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The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (hereinafter Regional Board), finds that:

A. BASIS FOR THE ORDER

1. This Order is based on the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the Water Code, commencing with Section 13000), applicable State and federal regulations, all applicable provisions of statewide Water Quality Control Plans and Policies adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin adopted by the Regional Board, the California Toxics Rule, and the California Toxics Rule Implementation Plan.

2. This Order reissues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0108740, which was first adopted by the Regional Board on July 16, 1990 (Order No. 90-38), and then reissued on August 8, 1996 (Order No. 96-03) and February 13, 2002 (Order No. R9-2002-01). On August 21, 2006, in accordance with Order No. R9-2002-01, the County of Orange, as the Principal Copermittee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for reissuance of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Permit.

3. This Order is consistent with the following precedential Orders adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) addressing MS4 NPDES Permits: Order 99-05, Order WQ-2000-11, Order WQ 2001-15, Order WQO 2002-0014, and Order WQ-2005-0008 (SWRCB/OCC FILE A-1780).

4. The Fact Sheet / Technical Report for the Order No. R9-2009-0002, NPDES No. CAS0108740, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds of the County of Orange, the Incorporated Cities of Orange County, and the Orange County Flood Control District Within the San Diego Region includes cited regulatory and legal references and additional explanatory information and data in support of the requirements of this Permit. This information, including any supplements thereto, and any response to comments on the Tentative Orders, is hereby incorporated by reference into these findings.

B. REGULATED PARTIES

1. Each of the persons in Table 1 below, hereinafter called Copermittees or dischargers, owns or operates an MS4, through which it discharges runoff into waters of the United States within the San Diego Region. These MS4s fall into one or more of the following categories: (1) a medium or large MS4 that services a population of greater than 100,000 or 250,000 respectively; or (2) a small MS4 that is "interrelated" to a medium or large MS4; or (3) an MS4 which contributes to a
violation of a water quality standard; or (4) an MS4 which is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States (waters of the U.S).

Table 1. Municipal Copermittees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Aliso Viejo</th>
<th>8. City of Mission Viejo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>City of Dana Point</td>
<td>9. City of Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>City of Laguna Beach</td>
<td>10. City of San Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>City of Laguna Hills</td>
<td>11. City of San Juan Capistrano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>City of Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>12. County of Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>City of Laguna Woods</td>
<td>13. Orange County Flood Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>City of Lake Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. DISCHARGE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Runoff discharged from an MS4 contains waste, as defined in the California Water Code (CWC), and pollutants that adversely affect the quality of the waters of the State. The discharge of runoff from an MS4 is a “discharge of pollutants from a point source” into waters of the U.S. as defined in the CWA.

2. MS4 storm water and non-storm water discharges are likely to contain pollutants that cause or threaten to cause a violation of water quality standards, as outlined in the Regional Board’s Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan). Storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are subject to the conditions and requirements established in the San Diego Basin Plan for point source discharges. These surface water quality standards must be complied with at all times, irrespective of the source and manner of discharge.

3. The most common categories of pollutants in runoff include total suspended solids, sediment, pathogens (e.g., bacteria, viruses, protozoa); heavy metals (e.g., copper, lead, zinc and cadmium); petroleum products and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons; synthetic organics (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, and PCBs); nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers); oxygen-demanding substances (decaying vegetation, animal waste); detergents; and trash.

4. The discharge of pollutants and/or increased flows from MS4s may cause or threaten to cause the concentration of pollutants to exceed applicable receiving water quality objectives and/or impair or threaten to impair designated beneficial uses resulting in a condition of pollution (i.e., unreasonable impairment of water quality for designated beneficial uses), contamination, or nuisance.

5. Pollutants in runoff can threaten and adversely affect human health. Human illnesses have been clearly linked to recreating near storm drains flowing to coastal waters. Also, runoff pollutants in receiving waters can bioaccumulate in the tissues of invertebrates and fish, which may be eventually consumed by humans.
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6. Runoff discharges from MS4s often contain pollutants that cause toxicity to aquatic organisms (i.e., adverse responses of organisms to chemicals or physical agents ranging from mortality to physiological responses such as impaired reproduction or growth anomalies). Toxic pollutants impact the overall quality of aquatic systems and beneficial uses of receiving waters.

7. The Copermittees discharge runoff into lakes, drinking water reservoirs, rivers, streams, creeks, bays, estuaries, coastal lagoons, the Pacific Ocean, and tributaries thereto within one of the eleven hydrologic units (San Juan Hydrologic Unit) comprising the San Diego Region as shown in Tables 2a and 2b. Some of the receiving water bodies have been designated as impaired by the Regional Board and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in 2006 pursuant to CWA section 303(d). Also shown in the Tables are the watershed management areas (WMAs) as defined in the Regional Board report, Watershed Management Approach, January 2002.

Table 2a. Common Watersheds and CWA Section 303(d) Impaired Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Board Watershed Management Area (WMA)</th>
<th>Hydrologic Area (HA) or Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) of the San Juan Hydrologic Unit</th>
<th>Major Receiving Water Bodies</th>
<th>303(d) Pollutant(s)/stressor or Water Quality Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Coastal Streams</td>
<td>Laguna HA, excluding Aliso HSA and Dana Point HSA</td>
<td>Laguna Canyon Creek, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>Bacterial indicators Sediment toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Creek</td>
<td>Aliso HSA</td>
<td>Aliso Creek, English Canyon, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>Toxicity Phosphorus Bacterial indicators Benzo[b]fluoranthene Dieldrin Sediment Toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point Coastal Streams</td>
<td>Dana Point HSA</td>
<td>Dana Point Harbor, Salt Creek, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>Bacterial indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Creek</td>
<td>Mission Viejo HA</td>
<td>San Juan Creek, Trabuco Creek, Oso Creek, Canada Gobernadora, Bell Canyon, Verdugo Canyon, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>Bacterial indicators DDE Chloride Sulfates Total dissolved solids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The listed 303(d) pollutant(s) do not necessarily reflect impairment of the entire corresponding WMA or all corresponding major surface water bodies. The specific impaired portions of each WMA are listed in the State Water Resources Control Board's 2006 Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments.
### Table 2a. Common Watersheds and CWA Section 303(d) Impaired Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Board Watershed Management Area (WMA)</th>
<th>Hydrologic Area (HA) or Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) of the San Juan Hydrologic Unit</th>
<th>Major Receiving Water Bodies</th>
<th>303(d) Pollutant(s)/stressor or Water Quality Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente Coastal Streams</td>
<td>San Clemente HA</td>
<td>Prima Deshecha, Segunda Deshecha, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td>Bacterial indicators, Phosphorus, Turbidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Creek</td>
<td>San Mateo HA</td>
<td>San Mateo Creek, Christianitos Creek, Pacific Ocean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2b. Common Watersheds and Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Laguna Coastal Streams</th>
<th>Aliso Creek</th>
<th>Dana Point Coastal Streams</th>
<th>San Juan Creek</th>
<th>San Clemente Coastal Streams</th>
<th>San Mateo Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Hills *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Woods *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Orange *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Flood Control District *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Municipality also includes areas within watersheds of the Santa Ana Regional Board that are outside the scope of this Order

8. Trash is a persistent pollutant which can enter receiving waters from the MS4 resulting in accumulation and transport in receiving waters over time. Trash poses a serious threat to the Beneficial Uses of the receiving waters, including, but not limited to, human health, rare and endangered species, navigation and human recreation.

9. The Copermittees' water quality monitoring data submitted to date documents persistent violations of Basin Plan water quality objectives for various runoff-related pollutants (fecal coliform bacteria, total suspended solids, turbidity, metals, etc.) at

---
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various watershed monitoring stations. Persistent toxicity has also been observed at some watershed monitoring stations. In addition, bioassessment data indicates that the majority of urbanized receiving waters have Poor to Very Poor Index of Biotic Integrity ratings. In sum, the above findings indicate that runoff discharges are causing or contributing to water quality impairments, and are a leading cause of such impairments in Orange County.

10. When natural vegetated pervious ground cover is converted to impervious surfaces such as paved highways, streets, rooftops, and parking lots, the natural absorption and infiltration abilities of the land are lost. Therefore, runoff leaving a developed area is significantly greater in runoff volume, velocity, and peak flow rate than pre-development runoff from the same area. Runoff durations can also increase as a result of flood control and other efforts to control peak flow rates. Increased volume, velocity, rate, and duration of runoff, and decreased natural clean sediment loads, greatly accelerate the erosion of downstream natural channels. Significant declines in the biological integrity and physical habitat of streams and other receiving waters have been found to occur with as little as a 3-5 percent conversion from natural to impervious surfaces. The increased runoff characteristics from new development must be controlled to protect against increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

11. Development creates new pollution sources as human population density increases and brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, municipal sewage, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, trash, etc. which can either be washed or directly dumped into the MS4. As a result, the runoff leaving the developed urban area is significantly greater in pollutant load than the pre-development runoff from the same area. These increased pollutant loads must be controlled to protect downstream receiving water quality.

12. Development and urbanization especially threaten environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs), such as water bodies designated as supporting a RARE beneficial use (supporting rare, threatened or endangered species) and CWA 303(d)-impaired water bodies. Such areas have a much lower capacity to withstand pollutant shocks than might be acceptable in other areas. In essence, development that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may become significant in a particularly sensitive environment. Therefore, additional control to reduce storm water pollutants from new and existing development may be necessary for areas adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA.

13. Although dependent on several factors, the risks typically associated with properly managed infiltration of runoff (especially from residential land use areas) are not significant. The risks associated with infiltration can be managed by many techniques, including (1) designing landscape drainage features that promote infiltration of runoff, but do not "inject" runoff (injection bypasses the natural processes of filtering and transformation that occur in the soil); (2) taking reasonable
steps to prevent the illegal disposal of wastes; (3) protecting footings and foundations; (4) ensuring that each drainage feature is adequately maintained in perpetuity; and (5) pretreatment.

14. Non-storm water (dry weather) discharge from the MS4 is not considered a storm water (wet weather) discharge and therefore is not subject to regulation under the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) standard from CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(iii), which is explicitly for “Municipal ... Stormwater Discharges” from the MS4. Non-storm water discharges, per CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), are to be effectively prohibited. Such dry weather non-storm water discharges have been shown to contribute significant levels of pollutants and flow in arid, developed Southern California watersheds and are to be effectively prohibited under the Clean Water Act.

