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This Fact Sheet contains information regarding the waste discharge requirements and
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the California State
Department of Transportation (Department) for discharges of storm water and certain types
of non-storm water. This Fact Sheet describes the factual, legal, and methodological basis
for the permit conditions, provides supporting documentation, and explains the rationale and
assumptions used in deriving the limits and requirements.

BACKGROUND

In 1972, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (also referred to as the Clean Water Act
(C.W.A.,)) was amended to provide that the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United
States from any point source is unlawful, unless the discharge is in compliance with an
NPDES permit. The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act added section 402(p).
Section 402(p) establishes that storm water discharges are point source discharges and
lays out a framework for regulating municipal and industrial storm water discharges under
the NPDES program. On November 16, 1990, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(USEPA) promulgated final regulations that establish the storm water permit
requirements.

Pursuant to the 1990 regulations, storm water permits are required for discharges from a
municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) serving a population of 100,000 or more.
USEPA defines an MS4 as a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with
drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made
canals, or storm drains) owned or operated by a State (40 Code of Federal
Regulations (C.F.R.), § 122.26(b)(8)). The regulations also require storm water permits
for 11 categories of industry, including construction activities where the construction
activity: (1) disturbs more than 1 acre of land; (2) is part of a larger common plan of
development; and/or (3) is found to be a significant threat to water quality.

Before July 1999, storm water discharges from Department storm water systems were
regulated by individual NPDES permits issued by the Regional Water Quality Control
Boards (Regional Water Boards). On July 15, 1999, the State Water Resources Control
Board (State Water Board) issued a statewide permit (Order No. 99-06-DWQ), which
regulated all storm water discharges from Department owned MS4s, maintenance facilities and construction activities. The existing permit (Order No. 99-06-DWQ) will be superseded by adoption of a new permit.

Industrial activities are covered by two General Permits that have been adopted by the State Water Board. The Department’s construction activities are subject to the requirements under the NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities (CGP, NPDES Permit No. CAS000002) for construction activities that are equal to or greater than 1 acre. The exception to this is in the Lake Tahoe area, where the Lahontan Regional Water Board adopted its own construction general permit (NPDES Permit No. CAG616002). The Department’s industrial facility activities are subject to the requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Industrial Activities (IGP, NPDES Permit No. CAS000001).

The Department is responsible for the design, construction, management, and maintenance of the State highway system, including freeways, bridges, tunnels, the Department’s facilities, and related properties. The Department’s discharges consist of storm water and non-storm water discharges from State owned rights-of-way.

Clean Water Act section 402(p) and 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (a)(v) give the State authority to regulate discharges from an MS4 on a system-wide or jurisdiction-wide basis. The State Water Board considers all storm water discharges from all MS4s and activities under the Department’s jurisdiction as one system. Therefore, this Order is intended to cover all of the Department’s municipal storm water activities.

This Order will be implemented by the Department and enforced by the State Water Board and nine Regional Water Boards.

The Department operates highways and highway-related properties and facilities that cross through local jurisdictions. Some storm water discharges from the Department’s MS4 enter the MS4s owned and managed by these local jurisdictions. This Order does not supersede the authority of local agencies to prohibit, restrict, or control storm water discharges and conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges to storm drain systems or other watercourses within their jurisdiction as allowed by State and federal law. The Department is expected to comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities and other local, regional, and/or state agencies regarding discharges of storm water to separate storm sewer systems or other watercourses under the agencies’ jurisdictions.

**GENERAL DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS**

This Order authorizes storm water and conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges from the Department’s properties, facilities and activities. This Order prohibits the discharge of material other than storm water, unless specifically authorized in this Order.

