May 28, 2015

Via FedEx

Adrianna Crowl, Staff Services Analyst
State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Crowl:

Please find enclosed the petition for review submitted by the Natural Resources Defense Council, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, captioned: Petition of NRDC, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, for Review by the State Water Resources Control Board of the Regional Board Executive Officer’s Action to Conditionally Approve Nine Watershed Management Programs Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 (“Petition”). Please also find enclosed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of the Petition with accompanying Exhibits A – D. In addition to Exhibit C, we have enclosed a CD containing copies of the nine revised WMPs referenced in the Petition. The above documents were filed with the State Board via email on May 28, 2015. Please do not hesitate to contact us at 310-434-2300 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Becky Hayat
Project Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council

Rita Kampalath
Science and Policy Director
Heal the Bay

Liz Crosson
Executive Director
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
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PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S ACTION TO CONDITIONALLY APPROVE NINE WMPs PURSUANT TO THE L.A. COUNTY MS4 PERMIT
LIZ CROSSON, Bar No. 262178
TATIANA GAUR, Bar No. 246227
LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER
120 Broadway, Suite 105
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Attorneys for LOS ANGELES
WATERKEEPER
AND HEAL THE BAY

DANIEL COOPER, Bar No. 153576
LAWYERS FOR CLEAN WATER, INC.
1004A O’Reilly Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94129
(415) 440-6520

Attorney for LOS ANGELES
WATERKEEPER
Pursuant to Part VI.A.6 of the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175) (“2012 MS4 Permit” or “Permit”), the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”), Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay (collectively “Petitioners”) hereby petition the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (“Regional Board”) to review the Regional Board Executive Officer’s action in conditionally approving nine Watershed Management Programs (“WMPs”) prepared by dischargers regulated by the 2012 MS4 Permit. Additionally, in accordance with Section 13320 of the California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, Petitioners hereby petition the State Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”) to review the Executive Officer’s action to issue these conditional approvals.

The 2012 MS4 Permit regulates stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (“MS4s”) for Los Angeles County and the 84 incorporated cities therein (collectively “Permittees”). The 2012 MS4 Permit is the fourth iteration of the MS4 permit for Los Angeles County. Unlike the prior 2001 Permit, the 2012 MS4 Permit provides Permittees the option of developing a WMP or an Enhanced Watershed Management Program (“EWMP”) as an alternative mechanism to implement permit requirements.

On April 28, 2015, the Executive Officer, on behalf of the Regional Board, conditionally approved nine WMPs that were submitted by Permittees. For reasons discussed below, Petitioners request that the Regional Board invalidate the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals and deny all nine WMPs as required by the 2012 MS4 Permit. Absent such action by the Regional Board, Petitioners request that the State Board invalidate the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals as such action constitutes an abuse of discretion pursuant to Cal. Water Code §§ 13220 and 13330.

1. NAME, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE NUMBER, AND E-MAIL ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
1314 Second Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Attention: Steve Fleischli, Esq. (sfleischli@nrdc.org)
Becky Hayat, Esq. (bhayat@nrdc.org)
(310) 434-2300
Los Angeles Waterkeeper  
120 Broadway, Suite 105  
Santa Monica, CA  90401  
Attention: Liz Crosson  (liz@lawaterkeeper.org)  
Tatiana Gaur  (tgaur@lawaterkeeper.org)  
(310) 394-6162  

Heal the Bay  
1444 9th Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
Attention: Rita Kampalath  (rkampalath@healthebay.org)  
(310) 451-1500  

2. THE SPECIFIC ACTION OR INACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH THE STATE BOARD IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW AND A COPY OF ANY ORDER OR RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH IS REFERRED TO IN THE PETITION: 

Petitioners seek review of the Regional Board Executive Officer’s action to conditionally approve nine WMPs pursuant to the 2012 MS4 Permit. Copies of the Executive Officer’s letters of conditional approvals are attached as Exhibit B.  

3. THE DATE ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED OR REFUSED TO ACT OR ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD WAS REQUESTED TO ACT:  

April 28, 2015.  

4. A FULL AND COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE REASONS THE ACTION OR FAILURE TO ACT WAS INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER:  

In conditionally approving the nine WMPs, the Executive Officer failed to act in accordance with relevant governing law, acted inappropriately and improperly, and abused his discretion. Specifically, but without limitation, the Executive Officer:  

A. Improperly acted outside the scope of delegated authority in “conditionally” approving WMPs because the only authority explicitly delegated to the Executive Officer by the Regional Board was to approve or deny the WMPs. Such action, therefore, constitutes an abuse of discretion. (Cal. Water Code § 13223(a); see also California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (April 11, 2014), Resolution No. R14-005 amending Resolution No. R10-009, Delegation of Authority to the Executive Officer.)
B. Improperly modified the 2012 MS4 Permit by failing to comply with the substantive and procedural requirements pursuant to state and federal law, and exceeded the statutory limits for delegation. (See Environmental Defense Center, Inc. v. EPA, 344 F.3d 832, 853 (9th Cir. 2003); 40 C.F.R. §§ 124.5-124.15; Cal. Water Code Section § 13223(a).)

C. Improperly imposed conditions in the approvals that are inconsistent with Permit requirements and the federal Clean Water Act (“CWA”).

5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED:

Petitioners are non-profit, environmental organizations that have a direct interest in protecting, inter alia, the quality of Los Angeles County’s aquatic resources, including Santa Monica Bay, the Los Angeles River, and other Los Angeles area waters, as well as the health of beachgoers and other users. NRDC is a non-profit organization whose purpose is to safeguard the Earth: its people, its plants and animals, and the natural systems on which all life depends. NRDC represents approximately 72,000 members in California, approximately 12,600 of whom reside in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles Waterkeeper is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation, protection, and defense of the rivers, creeks and coastal waters of Los Angeles County from all sources of pollution and degradation. Waterkeeper represents approximately 3,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Los Angeles area. Heal the Bay is a non-profit organization whose mission is making southern California’s coastal waters and watersheds, including Santa Monica Bay, safe, healthy and clean. Heal the Bay represents approximately 13,000 members in Los Angeles County.

