In lieu of actual monitoring results, the TR simply concludes that "it is highly probable that historical and current discharges from th[ese] outfalls have discharged" various contaminants. (Id.) This approach cannot be reconciled with NRDC.

In an effort to evade the plain meaning of NRDC and the obligation to provide discharge sampling, CUT argued that NRDC imposed specific testing requirements because the NPDES permits in that case contained specific numeric discharge limits. (Attachment [CUT’s 8/11 Comments]N at p. 11-34.) From this premise, CUT concluded that NRDC would not apply in the present case because the Port is not being held liable for an NPDES violation but for a narrative standard that prohibits discharges that "cause or contribute to the condition of pollution or nuisance at the Site." (Id.) CUT’s analysis is wrong. The NRDC permits contained a narrative standard under which the co-permittees were bound to "neither cause nor contribute to the exceedance of water quality standards and objectives nor create conditions of nuisance in the receiving waters." (NRDC, supra, 636 F.3d at 1241. [emphasis added].) In fact, the Ninth Circuit expressly noted:

[T]he Permit prohibits MS4 discharges into receiving waters that exceed the Water Quality Standards established in the Basin Plan and elsewhere. Specifically, Section 2.1 provides: "[D]ischarges from the MS4 that cause or contribute to the violation of Water Quality Standards or water quality objectives are prohibited." Section 2.2. of the Permit reads: "Discharges from the MS4 of storm water, or non-storm water, for which a Permittee is responsible for, shall not cause or contribute to a condition of nuisance."

(NRDC, supra, 636 F.3d at 1244 [emphasis added].) In short, the alleged NRDC permit violation was indistinguishable from the narrative standard CUT cites as the basis for Port MS4 liability.

CUT’s claim that Port MS4 liability can rest entirely on circumstantial evidence fails for
another reason. The Port presented evidence that it has been complying with its MS4 permit obligations. (Attachment L at para. 9 and Attachment H at 149:2-150:19.) The Port conducts the inspections required under the MS4 permit and sweeps the associated areas as well. (See Attachment L at para. 8(g).) The Port has prepared the JURMP document required by the MS4 permit and operates in MS4 facilities in compliance with that document. (Id. at para. 8(h).) The Port’s compliance program is being implemented to the “maximum extent practicable” and in many cases has proactively implemented compliance at a higher level. (Attachment L [Collacott Declaration] pp. 4-5, paras. 8(g)-(h), 9; Attachment H at 150:15-19.) In sum, there is an absence of substantial and legally necessary evidence to support a finding of Port liability based on MS4 discharges.

C. Conclusion

The Port should not be named as a primary discharger in the CAO. The Regional Board fell prey to CUT’s improper motivation and the incorrect and improper legal standard CUT offered to support naming the Port as a primary discharger. As a non-discharging public entity landlord, the Port should be secondarily liable and responsible for CAO compliance only in the event the primary dischargers fail to comply with the CAO. Likewise, there is no substantial evidence to support the CAO’s conclusion that the Port is liable as a discharger based upon MS4 discharges, because the Port is not the owner or operator of the MS4 facilities at issue. Furthermore, there is no substantial evidence of the type required by law to establish liability for MS4 discharges.

The Port has worked well and cooperatively with the Regional Board at this and numerous other sites. The Port supports the remedial approach at the Shipyard Sediment Site and will continue to provide appropriate support. Placing the Port in its proper position as a secondarily liable party will not alter the Port’s support for the process and the proposed remediation. However, for the reasons discussed throughout this petition, the Regional Board’s findings of Port primary liability are arbitrary and capricious and constitute an abuse of its discretion. The CAO should therefore be amended as requested in Section VI, supra.
VIII.

THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE REGIONAL BOARD AND TO NAMED DISCHARGERS

True and correct copies of this Petition, were sent electronically to:

Jeannette L. Bashaw, Legal Analyst
State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
ibashaw@waterboards.ca.gov

David Gibson, Executive Officer
San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
dgibson@waterboards.ca.gov
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IX.
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Attachment G
June 24, 2013

BY EMAIL: Eric.Becker@waterboards.ca.gov
Jody.Ebsen@waterboards.ca.gov

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
Attention: Eric Becker and Jody Ebsen

Re: Comment – Tentative Order No. R9-2013-0093, Place ID: 794466:
Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements for San Diego Bay Environmental
Restoration Fund – North, the San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration
Fund-South, San Diego Shipyard Sediment Remediation Project, San Diego
Bay, San Diego, California

Dear Mr. Becker and Ms. Ebsen:

The San Diego Unified Port District ("Port District") submits the following comments on
Tentative Order No. R9-2013-0093, in which the San Diego Regional Water Quality
Control Board ("Regional Board") proposes Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements
("WDRs") for the dredging and sand capping remediation project to be performed
pursuant to Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R9-2012-0024 (the "CAO") in the area
known as the "Shipyard Sediment Site."

In the Tentative WDRs, the Regional Board proposes to name as Dischargers the
project applicants (the San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund – North and the
San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund – South), which are two trusts created
by BAE Systems San Diego Ship Repair, Inc. ("BAE Systems") and National Steel and
Shipbuilding Company ("NASSCO"), respectively, BAE Systems and NASSCO, as the
facility operators, the United States Navy and the Port District, as alleged owners of
property on which the work is to be performed.1

1 These are the expressed reasons for naming these respective parties in the WDRs. (WDRs,
I.f.) The Regional Board acknowledges that there are other parties who are named dischargers
"accountable for ensuring that the Project attains the target cleanup levels...of the CAO," who are not
proposed to be named as dischargers in the WDRs, including the City of San Diego ("City"), San Diego
Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E"), and Campbell Industries ("Campbell"). (Id.) The Port District
therefore assumes that the Regional Board is not proposing to name the Port District in the WDRs based
upon its being named as a discharger in the CAO. Of course, if this assumption is incorrect, and the
The Port District hereby formally objects to the Regional Board's proposed inclusion of the Port District as a "Discharger" in the WDRs on the following grounds:

1. The Port District is not the party proposing to make the discharges for which the WDRs are being issued, nor is it the operator of any of the facilities on which the discharges are proposed to be made; it is merely the non-operating landlord and public trustee of the subject tidelands under the San Diego Unified Port District Act (Harb. & Nav. Code, App. 1).

2. Consistent with the 1990 agreement between the State Water Board, the Regional Board, and the Port District, the Regional Board's long-standing business practice has been not to name the Port District as primarily liable in WDRs issued for work to be performed by or on behalf of its tenants and there is no reason to depart from that practice in connection with these WDRs.

3. In no event can the Port District be liable for any proposed activities or WDRs issued with respect to the "S Lane," which is owned by the United States Navy, and over which the Port District has no jurisdictional authority.

Each of these objections is discussed in more detail below.

II. THE PORT DISTRICT SHOULD NOT BE NAMED AS A DISCHARGER IN THE WDRs

A. The Port District Is Not The Party Making Or Proposing To Make The Discharge For Which The WDRs Are Being Issued And Is Not The Operator Of the Facilities On Which The Discharges Will Occur

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code §§ 13000, et seq.) requires that "a person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, other than into a community sewer system, shall file with the regional board a report of the discharge." (Water Code § 13260(a)(1) (emphasis added).) Section 13263(f) of the Water Code requires that the regional board must notify "the person making or proposing the discharge...of the discharge requirements to be met. After receipt of that notice, the person so notified shall provide adequate means to meet the requirements." (emphasis added). Similarly, the federal permitting regulations likewise require that "any person who discharges or

Regional Board proposes to name the Port District on that basis, then the Port District asserts that it would be wrongly named for all of the reasons set forth in its pending petition to the State Water Board challenging the CAO, and further asserts that the Regional Board would likewise have to name the City, SDG&E, and Campbell in the WDRs too.
proposes to discharge pollutants must obtain a permit to do so under the Clean Water Act. (See 40 C.F.R. § 122.21(a).)