The Department owns and operates highway systems that are located adjacent to and discharge into many ASBS. This Order specifies that Department discharges to an ASBS are prohibited except in compliance with the conditions and special protections
contained in the General Exception for Storm Water and Non-Point Source Discharges to ASBS, State Water Board Resolution 2012-0012. This State Water Board resolution is hereby incorporated by reference and the Department is required to comply with applicable requirements. Attachment III identifies 84 priority Department ASBS discharge locations. These locations represent sites having significant potential to impact the ASBS that are feasible to retrofit. The following locations are not included in the list:

1. Inland sites discharging indirectly to the ASBS,
2. Sites where the discharge is attenuated through vegetation,
3. Sites where it is infeasible to install a BMP, e.g. an overhanging outfall or where there is insufficient space to install a treatment control, and
4. Sites that would pose a safety hazard to motorists, or that would be unsafe to install or maintain.

Provision E.5 of the Order requires the Department to ensure that structural controls at these locations are operational within six years of the effective date of the General Exception.

NON-STORM WATER

Non-storm water discharges that are not specifically or conditionally exempted by this Order are subject to the existing regulations for point source discharges. Conditionally exempt non-storm water discharges that are found to be significant sources of pollution are to be effectively prohibited.

The Department (2007a) indicated in its Non-Storm Water Report that agricultural irrigation water return flows carrying pollutants pass under the Department’s right-of-way in many locations and enter its MS4. Agricultural return flows are not prohibited or conditionally exempted non-storm water discharges and are not subject to the non-storm water requirements of the Order.

The regulations conditionally exempt MS4s from the requirement to effectively prohibit “irrigation water” discharges to the MS4. The regulations also completely exempt MS4s from addressing non-storm water discharges (also called “illicit discharges”) if they are regulated by an NPDES permit (40 C.F.R., §§ 122.26(b)(2); 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)). The term “irrigation water” is not defined and the regulations do not clarify whether that term is intended to encompass agricultural return flows that may run on to the Department’s rights of way.

Because agricultural return flows cannot be regulated by an NPDES permit, it is unlikely that they were intended to be treated as “illicit discharges” under the federal MS4 regulations. In discussing illicit non-storm water discharges and the requirement to effectively prohibit such discharges, the preamble of the Phase I final regulations states: “The CWA prohibits the point source discharge of non-storm water not subject to an NPDES permit through municipal separate storm sewers to waters of the United States. Thus, classifying such discharges as illicit properly identifies such discharges as being illegal” (55 FR 47996) (emphasis added). Implicit in this statement is that illicit discharges
do not include non-point source discharges, including agricultural return flows, which are statutorily excluded from the definition of a point-source discharge (C.W.A., § 502(14)).

Clean Water Act Section 402(l)(1) states that an NPDES permitting agency “shall not require a permit under this section for discharges composed entirely of return flows from irrigated agriculture.” Accordingly, agricultural return flows co-mingling with an illicit discharge would be treated as a point source discharge. This fact, however, does not lead the State Water Board to find that agricultural return flows should be subject to the conditional prohibition on non-storm water discharges.

First, the illicit discharge prohibition acts to prevent non-storm water discharges “into the storm sewers” (C.W.A., § 402(p)(3)(B)(ii)) (emphasis added). Based on a plain reading of the statutory language, a determination of what constitutes an illicit discharge should be made with reference to the nature of the discharge as it enters the MS4. Unless the agricultural return flow has co-mingled with a point source discharge prior to entering the MS4, it is not subject to the discharge prohibition. Further, since certain point source discharges are conditionally exempted from the requirement for effective prohibition under 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1), the fact that the agricultural return flow may have co-mingled with such an exempted dry weather point source discharge prior to entering the MS4 does not render it an illicit discharge subject to the effective prohibition.

Sea Fishermen Against the Destruction of the Environment, Inc. v. Closter Farms, Inc. (11th Cir. 2002) 300 F.3d 1294.

Second, even assuming that the agricultural return flow mingling with a point source discharge after entering the MS4 would trigger the requirements related to non-storm water discharges, agricultural return flows are not expected to require an effective prohibition. Irrigation of agricultural fields typically occurs in dry weather, not wet weather, and therefore the State Water Board anticipates that irrigation return flows into the Department’s MS4 would generally not co-mingle with discharges other than exempt non-storm water discharges.