15. Non-storm water discharges to the MS4 granted an influent exception [i.e., which are exempt from the effective prohibition requirement set forth in CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii)] under 40 CFR 122. 26 are included within this Order. Any exempted discharges identified by Copermittees as a source of pollutants are subsequently required to be addressed (emphasis added) as illicit discharges through prohibition and incorporation into existing ICID programs. The Copermittees have identified landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn water, previously exempted discharges, as a source of pollutants and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the United States.

D. RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

1. General

a. This Order specifies requirements necessary for the Copermittees to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). However, since MEP is a dynamic performance standard, which evolves over time as runoff management knowledge increases, the Copermittees' runoff management programs must continually be assessed and modified to incorporate improved programs, control measures, best management practices (BMPs), etc. in order to achieve the evolving MEP standard. Absent evidence to the contrary, this continual assessment, revision, and improvement of runoff management program implementation is expected to ultimately achieve compliance with water quality standards in the Region.

b. The Copermittees have generally been implementing the jurisdictional runoff management programs required pursuant to Order No. 2002-01 since February 13, 2003. Prior to that, the Copermittees were regulated by Order No. 96-03 since August 8, 1996. Runoff discharges, however, continue to cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards as evidenced by the Copermittees monitoring results.
c. This Order contains new or modified requirements that are necessary to improve Copermitttees’ efforts to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the MEP and achieve water quality standards. Some of the new or modified requirements, such as the revised Watershed Runoff Management Program section, are designed to specifically address high priority water quality problems. Other new or modified requirements address program deficiencies that have been noted during audits, report reviews, and other Regional Board compliance assessment activities.

d. Updated Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plans (JRMPs) and Watershed Runoff Management Plans (WRMPs), which describe the Copermitttees’ runoff management programs in their entirety, are needed to guide the Copermitttees’ runoff management efforts and aid the Copermitttees in tracking runoff management program implementation. It is practicable for the Copermitttees to update the JRMPs and WRMPs within one year, since significant efforts to develop these programs have already occurred.

e. Pollutants can be effectively reduced in storm water runoff by the application of a combination of pollution prevention, source control, and treatment control BMPs. Pollution prevention is the reduction or elimination of pollutant generation at its source and is the best “first line of defense.” Source control BMPs (both structural and non-structural) minimize the contact between pollutants and flows (e.g., rerouting run-on around pollutant sources or keeping pollutants on-site and out of receiving waters). Treatment control BMPs remove pollutants that have been mobilized by wet-weather or dry-weather flows.

f. Runoff needs to be addressed during the three major phases of urban development (planning, construction, and use) in order to reduce the discharge of pollutants from storm water to the MEP, effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges and protect receiving waters. Development which is not guided by water quality planning policies and principles can unnecessarily result in increased pollutant load discharges, flow rates, and flow durations which can negatively impact receiving water beneficial uses. Construction sites without adequate BMP implementation result in sediment runoff rates which greatly exceed natural erosion rates of undisturbed lands, causing siltation and impairment of receiving waters. Existing development generates substantial pollutant loads which are discharged in runoff to receiving waters.

g. Annual reporting requirements included in this Order are necessary to meet federal requirements and to evaluate the effectiveness and compliance of the Copermitttees’ programs.

h. This Order establishes Storm Water Action Levels (SALs) for selected pollutants based on USEPA Rain Zone 6 (arid southwest) Phase I MS4 monitoring data for pollutants in storm water. The SALs were computed as the 90th percentile of the data set, utilizing the statistical based population approach, one of three
approaches recommended by the California Water Board’s Storm Water Panel in its report, 'The Feasibility of Numerical Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities (June 2006). SALs are identified in Section D of this Order. Copermittees shall implement a timely, comprehensive, cost-effective storm water pollution control program to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water from the permitted areas so as not to exceed the SALs. Exceedance of SALs may indicate inadequacy of programmatic measures and BMPs required in this Order.

2. Development Planning

a. The Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SSMP) requirements contained in this Order are consistent with Order WQ-2000-11 adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) on October 5, 2000. In the precedential order, the State Board found that the design standards, which essentially require that runoff generated by 85 percent of storm events from specific development categories be infiltrated or treated, reflect the MEP standard. The order also found that the SSMP requirements are appropriately applied to the majority of the Priority Development Project categories contained in Section D.1 of this Order. The State Board also gave Regional Water Quality Control Boards the needed discretion to include additional categories and locations, such as retail gasoline outlets (RGOs), in SSMPs.

b. Controlling runoff pollution by using a combination of onsite source control and site design BMPs augmented with treatment control BMPs before the runoff enters the MS4 is important for the following reasons: (1) Many end-of-pipe BMPs (such as diversion to the sanitary sewer) are typically ineffective during significant storm events. Whereas, onsite source control BMPs can be applied during all runoff conditions; (2) End-of-pipe BMPs are often incapable of capturing and treating the wide range of pollutants which can be generated on a sub-watershed scale; (3) End-of-pipe BMPs are more effective when used as polishing BMPs, rather than the sole BMP to be implemented; (4) End-of-pipe BMPs do not protect the quality or beneficial uses of receiving waters between the pollutant source and the BMP; and (5) Offsite end-of-pipe BMPs do not aid in the effort to educate the public regarding sources of pollution and their prevention.

c. Use of Low-Impact Development (LID) site design BMPs at new development, redevelopment and retrofit projects can be an effective means for minimizing the impact of storm water runoff discharges from the development projects on receiving waters. LID is a site design strategy with a goal of maintaining or replicating the pre-development hydrologic regime through the use of design techniques. LID site design BMPs help preserve and restore the natural hydrologic cycle of the site, allowing for filtration and infiltration which can greatly reduce the volume, peak flow rate, velocity, and pollutant loads of storm water runoff. Current runoff management, knowledge, practices and technology have
resulted in the use of LID BMPs as an acceptable means of meeting the storm water MEP standard.

d. Retail Gasoline Outlets (RGOs) are significant sources of pollutants in storm water runoff. RGOs are points of convergence for motor vehicles for automotive related services such as repair, refueling, tire inflation, and radiator fill-up and consequently produce significantly higher loadings of hydrocarbons and trace metals (including copper and zinc) than other developed areas.

e. Industrial sites are significant sources of pollutants in runoff. Pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from industrial sites are similar or exceed pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from other land uses, such as commercial or residential land uses. As with other land uses, LID site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs are needed at industrial sites in order to meet the MEP standard. These BMPs are necessary where the industrial site is larger than 10,000 square feet. The 10,000 square feet threshold is appropriate, since it is consistent with requirements in other Phase I NPDES storm water regulations throughout California.

f. If not properly designed or maintained, certain BMPs implemented or required by municipalities for runoff management may create a habitat for vectors (e.g. mosquitoes and rodents). Proper BMP design and maintenance to avoid standing water, however, can prevent the creation of vector habitat. Nuisances and public health impacts resulting from vector breeding can be prevented with close collaboration and cooperative effort between municipalities, the Orange County Vector Control District, and the California Department of Public Health during the development and implementation of runoff management programs.

g. The increased volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas has the potential to greatly accelerate downstream erosion, impair stream habitat in natural drainages, and negatively impact beneficial uses. Development and urbanization increase pollutant loads in storm water runoff and the volume of storm water runoff. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants and thus lose the purification and infiltration provided by natural vegetated soil. Hydromodification measures for discharges to hardened channels are needed for the future restoration of the hardened channels to their natural state, thereby restoring the chemical, physical, and biological integrity and Beneficial Uses of local receiving waters.

3. Construction and Existing Development

a. In accordance with federal NPDES regulations and to ensure the most effective oversight of industrial and construction site discharges, discharges of runoff from industrial and construction sites are subject to dual (State and local) storm water regulation. Under this dual system, each Copermittee is responsible for enforcing its local permits, plans, and ordinances, and the Regional Board is
responsible for enforcing the General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit, State Board Order 99-08 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 (General Construction Permit) and the General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit, State Board Order 97-03 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000001 (General Industrial Permit) and any reissuance of these permits. NPDES municipal regulations require that municipalities develop and implement measures to address runoff from industrial and construction activities. Those measures may require the implementation of additional BMPs than are required under the statewide general permits for activities subject to both State and local regulation.

b. Identification of sources of pollutants in runoff (such as municipal areas and activities, industrial and commercial sites/sources, construction sites, and residential areas), development and implementation of BMPs to address those sources, and updating ordinances and approval processes are necessary for the Copermittees to ensure that discharges of pollutants from its MS4 in storm water are reduced to the MEP and that non-storm water discharges are not occurring. Inspections and other compliance verification methods are needed to ensure minimum BMPs are implemented. Inspections are especially important at high risk areas for pollutant discharges.

c. Historic and current development makes use of natural drainage patterns and features as conveyances for runoff. Urban streams used in this manner are part of the municipalities MS4 regardless of whether they are natural, anthropogenic, or partially modified features. In these cases, the urban stream is both an MS4 and receiving water.

d. As operators of the MS4s, the Copermittees cannot passively receive and discharge pollutants from third parties. By providing free and open access to an MS4 that conveys discharges to waters of the U.S., the operator essentially accepts responsibility for discharges into the MS4 that it does not prohibit or control. These discharges may cause or contribute to a condition of contamination or a violation of water quality standards.

e. Waste and pollutants which are deposited and accumulate in MS4 drainage structures will be discharged from these structures to waters of the U.S. unless they are removed. These discharges may cause or contribute to, or threaten to cause or contribute to, a condition of pollution in receiving waters. For this reason, pollutant discharges from storm water into MS4s must be reduced using a combination of management measures, including source control, and an effective MS4 maintenance program must be implemented by each Copermittee.

f. Enforcement of local runoff related ordinances, permits, and plans is an essential component of every runoff management program and is specifically required in the federal storm water regulations and this Order. Each Copermittee is individually responsible for adoption and enforcement of ordinances and/or policies, implementation of identified control measures/BMPs needed to prevent
or reduce pollutants in storm water runoff, and for the allocation of funds for the capital, operation and maintenance, administrative, and enforcement expenditures necessary to implement and enforce such control measures/BMPs under its jurisdiction. Education is an important aspect of every effective runoff management program and the basis for changes in behavior at a societal level. Education of municipal planning, inspection, and maintenance department staffs is especially critical to ensure that in-house staffs understand how their activities impact water quality, how to accomplish their jobs while protecting water quality, and their specific roles and responsibilities for compliance with this Order. Public education, designed to target various urban land users and other audiences, is also essential to inform the public of how individual actions affect receiving water quality and how adverse effects can be minimized.

g. Public participation during the development of runoff management programs is necessary to ensure that all stakeholder interests and a variety of creative solutions are considered.

h. Retrofitting existing development with storm water treatment controls, including LID, is necessary to address storm water discharges from existing development that may cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or a violation of water quality standards. Although SSMP BMPs are required for redevelopment, the current rate of redevelopment will not address water quality problems in a timely manner. Cooperation with private landowners is necessary to effectively identify, implement and maintain retrofit projects for the preservation, restoration, and enhancement of water quality.