Here, the WDRs acknowledge that the Reports of Waste Discharge were submitted by de maximis, inc., a trustee acting on behalf of the so-called San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund – North (with the authorization of Shaun Halvax, Manager Environmental Programs for the Facility Operator, BAE Systems), and the so-called San Diego Bay Environmental Restoration Fund – South (with the authorization of T. Michael Chee, the Environmental Manager of the Facility Operator, NASSCO) (WDRs, Section II.C.). Those are the entities that plan to carry out the described Project through contractors that they engage on the facilities owned, controlled and operated by BAE Systems and NASSCO, respectively. Accordingly, each of these entities is appropriately named in the WDRs.²

On the other hand, the Port District is not an applicant for these WDRs and is not proposing to perform the Project or cause any discharges at the subject sites. Nor is it an owner or operator of the shipyard facilities: to the contrary, it has absolutely no authority, ability, desire, or financial wherewithal to control their day-to-day operations, including their implementation of the proposed Project. Rather, the federally-secured shipyard facilities are solely operated by BAE Systems and NASSCO, respectively, under long-term ground leases from the Port District.

The Porter-Cologne Act does not require that non-operating landlords, and in particular, state-mandated trustees of public tidelands,³ be named as dischargers in permits and WDRs sought by or on behalf of their tenants.⁴ Indeed, it would be impracticable, if not impossible, for the Port District, which has no right to unrestricted daily access to the secured shipyards, to perform the myriad activities necessary to comply with the WDRs. Those requirements include the implementation of numerous on-site best management practices ("BMPs") and sampling and monitoring activities. (See, e.g., WDRs, Sections V (Construction BMPs relating to, among many other things, the specifications and requirements for silt curtain deployment; the specific manner in which sediment dredging by the clamshell buckets is to be conducted and the manner in which dredged sediments are to be placed on barges; the placement of clean sand cover; the

---

² See also the "instructions" issued by the State Water Resources Control Board for WDRs, which require that a facility owner be named in WDRs issued for work on its facility, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

³ As recognized in the WDRs (Project Description, I.F., p. 7), the Port District holds title as the mere trustee of the tidelands for the State of California. (See also Port Act, §§ 5, 5.5, 14, 68, 87 (each noting the Port District holds such lands "in trust" subject to the terms of the Port Act.).)

⁴ The federal regulations implementing the Clean Water Act likewise make clear that "When a facility or activity is owned by one person but is operated by another person, it is the operator's duty to obtain a permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.21(b).)"
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processing and management of dredged sediments, etc.), VII (Monitoring Requirements) and VIII (Reporting Requirements).

Thus, the Port District is neither a person making or proposing to make the discharge, is not a facility owner or operator, and is not able to control the day-to-day activities and monitoring and sampling activities at the Project site. Consequently, the Port District is not within the scope of the parties required to apply for or be named in these WDRs under the Porter Cologne Act or the Clean Water Act and it should be removed as a proposed discharger in these WDRs.

B. The Regional Board's Long-Standing Practice Has Been Not To Name The Port District As A Primarily Liable Discharger In WDRs Issued To Its Tenants And There Is No Reason To Depart From That Practice

It has long been the policy of the State Water Resources Control Board that landowners "should not be held responsible for day-to-day compliance with waste discharge requirements" (see, e.g., In the Matter of the Petition of San Diego Unified Port Dist. ("Port Petition"), SWRCB Order No. WQ 90-3; In re Petition of Southern California Edison Company, SWRCB Order No. WQ 86-11) and that public agencies should be afforded the opportunity to obtain compliance from their tenants prior to any enforcement action against the agency. (See Port Petition, SWRCB Order No. WQ 90-3 at 12 ("[b]ecause the Port District is a public agency, it should...be afforded the opportunity to obtain compliance from the tenant prior to enforcement by the Regional Board against the Port District"); see also In re Petition of U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, SWRCB Order No. WQ 87-5 at 5 ("[t]he Forest Service deserves the opportunity to exercise its own authority before the Regional Board holds it responsible for any violations of the [permit] requirements.").

In 1990, the State Water Board, this Regional Board and the Port District mutually agreed that these policies would expressly be applied to WDR/NPDES permits issued to Port District tenants. The agreement arose from the Port District's challenge to its being named by the Regional Board in amendments to WDR/NPDES permits issued to six of its boatyard and shipyard tenants. (See July 2, 1990 letter from David B. Hopkins to Sheila K. Vassey and David T. Barker, attached hereto as Exhibit B.)

---

5 The same policy has been applied to non-operating landlords more generally. (See In re Petition of Wenwest, SWRCB Order No. WQ 92-13 at 9; In re Petition of Spitzer, SWRCB Order No. WQ 89-8 at 6; In re Petition of Prudential Insurance, SWRCB Order No. WQ 87-5 at 5; in re Petition of Schmidl, SWRCB Order No. WQ 89-1 at 4.)