Further, agricultural return flows entering an MS4, while not regulated by an NPDES permit, are through much of the State regulated under WDRs, waivers, and Basin Plan prohibitions. The regulations exempt MS4s from addressing non-storm water discharges that are regulated by an NPDES permit. Flows to the Department’s MS4 regulated through state-law based permits are subject to regulatory oversight analogous to being subject to an NPDES permit. The appropriate regulatory mechanism for these

---

1 Elsewhere in the preamble, EPA refers to the conditionally exempted non-storm water discharges as "seemingly innocent flows that are characteristic of human existence in urban environments and which discharge to municipal separate storm sewers" (55 F.R.48037) (emphasis added). This language further suggests that the term "irrigation water" was not intended to encompass irrigation return flows characteristic of a rural area.

2 40 C.F.R. §122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(1) similarly states that the MS4 is to "prevent illicit discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer system." (emphasis added).

3 The Federal Register discussion clarifies that "irrigation return flows are excluded from regulation under the NPDES program," but that "joint discharges," i.e. discharges with a component "from activities unrelated to crop production" may be regulated (55 FR 47996).
discharges is the non-point source regulatory programs and not a municipal storm water permit.  

**EFFLUENT LIMITS**

The State of California Nonpoint Source Program Five-Year Implementation Plan (SWRCB, 2003) (the Plan) describes a variety of pollutants in urban storm water and non-storm water that are carried in MS4 discharges to receiving waters. These include oil, sand, de-icing chemicals, litter, bacteria, nutrients, toxic materials and general debris from urban and suburban areas. The Plan identifies construction as a major source of sediment erosion and automobiles as primary sources of petroleum hydrocarbons.

The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) also identified two main causes of storm water pollution in urban areas (NRDC, 1999). Both identified causes are directly related to development in urban and urbanizing areas:

1. Increased volume and velocity of surface runoff. There are three types of human-made impervious cover that increase the volume and velocity of runoff: (i) rooftops, (ii) transportation imperviousness, and (iii) non-porous (impervious) surfaces. As these impervious surfaces increase, infiltration will decrease, forcing more water to run off the surface, picking up speed and pollutants.

2. The concentration of pollutants in the runoff. Certain industrial, commercial, residential and construction activities are large contributors of pollutant concentrations in urban runoff. As human population density increases, it brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, municipal sewage, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, trash, etc.

As a result of these two causes, runoff leaving developed urban areas is significantly greater in volume, velocity, and pollutant load than pre-development runoff from the same area.

NPDES storm water permits must meet applicable provisions of sections 301 and 402 of the Clean Water Act. For discharges from an MS4, Clean Water Act section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) requires control of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). A permitting agency also has the discretion to require dischargers to implement more stringent controls, if necessary, to meet water quality standards (*Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner* (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159, 1166.), (discussed below under Receiving Water Limitations).

---

4 It should also be noted that the Department has limited control options since up gradient flows such as agricultural runoff must in many cases be allowed to flow under or alongside the roadway so as to not threaten roadway integrity.
MEP is the technology-based standard established by Congress in Clean Water Act section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) that municipal dischargers of storm water must meet. Technology-based standards establish the level of pollutant reductions that dischargers must achieve. MEP is generally achieved by emphasizing pollution prevention and source control BMPs as the first lines of defense in combination with structural and treatment methods where appropriate. The MEP approach is an ever evolving, flexible, and advancing concept, which considers technical and economic feasibility. As knowledge about controlling urban runoff continues to evolve, so does that which constitutes MEP.

In a precedential order (State Water Board Order WQ 2000-11 (In the Matter of the petitions of the Cities of Bellflower et al.)), the State Water Board has stated as follows:

While the standard of MEP is not defined in the storm water regulations or the Clean Water Act, the term has been defined in other federal rules. Probably the most comparable law that uses the term is the Superfund legislation, or CERCLA, at section 121(b). The legislative history of CERCLA indicates that the relevant factors, to determine whether MEP is met in choosing solutions and treatment technologies, include technical feasibility, cost, and state and public acceptance. Another example of a definition of MEP is found in a regulation adopted by the Department of Transportation for onshore oil pipelines. MEP is defined as to “the limits of available technology and the practical and technical limits on a pipeline operator . . . .”