Petitioners’ members recreate in and around the waters to which the 2012 MS4 Permit regulates discharges of stormwater runoff and are impacted by pollution in stormwater runoff and its resulting health impacts, and by beach closures which restrict the ability of residents and visitors in Los Angeles County to use the beach and local waters for recreation and other purposes. In particular, Petitioners’ members directly benefit from Los Angeles County waters in the form of recreational swimming, surfing, diving, photography, birdwatching, fishing, and boating.
Petitioners’ members are aggrieved by the Executive Officer’s action to conditionally approve the nine WMPs pursuant to the 2012 MS4 Permit because such action is an obstruction to achieving the Permit’s ultimate goal of meeting Water Quality Standards (“WQS”), as required by the CWA. Specifically, the Executive Officer’s failure to deny the WMPs as required by the 2012 MS4 Permit – and thereby failure to adequately control urban stormwater runoff through the Permit and to ensure that pollution in stormwater discharges will not degrade the region’s waters – has enormous consequences for Los Angeles County residents and Petitioners’ members. Urban stormwater runoff is one of the largest sources of pollution to the coastal and other receiving waters of the nation, and is a particularly severe problem in the Los Angeles region. Waters discharged from municipal storm drains carry bacteria, metals, and other pollutants at unsafe levels to rivers, lakes, and beaches in Los Angeles County. This pollution has damaging effects on both human health and aquatic ecosystems, causing increased rates of human illness and resulting in an economic loss of tens to hundreds of millions of dollars every year from public health impacts alone. The pollutants also adversely impact aquatic animals and plant life in receiving waters.

Receiving waters in the Permittees’ jurisdiction continue to be impaired for a variety of pollutants, and monitoring data show that stormwater discharges continue to contain pollutants at levels that cause or contribute to these impairments. Urban development increases impervious land cover and exacerbates problems of stormwater volume, rate, and pollutant loading. Consequently, Los Angeles County’s high rate of urbanization and persistent water quality problems demand that the most effective stormwater management tools be required. Both the Regional and State Board have defined the WMPs as the means by which compliance with WQSs is determined. By conditionally approving clearly deficient WMPs, however, the Executive Officer is allowing Permittees to defer compliance with WQSs, resulting in zero improvement in water quality.

All of these documented facts demonstrate the considerable negative impact on Petitioners’ members and the environment that continues today as a result of the Executive Officer’s failure to comply with the terms of the 2012 MS4 Permit.

///
6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE REGIONAL OR STATE BOARD WHICH
PETITIONER REQUESTS:

Petitioners seek an Order by the Regional or State Board that:

Invalidates the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals and Denies all Nine
WMPs as required by the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Stormwater
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, Order No. R4-
2012-0175, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001.

7. A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION:

See, Section 4, above. Petitioners have enclosed a separate Memorandum of Points and
Authorities in support of this Petition.

8. A STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE
REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE DISCHARGERS, IF NOT THE PETITIONER:

A true and correct copy of this petition was delivered by electronic mail to the Regional
Board and the Permittees on May 28, 2015. A true and correct copy of this petition was also
mailed via First Class mail to the Regional Board on May 28, 2015.

9. A STATEMENT THAT THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES OR OBJECTIONS RAISED IN
THE PETITION WERE RAISED BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD, OR AN
EXPLANATION OF WHY THE PETITIONER WAS NOT REQUIRED OR WAS
UNABLE TO RAISE THESE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES OR OBJECTIONS BEFORE
THE REGIONAL BOARD.

All of the substantive issues and objections raised herein were presented to the Regional
Board during the period for public comment on the draft WMPs. Petitioners submitted written
comments regarding the revised WMPs on March 25, 2015. Petitioners presented testimony
before the Regional Board on April 13, 2015.

Respectfully submitted via electronic mail and Federal Express,

Dated: May 28, 2015          NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.

__________________________
Becky Hayat
Steve Fleischli
Attorneys for NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. & HEAL THE BAY
Dated: May 28, 2015

LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER

Elizabeth Crosson
Tatiana Gaur
Attorneys for LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER
& HEAL THE BAY

Dated: May 28, 2015

HEAL THE BAY

Rita Kampalath
Director of Science and Policy, HEAL THE BAY
PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 1314 Second Street, Santa Monica, California 90401.

On May 28, 2015, I served the within documents described as PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S ACTION TO CONDITIONALLY APPROVE NINE WMPs PURSUANT TO THE L.A. COUNTY MS4 PERMIT and MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR REVIEW OF LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S ACTION TO CONDITIONALLY APPROVE NINE WMPs PURSUANT TO THE L.A. COUNTY MS4 PERMIT on the following interested parties in said action by submitting a true copy thereof via electronic mail to the email addresses below:

City of Agoura Hills
c/o Ramiro S. Adeva III, Public Works Director/City Engineer
Greg Ramirez, City Manager
Ken Berkman, City Engineer
rameva@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us
gramirez@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us
kberkman@agoura-hills.ca.us

City of Alhambra
c/o David Dolphin Environmental Compliance Specialist
ddolphin@cityofalhambra.org

City of Arcadia
c/o Vanessa Hevener, Environmental Services Officer
Dominic Lazzaretto, City Manager
Tom Tait, Public Works Services Director
vhevener@ci.arcadia.ca.us
dlazzaretto@ci.arcadia.ca.us
ttait@ci.arcadia.ca.us

City of Bell
c/o Terry Rodrigue, City Engineer
trodrigue@cityofbell.org

City of Bell Gardens
c/o John Oropesa, Assistant City Manager
cvll@bellgardens.org

City of Bellflower
c/o Bernie Iniguez Environmental Services Manager
biniguez@bellflower.org

City of Beverly Hills
c/o Josette Descalzo, Environmental Compliance and Sustainability Manager
jdescalzo@beverlyhills.org
jkolin@beverlyhills.org

City of Artesia
c/o Susie Gomes, Assistant to the City Manager
sgomes@cityofartesia.us
City of Azusa  
c/o Carl Hassel, City Engineer  
Daniel Bobadilla, Interim Director of Public Works/City Engineer  
chassel@ci.azusa.ca.us  
dbobadilla@ci.azusa.ca.us  

City of Baldwin Park  
c/o David Lopez, Associate Engineer  
dlopez@baldwinpark.com  

City of Calabasas  
c/o Alex Farassati, Environmental Services Supervisor  
afarassati@cityofcalabasas.com  

City of Cerritos  
c/o Mike O’Grady, Environmental Services  
mogrady@cerritos.us  

City of Commerce  
c/o Gina Nila, Environmental Services  
gnila@ci.commerce.ca.us  

City of Covina  
c/o Vivian Castro, Environmental Services Manager  
vcastro@ci.covina.ca.us  

City of Culver City  
c/o Damian Skinner, Manager  
John Nachbar, City Manager  
damian.skinner@culvercity.org  
john.nachbar@culvercity.org  