4. Watershed Runoff Management

a. Since runoff within a watershed can flow from and through multiple land uses and political jurisdictions, watershed-based runoff management can greatly enhance the protection of receiving waters. Such management provides a means to focus on the most important water quality problems in each watershed. By focusing on the most important water quality problems, watershed efforts can maximize protection of beneficial use in an efficient manner. Effective watershed-based runoff management actively reduces pollutant discharges and abates pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems. Watershed-based runoff management that does not actively reduce pollutant discharges and abate pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems can necessitate implementation of the iterative process outlined in section A.3 of the Tentative Order. Watershed management of runoff does not require Copermitees to expend resources outside of their jurisdictions. Watershed management requires the Copermitees within a watershed to develop a watershed-based management strategy, which can then be implemented on a jurisdictional basis.
b. Some runoff issues, such as general education and training, can be effectively addressed on a regional basis. Regional approaches to runoff management can improve program consistency and promote sharing of resources, which can result in implementation of more efficient programs.

c. It is important for the Copermittees to coordinate their water quality protection and land use planning activities to achieve the greatest protection of receiving water bodies. Copermittee coordination with other watershed stakeholders, especially the State of California Department of Transportation, the United States Department of Defense, and water and sewer districts, is also important.

E. STATUTE AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Receiving Water Limitations (RWL) language specified in this Order is consistent with language recommended by the USEPA and established in State Board Water Quality Order 99-05, Own Motion Review of the Petition of Environmental Health Coalition to Review Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-03, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108740, adopted by the State Board on June 17, 1999. The RWL in this Order require compliance with water quality standards, which for storm water discharges is to be achieved through an iterative approach requiring the implementation of improved and better-tailored BMPs over time. Compliance with receiving water limits based on applicable water quality standards is necessary to ensure that MS4 discharges will not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards and the creation of conditions of pollution.

2. The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan), identifies the following beneficial uses for surface waters in Orange County: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN)², Agricultural Supply (AGR), Industrial Process Supply (PROC), Industrial Service Supply (IND), Ground Water Recharge (GWR), Contact Water Recreation (REC1), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE), Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH), Hydropower Generation (POW), and Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL). The following additional beneficial uses are identified for coastal waters of Orange County: Navigation (NAV), Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM), Estuarine Habitat (EST), Marine Habitat (MAR), Aquaculture (AQUA), Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR), Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN), and Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL).

3. This Order is in conformance with State Board Resolution No. 68-16, Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California, and the federal Antidegradation Policy described in 40 CFR 131.12.

² Subject to exceptions under the "Sources of Drinking Waters" Policy (Resolution No. 89-33)
4. Section 6217(g) of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires coastal states with approved coastal zone management programs to address non-point pollution impacting or threatening coastal water quality. CZARA addresses five sources of non-point pollution: agriculture, silviculture, urban, marinas, and hydromodification. This NPDES permit addresses the management measures required for the urban category, with the exception of septic systems. The adoption and implementation of this NPDES permit relieves the Copermittee from developing a non-point source plan, for the urban category, under CZARA. The Regional Board addresses septic systems through the administration of other programs.

5. Section 303(d)(1)(A) of the CWA requires that "Each state must identify those waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limitations...are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard (WQS) applicable to such waters." The CWA also requires states to establish a priority ranking of impaired water bodies known as Water Quality Limited Segments and to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for such waters. This priority list of impaired water bodies is called the Section 303(d) List. The current Section 303(d) List was approved by the State Board on October 25, 2006. On June 28, 2007 the 2006 303(d) list for California was given final approval by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

6. This Order does not constitute an unfunded local government mandate subject to subvention under Article XIIIIB, Section (6) of the California Constitution for several reasons, including, but not limited to, the following. First, this Order implements federally mandated requirements under federal Clean Water Act section 402. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B).) Second, the local agency Copermittees' obligations under this Order are similar to, and in many respects less stringent than, the obligations of non-governmental and new dischargers who are issued NPDES permits for storm water and non-storm water discharges. Third, the local agency Copermittees have the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for compliance with this Order. Fourth, the Copermittees have requested permit coverage in lieu of compliance with the complete prohibition against the discharge of pollutants contained in federal Clean Water Act section 301, subdivision (a) (33 U.S.C. § 1311(a)) and in lieu of numeric restrictions on their storm water discharges. Fifth, the local agencies' responsibility for preventing discharges of waste that can create conditions of pollution or nuisance from conveyances that are within their ownership or control under State law predates the enactment of Article XIIIIB, Section (6) of the California Constitution. Likewise, the provisions of this Order to implement total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) are federal mandates. The federal Clean Water Act requires TMDLs to be developed for water bodies that do not meet federal water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. sec. 1313(d).) Once the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or a state develops a TMDL, federal law requires that permits must contain effluent limitations consistent with the assumptions of any applicable wasteload allocation. (40 C.F.R. sec. 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)
7. Runoff treatment and/or mitigation must occur prior to the discharge of runoff into receiving waters. Treatment BMPs must not be constructed in waters of the U.S. or State unless the runoff flows are sufficiently pretreated to protect the values and functions of the water body. Federal regulations at 40 CFR 131.10(a) state that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a designated use for any waters of the U.S. Authorizing the construction of an runoff treatment facility within a water of the U.S., or using the water body itself as a treatment system or for conveyance to a treatment system, would be tantamount to accepting waste assimilation as an appropriate use for that water body. Furthermore, the construction, operation, and maintenance of a pollution control facility in a water body can negatively impact the physical, chemical, and biological integrity, as well as the beneficial uses, of the water body. Without federal authorization (e.g., pursuant to Clean Water Act Section 404), waters of the U.S. may not be converted into, or used as, waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Similarly, waste discharge requirements pursuant to California Water Code Section 13260 are required for the conversion or use of waters of the State as waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Diversion from waters of the U.S./State to treatment facilities and subsequent return to waters of the U.S. is allowable, provided that the effluent complies with applicable NPDES requirements.

8. The issuance of waste discharge requirements and an NPDES permit for the discharge of runoff from MS4s to waters of the U.S. is exempt from the requirement for preparation of environmental documents under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Division 13, Chapter 3, section 21000 et seq.) in accordance with the CWC section 13389.

9. Multiple water bodies in Orange County have been identified as impaired and placed on the 303(d) list. In 2004, Bacteria Impaired Waters TMDL Project II included six bacteria impaired shorelines in Dana Point Harbor and San Diego Bay: Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park, B Street, G Street Pier, Tidelands Park, and Chula Vista Marina in San Diego Bay. Since then, only Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park in San Diego Bay can be confirmed as still impaired by indicator bacteria. On June 11, 2008 the Regional Board adopted a Basin Plan amendment to incorporate Bacteria Impaired Waters TMDL Project II for San Diego Bay and Dana Point Harbor Shorelines. On June 16, 2009, the State Board approved the Basin Plan amendment. This action meets requirements of section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Basin Plan amendment process is authorized under section 13240 of the Water Code. The State's Office of Administrative Law (OAL) approved the TMDLs on September 15, 2009. The effective date of the TMDLs is the date of OAL approval. USEPA approved the TMDLs on October 26, 2009.

10. Storm water discharges from developed and developing areas in Orange County are significant sources of certain pollutants that cause, may be causing, threatening to cause or contributing to water quality impairment in the waters of Orange County.

FINDINGS E: STATUTE AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS
Furthermore, as delineated in the CWA section 303(d) list in Table 3, the Regional Board has found that there is a reasonable potential that municipal storm water and non-storm water discharges from MS4s cause or may cause or contribute to an excursion above water quality standards for the following pollutants: Indicator Bacteria, Phosphorous, Toxicity and Turbidity. In accordance with CWA section 303(d), the Regional Board is required to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for these pollutants to these waters to eliminate impairment and attain water quality standards. Therefore, certain early pollutant control actions and further pollutant impact assessments by the Copermittees are warranted and required pursuant to this Order.

### Table 3. 2006 Section 303(d) Listed Waterbodies in So. Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody</th>
<th>Pollutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Creek</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria, Phosphorus, Toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Creek Mouth</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point Harbor</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Canyon Creek</td>
<td>Benzo[b]fluoranthene, Dieldrin, Sediment Toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Canyon Channel</td>
<td>Sediment Toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso Creek (at Mission Viejo Golf Course)</td>
<td>Chloride, Sulfates, Total Dissolved Solids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, Aliso HSA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, Dana Point HSA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, Laguna Beach HSA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, Lower San Juan HSA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, San Clemente HA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean Shoreline, San Joaquin Hills HSA</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prima Deshecha Creek</td>
<td>Phosphorus, Turbidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Creek</td>
<td>DDE, Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Creek (mouth)</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segunda Deshecha Creek</td>
<td>Phosphorus, Turbidity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. This Order incorporates only those MS4 Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) developed in TMDLs that have been adopted by the Regional Water Board and have been approved by the State Board, Office of Administrative Law and U.S. EPA. Approved TMDL WLAs are to be addressed using water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) calculated as numeric limitations (either in the receiving waters and/or at the point of MS4 discharge) and/or as BMPs. In most cases, the numeric limitation must be achieved to ensure the adequacy of the BMP program. Waste load...
allocations for storm water and non-storm water discharges have been included within this Order only if the TMDL has received all necessary approvals. This Order establishes WQBELs and conditions consistent with the requirements and assumptions of the WLAs in the TMDLs as required by 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).