These definitions focus mostly on technical feasibility, but cost is also a relevant factor. There must be a serious attempt to comply, and practical solutions may not be lightly rejected. If, from the list of BMPs, a permittee chooses only a few of the least expensive methods, it is likely that MEP has not been met. On the other hand, if a permittee employs all applicable BMPs except those where it can show that they are not technically feasible in the locality, or whose cost would exceed any benefit to be derived, it would have met the standard. MEP requires permittees to choose effective BMPs, and to reject applicable BMPs only where other effective BMPs will serve the same purpose, the BMPs would not be technically feasible, or the cost would be prohibitive. Thus while cost is a factor, the Regional Water Board is not required to perform a cost-benefit analysis.

The final determination of whether a municipality has reduced pollutants to the maximum extent practicable can only be made by the permitting agency, and not by the discharger.

Because of the numerous advances in storm water regulation and management and the size of the Department’s MS4, this Order does not require the Department to fully incorporate and implement all advances in a single permit term. The Order allows for prioritization of efforts to ensure the most effective use of available funds.
This Order will have an impact on costs to the Department above and beyond the costs from the Department’s prior permit. Such costs will be incurred in complying with the post-construction, hydrograph modification, Low Impact Development, and monitoring and reporting requirements of this Order. Additional costs will also be incurred in correcting non-compliant discharges. Recognizing that there are cost increases associated with the Order, the State Water Board has prepared a cost analysis to approximate the anticipated cost associated with implementing this permit. The resulting cost analysis is discussed later in this Fact Sheet under the section on “Cost of Compliance and Other MEP Considerations.” The cost analysis has been prepared based on available data and is not a cost-benefit analysis.

The individual and collective activities required by this Order and contained in the Department’s Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) meet the MEP standard.

RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A permitting agency also has the discretion to require dischargers to implement more stringent controls, if necessary, to meet water quality standards (Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1159, 1166). The State Water Board issued precedential Order WQ 2001-15, stating that municipal storm water permits should require compliance with water quality standards. The order did not require strict compliance through effluent limitations, but established an expectation that compliance could be achieved over time through an iterative process of “timely improvement of BMPs.”

In Order WQ 98-01, the State Water Board prescribed specific precedent setting Receiving Water Limitations language to be included in all future MS4 permits. This language specifically requires that MS4 dischargers meet water quality standards or water quality objectives (collectively, WQS) and allows for the use of BMPs (increasing in stringency and implemented in an iterative process) as the mechanism by which water quality standards can be met.

In Order WQ 99-05, the State Water Board modified the receiving water limitations language in Order WQ-98-01 to meet specific objections by the USEPA (the modifications resulted in stricter compliance with water quality standards). State Water Board Order WQ 99-05 states, “the following receiving water limitations language shall be included in future municipal storm water permits.”

This Order contains provisions consistent with the receiving water limitations language in Order WQ 99-05. The Order prohibits storm water discharges that cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable water quality standard. If receiving water quality standards are exceeded, the Department is required to submit a written report providing additional BMPs or other measures that will be implemented to achieve water quality standards through an iterative approach.
NUMERIC EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND BLUE RIBBON PANEL OF EXPERTS

Under 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(k)(2)&(3), the State Water Board may impose BMPs for control of storm water discharges in lieu of numeric effluent limitations.  

In 2005, the State Water Board assembled a blue ribbon panel to address the feasibility of including numeric effluent limits as part of NPDES municipal, industrial, and construction storm water permits. The panel issued a report dated June 19, 2006, which included recommendations as to the feasibility of including numeric limitations in storm water permits, how such limitations should be established, and what data should be required (SWRCB, 2006).

The report concluded that “It is not feasible at this time to set enforceable numeric effluent criteria for municipal BMPs and in particular urban discharges. However, it is possible to select and design them much more rigorously with respect to the physical, chemical and/or biological processes that take place within them, providing more confidence that the estimated mean concentrations of constituents in the effluents will be close to the design target.”