City of Bradbury  
c/o Michelle Keith, City Manager  
mkeith@cityofbradbury.org  

City of Burbank  
c/o Bonnie Teaford, Public Works Director  
bteaford@ci.burbank.ca.us  

City of Carson  
c/o Patricia Elkins, Building Construction Manager  
David Biggs, City Manager  
Farrokh Abolfathi, Principal Civil Engineer  
pelkins@carson.ca.us  
dbiggs@carson.ca.us  
fabolfathi@carson.ca.us  

City of Claremont  
c/o Brian Desatnik, Director of Community Development  
Loretta Mustafa, City Engineer  
bdesatnik@ci.claremont.ca.us  
lmustafa@ci.claremont.ca.us  

City of Compton  
c/o Hien Nguyen, Assistant City Engineer  
hnguyen@comptoncity.org  

City of Cudahy  
c/o Hector Rodriguez, City Manager  
Albert Santos, Acting City Manager, Assistant to the City Manager  
hrodriguez@cityofcudahy.ca.us  
asantos@cityofcudahyca.gov  

City of Diamond Bar  
c/o David Liu, Director of Public Works  
dlui@diamondbarca.gov
City of Downey
c/o Jason Wen, Ph.D., P.E.
Utilities Superintendent
Yvette M. Abich Garcia,
City Attorney
jwen@downeyca.org
ygarcia@downeyca.org

City of Duarte
c/o Darrel George, City Manager
Rafael Casillas, Public Works Manager
georged@accessduarte.com
rcasillas@accessduarte.com

City of El Monte
c/o Frank Senteno,
Director of Public Works
pwmaintenance@elmonte.ca.gov

City of El Segundo
c/o Stephanie Katsouleas,
Public Works Director
skatsouleas@elsegundo.org

City of Gardena
c/o John Felix, Assistant
Engineer
Mitchell Lansdell, City
Manager
jfelix@ci.gardena.ca.us
mlansdell@ci.gardena.ca.us

City of Glendora
c/o Dave Davies
Director of Public Works
ddavies@ci.glendora.ca.us

City of Glendale
c/o Maurice Oillataguerre,
Senior Environmental Program Scientist
moillataguerre@ci.glendale.ca.us

City of Hawaiian Gardens
c/o Joseph Colombo,
Director of Community Development
jcolombo@ghcity.org

City of Hawthorne
c/o Arnold Shadbeh,
Chief General Service and Public Works
ashadbeh@cityofhawthorne.org

City of Hermosa Beach
c/o Homayoun Behboodi, Associate Engineer
hbehboodi@hermosabch.org

City of Hidden Hills
c/o Kimberly Colberts,
Environmental Coordinator
staff@hiddenhillscity.org

City of Huntington Park
c/o James Enriquez, Director of Public
Works/City Engineer
jenriquez@huntingtonpark.org

City of Industry
c/o Troy Helling, Senior
Planner
thelling@cityofindustry.org
planning@cityofindustry.org

City of Inglewood
c/o Lauren Amimoto,
Senior Administrative Analyst
Barmeshwar Rai, Principal Engineer
Louis Atwell, Public Works Director
Artie Fields, City Manager
lamimoto@cityofinglewood.org
brai@cityofinglewood.org
City of Irwindale  
c/o William Kwok  
Tam, Director of  
Public Works  
wtam@ci.irwindale.ca.us

City of La Habra Heights  
c/o Shauna Clark, City Manager  
shaunac@lhhcity.org

City of La Puente  
c/o John DiMario,  
Director of Development Services  
jdmario@lapuente.org

City of Lakewood  
c/o Konya Vivanti,  
Environmental Programs Manager  
kvivanti@lakewoodcity.org

City of Lomita  
c/o Michael Rock, City Manager/City Clerk  
Mark McAvoy, Public Works Director/City Engineer  
m.rock@lomitacity.com  
m.mcavoy@lomitacity.com

City of Lynwood  
c/o Josef Kekula,  
Public Works Association  
Elias Saikaly, Senior Public Works Manager  
jkekula@lynwood.ca.us  
esaikaly@lynwood.ca.us

City of Manhattan Beach  
c/o Mark Danaj, City Manager  
cm@citymb.info

City of La Canada Flintridge  
c/o Edward G. Hitti, Director of Public Works  
ehitti@lcf.ca.gov

City of La Mirada  
c/o Mark Stowell, Public Works Director/City Engineer  
mstowell@cityoflamirada.org

City of La Verne  
c/o Daniel Keeseey, Director of Public Works  
dkeesey@ci.la-verne.ca.us

City of Lawndale  
c/o Nasser Abbaszadeh, Director of Public Works  
Steve Mandoki, City Manager  
smandoki@lawndalecity.org  
nabbaszadeh@lawndalecity.org

City of Los Angeles  
c/o Shahram Kharaghani, Division Manager  
shahram.kharaghani@lacity.org

City of Malibu  
c/o Jennifer Brown,  
Senior Environmental Programs Coordinator  
jbrown@malibucity.org

City of Maywood  
c/o Andre Dupret, Project Manager  
andre.dupret@cityofmaywood.org
mdanaj@citymb.info

City of Monrovia
c/o Sharon Gallant, Environmental Services Analyst II
Oliver Chi, City Manager
cityhall@ci.monrovia.ca.us
gallant@ci.monrovia.ca.us
ochi@ci.monrovia.ca.us

City of Monterey Park
c/o Amy Ho, Principal Management Analyst
John Hunter, Consultant
amho@montereypark.ca.gov
jhunter@jhla.net

City of Palos Verdes Estates
c/o Jack Rydell, City Engineer
Sherri Repp-Loadsman, Planning and Building Director
jackrydell@caaprofessionals.com
srepp@pvestates.org

City of Pasadena
c/o Stephen Walker
Principal Engineer
swalker@cityofpasadena.net

City of Pomona
c/o Julie Carver,
Environmental Programs Coordinator
Linda Lowry, City Manager
julie_carver@ci.pomona.ca.us
linda_lowry@ci.pomona.ca.us

City of Redondo Beach
c/o Mike Shay, Principal Civil Engineer
Mike Witzansky, Assistant City Manager
mshay@redondo.org

City of Montebello
c/o Danilo Batson, Director of Public Works
Cory Roberts
croberts@aaeinc.com
dbatson@cityofmontebello.com