6 In consideration of this agreement, the Port District agreed not to file a writ petition to challenge the State Water Board's conclusion, in SWRCB Order No. WQ 90-3, that the Port District could be named in WDR/NPDES permits issued to its tenants, but would only be "secondarily liable" for the tenant's monitoring program and day-to-day operations. (See Port Petition, Order No. WQ 90-3 at 16.)
1990 agreement provided that the following language would be included in the tenant's permits:

The Regional Board will notify the Port District of any violation by [the tenant] of any permit conditions, for the purpose of obtaining the assistance of the Port District in attempting to obtain compliance by [the tenant]. The Port District is not primarily responsible for compliance with the permit requirements. The Regional Board will not take enforcement action against the Port District for violations by [the tenant] unless there is continued failure to comply by [the tenant] after the Port District has been given notice of the violations, and until after the Regional Board has issued against [the tenant] either a cleanup and abatement order, cease and desist order, or complaint for administrative civil liabilities.

(See Exhibit B, hereto.)

In recognition of this policy, it has been the Regional Board's long-standing business practice not to name the Port District as a primarily responsible party in WDR/NPDES permits issued to its tenants, including those issued to BAE Systems and NASSCO for their operations at the subject site. (See, e.g., SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2002-0161 (issued to Southwest Marine, Inc., which is now BAE Systems); SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2003-0005 (NASSCO).)

In the most recent WDR/NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board to these shipyards, the Port District was not named as a discharger at all. (See SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2009-0080, as modified by Order No. R9-2010-0090 (BAE Systems); SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2009-0099 (NASSCO), the pertinent pages of which are attached hereto as Exhibit D and Exhibit E, respectively.) Similarly, the Port District was not named as a Discharger in the permit recently issued to BAE Systems for its Pier 4 Replacement project and related dredging activities. (See Certification No. 11C-026 (Clean Water Act 401 Certification and acknowledgement of enrollment under

---

Consistent with the 1990 Agreement, those permits each included the Port District within the definition of "discharger," but also included language to make clear that the Port District was "not primarily responsible for day-to-day operations at [the tenant's facility] or for compliance with the requirements of this Order (including monitoring and reporting requirements)," and that the Regional Board would notify the Port District of any non-compliance by its lessee and permit it to obtain such compliance before any enforcement action would be taken against it. (See SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2002-0161 at 3, ¶ 13.c.; SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2003-0005 at 4, ¶ 14.c.) The pertinent pages of those two Orders are collectively attached hereto as Exhibit C.

The Regional Board has complete copies of these very lengthy permits in its files, but the Port District can provide additional copies if requested.
SWRCB Order No. 2003-017-DWG, the Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Dredged or Fill Discharges, issued by the Regional Board to BAE Systems on December 28, 2012, as amended on May 31, 2013, attached hereto as Exhibit F (without attachments.)

There is no reason for the Regional Board to depart from this long-standing practice in connection with the WDRs to be issued for the subject Project. This is particularly true given that the Port District itself has been asked by these same project applicants to issue each of them a Coastal Development Permit ("CDP") for this Project, which will likewise include the mitigation and other requirements for compliance with the Regional Board's Environmental Impact Report for the Project. The CDPs are independently enforceable by the Port District. Accordingly, the Port District should not be named as a discharger in the WDRs for the proposed Project.

III. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES CAN THE PORT DISTRICT BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR WORK AT THE "S LANE," WHICH IS OWNED BY THE U.S. NAVY AND LEASED BY NASSCO

There is no legal basis upon which the Port District can be held responsible for any activities conducted on property outside its jurisdiction, which includes the "S Lane" area proposed by NASSCO and the South Restoration Fund for use as a sediment dewatering area for sediments dredged at the NASSCO (South) site.

The WDRs define the "Project Site" as including "[t]he sediment remediation areas, combined with...2) the 2.5 acre S-Lane Parcel sediment staging and offloading area for the South Project Site, located on the NASSCO leasehold on the north side of Chollas Creek." (WDRs, II.H.) The WDRs further acknowledge that the "southern Project sediment staging and stockpile area is located on property owned by the United States (sic) Navy and leased to NASSCO." (Id., II.F.) The Port District has no involvement, as trustee or otherwise, with the "S Lane."