Consistent with the findings of the Blue Ribbon Panel and precedential State Water Board orders (State Water Board Orders Nos. WQ 91-03 and WQ 91-04), this Order allows the Department to implement BMPs to comply with the requirements of the Order.

In 1980, the State Water Resources Control Board adopted concentration-based numeric effluent limitations for total nitrogen, total phosphate, total iron, turbidity, and grease and oil for storm water discharges in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Lahontan Regional Water Board included revised versions of those limitations in Table 5.6-1 of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan). The numeric effluent limitations in Table 5.6-1 were included in previous iterations of the Department's MS4 permit. This Order does not include these referenced numeric effluent limitations. The TMDL for sediment and nutrients in Lake Tahoe, approved by USEPA on August 16, 2011, removed statements from the Basin Plan requiring the effluent limitations in Table 5.6-1 to apply to municipal jurisdictions and the Department. The Lake Tahoe TMDL would constitute cause for permit revocation and reissuance in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.62(a)(3), so the removal of the referenced numeric

5 On November 12, 2010, USEPA issued a revision to a November 22, 2002 memorandum in which it had “affirm[ed] the appropriateness of an iterative, adaptive management best management practices (BMP) approach” for improving storm water management over time. In the revisions, USEPA recommended that, in the case the permitting authority determines that MS4 discharges have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a water quality excursion, the permitting authority, where feasible, include numeric effluent limitations as necessary to meet water quality standards. However, the revisions recognized that the permitting authority's decision as to how to express water quality based effluent limitations (WQBELs), i.e. as numeric effluent limitations or BMPs, would be based on an analysis of the specific facts and circumstances surrounding the permit. USEPA has since invited comment on the revisions to the memorandum and will be making a determination as to whether to “either retain the memorandum without change, to reissue it with revisions, or to withdraw it.” http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sw_tmdlwla_comments_pdf
effluent limitations is consistent with 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(l)(1). Further, any water quality based effluent limitations in MS4 permits are imposed under section 402(p)(3)(B) of the Clean Water Act rather than under section 301(b)(1)(C), and are accordingly not subject to the antibacksliding requirements of section 402(o). The Order requires compliance with pollutant load reduction requirements established by the Lake Tahoe TMDL for total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and fine sediment particles.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THIS ORDER

Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP)

The SWMP describes the procedures and practices that the Department proposes to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants to storm drainage systems and receiving waters. On May 17, 2001, the State Water Board approved a Storm Water Management Plan submitted by the Department. That SWMP was updated in 2003 (Department, 2003b) and the updates were approved by the Executive Director of the State Water Board on February 13, 2003. On January 15, 2004, the Department submitted a proposed Storm Water Management Plan as part of its NPDES permit application to renew its previous statewide storm water permit (Order No. 99-06-DWQ). The State Water Board and Regional Water Board staff and the Department discussed and revised Best Management Practices (BMP) controls and many other components proposed in each section of the SWMP during numerous meetings from January 2004 to 2006. The Department submitted a revised SWMP in June 2007. The 2004 and 2007 SWMPs have not been approved by the State Water Board and the Department has continued to implement the 2003 SWMP. The Department is in the process of revising aspects of the 2003 SWMP to address the Findings of Violation and Order for Compliance issued by USEPA in 2011 (USEPA Docket No. CWA-09-2011-0001).

This Order requires the Department to update, maintain and implement an effective SWMP that describes how the Department will meet requirements of this Order. Within one year of the effective date of the Order, the Department shall submit for Executive Director approval a SWMP consistent with the provisions and requirement of the Order. The SWMP is an integral and enforceable component of this Order and is required to be updated on an annual basis.