A TMDL is the total amount of a particular pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet Water Quality Standards (WQSS), which are comprised of Water Quality Objectives (WQOs), Beneficial Uses and the States Policy on Maintaining High Quality Waters. The WQOs serve as the primary basis for protecting the associated Beneficial Use. The Numeric Target of a TMDL interprets and applies the numeric and/or narrative WQOs of the WQSSs as the basis for the WLAs. This Order addresses TMDLs through Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) that must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the WLA. Federal guidance states that when adequate information exists, storm water permits are to incorporate numeric water quality based effluent limitations. In most cases, the numeric target(s) of a TMDL are a component of the WQBELs. When the numeric target is based on one or more numeric WQOs, the numeric WQOs and underlying assumptions and requirements will be used in the WQBELs as numeric effluent limitations by the end of the TMDL compliance schedule, unless additional information is required. When the numeric target interprets one or more narrative WQOs, the numeric target may assess the efficacy and progress of the BMPs in meeting the WLAs and restoring the Beneficial Uses by the end of the TMDL compliance schedule.

This Order fulfills a component of the TMDL Implementation Plan adopted by this Regional Board on June 11, 2008 for indicator bacteria in Baby Beach by establishing WQBELs expressed as both BMPs to achieve the WLAs and as numeric limitations for the City of Dana Point and the County of Orange. The establishment of WQBELs expressed as BMPs should be sufficient to achieve the WLA specified in the TMDL. The Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) and Numeric Targets are the necessary metrics to ensure that the BMPs achieve appropriate concentrations of bacterial indicators in the receiving waters.

3 State Water Resources Control Board, Resolution No. 68-16
4 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)
6 The Waste Load Allocations are defined in Resolution No. R9-2008-0027, A Resolution to Adopt an Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9) to Incorporate Total Maximum Daily Loads for Indicator Bacteria, Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park in San Diego Bay.
12. This Order requires each Copermittee to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into its MS4. However, historically pollutants have been identified as present in dry weather non-storm water discharges from the MS4s through 303(d) listings, monitoring conducted by the Copermittees under Order No. R9-2002-0001, and there are others expected to be present in dry weather non-storm water discharges because of the nature of these discharges. This Order includes action levels for pollutants in non-storm water, dry weather, discharges from the MS4 designed to ensure that the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water in the MS4 is being complied with. Action levels in the Order are based upon numeric or narrative water quality objectives and criteria as defined in the Basin Plan, the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California (Ocean Plan), and the State Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). An exceedance of an action level requires specified responsive action by the Copermittees. This Order describes what actions the Copermittees must take when an exceedance of an action level is observed. Exceedances of non-storm water action levels do not alone constitute a violation of this Order but could indicate non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 or other prohibitions established in this Order. Failure to undertake required source investigation and elimination action following an exceedance of 2a non-storm water action level (NAL or action level) is a violation of this Order. The Regional Board recognizes that use of action levels will not necessarily result in detection of all unauthorized sources of non-storm water discharges because there may be some discharges in which pollutants do not exceed established action levels. However, establishing NALs at levels appropriate to protect water quality standards is expected to lead to the identification of significant sources of pollutants in dry weather non-storm water discharges.


F. PUBLIC PROCESS

1. The Regional Board has notified the Copermittees, all known interested parties, and the public of its intent to consider adoption of an Order prescribing waste discharge requirements that would serve to renew an NPDES permit for the existing discharge of runoff.

2. The Regional Board has held public hearings on April 11, 2007, February 13, 2008, July 1, 2009, and November 18, 2009 and heard and considered all comments pertaining to the terms and conditions of this Order.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Copermittees, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code (CWC) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations adopted thereunder, must each comply with the following:

A. PROHIBITIONS AND RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

1. Discharges into and from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) in a manner causing, or threatening to cause, a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance (as defined in CWC section 13050), in waters of the state are prohibited.

2. Storm water discharges from MS4s containing pollutants which have not been reduced to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) are prohibited.\(^7\)

3. Discharges from MS4s that cause or contribute to the violation of water quality standards (designated beneficial uses, water quality objectives developed to protect beneficial uses, and the State policy with respect to maintaining high quality waters) are prohibited.

   a. Each Copermittee must comply with section A.3 and section A.4 as it applies to Prohibition 5 in Attachment A of this Order through timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges in accordance with this Order, including any modifications. If exceedance(s) of water quality standards persist notwithstanding implementation of this Order, the Copermittee must assure compliance with section A.3 and section A.4 as it applies to Prohibition 5 in Attachment A of this Order by complying with the following procedure:

   (1) Upon a determination by either the Copermittee or the Regional Board that storm water MS4 discharges are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable water quality standard, the Copermittee must notify the Regional Board within 30 days and thereafter submit a report to the Regional Board that describes best management practices (BMPs) that are currently being implemented and additional BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards. The report may be incorporated in the Annual Report unless the Regional Board directs an earlier submittal. The report must include an implementation schedule. The Regional Board may require modifications to the report;

---

\(^7\) This prohibition does not apply to MS4 discharges which receive subsequent treatment to reduce pollutants to the MEP prior to entering receiving waters (e.g., low flow diversions to the sanitary sewer).

DIRECTIVE A: PROHIBITIONS AND RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS
(2) Submit any modifications to the report required by the Regional Board within 30 days of notification;

(3) Within 30 days following approval of the report described above by the Regional Board, the Copermittee must revise its Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and monitoring program to incorporate the approved modified BMPs that have been and will be implemented, the implementation schedule, and any additional monitoring required; and

(4) Implement the revised Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and monitoring program in accordance with the approved schedule.

b. The Copermittee must repeat the procedure set forth above to comply with the receiving water limitations for continuing or recurring exceedances of the same water quality standard(s) unless directed to do otherwise by the Regional Board Executive Officer.

c. Nothing in section A.3 must prevent the Regional Board from enforcing any provision of this Order while the Copermittee prepares and implements the above report.

4. In addition to the above prohibitions, discharges from MS4s are subject to all Basin Plan prohibitions cited in Attachment A to this Order.

B. NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES

1. Each Copermittee must effectively prohibit all types of non-storm water discharges into its MS4 unless such discharges are either authorized by a separate National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit; or not prohibited in accordance with sections B.2 and B.3 below.

2. The following categories of non-storm water discharges are not prohibited unless a Copermittee or the Regional Board identifies the discharge category as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. Where the Copermittee(s) have identified a category as a source of pollutants, the category shall be addressed as an illicit discharge and prohibited through ordinance, order or similar means. The Regional Board may identify categories of discharge that either requires prohibition or other controls. For such a discharge category, the Copermittee, under direction of the Regional Board, must either prohibit the discharge category or develop and implement appropriate control measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 and report to the Regional Board pursuant to Section K.1 and K.3 of this Order.

   a. Diverted stream flows;
   b. Rising ground waters;
   c. Uncontaminated ground water infiltration [as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)] to

DIRECTIVE B: NON STORM WATER DISCHARGES
MS4s;
d. Uncontaminated pumped ground water; 
e. Foundation drains;
f. Springs;
g. Water from crawl space pumps;
h. Footing drains;
i. Air conditioning condensation;
j. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands;
k. Water line flushing;
l. Discharges from potable water sources not subject to NPDES Permit No. CAG679001, other than water main breaks;
m. Individual residential car washing; and
n. Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges.

3. Emergency fire fighting flows (i.e., flows necessary for the protection of life or property) do not require BMPs and need not be prohibited. As part of the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP), each Copermittee must develop and implement a program to address pollutants from non-emergency fire fighting flows (i.e., flows from controlled or practice blazes and maintenance activities) identified by the Copermittee to be significant sources of pollutants to waters of the United States.

a. Building fire suppression system maintenance discharges (e.g. sprinkler line flushing) contain waste. Therefore, such discharges are to be prohibited by the Copermittees as illicit discharges through ordinance, order, or similar means.

4. Each Copermittee must examine all dry weather effluent analytical monitoring results collected in accordance with section F.4 of this Order and Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R9-2009-0002 to identify water quality problems which may be the result of any non-prohibited discharge category(ies) identified above in section B.2. Follow-up investigations must be conducted as necessary to identify and control, pursuant to section B.2, any non-prohibited discharge category(ies) listed above.

---

8 Requires enrollment under Order R9-2008-002. Discharges into the MS4 require authorization from the owner and operator of the MS4 system.
9 This exemption does not include fire suppression sprinkler system maintenance and testing discharges. Those discharges may be regulated under Section B.3.
10 Requires enrollment under Order R9-2002-0020.
11 Including saline swimming pool discharges directly to a saline water body.

DIRECTIVE B: NON STORM WATER DISCHARGES
C. NON-STORM WATER DRY WEATHER ACTION LEVELS

1. Each Copermittee, beginning no later than May 1, 2011, shall implement the non-storm water dry weather action level (NAL) monitoring as described in Attachment E of this Order.

2. In response to an exceedance of an NAL, each Copermittee must investigate and identify the source of the exceedance in a timely manner. However, if any Copermittee identifies exceedances of NALs that prevent them from adequately conducting source investigations in a timely manner, then the Copermittees may submit a prioritization plan and timeline that identifies the timeframe and planned actions to investigate and report their findings on all of the exceedances. Following the source investigation and identification, the Copermittees must submit an action report dependant on the source of the pollutant exceedance as follows:

a. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as natural (non-anthropogenically influenced) in origin and in conveyance into the MS4; then the Copermittee shall report their findings and documentation of their source investigation to the Regional Board within fourteen days of the source identification.

b. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as an illicit discharge or connection, then the Copermittees must eliminate the discharge to their MS4 and report the findings, including any enforcement action(s) taken, and documentation of the source investigation to the Regional Board within fourteen days of the source identification. If the Copermittee is unable to eliminate the source of discharge within fourteen days, then the Copermittee must submit, as part of their action report, their plan and timeframe to eliminate the source of the exceedance. Those dischargers seeking to continue such a discharge must become subject to a separate NPDES permit prior to continuing any such discharge.

c. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as an exempted category of non-storm water discharge, then the Cpermittees must determine if this is an isolated circumstance or if the category of discharges must be addressed through the prevention or prohibition of that category of discharge as an illicit discharge. The Copermittee must submit their findings in including a description of the steps taken to address the discharge and the category of discharge, to the Regional Board for review with the next subsequent annual report. Such description shall include relevant updates to or new ordinances, orders, or other legal means of addressing the category of discharge. The Copermittees must also submit a summary of their findings with the Report of Waste Discharge.

d. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as a non-storm water discharge in violation or potential violation of an existing separate NPDES permit
(e.g. the groundwater dewatering permit), then the Copermittee must report, within three business days, the findings to the Regional Board including all pertinent information regarding the discharger and discharge characteristics.

e. If the Copermittee is unable to identify the source of the exceedance after taking and documenting reasonable steps to do so, then the Copermittee must identify the pollutant as a high priority pollutant of concern in the tributary subwatershed, perform additional focused sampling and update their programs within a year to reflect this priority. The Copermittee’s annual report shall include these updates to their programs including, where applicable, updates to their watershed workplans (Section G.2), retrofitting consideration (Section F.3.d) and program effectiveness work plans (Section J.4).

f. The Copermittees or any interested party, may evaluate existing NALs and propose revised NALs for future Board consideration.