Nevertheless, the WDRs seek to make all alleged Dischargers liable for all work to be performed under the WDRs wherever located. (See, e.g., WDRs, II.J. (prescribing BMPs for the "sediment management areas"); II.R. (requiring the Discharger to comply with all of the mitigation measures in the Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program contained in Attachment B of the Order); IX ("The Discharger must comply with all conditions of this Order...").)

The WDRs as proposed would therefore unlawfully require the Port District to undertake work, and/or assume responsibility for work being undertaken by third parties, on property over which it has no right to exercise any jurisdictional authority pursuant to the Port Act (Harb. & Nav. Code, App. 1). Consequently, there is no legal basis upon which
the Regional Board could impose any liability on the Port District in connection with any work required by the WDRs at the "S Lane."

IV. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Port District respectfully requests that it should not be named as a discharger—much less a primarily liable discharger—in the WDRs for the proposed Project. Instead, the Regional Board can rely upon the Port District to assist it, as and if necessary, in obtaining its tenants' compliance with the WDRs and know that it will also independently enforce compliance by all Project applicants with the CDPs issued to them by the Port District for the Project.

Very truly yours,

ELLEN F. GROSS
Deputy Port Attorney

EFG/clb
Attachments
INTRODUCTION

This application package constitutes a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) pursuant to California Water Code Section 13260. Section 13260 states that persons discharging or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, shall file a ROWD containing information which may be required by the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

This package is to be used to start the application process for all waste discharge requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits* issued by a RWQCB except:

a) Those landfill facilities that must use a joint Solid Waste Facility Permit Application Form, California Integrated Waste Management Board Form E-1-77; and

b) General WDRs or general NPDES permits that use a Notice of Intent to comply or specify the use of an alternative application form designed for that permit.

This application package contains:

1. Application/General Information Form for WDRs and NPDES Permits [Form 200 (10/97)].

Instructions

Instructions are provided to assist you with completion of the application. If you are unable to find the answers to your questions or need assistance with the completion of the application package, please contact your RWQCB representative. The RWQCBs strongly recommend that you make initial telephone or personal contact with RWQCB regulatory staff to discuss a proposed new discharge before submitting your application. The RWQCB representative will be able to answer procedural and annual fee related questions that you may have. (See map and telephone numbers inside of application cover.)

All dischargers regulated under WDRs and NPDES permits must pay an annual fee, except dairies, which pay a filing fee only. The RWQCB will notify you of your annual fee based on an evaluation of your proposed discharge. Please do NOT submit a check for your first annual fee or filing fee until requested to do so by a RWQCB representative. Dischargers applying for reissuance (renewal) of an existing NPDES permit or update of an existing WDR will be billed through the annual fee billing system and are therefore requested NOT to submit a check with their application. Checks should be made payable to the State Water Resources Control Board.

Additional Information Requirements

A RWQCB representative will notify you within 30 days of receipt of the application form and any supplemental documents whether your application is complete. If your application is incomplete, the RWQCB representative will send you a detailed list of discharge specific information necessary to complete the application process. The completion date of your application is normally the date when all required information, including the correct fee, is received by the RWQCB.

* NPDES PERMITS: If you are applying for a permit to discharge to surface water, you will need an NPDES permit which is issued under both State and Federal law and may be required to complete one or more of the following Federal NPDES permit application forms: Short Form A, Standard Form A, Forms 1, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E, and 2F. These forms may be obtained at a RWQCB office or can be ordered from the National Center for Environmental Publications and Information at (513) 891-6561.
INSTRUCTIONS
FOR COMPLETING THE APPLICATION/REPORT OF WASTE DISCHARGE
GENERAL INFORMATION FORM FOR:
WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS/NPDES PERMIT

If you have any questions on the completion of any part of the application, please contact your RWQCB representative. A map of RWQCB locations, addresses, and telephone numbers is located on the reverse side of the application cover.

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

You must provide the factual information listed below for ALL owners, operators, and locations and, where appropriate, for ALL general partners and lease holders.

A. FACILITY:
Legal name, physical address including the county, person to contact, and phone number at the facility.
(NO P.O. Box numbers! If no address exists, use street and nearest cross street.)