In ruling upon the adequacy of federal regulations for discharges from small municipal storm sewer systems, the court in *Environmental Defense Center v. United States EPA* (9th Cir. 2003) 344 F.3d 832 held that NPDES “notices of intent” that required the inclusion of a proposed storm water management program (SWMP) are subject to the public participation requirements of the federal Clean Water Act because they are functionally equivalent to NPDES permit applications and because they contain “substantive information” about how the operator will reduce its discharges to the maximum extent practicable. By implication, the public participation requirements of the Clean Water Act may also apply to proposals to revise the Department’s SWMP. Although the Proposed Order contains significantly more detailed and prescriptive requirements for achievement of MEP than previously adopted orders for the Department, some of the substantive information about how MEP will be achieved is
arguably still set out in the SWMP. This Order accordingly provides for public participation in the SWMP revision process. However, because there may be a need for numerous revisions to the SWMP during the term of this Order, a more streamlined approach to SWMP revisions is needed to provide opportunities for public hearings while preserving the State Water Board’s ability to effectively administer its NPDES storm water permitting program. (See Costle v. Pacific Legal Foundation (1980) 445 U.S. 198, 216-221, Natural Resources Defense Council v. Costle (9th Cir. 1977) 568 F.2d 1369, 1382.)

This Order establishes that revisions to the SWMP requiring Executive Director approval will be publicly noticed for thirty days on the State Water Board’s website (except as otherwise specified). During the public notice period, a member of the public may submit a written comment or request that a public hearing be conducted. A request for a public hearing shall be in writing and shall state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised in the hearing. Upon review of the request or requests for a public hearing, the Executive Director may, in his or her discretion, schedule a public hearing to take place before approval of the SWMP revision. The Executive Director shall schedule a hearing if there is a significant degree of public interest in the proposed revision. If no public hearing is conducted, the Executive Director may approve the SWMP revision if it meets the conditions set forth in this Order. Any SWMP revision approved by the Executive Director will be posted on the State Water Board’s website.

The Department references various policies, manuals, and other guidance related to storm water in the SWMP. These documents are intended to facilitate implementation of the SWMP and must be consistent with all requirements of the Order.

In addition to the annual submittal of the proposed SWMP revisions, this Order also requires the Department to submit workplans that explain how the program will be implemented in each District. The purpose of the workplans is to bring the proposed statewide program of the SWMP to the practical and implementable level at the District, watershed, and water body level.

**Legal Authority**

The Department has submitted a certification of adequate legal authority to implement the program. Through implementation of the storm water program, the Department may find that the legal authority is, in fact, not adequate. This Order requires the Department to reevaluate the legal authority each year and recertify that it is adequate. The Department is required to submit the Certification of the Adequacy of Legal Authority as part of the Annual Report each year. If it becomes clear that the legal authority is not adequate to fully implement the SWMP and the requirements of this Order, the Department must seek the authority necessary for implementation of the program.

**SWMP Implementation Requirements**

**Management and Organization**

The Department must maintain adequate funding to implement an effective storm water program and must submit an analysis of the funding each year. This includes a report on
the funding that is dedicated to storm water as well as an estimate of the funding that has been allocated to various program elements that are not included in the storm water program funding. An example of this would be to estimate the funding that has been made available to the Maintenance Program to implement the development of Maintenance Facility Pollution Prevention Plans (FPPP) and to implement the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are necessary for water quality.

The Department’s facilities and rights-of-way may cross or overlap other MS4s. The Department is required to coordinate their activities with other municipalities and local governments that have responsibility for storm water runoff. This Order requires the Department to prepare a Municipal Coordination Plan describing the approach that the Department will take in establishing communication, coordination, cooperation and collaboration with other storm water management programs.

Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program

Since 1998, the Department has conducted monitoring of runoff from representative transportation facilities throughout California. The key objectives of the characterization monitoring were to produce scientifically credible data on runoff from the Department’s facilities, and to provide useful information in designing effective storm water management strategies. Between 2000 and 2003, the Department conducted a three-year characterization monitoring study (Department, 2003a). The study generated over 60,000 data points from over 180 monitoring sites. Results were compared with California Toxics Rule (CTR) objectives and other relevant receiving water quality objectives (USEPA, 2000b). Copper, lead, and zinc were estimated to exceed the CTR objectives for dissolved and total fractions in greater than 50% of samples. Diazinon and chlorpyrifos were also found to exceed the California Department of Fish and Game recommended chronic criteria in a majority of samples.