3. An exceedance of an NAL does not alone constitute a violation of the provisions of this Order, but an exceedance of an NAL may indicate lack of compliance with the requirement that Copermittees effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 or other prohibitions set forth in Sections A and B of this Order. Failure to timely implement required actions specified in this Order following an exceedance of an NAL constitutes a violation of this Order. However, neither compliance with NALs nor compliance with required actions following observed exceedances, excuses any non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4s or any non-compliance with the prohibitions in Sections A and B of this Order. NALs provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the prohibition of non-storm water discharges and of the appropriateness of exempted non-storm water discharges. During any annual reporting period in which one or more exceedances of NALs have been documented the Copermittee must submit with their next scheduled annual report, a report describing whether and how the observed exceedances did or did not result in a discharge form the MS4 that caused, or threatened to cause or contribute to a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance in the receiving waters.

4. Monitoring of effluent will occur at the end-of-pipe prior to discharge into the receiving waters, with a focus on Major Outfalls, as defined in 40 CFR 122.26(B 5-6) and Attachment E of this Order. The Copermittees must develop their monitoring plans to sample a representative percentage of major outfalls and identified stations within each hydrologic subarea. At a minimum, outfalls that exceed any NALs once during any year must be monitored in the subsequent year. Any station that does not exceed an NAL for 3 years may be replaced with a different station.
5. Each Copermittee shall monitor for the non-storm water dry weather action levels, which are incorporated into this Order as follows:

a. Action levels for discharges to inland surface waters:

### Table 4.a.1: General Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>AMAL</th>
<th>MDAL</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>200(^A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400(^B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterococci</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104(^C)</td>
<td>BPO/OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not less than 5.0 in WARM waters and not less than 6.0 in COLD waters</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>See MDEL</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>See MDEL</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylene Blue Active Substances</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>See MDEL</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^A\) - Based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period
\(^B\) - No more than 10 percent of total samples may exceed 400 per 100 ml during any 30 day period
\(^C\) - This value has been set to Ocean Plan Criteria for Designated Beach Areas

BPO - Basin Plan Objective

OP - Ocean Plan

MDAL - Maximum Daily Action Level

AMAL - Average Monthly Action Level

### Table 4.a.2: Priority Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>MDAL</th>
<th>AMAL</th>
<th>MDAL</th>
<th>AMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium III</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium VI (hexavalent)</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CTR - California Toxic Rule

* - Action Levels developed on a case-by-case basis (see below)

The NALs for Cadmium, Copper, Chromium (III), Lead, Nickel, Silver and Zinc will be developed on a case-by-case basis because the freshwater criteria are based on site-specific water quality data (receiving water hardness). For these priority pollutants, the following equations (40 CFR 131.38.b.2) will be required:

\begin{align*}
\text{Cadmium (Total Recoverable)} & = \exp(0.7852[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 2.715) \\
\text{Chromium III (Total Recoverable)} & = \exp(0.8190[\ln(\text{hardness})] + 0.6848) \\
\text{Copper (Total Recoverable)} & = \exp(0.8545[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 1.702) \\
\text{Lead (Total Recoverable)} & = \exp(1.273[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 4.705)
\end{align*}
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Nickel (Total Recoverable) = \exp(.8460[\ln(\text{hardness})] + 0.0584)
Silver (Total Recoverable) = \exp(1.72[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 6.52)
Zinc (Total Recoverable) = \exp(0.8473[\ln(\text{hardness})] + 0.884)

b. Action levels for discharges to bays, harbors and lagoons/estuaries:

Table 4.b: General Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>AMAL</th>
<th>MDAL</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>200^A, 400^B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterococci</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104^C</td>
<td>BPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Within limit of 6.0 to 9.0 at all times</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Pollutants</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>See limitations in Table 4.a.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period
B - No more than 10 percent of total samples may exceed 400 per 100 ml during any 30 day period
C - Designated Beach Areas
OP - California Ocean Plan 2005
MDAL - Maximum Daily Action Level
AMAL - Average Monthly Action Level

C. Action levels for discharges to the surf zone:

Table 4.c: General Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>AMAL</th>
<th>MDAL</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal Coliform</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>200^B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterococci</td>
<td>MPN/100 ml</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104^C</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Total coliform density shall not exceed 1,000 per 100 ml when the ratio of fecal/total coliform exceeds 0.1
B - During any 30 day period
C - Designated Beach Areas
OP - California Ocean Plan 2005

DIRECTIVE C: NON STORM WATER DRY WEATHER ACTION LEVELS
D. STORM WATER ACTION LEVELS

1. Beginning Year 3 after Order adoption date, a running average of twenty percent or greater of exceedances of any discharge of storm water from the MS4 to waters of the United States that exceed the Storm Water Action Levels (SALs) for the pollutants listed in Table 5 (below) will require each Coprmittee to affirmatively augment and implement all necessary storm water controls and measures to reduce the discharge of the associated class of pollutants(s) to the MEP standard. The Coprmittees must utilize the exceedance information when adjusting and executing annual work plans, as required by this Order. Coprmittees shall take the magnitude, frequency, and number of constituents exceeding the SAL(s), in addition to receiving water quality data and other information, into consideration when reacting to SAL exceedances in an iterative manner. Failure to appropriately consider and react to SAL exceedances in an iterative manner creates a presumption that the Coprmittee(s) have not complied with the MEP standard.

Table 5. Storm Water Action Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Action Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity (NTU)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate &amp; Nitrite total (mg/L)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P total (mg/L)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd total (μg/L)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu total (μg/L)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb total (μg/L)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni total (μg/L)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn total (μg/L)</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The end-of-pipe assessment points for the determination of SAL compliance are all major outfalls, as defined in 40 CFR 122.26(b)(5) and (b)(6). The Coprmittees must develop their monitoring plans to sample a representative percent of the major outfalls within each hydrologic subarea. At a minimum, outfalls that exceed SALs must be monitored in the subsequent year. Any station that does not exceed an SAL for 3 years may be replaced with a different station. SAL samples must be 24 hour time weighted composites.

3. The absence of SAL exceedances does not relieve the Coprmittees from implementing all other required elements of this Permit.

4. This Permit does not regulate natural sources and conveyances of constituents listed in Table 5. To be relieved of the requirements to prioritize pollutant/watershed combinations for BMP updates and to continue monitoring a station, the Coprmittee must demonstrate that the likely and expected cause of the SAL exceedance is not anthropogenic in nature.

5. The SALs will be reviewed and updated at the end of every permit cycle. The data collected pursuant to D.2 above can be used to create SALs based upon local data.
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It is the goal of the SALs, through the iterative and MEP process, to have outfall storm water discharges meet all applicable water quality standards.

E. LEGAL AUTHORITY

1. Each Copermittee must establish, maintain, and enforce adequate legal authority to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 through ordinance, statute, permit, contract or similar means. Nothing herein shall authorize a Co-Permittee or other discharger regulated under the terms of this order to divert, store or otherwise impound water if such action is reasonably anticipated to harm downstream water right holders in the exercise of their water rights. This legal authority must, at a minimum, authorize the Copermittee to:

   a. Control the contribution of pollutants in discharges of runoff associated with industrial and construction activity to its MS4 and control the quality of runoff from industrial and construction sites. This requirement applies both to industrial and construction sites which have coverage under the statewide general industrial or construction storm water permits, as well as to those sites which do not. Grading ordinances must be updated and enforced as necessary to comply with this Order;

   b. Prohibit all identified illicit discharges not otherwise allowed pursuant to section B.2;

   c. Prohibit and eliminate illicit connections to the MS4;

   d. Control the discharge of spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other than storm water to its MS4;

   e. Require compliance with conditions in Copermittee ordinances, permits, contracts or orders (i.e., hold dischargers to its MS4 accountable for their contributions of pollutants and flows);

   f. Utilize enforcement mechanisms to require compliance with Copermittee storm water ordinances, permits, contracts, or orders;

   g. Control the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements among Copermittees. Control of the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements with other owners of the MS4 such as the State of California Department of Transportation, the United States Department of Defense, or Native American Tribes is encouraged;

   h. Carry out all inspections, surveillance, and monitoring necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with local ordinances and permits and with this Order, including the prohibition on illicit discharges to the MS4. This means the Copermittee must have authority to enter, monitor, inspect, take measurements, review and copy records, and require regular reports from industrial facilities discharging into its MS4, including construction sites;

   i. Require the use of BMPs to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants into MS4s from storm water to the MEP; and
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j. Require documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants to the MS4 to the MEP.