B. FACILITY OWNER:
Legal owner, address, person to contact, and phone number. Also include the owner's Federal Tax Identification Number.

OWNER TYPE:
Check the appropriate Owner Type. The legal owner will be named in the WDRs/NPDES permit.

C. FACILITY OPERATOR (The agency or business, not the person):
If applicable, the name, address, person to contact, and telephone number for the facility operator. Check the appropriate Operator Type. If identical to B, above, enter "same as owner".

D. OWNER OF THE LAND:
Legal owner of the land(s) where the facility is located, address, person to contact, and phone number. Check the appropriate Owner Type. If identical to B, above, enter "same as owner".

E. ADDRESS WHERE LEGAL NOTICE MAY BE SERVED:
Address where legal notices may be served, person to contact, and phone number. If identical to B, above, enter "same as owner".

F. BILLING ADDRESS
Address where annual fee invoices should be sent, person to contact, and phone number. If identical to B, above, enter "same as owner".

Form 20016/97
II. TYPE OF DISCHARGE

Check the appropriate box to describe whether the waste will be discharged to: A. Land, or B. Surface Water.

Check the appropriate box(es) which best describe the activities at your facility.

Hazardous Waste - If you check the Hazardous Waste box, STOP and contact a representative of the RWQCB for further instructions.

Landfills - A separate form, APPLICATION FOR SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT/WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS, California Integrated Waste Management Board Form E-1-77, may be required. Contact a RWQCB representative to help determine the appropriate form for your discharge.

III. LOCATION OF THE FACILITY

1. Enter the Assessor's Parcel Number(s) (APN), which is located on the property tax bill. The number can also be obtained from the County Assessor's Office. Indicate the APN for both the facility and the discharge point.

2. Enter the Latitude of the entrance to the proposed/existing facility and of the discharge point. Latitude and longitude information can be obtained from a U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle topographic map. Other maps may also contain this information.

3. Enter the Longitude of the entrance to the proposed/existing facility and of the discharge point.

IV. REASON FOR FILING

NEW DISCHARGE OR FACILITY:
A discharge or facility that is proposed but does not now exist, or that does not yet have WDRs or an NPDES permit.

CHANGE IN DESIGN OR OPERATION:
A material change in design or operation from existing discharge requirements. Final determination of whether the reported change is material will be made by the RWQCB.

CHANGE IN QUANTITY/TYPE OF DISCHARGE:
A material change in characteristics of the waste from existing discharge requirements. Final determination of whether the reported change would have a significant effect will be made by the RWQCB.

CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP/OPERATOR:
Change of legal owner of the facility. Complete Parts I, III, and IV only and contact the RWQCB to determine if additional information is required.

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS UPDATE OR NPDES PERMIT REISSUANCE:
WDRs must be updated periodically to reflect changing technology standards and conditions. A new application is required to reissue an NPDES permit which has expired.

OTHER:
If there is a reason other than the ones listed, please describe the reason on the space provided. (If more space is needed, attach a separate sheet.)
V. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

It should be emphasized that communication with the appropriate RWQCB staff is vital before starting the CEQA documentation, and is recommended before completing this application. There are Basin Plan issues which may complicate the CEQA effort, and RWQCB staff may be able to help in providing the needed information to complete the CEQA documentation.

Name the Lead Agency responsible for completion of CEQA requirements for the project, i.e., completion and certification of CEQA documentation.

Check YES or NO. Has a public agency determined that the proposed project is exempt from CEQA?
If the answer is YES, state the basis for the exemption and the name of the agency supplying the exemption on the space provided. (Remember that, if extra space is needed, use an extra sheet of paper, but be sure to indicate the attached sheet under Section VII. Other.)

Check YES or NO. Has the “Notice of Determination” been filed under CEQA? If YES, give the date the notice was filed and enclose a copy of the Notice of Determination and the Initial Study, Environmental Impact Report, or Negative Declaration. If NO, check the box of the expected type of CEQA document for this project, and include the expected date of completion using the timelines given under CEQA. The date of completion should be taken as the date that the Notice of Determination will be submitted. (If not known, write “Unknown”)

VI. OTHER REQUIRED INFORMATION

To be approved, your application MUST include a COMPLETE characterization of the discharge. If the characterization is found to be incomplete, RWQCB staff will contact you and request that additional specific information be submitted.