The discharge monitoring program has been structured to focus on the highest priority water quality problems in order to ensure the most effective use of limited funds. A tiered approach is established that gives first priority to monitoring in ASBS and TMDL watersheds. Monitoring in these locations must be conducted pursuant to the applicable requirements of the ASBS Special Protections or TMDL, without limitation as to the number of sites. The second monitoring tier requires the Department to examine and prioritize existing monitoring locations where existing data show elevated levels of pollutants. Fifteen percent of the highest priority sites must be scheduled for retrofit, with a maximum of 100 sites per year.

Monitoring constituents were chosen by the State Water Board from the results of the Department’s comprehensive, multi-component storm water characterization monitoring program conducted in 2002 and 2003 and various other characterization studies.

Toxicity in storm water discharges from the Department’s rights-of-way has been reported in a number of studies. A 2005 report prepared for the Department by the University of California at Davis “Toxicity of Storm Water from Caltrans Facilities” reported significant occurrences of acute and chronic toxicity (Department, 2005). Toxicity Identification Evaluations showed toxicity from a number of compounds, including heavy metals,
organic compounds, pesticides and surfactants. Toxicity testing is required under the Order, and a workplan for conducting Toxicity Reduction Evaluations is required to be included in the SWMP.

Monitoring data must be filed electronically in the Storm Water Multiple Application Report and Tracking System (SMARTS). Receiving water monitoring data must be comparable\(^6\) with the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP), (SWAMP, 2010), and must be uploaded to the California Data Exchange Network (CEDEN).

**Incident Reporting - Non-Compliance and Potential/Threatened Non-Compliance**
The Department may at times be out of compliance with the requirements of this Order. Incidents of non-compliance and potential or threatened non-compliance must be reported to the State and Regional Water Boards. This Order identifies the conditions under which non-compliance reporting will be required. This Order distinguishes between emergency, field, and administrative (procedural) incidents that require notification to the State and Regional Water Boards, and requires that a summary of non-compliance incidents and the subsequent actions taken by the Department to reduce, eliminate and prevent the reoccurrence of the non-compliance be included in the Annual Report.

Emergency, field and administrative incidents are defined in Attachment I and have separate reporting requirements. Generally, failure to meet any permit requirement that is local or regional in nature will be reported to the Regional Water Boards. Attachment I outlines the reporting timelines for the three categories. This reporting will be conducted through the Storm Water Multiple Application Report and Tracking System (SMARTS)\(^7\). Distribution of this report internally between the State Water Board and any Regional Water Boards will be conducted through this system.

**Project Planning and Design**
In Order WQ 2000-11, the State Water Board considered Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) related to new development and redevelopment. The SUSMPs include a list of BMPs for specific development categories, and a numeric design standard for structural or treatment control BMPs. The numeric design standard created objective and measurable criteria for the amount of runoff that must be treated or infiltrated by BMPs. While this Order does not regulate construction activities, it does regulate the post-construction storm water runoff pursuant to municipal storm water regulations. SUSMPs are addressed in this Order through the numeric sizing criteria that apply to treatment BMPs at specified new and redevelopment projects and through requirements to implement Low Impact Development through principles of source control, site design, and storm water treatment and infiltration.

---

\(^6\) USEPA defines comparability as the measure of confidence with which one data set, element, or method can be considered as similar to another. Functionally, SWAMP comparability is defined as adherence to the SWAMP Quality Assurance Program Plan and the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program Information Management Plan. https://smarts.waterboards.ca.gov/smarts/faces/SwSmartsLogin.jsp
The Order provides the Department with an alternative compliance method for complying with the Treatment Control BMP numeric sizing criteria for projects where on-site treatment is infeasible. Under that method, the Department may propose complying with the requirements by installing and maintaining equivalent treatment BMPs at an offsite location (meaning outside of Project Limits) within the watershed, or by contributing funds to achieve the same amount of treatment at a regional project within the watershed. This compliance method will provide some flexibility to the Department in meeting the treatment control requirements.

**Hydromodification and Channel Protection**

Department development and redevelopment projects have the potential to negatively impact stream channels and downstream receiving waters. The potential impacts of hydromodification by Department projects must be assessed in the project planning and design stage, and measures taken to mitigate them. This section describes the rationale and approach for the hydromodification and channel protection requirements.