City of Norwalk
c/o Daniel R. Garcia, City Engineer
William Zimmerman, Interim City Engineer
dgarcia@norwalkca.gov
administration@norwalkca.gov
bzzimmerman@norwalkca.gov

City of Paramount
c/o Christopher S. Cash
Director of Public Works
cash@paramountcity.com

City of Pico Rivera
c/o Rene Bobadilla, City Manager
rbobadilla@pico-rivera.org

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
c/o Douglas Willmore, City Manager
Michael Throne, Director of Public Works
citymanager@rpv.com
dwillmore@rpvca.gov
michaelt@rpvca.gov

City of Rolling Hills
c/o Greg Grammer,
Assistant City Manager
ggrammar@rollinghillsestatesca.gov
mike.witzansky@redondo.org

City of Rolling Hills Estates
  c/o Greg Grammer,
  Assistant City Manager
ggrammer@rollinghillestatesca.gov

City of San Dimas
  c/o Latoya Cyrus,
  Environmental Coordinator
cyrus@ci.san-dimas.ca.us

City of San Gabriel
  c/o Daren T. Grilley, City Engineer
dgrilley@sgca.org

City of Santa Clarita
  c/o Travis Lange
  Environmental Services Manager
ttlange@santa-clarita.com

City of Santa Monica
  c/o Neal Shapiro,
  Urban Runoff Coordinator
  nshapiro@smgov.net

City of Signal Hill
  c/o John Hunter
  Ken Farfsing, City Manager
  jhunter@jlha.net
  kfarfsing@cityofsignalhill.org

City of South Gate
  c/o John Hunter
  jhunter@jlha.net

City of Temple City
  c/o John Hunter
  jhunter@jlha.net

City of Rosemead
  c/o Matt Hawkesworth, Assistant City Manager/Acting Public Works Director
  mhawksworth@cityofrosemead.org

City of San Fernando
  c/o Chris Marcarello, Deputy City Manager/Public Works Director
  cmarcarello@sfcity.org

City of San Marino
  c/o Chuck Richie,
  Director of Parks and Public Works
  John Schaefer, City Manager
  crichie@cityofsanmarino.org
  jschaefer@cityofsanmarino.org

City of Santa Fe Springs
  c/o Sarina Morales-Choate, Civil Engineer Assistant
  smorales-choate@santafesprings.org

City of Sierra Madre
  c/o James Carlson, Management Analyst
  Elaine Aguilar, City Manager
  jcarlson@cityofsierramadre.com
  eaguiar@cityofsierramadre.com

City of South El Monte
  c/o Anthony Ybarra, City Manager
  tybarra@soelmonte.org

City of South Pasadena
  c/o John Hunter
  jhunter@jlha.net

City of Torrance
  c/o LeRoy Jackson, City Manager
  Robert Beste, Public Works
  ljackson@torranceca.gov
City of Vernon
c/o Claudia Arellano, Stormwater and Special Projects Analyst
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

City of West Covina
c/o Samuel Gutierrez, Civil Engineering Associate
sam.gutierrez@westcovina.org

City of Westlake Village
c/o Joe Bellomo
Stormwater Program Manager
jbellomo@willdan.com

City of Walnut
c/o Alicia Jensen, Community Services Superintendent
ajensen@ci.walnut.ca.us

City of West Hollywood
c/o Sharon Perlstein, City Engineer
sperlstein@weho.org

City of Whittier
c/o David A. Pelser, PE, BCEE
Director of Public Works
dpelser@cityofwhittier.org
pubwks@cityofwhittier.org

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 28, 2015, at Santa Monica, California.

______________________________
Laura West

rbeste@torranceca.gov
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San Francisco, CA 94129
(415) 440-6520

Attorney for LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER
I. INTRODUCTION

This petition seeks review of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (“Regional Board”) Executive Officer’s action to conditionally approve nine Watershed Management Programs (“WMPs”) pursuant to the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (“MS4”) Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175) (“2012 MS4 Permit” or “Permit”). The 2012 MS4 Permit regulates the discharge of stormwater for Los Angeles County and 84 incorporated cities therein (collectively “Permittees”). Petitioners request that the Executive Officer’s action be reviewed by the Regional Board pursuant to Part VI.A.6 of the 2012 MS4 Permit, which states that concerns with the WMP approval process must be appealed to the Regional Board. However, the California Water Code requires all improper actions by the Executive Officer be appealed to the State Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”) within 30 day of such action. Therefore, Petitioners also file this appeal with the State Board and request that, absent Regional Board action, the Executive Officer’s action be reviewed by the State Board in accordance with Cal. Water Code § 13320 and 23 C.C.R. § 2050 et seq.

The 2012 MS4 Permit provides Permittees the option of developing a WMP or an Enhanced Watershed Management Program (“EWMP”) as an alternative mechanism for meeting water quality-based permit requirements. The Permit requires that the Regional Board, or Executive Officer on behalf of the Board, must approve or deny the final WMPs submitted by Permittees by April 28, 2015.\(^1\) However, on April 28, 2015, the Executive Officer neither approved nor denied the final WMPs pursuant to delegated authority in the Permit; rather, the Executive Officer granted so-called “conditional approvals” for a total of nine final WMPs that were submitted by Permittees.\(^2\) For reasons discussed below, the Executive Officer’s action in issuing the “conditional approvals” fails to comply with legal requirements. Petitioners therefore request that the Regional Board invalidate the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals and deny

\(^1\) Final WMPs were submitted to the Regional Board at the end of January 2015. Within three months of receiving the final WMPs, the Regional Board, or Executive Officer on behalf of the Board, must approve or deny the programs. 2012 MS4 Permit, at Table 9. That deadline was April 28, 2015.

\(^2\) See Exhibit B: Letters of Conditional Approvals from the Executive Officer.
all nine final WMPs as required by the 2012 MS4 Permit. (2012 MS4 Permit, at Part VI.A.6.)

Absent such action by the Regional Board, Petitioners request that the State Board invalidate the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals as such action constitutes an abuse of discretion pursuant to Cal. Water Code § 13330(e) and Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 1094.5(b) and 1094(c).

The Executive Officer’s action to conditionally approve nine WMPs pursuant to the 2012 MS4 Permit is an abuse of discretion for three principal reasons: 1) the Executive Officer acted outside of his delegated authority in conditionally approving the WMPs; 2) the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals – a step nowhere allowed in the 2012 MS4 Permit – is an improper permit modification without notice, hearing, or Regional Board approval as required by law and furthermore, exceeds the statutory limits for delegation imposed by Cal. Water Code § 13223(a); and 3) the terms of the conditional approvals are inconsistent with core Permit requirements and the federal Clean Water Act (“CWA”), and therefore demonstrate that the only available course of action for the Executive Officer was to deny the WMPs.