2. Each Copermittee must submit within 365 days of adoption of this Order, a statement certified by its chief legal counsel that the Copermittee has taken the necessary steps to obtain and maintain full legal authority to implement and enforce each of the requirements contained in 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A-F) and this Order except for the updated requirements for low impact development and hydromodification in section F.1. Each Copermittee must submit as part of its updated SSMP, a statement certified by its chief legal counsel that the Copermittee has taken the necessary steps to obtain and maintain full legal authority to implement and enforce the low impact development and hydromodification requirements in section F.1. These statements must include:

a. Identification of all departments within the jurisdiction that conduct runoff related activities, and their roles and responsibilities under this Order. Include an up to date organizational chart specifying these departments and key personnel.

b. Citation of runoff related ordinances and the reasons they are enforceable;

c. Identification of the local administrative and legal procedures available to mandate compliance with runoff related ordinances and therefore with the conditions of this Order;

d. A description of how runoff related ordinances are implemented and appealed; and

e. Description of whether the municipality can issue administrative orders and injunctions or if it must go through the court system for enforcement actions.
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F. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (JRMP)

Each Copermittee must implement all requirements of section F of this Order no later than 365 days after adoption of the Order, unless otherwise specified in this Order. Prior to 365 days after adoption of the Order, each Copermittee must at a minimum implement its Jurisdictional RMP document, as the document was developed and amended to comply with the requirements of Order No. R9-2002-001.

Each Copermittee must develop and implement an updated JRMP for its jurisdiction. Each updated JRMP must meet the requirements of section F of this Order, reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMPONENT

Each Copermittee must implement a program which meets the requirements of this section and (1) reduces Development Project discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP; (2) prevents Development Project discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards; (3) prevents illicit discharges into the MS4; and (4) manages increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from Development Projects that are likely to cause increased erosion of stream beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

a. GENERAL PLAN

Each Copermittee must revise as needed its General Plan or equivalent plan (e.g., Comprehensive, Master, or Community Plan) for the purpose of providing effective water quality and watershed protection principles and policies that direct land-use decisions and require implementation of consistent water quality protection measures for all development and redevelopment projects.

b. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Each Copermittee must revise as needed its current environmental review processes to accurately evaluate water quality impacts and cumulative impacts and identify appropriate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate those impacts for all Development Projects.

c. APPROVAL PROCESS CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

For all proposed Development Projects, each Copermittee during the planning process, and prior to project approval and issuance of local permits, must prescribe the necessary requirements so that Development Project discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 will be reduced to the MEP, will not cause or
contribute to a violation of water quality standards, and will comply with Copermittee's ordinances, permits, plans, and requirements, and with this Order. Performance Criteria: Discharges from each approved development project must be subject to the following management measures:

(1) Source control BMPs that reduce storm water pollutants of concern in runoff, including prevention of illicit discharges into the MS4; prevention of irrigation runoff; storm drain system stenciling or signage; properly designed outdoor material storage areas; properly designed outdoor work areas; and properly designed trash storage areas;

(2) The following LID BMPs listed below shall be implemented at all Development Projects where applicable and feasible.

(a) Conserve natural areas, including existing trees, other vegetation, and soils.
(b) Construct streets, sidewalks, or parking lot aisles to the minimum widths necessary, provided that public safety is not compromised.
(c) Minimize the impervious footprint of the project.
(d) Minimize soil compaction to landscaped areas.
(e) Minimize disturbances to natural drainages (e.g., natural swales, topographic depressions, etc.)
(f) Disconnect impervious surfaces through distributed pervious areas.

(3) Buffer zones for natural water bodies, where feasible. Where buffer zones are infeasible, require project proponent to implement other buffers such as trees, access restrictions, etc;

(4) Measures necessary so that grading or other construction activities meet the provisions specified in section F.2 of this Order; and

(5) Submittal of proof of a mechanism under which ongoing long-term maintenance of all structural post-construction BMPs will be conducted.

(6) Infiltration and Groundwater Protection

To protect groundwater quality, each Copermittee must apply restrictions to the use of treatment control BMPs that are designed to primarily function as centralized infiltration devices (such as large infiltration trenches and infiltration basins). Such restrictions must be designed so that the use of such infiltration treatment control BMPs must not cause or contribute to an exceedance of groundwater quality objectives. At a minimum, each treatment control BMP designed to primarily function as a centralized infiltration device must meet the restrictions below, unless it is demonstrated that a restriction is not necessary to protect groundwater quality. The Copermittees may collectively or individually develop alternative restrictions on the use of
treatment control BMPs which are designed to primarily function as centralized infiltration devices. Alternative restrictions developed by the Copermittees can partially or wholly replace the restrictions listed below. The restrictions are not intended to be applied to small infiltration systems dispersed throughout a development project.

(a) Runoff must undergo pretreatment such as sedimentation or filtration prior to infiltration;

(b) All dry weather flows containing significant pollutant loads must be diverted from infiltration devices and treated through other BMPs;

(c) Pollution prevention and source control BMPs must be implemented at a level appropriate to protect groundwater quality at sites where infiltration treatment control BMPs are to be used;

(d) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must be adequately maintained so that they remove storm water pollutants to the MEP;

(e) The vertical distance from the base of any infiltration treatment control BMP to the seasonal high groundwater mark must be at least 10 feet. Where groundwater basins do not support beneficial uses, this vertical distance criteria may be reduced, provided groundwater quality is maintained;

(f) The soil through which infiltration is to occur must have physical and chemical characteristics (such as appropriate cation exchange capacity, organic content, clay content, and infiltration rate) which are adequate for proper infiltration durations and treatment of runoff for the protection of groundwater beneficial uses;

(g) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must not be used for areas of industrial or light industrial activity; areas subject to high vehicular traffic (25,000 or greater average daily traffic on main roadway or 15,000 or more average daily traffic on any intersecting roadway); automotive repair shops; car washes; fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.); nurseries; and other high threat to water quality land uses and activities as designated by each Copermittee unless first treated or filtered to remove pollutants prior to infiltration and a comprehensive site-specific evaluation has been conducted; and

(h) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must be located a minimum of 100 feet horizontally from any water supply wells.

(7) Where feasible, landscaping with native or low water species shall be preferred in areas that drain to the MS4 or to waters of the United States.
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d. STANDARD STORM WATER MITIGATION PLANS (SSMPs) – APPROVAL PROCESS CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Within two years of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees must submit an updated model SSMP, to the Regional Board’s Executive Officer for a 30 day public review and comment period. The Regional Board’s Executive Officer has the discretion to determine the necessity of a public hearing. Within 180 days of determination that the Model SSMP is in compliance with this Permit’s provisions, each Copermittee must update their own local SSMP, and amended ordinances consistent with the model SSMP, and shall submit both (local SSMP and amended ordinances) to the Regional Board. The model SSMP must meet the requirements of section F.1.d of this Order to (1) reduce Priority Development Project discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and (2) prevent Priority Development Project runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.\(^{12}\)

(1) Definition of Priority Development Project (PDP):

Priority Development Projects are:

(a) All new Development Projects that fall under the project categories or locations listed in section F.1.d.(2), and

(b) Those redevelopment projects that create, add, or replace at least 5,000 square feet of impervious surfaces on an already developed site and the existing development and/or the redevelopment project falls under the project categories or locations listed in section F.1.d.(2). Where redevelopment results in an increase of less than fifty percent of the impervious surfaces of a previously existing development, and the existing development was not subject to SSMP requirements, the numeric sizing criteria discussed in section F.1.d.(6) applies only to the addition or replacement, and not to the entire development. Where redevelopment results in an increase of more than fifty percent of the impervious surfaces of a previously existing development, the numeric sizing criteria applies to...

\(^{12}\) Updated SSMP and hydromodification requirements must apply to all priority projects or phases of priority projects which have not yet begun grading or construction activities at the time any updated SSMP or hydromodification requirement commences. If lawful prior approval of a project exists, whereby application of an updated SSMP or hydromodification requirement to the project is illegal, the updated SSMP or hydromodification requirement need not apply to the project. Updated Development Planning requirements set forth in Sections F.1. (a) through (h) of this Order must apply to all projects or phases of projects, unless, at the time any updated Development Planning requirement commences, the projects or project phases meet any one of the following conditions: (i) the project or phase has begun grading or construction activities; or (ii) a Copermittee determines that lawful prior approval rights for a project or project phase exist, whereby application of the Updated Development Planning requirement to the project is legally infeasible. Where feasible, the Permittees must utilize the SSMP and hydromodification update periods to ensure that projects undergoing approval processes include application of the updated SSMP and hydromodification requirements in their plans.
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the entire development.

(c) One acre threshold: In addition to the Priority Development Project Categories identified in section F.1.d.(2), Priority Development Projects must also include all other pollutant-generating Development Projects that result in the disturbance of one acre or more of land within three years of adoption of this Order.13 As an alternative to this one-acre threshold, the Copermittees may collectively identify a different threshold, provided the Copermittees' threshold is at least as inclusive of Development Projects as the one-acre threshold.

(2) Priority Development Project Categories

Where a new Development Project feature, such as a parking lot, falls into a Priority Development Project Category, the entire project footprint is subject to SSMP requirements.

(a) New development projects that create 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces (collectively over the entire project site) including commercial, industrial, residential, mixed-use, and public projects. This category includes development projects on public or private land which fall under the planning and building authority of the Copermittees.

(b) Automotive repair shops. This category is defined as a facility that is categorized in any one of the following Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes: 5013, 5014, 5541, 7532-7534, or 7536-7539.

(c) Restaurants. This category is defined as a facility that sells prepared foods and drinks for consumption, including stationary lunch counters and refreshment stands selling prepared foods and drinks for immediate consumption (SIC code 5812), where the land area for development is greater than 5,000 square feet. Restaurants where land development is less than 5,000 square feet must meet all SSMP requirements except for structural treatment BMP and numeric sizing criteria requirement F.1.d.(6) and hydromodification requirement F.1.h.

(d) All hillside development greater than 5,000 square feet. This category is defined as any development which creates 5,000 square feet of impervious surface which is located in an area with known erosive soil conditions, where the development will grade on any natural slope that is twenty-five percent or greater.

(e) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). All development located within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA (where discharges

13 Pollutant generating Development Projects are those projects that generate pollutants at levels greater than natural background levels.
from the development or redevelopment will enter receiving waters within the ESA), which either creates 2,500 square feet of impervious surface on a proposed project site or increases the area of imperviousness of a proposed project site to 10 percent or more of its naturally occurring condition. "Directly adjacent" means situated within 200 feet of the ESA. "Discharging directly to" means outflow from a drainage conveyance system that is composed entirely of flows from the subject development or redevelopment site, and not commingled with flows from adjacent lands.