This application MUST be accompanied by a site map. A USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle map or a street map, if more appropriate, is sufficient for most applications.

VII. OTHER

If any of the answers on your application form need further explanation, attach a separate sheet. Please list any attachments with the titles and dates on the space provided.

VIII. CERTIFICATION

Certification by the owner of the facility or the operator of the facility, if the operator is different from the owner, is required. The appropriate person must sign the application form.

Acceptable signatures are:
1. for a corporation, a principal executive officer of at least the level of senior vice-president;
2. for a partnership or individual (sole proprietorship), a general partner or the proprietor;
3. for a governmental or public agency, either a principal executive officer or ranking elected/appointed official.

DISCHARGE SPECIFIC INFORMATION

In most cases, a request to supply additional discharge specific information will be sent to you by a representative of the RWQCB. If the RWQCB determines that additional discharge specific information is not needed to process your application, you will be so notified.
## A. Facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. Facility Owner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
<th>Federal Tax ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C. Facility Operator (The agency or business, not the person):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. Owner of the Land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E. Address Where Legal Notice May Be Served:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## F. Billing Address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Telephone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. TYPE OF DISCHARGE

Check Type of Discharge(s) Described in this Application (A or B):

☐ A. WASTE DISCHARGE TO LAND  ☐ B. WASTE DISCHARGE TO SURFACE WATER

Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic/Municipal Wastewater Treatment and Disposal
☐ Animal Waste Solids
☐ Animal or Aquacultural Wastewater
☐ Cooling Water
☐ Land Treatment Unit
☐ Biosolids/Residual
☐ Mining
☐ Dredge Material Disposal
☐ Hazardous Waste (see instructions)
☐ Waste Pile
☐ Surface Impoundment
☐ Landfill (see instructions)
☐ Wastewater Reclamation
☐ Industrial Process Wastewater
☐ Storm Water
☐ Other, please describe:

III. LOCATION OF THE FACILITY

Describe the physical location of the facility.

1. Assessor's Parcel Number(s)
Facility: Discharge Point:
2. Latitude
Facility: Discharge Point:
3. Longitude
Facility: Discharge Point:

IV. REASON FOR FILING

☐ New Discharge or Facility  ☐ Changes in Ownership/Operator (see instructions)
☐ Change in Design or Operation  ☐ Waste Discharge Requirements Update or NPDES Permit Reissuance
☐ Change in Quantity/Type of Discharge  ☐ Other:

V. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Name of Lead Agency:

Has a public agency determined that the proposed project is exempt from CEQA?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
If Yes, state the basis for the exemption and the name of the agency supplying the exemption on the line below.
Basis for Exemption/Agency:

Has a "Notice of Determination" been filed under CEQA?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
If Yes, enclose a copy of the CEQA document, Environmental Impact Report, or Negative Declaration. If no, identify the expected type of CEQA document and expected date of completion.

Expected CEQA Documents:
☐ EIR  ☐ Negative Declaration

Expected CEQA Completion Date:
VI. OTHER REQUIRED INFORMATION

Please provide a COMPLETE characterization of your discharge. A complete characterization includes, but is not limited to, design and actual flows, a list of constituents and the discharge concentration of each constituent, a list of other appropriate waste discharge characteristics, a description and schematic drawing of all treatment processes, a description of any Best Management Practices (BMPs) used, and a description of disposal methods.

Also include a site map showing the location of the facility and, if you are submitting this application for an NPDES permit, identify the surface water to which you propose to discharge. Please try to limit your maps to a scale of 1:24,000 (7.5' USGS Quadrangle) or a street map, if more appropriate.

VII. OTHER

Attach additional sheets to explain any responses which need clarification. List attachments with titles and dates below:

________________________________________

You will be notified by a representative of the RWQCB within 30 days of receipt of your application. The notice will state if your application is complete or if there is additional information you must submit to complete your Application/Report of Waste Discharge, pursuant to Division 7, Section 13260 of the California Water Code.

VIII. CERTIFICATION

"I certify under penalty of law that this document, including all attachments and supplemental information, were prepared under my direction and supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment."

Print Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________