A. Legal Background

In 1972, Congress enacted the CWA to “restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.”3 Because of the serious threats imposed by stormwater runoff, Congress amended the CWA in 1987 with a phased schedule for developing stormwater permitting regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) program.4 Twenty years later, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) has noted the continuing problems caused by stormwater, stating that “[s]tormwater has been identified as one of the leading sources of pollution for all waterbody types in the United States.”5

The CWA requires each state to adopt Water Quality Standards (“WQSs”) for all waters within its boundaries, which include maximum permissible pollutant levels that must be sufficiently stringent to protect public health and enhance water quality.6 States must also identify

as impaired any water bodies that fail to meet WQSs for specific designated uses. For impaired waters, states must establish total maximum daily loads ("TMDLs"), which set a daily limit on the discharge of each pollutant necessary to achieve WQSs. TMDLs assign a waste load allocation ("WLA") to each source for which an NPDES permit is required, and "once a TMDL is developed, effluent limitations in NPDES permits must be consistent with the WLAs in the TMDL." Beginning in 1990, the Regional Board issued a NPDES permit to cover stormwater discharges by the County and municipalities in the region. (2012 MS4 Permit, at Finding B.) Whenever a permit is reissued, modified, or revoked, a new draft permit must be prepared and fully comply with certain substantive and procedural requirements under state and federal law, such as being accompanied by a fact sheet, and providing public notice, comment period, and hearings.

**B. The 2012 MS4 Permit**

On November 8, 2012, the Regional Board approved the current 2012 MS4 Permit for Los Angeles County. The previous MS4 Permit for Los Angeles County issued in 2001 (Order No. 01-182) ("2001 Permit") set receiving water limitations ("RWLs") for Los Angeles County waters, stating that discharges from the municipal storm drain system that "cause or contribute" to violations of WQSs or water quality objectives are prohibited. (2001 Permit, at Part 2.3.) The 2012 MS4 Permit contains the same RWLs provisions as the 2001 Permit, but unlike the 2001 Permit, incorporates several "safe harbors" that create an alternative means to comply with the RWLs provisions in certain circumstances. Specifically, under the 2012 MS4 Permit, Permittees may develop a WMP or an EWMP whereby they can select their own control measures, best management practices, and compliance schedules to implement permit requirements, subject to minimum standards set forth in the Permit. (2012 MS4 Permit, at Part VI.C.) Under certain circumstances, if a Permittee fully complies with the WMP development and implementation.

---

7 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d).
10 See 40 C.F.R. §§ 124.5-124.15.
11 Regional Board Order No. R4-2012-0175.
requirements pursuant to the Permit, it will be deemed in compliance with the RWLs, at least temporarily, whether or not such limitations are actually achieved. (Id., at Part VI.C.2.b.)

On December 10, 2012, Petitioners filed a petition for review to the State Board challenging the Regional Board’s adoption of the 2012 MS4 Permit. The State Board has yet to make a final determination on Petitioners’ petition, but it has issued a Draft Order as well as a subsequent revised Draft Order on the various Permit petitions. In the revised Draft Order, the State Board continues to assert that the WMP alternative compliance approach “is a clearly defined, implementable, and enforceable alternative to the receiving water limitations provisions.”12 Thus, the Revised Draft Order defines the WMPs as an acceptable means by which compliance with WQSs – a core CWA requirement for all NPDES permits – is determined.

According to the 2012 MS4 Permit, once Permittees elect to participate in the Permit’s alternative compliance approach and develop a WMP, the Regional Board, or Executive Officer on behalf of the Board, must approve or deny the final draft WMPs submitted by Permittees. (Id., at Table 9.) The Permit provides a clear schedule for WMP development, submission, and approval or denial as well as opportunity for public comments on the draft WMPs. (Id.) Furthermore, the Permit contains a detailed section specifying the minimum requirements that must be included in a draft WMP prior to approval, such as: 1) identification of water quality priorities; 2) selection of watershed control measures; and 3) compliance schedules. (See id., at Part VI.C.5.) The Permit does not allow for “conditional approvals” of final draft WMPs submitted by Permittees by the Regional Board or Executive Officer on behalf of the Board. (Id., at Table 9).

The WMPs subject to this Petition were first submitted in June 2014. On August 18, 2014, Petitioners submitted comments on most of the draft WMPs, which, among other things, addressed the many deficiencies in the programs. Regional Board staff also reviewed the draft WMPs and in October 2014, sent a letter to each of the nine WMP groups identifying significant deficiencies to

be corrected as a prerequisite to the Board’s approval of the WMPs. The Permittees were directed to submit revised WMPs addressing the Board’s concerns, and accordingly all nine WMP groups submitted revised plans in January 2015 – with the exception of City of Walnut, which submitted its revised WMP in April 2015 – for Regional Board review and approval.

In all nine revised WMPs, Permittees failed to correct many, if not most, of the deficiencies that Regional Board staff had identified. Despite the revised plans’ near complete disregard for the Regional Board demands and thereby Permit requirements, on April 28, 2015, the Executive Officer, on behalf of the Board, illegally issued conditional approvals for the nine revised WMPs.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

In reviewing the Executive Officer’s decision, both the Regional and State Boards must exercise their independent judgment as to whether the Executive Officer’s action is reasonable. The Executive Officer’s action constitutes an “[a]buse of discretion…if [he] has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the order or decision is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence.”

///

///

///

13 See Exhibit A: Regional Board Staff Review of Draft WMPs.
14 See Exhibit C: Links to Revised WMPs.
15 Petitioners have conducted a detailed analysis of draft WMPs, Regional Board staff comments, and revised WMPs for three watershed management groups: Lower San Gabriel River, Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2, and Lower Los Angeles River. See Comments on Revised Watershed Management Plans under the Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001, Order No. R4-2012-0175 submitted by NRDC, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and Heal the Bay, March 25, 2015. Petitioners’ detailed comments on these three WMPs are representative of inadequacies in all nine WMPs that were conditionally approved pursuant to the 2012 MS4 Permit.
16 See Stinnes-Western Chemical Corp., State Board WQ Order No. 86-16 (1986).
III. ARGUMENT

A. The Executive Officer’s Action to Grant Conditional Approvals Was Beyond His Delegated Authority and Thus Constitutes an Abuse of Discretion

The Executive Officer “conditionally” approved nine WMPs when the only authority delegated to him by the Regional Board was to approve or deny the WMPs. *(Id., at Table 9.)* By granting conditional approvals, the Executive Officer has acted outside of his legally delegated authority as provided for in the 2012 MS4 Permit, and therefore has abused his discretion.