(f) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more or with 15 or more parking spaces and potentially exposed to runoff. Parking lot is defined as a land area or facility for the temporary parking or storage of motor vehicles used personally, for business, or for commerce.

(g) Street, roads, highways, and freeways. This category includes any paved surface that is 5,000 square feet or greater used for the transportation of automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and other vehicles.

(h) Retail Gasoline Outlets (RGOs). This category includes RGOs that meet the following criteria: (a) 5,000 square feet or more or (b) a projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 100 or more vehicles per day.

(3) Pollutants of Concern

As part of its local SSMP, each Copermittee must implement an updated procedure for identifying pollutants of concern for each Priority Development Project. The procedure must address, at a minimum: (1) Receiving water quality (including pollutants for which receiving waters are listed as impaired under CWA section 303(d)); (2) Land-use type of the Development Project and pollutants associated with that land use type; and (3) Pollutants expected to be present on site.

(4) Low Impact Development BMP Requirements

Each Copermittee must require each Priority Development Project to implement LID BMPs which will collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas, limit loss of existing infiltration capacity, and protect areas that provide important water quality benefits necessary to maintain riparian and aquatic biota, and/or are particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.

(a) The following LID BMPs must be implemented:

(i) Each Copermittee must require LID BMPs or make a finding of infeasibility for each Priority Development Project in accordance with the LID waiver program in Section F.1.d.(8);
(ii) Each Copermittee must incorporate formalized consideration, such as thorough checklists, ordinances, and/or other means, of LID BMPs into the plan review process for Priority Development Projects;

(iii) The review of each Priority Development Project must include an assessment of potential collection of storm water for on-site or off-site reuse opportunities;

(iv) The review of each Priority Development Project must include an assessment of techniques to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff close to the source of runoff; and

(v) Within 2 years after adoption of this Order, each Copermittee must review its local codes, policies, and ordinances and identify barriers therein to implementation of LID BMPs. Following the identification of these barriers to LID implementation, where feasible, the Copermittee must take, by the end of the permit cycle, appropriate actions to remove such barriers.

(b) The following LID BMPs must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects where technically feasible as required below:

(i) Maintain or restore natural storage reservoirs and drainage corridors (including depressions, areas of permeable soils, swales, and ephemeral and intermittent streams.

(ii) Projects with landscaped or other pervious areas must, where feasible, drain runoff from impervious areas (rooftops, parking lots, sidewalks, walkways, patios, etc) into pervious areas prior to discharge to the MS4. The amount of runoff from impervious areas that is to drain to pervious areas shall not exceed the total capacity of the project's pervious areas to infiltrate or treat runoff, taking into consideration the pervious areas' geologic and soil conditions, slope, and other pertinent factors.

(iii) Projects with landscaped or other pervious areas must, where feasible, properly design and construct the pervious areas to effectively receive and infiltrate or treat runoff from impervious areas, prior to discharge to the MS4. Soil compaction for these areas shall be minimized. The amount of the impervious areas that are to drain to pervious areas must be based upon the total size, soil conditions, slope, and other pertinent factors.

(iv) Projects with low traffic areas and appropriate soil conditions must construct walkways, trails, overflow parking lots, alleys, or other low-traffic areas with permeable surfaces, such as pervious concrete, porous asphalt, unit pavers, and granular materials.

(c) To protect ground water resources any infiltration LID BMPs must comply with Section F.1.(c)(6).
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(d) LID BMPs sizing criteria:

(i) LID BMPs shall be sized and designed to ensure onsite retention without runoff, of the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the County of Orange’s 85th Percentile Precipitation Map\(^\text{14}\) (“design capture volume”);

(ii) If onsite retention LID BMPs are technically infeasible per section F.1.d.(7)(b), LID biofiltration BMPs may treat any volume that is not retained onsite by the LID BMPs. The LID biofiltration BMPs must be designed for an appropriate surface loading rate to prevent erosion, scour and channeling within the BMP. Due to the flow through design of biofiltration BMPs, the total volume of the BMP, including pore spaces and prefilter detention volume, must be sized to hold at least 0.75 times the design storm volume that is not retained onsite by LID retention BMPs;

(iii) If it is shown to be technically infeasible to treat the remaining volume up to and including the design capture volume using LID BMPs (retention or biofiltration), the project must implement conventional treatment control BMPs in accordance with Section F.1.d.(6) below and must participate in the LID waiver program in Section F.1.d.(7).

(e) All LID BMPs shall be designed and implemented with measures to avoid the creation of nuisance or pollution associated with vectors, such as mosquitoes, rodents, and flies.

(5) Source Control BMP Requirements

Each Copermittee must require each Priority Development Project to implement source control BMPs. The source control BMPs to be required must:

(a) Prevent illicit discharges into the MS4;
(b) Minimize storm water pollutants of concern in runoff;
(c) Eliminate irrigation runoff;
(d) Include storm drain system stenciling or signage;
(e) Include properly designed outdoor material storage areas;
(f) Include properly designed outdoor work areas;
(g) Include properly designed trash storage areas;
(h) Include water quality requirements applicable to individual priority project categories.

\(^{14}\) The isopluvial map is available from the County of Orange. The map can also be found as Figure A-1 Exhibit 7.II in the Model WQMP (September 2003), page 5 of 57 at http://www.ocwatersheds.com/documents/2003_DAMP_Exhibit_7_II_Model_WQMP_Attachments.pdf
(6) Treatment Control BMP Requirements

Each Copermittee must require each Priority Development Project to implement treatment control BMPs that meet the following requirements:

(a) All treatment control BMPs for a single Priority Development Project must collectively be sized to comply with the following numeric sizing criteria:

(i) Volume-based treatment control BMPs must be designed to mitigate (infiltrate, filter, or treat) the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the County of Orange's 85th Percentile Precipitation Isopluvial Map, or

(ii) Flow-based treatment control BMPs must be designed to mitigate (infiltrate, filter, or treat) either: a) the maximum flow rate of runoff produced from a rainfall intensity of 0.2 inch of rainfall per hour, for each hour of a storm event; or b) the maximum flow rate of runoff produced by the 85th percentile hourly rainfall intensity (for each hour of a storm event), as determined from the local historical rainfall record, multiplied by a factor of two.

(b) Treatment control BMPs for all Priority Development Projects must mitigate (treat through infiltration, settling, filtration or other unit processes) the required volume or flow of runoff from all developed portions of the project, including landscaped areas.

(c) All treatment control BMPs must be located so as to remove pollutants from runoff prior to its discharge to any waters of the U.S. Multiple Priority Development Projects may use shared treatment control BMPs as long as construction of any shared treatment control BMP is completed prior to the use or occupation of any Priority Development Project from which the treatment control BMP will receive runoff.

(d) All treatment control BMPs for Priority Development Projects must, at a minimum:

(i) Be ranked with high or medium pollutant removal efficiency for the project's most significant pollutants of concern, as the pollutant removal efficiencies are identified in the Copermittees' Model.
SSMP. Treatment control BMPs with a low removal efficiency ranking must only be approved by a Copernmittee when a feasibility analysis has been conducted which exhibits that implementation of treatment control BMPs with high or medium removal efficiency rankings are infeasible for a Priority Development Project or portion of a Priority Development Project.

(ii) Be correctly sized and designed so as to remove storm water pollutants to the MEP.

(e) Target removal of pollutants of concern from runoff.

(f) Be implemented close to pollutant sources, and prior to discharging into waters of the U.S.

(g) Not be constructed within a waters of the U.S. or waters of the State.

(h) Include proof of a mechanism under which ongoing long-term maintenance will be conducted to ensure proper maintenance for the life of the project. The mechanisms may be provided by the project proponent or Copernmittee.

(i) Be designed and implemented with measures to avoid the creation of nuisance or pollution associated with vectors, such as mosquitoes, rodents, and flies.

(7) Low Impact Development (LID) BMP Waiver Program

The Copernmittees must develop, collectively or individually, a LID waiver program for incorporation into local SSMPs, which would allow a Priority Development Project to substitute implementation of all or a portion of required LID BMPs in section F.1.d(4) with implementation of treatment control BMPs and a mitigation project, payment into an in-lieu funding program, and/or watershed equivalent BMP(s) consistent with Section F.1.d.(11). The Copernmittees shall submit the LID waiver program as part of their updated model SSMP. At a minimum, the program must meet the requirements below:

(a) Prior to implementation, the LID waiver program must clearly exhibit that it will not allow PDPs to result in a net impact (after consideration of any mitigation and in-lieu payments) from pollutant loadings over and above the impact caused by projects meeting LID requirements;

(b) For each PDP participating, a technical feasibility analysis must be included demonstrating that it is technically infeasible to implement LID BMPs that comply with the requirements of Section F.1.d(4).
Copermittee(s) must develop criteria for the technical feasibility analysis including a cost benefit analysis, examination of LID BMPs considered and alternatives chosen. Each PDP participating must demonstrate that LID BMPs were implemented as much as feasible given the site's unique conditions. Analysis must be made of the pollutant loading for each project participating in the LID substitution program. The estimated impacts from not implementing the required LID BMPs in section F.1.d.(4) must be fully mitigated. Technical infeasibility may result from conditions including, but not limited to:

(i) Locations that cannot meet the infiltration and groundwater protection requirements in section F.1.c.(6). Where infiltration is technically infeasible, the project must still examine the feasibility of other onsite retention LID BMPs;

(ii) Smart growth and infill or redevelopment locations where the density and/or nature of the project would create significant difficulty for compliance with the onsite volume retention requirements; and

(iii) Other site, geologic, soil or implementation constraints identified in the Copermittees updated local SSMP document.

(c) The LID waiver program must include mechanisms to verify that each Priority Development Project participating in the program is in compliance with all applicable SSMP requirements;

(d) The LID waiver program must develop and implement a review process verifying that the BMPs to be implemented meet the designated design criteria. The review process must also verify that each Priority Development Project participating in the program is in compliance with all applicable SSMP requirements.

(e) The LID waiver program must include performance standards for treatment control BMPs specified in compliance with section F.1.(d)(6).