The 2012 MS4 Permit allows Permittees the option to develop a WMP to implement permit requirements. However, the Permit provisions make it clear that draft WMPs must meet certain minimum requirements in order to receive Regional Board approval and thus before Permittees can begin implementation of the approved WMPs. *(See id., at Part VI.C.5.)* The Regional Board, or the Executive Officer on behalf of the Board, must approve or deny the final plans within three months after Permittees’ submittal of those plans. *(Id., at Table 9.)*

Under state law, a Regional Board can delegate any of its powers and duties, with limited exceptions, to its Executive Officer.¹⁹ The Executive Officer’s actions, however, are limited to only carrying out the duties that have been explicitly delegated and, in any event, may not exceed the statutory limits imposed by Cal. Water Code § 13223(a). As indicated in Table 9 of the 2012 MS4 Permit, the Board delegated to the Executive Officer the power to approve or deny WMPs, which is a delegable duty under Section 13223(a).

Permittees submitted their revised final WMPs at the end of January 2015, making April 28, 2015 the date by which the Regional Board, or Executive Officer on behalf of the Board, had to approve or deny the final WMPs. In its October 2014 comments on the draft WMPs, the Regional Board staff required specific revisions that Permittees must make before their WMPs can be approved.²⁰ Unfortunately, there was not a single revised WMP that fully and properly

¹⁹ Cal. Water Code § 13223(a); see also California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (April 11, 2014), Resolution No. R14-005 amending Resolution No. R10-009, Delegation of Authority to the Executive Officer (“Resolution No. R14-005”).

²⁰ See Exhibit A: Regional Board Staff Review of Draft WMPs.
responded to the Board’s requests for revisions. In fact, as demonstrated by the Executive Officer’s
issuance of “conditional approvals” all nine WMPs failed to comply with the Regional Board’s
directive and thus fell short of meeting the Permit requirements necessary to allow Permittees to
pursue the Permit’s alternative compliance approach.21 Because the nine WMPs, as finally
submitted, failed to meet the program development requirements by the designated schedule set
forth in the Permit, neither the Regional Board nor the Executive Officer on its behalf could
approve the final WMPs. Therefore, the only course of action available to the Executive Officer
pursuant to the Permit was to deny the final WMPs by the April 28, 2015 deadline.

Not only did the Executive Officer improperly issue conditional approvals instead of
denying the WMPs, but by conditionally approving the WMPs, the Executive Officer also
provided Permittees an additional 45 days to comply with the Permit’s WMP development
requirements and thereby improperly extended the Permit’s WMP deadlines. Notwithstanding the
fact that the conditions imposed by the Executive Officer are themselves insufficient (as discussed
in Section III.C. below), they were aimed at correcting the WMPs’ failures to comply with the
Permit requirements and clearly demonstrate that the WMPs should have been properly denied on
April 28, 2015. The Executive Officer’s action to conditionally approve the final WMPs is thus not
only contrary to the Permit requirements, but also outside the scope of the Executive Officer’s
specifically-delegated authority to only approve or deny the WMPs on or before April 28, 2015.

Furthermore, the conditional approvals left the extension open-ended, specifying that “[t]he
Board may rescind this approval if all of the following conditions are not met to the satisfaction of
the Board” by June 12, 2015.22 Thus, the “conditional approvals” left open the possibility that the
Executive Officer/Regional Board may further extend the 45-day deadline and issue another round
of conditional approvals beyond June 12, 2015. However, the Executive Officer did not have any
authority to indefinitely extend the Permit’s deadlines. More significantly, the Regional Board

21 See Exhibit B: Letters of Conditional Approvals from the Executive Officer; Exhibit C: Links to Revised WMPs.
22 See Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, Notice of Approval, with Conditions, of Nine WMPs
Pursuant to the LA County MS4 Permit, Order No. R4-2012-0174, Including Three WMPs Also Pursuant to the City of
Long Beach MS4 Permit, Order No. R4-2014-0024, April 28, 2015 (emphasis added).
itself has repeatedly noted that the 2001 Permit’s iterative approach has been ineffective at bringing Permittees into compliance with WQSs and therefore wants to avoid a process of continual WMP implementation and endless extensions without ever achieving Permit compliance. The Permit required that the Executive Officer must approve or deny the final WMPs by April 28, 2015. (Id.) Therefore, the conditional approvals’ open-ended extensions are a further abuse of discretion.

As a result of the Executive Officer’s unauthorized actions, Permittees that have not complied with the 2012 MS4 Permit’s WMP development requirements by April 28, 2015 – and therefore have not demonstrated that their WMPs will achieve the RWLs and TMDL-specific limitations – are nevertheless improperly allowed to continue to avail themselves of the Permit’s “safe harbor” provisions. This directly undermines the Permit’s scheme and shows the validity of Petitioners’ long-standing concern that the WMP/EWMP provisions and process allow an endless loop of permit implementation without ultimate achievement of WQSs, specifically via the adaptive management process. Additionally, this is in direct contradiction to statements made by Regional Board staff themselves asserting their commitment to following the WMP approval/denial timeline.

While the State Board continues to claim that the WMP alternative compliance approach provides a finite, concrete, and rigorous process for meeting Permit requirements, it is quite evident that the exact opposite is happening here. By granting conditional approvals, the Executive Officer is creating yet another process and a new, unauthorized schedule that will only defer compliance with the Permit’s RWLs and TMDL-limitations. Moreover, once a WMP is approved, Permittees must immediately begin implementing measures and actions proposed in the WMP.

25 2012 Permit Adoption Hearing Transcript, at p. 69.
26 Revised Draft Order, at p. 36.
(Id., at Part VI.C.6.) However, if the WMPs are approved in their deficient state, implementing such deficient programs will, by definition, fail to put Permittees on a rigorous path to achieving Permit compliance.

**B. The Executive Officer’s Conditional Approvals Constitute an Improper Permit Modification**

By conditionally approving WMPs – a procedure nowhere provided for in the 2012 MS4 Permit – the Executive Officer improperly modified the 2012 MS4 Permit in violation of the substantive and procedural requirements of state and federal law. Specifically, in issuing the conditional approvals, the Executive Officer created new permit terms by: 1) inventing an intermediate approval process not provided for in the 2012 MS4 Permit; 2) modifying the WMP provisions by imposing conditions inconsistent with the express requirements of the Permit; and 3) providing for an open-ended extension to the deadline for complying with the Permit’s WMP provisions (allowing Permittees at least an additional 45 days to satisfy the conditions outlined by the Executive Officer after which the Executive Officer “may,” or may not, withdraw the approval).

The 2012 MS4 Permit’s terms specifically require that the Executive Officer, on behalf of the Regional Board, must either approve or deny the final draft WMPs by a date certain – in this case on or before April 28, 2015. (Id., at Table 9.) The Executive Officer did neither, and instead de facto amended the Permit terms, creating a new process, timeline, and set of standards by conditionally approving WMPs. The Permit’s WMP provisions constitute the Permit’s alternative compliance approach to meeting RWLs and TMDL-specific limitations and are therefore a key part of the Permit. (Id., at Part VI.C.6.) Moreover, once approved, the contents of the WMPs become enforceable, substantive terms of the Permit – terms that are at the core of the 2012 MS4 Permit. (Id.)

Thus, by conditionally approving the WMPs and thereby extending the deadline by which new substantive pollution control measures may be incorporated into the 2012 MS4 Permit,

---

27 See infra Section III.C.
28 See also Environmental Defense Center, Inc. v. EPA, 344 F.3d 832, 853 (9th Cir. 2003) (where a submission establishes what the discharger will do to reduce discharges to the maximum extent practicable, it crosses the threshold from being an item of procedural correspondence to being a substantive component of the regulatory regime).
the Executive Officer is modifying the Permit terms, but without circulation of a draft permit, public notice, fact sheet, or public hearing date, as required by law.

When a NPDES permit is reissued, or as here, modified, the issuing agency must follow substantive and procedural requirements set out in the CWA’s implementing regulations. While for modifications, the requirements apply only to those permit sections that are changed, the issuing agency must nevertheless prepare and circulate a draft permit reflecting those changes. The draft permit must include, among other things, compliance schedules, monitoring requirements, and a fact sheet. The fact sheet accompanying the draft permit must include, among other things: 1) a brief statement of the activity at issue; 2) the type of waste discharged; 3) a summary of the basis for the changed permit conditions, including citations to statutory and regulatory authorization, and facts in the record; 4) a description of the procedures by which a final decision on the modification will be reached, including the beginning and end dates for the required notice to the public; and 5) procedures for requesting a hearing. The issuing agency is required to provide at least 30 days from notice of the draft permit modification to allow for public comment. Finally, under state law, modification of a NPDES permit is not delegable from the Regional Board itself to the Executive Officer. Therefore, any NPDES permit modification must be adopted at a properly-noticed public hearing before the Regional Board members.

The conditional approvals constitute a modification of the 2012 MS4 Permit terms; yet, the Regional Board failed to follow the required permit modification procedure. Instead, the

\[\text{In certain circumstances where a permit modification satisfies the criteria for a “minor modification,” which are not applicable here, the permit may be modified without a draft permit or public review. 40 C.F.R. § 122.62. For stormwater permits, minor modifications are narrowly defined as those needed to correct typographical errors, require more frequent monitoring or reporting by the Permittee, change an interim compliance date in a schedule of compliance, allow for changes in ownership or operational control of a facility (as long as no other changes are needed), or to terminate a discharge outfall. 40 C.F.R. § 122.63. Conditionally approving WMPs – which, once approved, become the enforceable, binding terms of the 2012 MS4 Permit – when the Permit only allows for approval or denial does not constitute a minor modification.}\]

\[\text{See 40 C.F.R. §§ 124.5-124.15.}\]

\[\text{40 C.F.R. § 124.5.}\]

\[\text{40 C.F.R. § 124.6.}\]

\[\text{40 C.F.R. § 124.8(b).}\]

\[\text{40 C.F.R. § 124.10(b).}\]

\[\text{Cal. Water Code § 13223(a); see also Resolution No. R14-005 (“…the Executive Officer is specifically precluded from…[i]ssuing, modifying, or revoking any waste discharge requirements.”).}\]
conditional approvals were issued as letters to the Permittees. The Executive Officer’s action, therefore, failed to meet the requirements of the federal regulations for modifying a NPDES permit and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

C. The Terms of the Conditional Approvals Are Inconsistent with Permit Requirements and the Federal CWA and Therefore Establish That the Only Available Course of Action for the Executive Officer Was to Deny the WMPs

Following submission of the initial draft WMPs, Regional Board staff identified numerous and significant failures to comply with Permit requirements and therefore directed Permittees, in writing, to submit revised plans to address the deficiencies.36 Unfortunately, the revised draft WMPs failed to address virtually all of the identified non-compliance issues.37 Rather than denying the insufficient WMPs as required by the 2012 MS4 Permit, however, the Executive Officer approved the WMPs with conditions – conditions that fail to address all of the WMP inadequacies previously cited by Regional Board staff itself.38 As such, the terms of the Executive Officer’s conditional approvals are inconsistent with Permit requirements, and constitute an abuse of discretion.

1. Reasonable Assurance Analysis

Perhaps the most glaring deficiency in the WMPs is the flawed Reasonable Assurance Analysis (“RAA”) in each. The 2012 MS4 Permit requires:

(5) Permittees shall conduct a Reasonable Assurance Analysis for each water body-pollutant combination addressed by the Watershed Management Program. A Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA) shall be quantitative and performed using a peer-reviewed model in the public domain. Models to be considered for the RAA, without exclusion, are the Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS), Hydrologic Simulation Program—FORTRAN (HSPF), and the Structural BMP Prioritization and Analysis Tool (SBPAT). The RAA

36 See Exhibit A: Regional Board Staff Review of Draft WMPs.
37 See Exhibit C: Links to Revised WMPs.
38 While Petitioners’ review of the revised WMPs and their correlating letters of conditional approvals was mainly focused on three watershed management groups (Lower San Gabriel, Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2, and Lower Los Angeles River), Petitioners’ argument about the illegality of the conditional approvals applies to all nine WMPs that were conditionally approved.
shall commence with assembly of all available, relevant subwatershed data collected within the last 10 years, including land use and pollutant loading data, establishment of quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) criteria, QA/QC checks of the data, and identification of the data set meeting the criteria for use in the analysis. Data on performance of watershed control measures needed as model input shall be drawn only from peer-reviewed sources. These data shall be statistically analyzed to determine the best estimate of performance and the confidence limits on that estimate for the pollutants to be evaluated. The objective of the RAA shall be to demonstrate the ability of Watershed Management Programs and EWMPs to ensure that Permittees’ MS4 discharges achieve applicable water quality based effluent limitations and do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations.