(f) Each PDP that participates in the LID waiver program must mitigate for the pollutant loads expected to be discharged due to not implementing the LID BMPs in section F.1.d.(4). Mitigation projects must be implemented within the same hydrologic subarea as the PDP. Mitigation projects outside of the hydrologic subarea but within the same hydrologic unit may be approved provided that the project proponent demonstrates that mitigation projects within the same hydrologic subarea are infeasible and that the mitigation project will address similar beneficial use impacts as expected from the PDPs pollutant load types and amount. Offsite mitigation projects may include green streets projects, existing development retrofit projects, retrofit incentive programs, regional BMPs and stream restoration. Project applicants seeking to utilize these
alternative compliance provisions may propose other offsite mitigation projects, which the Copermittees may approve if they meet the requirements of this subpart.

(g) A Copermittee may choose to implement a pollutant credit system as part of the LID waiver program provided that such a credit system clearly exhibits that it will not allow PDPs to result in a net impact from pollutant loadings over and above the impact caused by projects meeting LID requirements. Any credit system that a Copermittee chooses to implement must be submitted to the Executive Officer for review and approval as part of the waiver program.

(h) The LID waiver program shall include a storm water mitigation fund developed by the Copermittee(s) to be used for water quality improvement projects which may serve in lieu of the PDP's required mitigation in section F.1.d.(8)(e). The LID waiver program's storm water mitigation fund shall, at a minimum, identify:

(i) The entity or entities that will manage the storm water mitigation fund (i.e., assume full responsibility);

(ii) The range and types of acceptable projects for which storm water mitigation funds may be expended;

(iii) The entity or entities that will assume full responsibility for each water quality improvement project, including its successful completion; and

(iv) How the dollar amount of storm water mitigation fund contributions will be determined. In-lieu payments must be proportional to the additional pollutant load discharged by not fully implementing LID.

(i) Each Copermittee must notify the Regional Board in their annual report of each PDP choosing to participate in the LID waiver program. The annual report must include the following information:

(i) Name of the developer of the participating PDP;

(ii) Site location;

(iii) Reason for LID waiver including technical feasibility analysis;

(iv) Description of BMPs implemented;

(v) Total amount deposited, if any, into the storm water mitigation fund described in section F.1.d.(8)(f);

(vi) Water quality improvement project(s) proposed to be funded; and

(vii) Timeframe for implementation of water quality improvement projects.

(8) Site Design and Treatment Control BMP Design Standards

As part of its local SSMP, each Copermittee must develop and require Priority
Development Projects to implement sitting, design, and maintenance criteria for each site design and treatment control BMP listed in its local SSMP to determine feasibility and applicability and so that implemented site design and treatment control BMPs are constructed correctly and are effective at pollutant removal, runoff control, and vector minimization. LID techniques, such as soil amendments, must be incorporated into the criteria for appropriate treatment control BMPs. Development of BMP design worksheets which can be used by project proponents is encouraged.

(9) Implementation Process

As part of its local SSMP, each Copermittee must implement a process to verify compliance with SSMP requirements. The process must identify at what point in the planning process Priority Development Projects will be required to meet SSMP requirements and at a minimum, the Priority Development Project must implement the required post-construction BMPs prior to occupancy and/or the intended use of any portion of that project. The process must also include identification of the roles and responsibilities of various municipal departments in implementing the SSMP requirements, as well as any other measures necessary for the implementation of SSMP requirements.

(10) Treatment BMP Review

(a) The Copermittees must review and update the BMPs that are listed in their local SSMPs as options for treatment control during the third year of implementation of this Order. At a minimum, the update must include removal of obsolete or ineffective BMPs and addition of LID BMPs that can be used for treatment, such as bioretention cells, bioretention swales, etc. The update must also add appropriate LID BMPs to any tables or discussions in the local SSMPs addressing pollutant removal efficiencies of treatment control BMPs. In addition, the update must include review and revision where necessary of treatment control BMP pollutant removal efficiencies.

(b) The update must incorporate findings from BMP effectiveness studies conducted by the Copermittees for projects funded wholly or in part by the State Board or Regional Board.

(c) Each Copermittee must implement a mechanism for annually incorporating findings from local treatment BMP effectiveness studies (e.g., ones conducted by, or on-behalf of, public agencies in Orange County) into SSMP project reviews and permitting.

(11) Where a development project, greater than 100 acres in total project size or smaller than 100 acres in size yet part of a larger common plan of
development that is over 100 acres, has been prepared using watershed and/or sub-watershed based water quality, hydrologic, and fluvial geomorphologic planning principles that implement regional LID BMPs in accordance with the sizing and location criteria of this Order and acceptable to the Regional Board, such standards shall govern review of projects with respect to Section F.1 of this Order and shall be deemed to satisfy this Order's requirements for LID site design, buffer zone, infiltration and groundwater protection standards, source control, treatment control, and hydromodification control standards. Regional BMPs must clearly exhibit that they will not result in a net impact from pollutant loadings over and above the impact caused by capture and retention of the design storm. Regional BMPs may be used provided that the BMPs capture and retain the volume of runoff produced from the 24-hour 85th percentile storm event as defined in section F.1.d.(6)(a)(i) and that such controls are located upstream of receiving waters. Any volume that is not retained by the LID BMPs, up to the design capture volume, must be treated using LID biofiltration. Where regional LID implementation has been shown to be technically infeasible (per section F.1.d.7.b) any volume up to and including the design capture volume, not retained by LID BMPs, nor treated by LID biofiltration, must be treated using conventional treatment control BMPs in accordance with Section F.1.d.(6) and participation in the LID waiver program in Section F.1.d.(7).

e. BMP CONSTRUCTION VERIFICATION

Prior to occupancy and/or intended use of any portion of the Priority Development Project subject to SSMP requirements, each Copermittee must inspect the constructed site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs to verify that they have been constructed and are operating in compliance with all specifications, plans, permits, ordinances, and this Order.

f. BMP MAINTENANCE TRACKING

(1) Each Copermittee must develop and maintain a watershed-based database to track and inventory all approved post-construction BMPs and BMP maintenance within its jurisdiction since July 2001. LID BMPs implemented on a lot by lot basis at a single family residential home, such as rainbarrels, are not required to be tracked or inventoried. At a minimum, the database must include information on BMP type, location, watershed, date of construction, party responsible for maintenance, maintenance certifications or verifications, inspections, inspection findings, and corrective actions, including whether the site was referred to the Vector Control District.

(2) Each Copermittee must establish a mechanism not only to track post-construction BMPs, but also to ensure that appropriate easements and ownerships are properly recorded in public records and the information is
conveyed to all appropriate parties when there is a change in project or site ownership.

(3) Each Copermittee must verify that approved post-construction BMPs are operating effectively and have been adequately maintained by implementing the following measures:

(a) An annual inventory of all approved BMPs within the Copermittee's jurisdiction. LID BMPs implemented on a lot by lot basis at a single family residential home, such as rainbarrels, are not required to be tracked or inventoried. The inventory must also include all BMPs approved for Priority Development Projects since July 2001;

(b) The designation of high priority BMPs. High-priority designation must include consideration of BMP size, recommended maintenance frequency, likelihood of operational and maintenance issues, location, receiving water quality, and other pertinent factors;

(c) Verify implementation, operation, and maintenance of BMPs by inspection, self-certification, surveys, or other equally effective approaches with the following conditions:

(i) The implementation, operation, and maintenance of at least 90 percent of approved and inventoried final project public and private SSMPs (a.k.a. WQMPs) must be verified annually. All post-construction BMPs shall be verified within every four year period;

(ii) Operation and maintenance verifications must be required prior to each rainy season;

(iii) All (100 percent) projects with BMPs that are high priority must be inspected by the Copermittee annually prior to each rainy season;

(iv) All (100 percent) public agency projects with BMPs must be inspected by the Copermittee annually;

(v) At least 50 percent of projects with drainage insert treatment control BMPs must be inspected by the Copermittee annually;

(vi) Appropriate follow-up measures (including re-inspections, enforcement, maintenance, etc.) must be conducted to ensure the treatment BMPs continue to reduce storm water pollutants as originally designed;

(vii) All inspections must verify effective operation and maintenance of the treatment control BMPs, as well as compliance with all ordinances, permits, and this Order; and

(viii) Inspections must note observations of vector conditions, such as mosquitoes. Where conditions are identified as contributing to mosquito production, the Copermittee must notify the Orange County Vector Control District.

DIRECTIVE F.1: JRMP DEVELOPMENT PLANNING
g. **ENFORCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SITES**

Each Copermittee must enforce its storm water ordinance for all Development Projects and at all development sites as necessary to maintain compliance with this Order. Copermittee ordinances or other regulatory mechanisms must include appropriate sanctions to achieve compliance. Sanctions must include the following or their equivalent: Non-monetary penalties, fines, bonding requirements, and/or permit or occupancy denials for non-compliance.

h. **HYDROMODIFICATION – LIMITATIONS ON INCREASES OF RUNOFF DISCHARGE RATES AND DURATIONS**

Each Copermittee shall collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop and implement a Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) to manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects. The HMP shall be incorporated into the local SSMP and implemented by each Copermittee so that estimated post-project runoff discharge rates and durations shall not exceed pre-development discharge rates and durations. Where the proposed project is located on an already developed site, the pre-project discharge rate and duration shall be that of the pre-developed, naturally occurring condition. The HMP shall be submitted to the Executive Officer within 2 years of permit adoption. The HMP will be made available for public review and comment and the Executive Officer will determine the need for a public hearing.

(1) The HMP must:

(a) Identify a method for assessing susceptibility of channel segments which receive runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects. The geomorphic stability within the channel shall be assessed. A performance standard shall be created that ensures that the geomorphic stability within the channel not be compromised as a result of receiving runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects.

(b) Utilize continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record (or other analytical method proposed by the Copermittees and deemed acceptable

---

17 Updated SSMP and hydromodification requirements shall apply to all priority projects or phases of priority projects which have not yet begun grading or construction activities at the time any updates SSMP or hydromodification requirement commences. If a Copermittee determines that lawful prior approval of a project exists, whereby application of an updated SSMP or hydromodification requirement to the project is legally infeasible, the updated SSMP or hydromodification requirement need not apply to the project. The Copermittees shall utilize the SSMP and hydromodification update periods to ensure that projects undergoing approval processes include application of the updated SSMP and hydromodification requirements in their plans.

**DIRECTIVE F.1: JRMP DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**