(a) Permittees shall demonstrate using the RAA that the activities and control measures identified in the Watershed Control Measures will achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations in Attachments L through R with compliance deadlines during the permit term.

(b) Where the TMDL Provisions in Part VI.E and Attachments L through R do not include interim or final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with compliance deadlines during the permit term, Permittees shall identify interim milestones and dates for their achievement to ensure adequate progress toward achieving interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations and/or receiving water limitations with deadlines beyond the permit term.

(c) For water body-pollutant combinations not addressed by TMDLs, Permittees shall demonstrate using the RAA that the activities and control measures identified in the Watershed Control Measures will achieve applicable receiving water limitations as soon as possible.

(Id. at Part VI.C.5.b.iv.5.)

Thus, the RAA is a detailed modeling exercise, intended to ensure that the WMPs implement stormwater pollution control measures of the correct type, location, and size to achieve compliance with WQSs in receiving water bodies. The RAA forms the bedrock for WMP development, and therefore for pollution control and compliance with the CWA for those Permittees that choose to develop WMPs. As noted by the State Board in the most recent Draft Order on the 2014 MS4 Permit,
…the requirement for a reasonable assurance analysis in particular is designed to ensure that Permittees are choosing appropriate controls and milestones for the WMP/EWMP. Competent use of the reasonable assurance analysis should facilitate achievement of final compliance within the specified deadlines.  

Moreover, Regional Board staff has also recognized the importance of the RAA in WMP development and implementation and thereby need for a robust analysis. As a result, Regional Board staff generated extensive comments on the RAAs that were described in the initial drafts of the WMPs. For example, for the Lower San Gabriel River WMP, Regional Board staff’s list of inadequacies included:

1) No modeling of organics (PAH, DDT, PCB);
2) No explanation for use of zinc as limiting pollutant and no assurance that zinc will lead to compliance with other parameters;
3) No predicted baseline presented for modeled pollutants;
4) No summary or time series comparisons of baseline data and applicable limits;
5) No measurable milestones for implementing BMPs in two year intervals provided;
6) No table providing existing runoff volume, required reduction, and proposed reduction to achieve 85% retention, by sub-basin; and
7) No table providing existing non-stormwater volume, required reduction, and proposed reduction by sub-basin.

For the Lower Los Angeles River WMP, Regional Board staff’s list of identified inadequacies included:

1) Dominguez Channel, LA and Long Beach Harbor Toxics TMDL completely omitted from WMP (and thus RAA); and
2) San Pedro Bay itself completely omitted from WMP (and thus RAA).

For the Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2 WMP, Regional Board staff identified a litany of inadequacies:

---

39 Revised Draft Order, at p. 41.
40 2012 Permit Adoption Hearing Transcript, at p 67.
41 See Exhibit A: Regional Board Staff Review of Draft WMPs.
42 Id.
1) Failed to separately calculate wet and dry weather allowable pollutant loading;
2) Failed to provide any dry weather modeling;
3) Failed to provide model outputs for interim WQBELs;
4) Failed to provide justification for 90th percentile rain years for use in model;
5) Failed to include category 2 and 3 pollutants in the RAA; and
6) Failed to calibrate the model – to compare modeling results to real world data and
   adjust on that basis.\(^{43}\)

In each of the initial comment letters, Regional Board staff warned Permittees that failure
to revise the WMPs to address the inadequacies would result in them being subject to the baseline
requirements of the Permit – in other words, the WMPs would be denied.\(^{44}\)

Despite the detailed comments from Regional Board staff, and the admonition that failure
to conduct the required corrections to the RAA modeling would result in denials, the final draft
WMPs for the Lower San Gabriel, Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2, and Lower Los Angeles
River watershed management groups either failed to meaningfully address or completely ignored
all of the Regional Board staff’s comments listed above. Furthermore, for the Los Angeles River
Upper Reach 2 WMP, the revised plan confirms that the model had not been calibrated and is thus
an almost entirely speculative exercise.

Rather than denying the facially inadequate final WMPs as required by the 2014 MS4
Permit, however, the Executive Officer, on behalf of the Regional Board, chose to conditionally
approve nine final WMPs, ostensibly requiring corrections within 45 days. Yet, the conditions
included in the conditional approvals fail to address any of the RAA inadequacies identified by
RWQCB staff. Therefore, even if fully complied with, the terms of the conditional approvals will
not ensure that the RAA – the basis for development, implementation, and evolution of the
pollution control measures to be implemented via the WMPs – will provide any level of assurance
that the WMP implementation will achieve compliance with WQSs and the CWA, let alone the

\(^{43}\) Id.
\(^{44}\) Id.
“reasonable” assurance that the 2012 MS4 Permit and the State Board require. For this reason alone, the WMPs must be denied.

2. **Substantive Program Requirements**

   In addition to the RAA-related deficiencies, Regional Board staff’s review of the draft WMPs identified basic failures to comply with the program development requirements pursuant to the 2012 MS4 Permit. Unfortunately, similar to the RAA-related deficiencies, many of the other inadequacies that Regional Board staff originally identified in their October 2015 comments were not addressed by the conditional approvals. Notably, there is a lack of specificity with regards to types and locations of structural projects, as well as schedules for implementation in the Lower San Gabriel River and Lower Los Angeles River WMPs. The initial Regional Board staff comments on the WMPs directed the Permittees to at least “commit to the construction of the necessary number of projects to ensure compliance with permit requirements per applicable compliance schedules” and to “clarify that sufficient sites were identified so that the remaining necessary BMP volume can be achieved…”; however, no changes were made in response to either of these comments, and the conditional approvals did not require any additional response. This lack of specificity makes it near impossible to track whether Permittees are making adequate effort towards compliance, or even to assess whether the WMPs present a path to compliance.

   A comprehensive list of the substantive requirements of the Permit that the conditional approvals fail to address is provided in Exhibit D. The failure of the revised WMPs to address these deficiencies should have resulted in denial of the WMPs.

IV. **CONCLUSION**

   For all the foregoing reasons, the instant Petition for Review should be GRANTED, and all nine WMPs that were conditionally approved on April 28, 2015 should be DENIED.

---

45 See Exhibit A: Regional Board Staff Review of Draft WMPs.
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