A dominant paradigm in fluvial geomorphology holds that streams adjust their channel dimensions (width and depth) in response to long-term changes in sediment supply and bankfull discharge. The bankfull stage corresponds to the discharge at which channel maintenance is the most effective, that is, the discharge at which the moving sediment, forming or removing bars, and forming or changing bends and meanders, are doing work that results in the average morphologic characteristics of channels (Finkenbine, 2000). A.W. Lane showed the generalized relationship between sediment load, sediment size, stream discharge and stream slope, as shown in Figure 1, (Rosgen, 1996). A change in any one of these variables sets up a series of mutual adjustments in the companion variables resulting in a direct change in the physical characteristics of the stream channel.
Stream slope times stream discharge (the right side of the scale) is an approximation of stream power, a unifying concept in fluvial geomorphology (Bledsoe, 1999). Urbanization generally increases stream power and affects the resisting forces in a channel (represented as sediment load and sediment size on the left side of the scale).

During construction, sediment loads can increase from 2 to 40,000 times over pre-construction levels (Goldman, 1986). Most of this sediment is delivered to stream channels during large, episodic rain events (Wolman, 2001). This increased sediment load leads to an initial aggradation phase where stream depths may decrease as sediment fills the channel, leading to a decrease in channel capacity and an increase in flooding and overbank deposition. A degradation phase initiates after construction is completed.

Schumm et al (Schumm, 1984) developed a channel evolution model that describes the series of adjustments from initial downcutting, to widening, to establishing new floodplains at lower elevations (Figure 2).
After Incised Channel Evolution Sequence in Schumm et. al 1984

Channel incision (Stage II) and widening (Stages III and to a lesser degree, Stage IV) are due to a number of fundamental changes on the landscape. Connected impervious area and compaction of pervious surfaces increase the frequency and volume of bankfull discharges (Stein, 2005; Booth, 1997), resulting in an increase in stream power. Increased drainage density (miles of stream length per square mile of watershed) also affects receiving channels (May, 1998; SCVURPPP, 2002). Increased drainage density and hydraulic efficiency leads to an increase in the frequency and volume of bankfull discharges because the time of concentration is shortened. Flows from engineered pipes and channels are also often “sediment starved” and seek to replenish their sediment supply from the channel.

Encroachment of stream channels can also lead to an increase in stream slope, which leads to an increase in stream power. In addition, watershed sediment loads and sediment size (with size generally represented as the median bed and bank particle size, or $d_{50}$) decrease during urbanization (Finkenbine, 2000; Pizzuto, 2000). This means that even if pre- and post- development stream power are the same, more erosion will occur in the post-development stage because the smaller particles are less resistant.
As shown in Stages II and III, the channel deepens and widens to accommodate the increased stream power (Hammer, 1973; Booth, 1990) and decrease in sediment load and sediment size. Channels may actually narrow as entrained sediment from incision is deposited laterally in the channel (Trimble, 1997). After incised channels begin to migrate laterally (Stage III), bank erosion begins, which leads to general channel widening (Trimble, 1997). At this point, a majority of the sediment that leaves a drainage area comes from within the channel, as opposed to the background and construction related hillslope contribution (Trimble, 1997). Stage IV is characterized by more aggradation and localized bank instability. Stage V represents a new quasi-equilibrium channel morphology in balance with the new flow and sediment supply regime. In other words, stream power is in balance with sediment load and sediment size.

The magnitude of the channel morphology changes discussed above varies along a stream network as well as with the age of development, slope, geology (sand-bedded channels may cycle through the evolution sequence in a matter of decades whereas clay-dominated channels may take much longer), watershed sediment load and size, type of urbanization, and land use history. It is also dependent on a channel's stage in the channel evolution sequence when urbanization occurs. Management strategies must take into account a channel’s stage of adjustment and account for future changes in the evolution of channel form (Stein, 2005).

The hydromodification requirements in this Order are based on established Federal Highway Administration procedures for assessing stream stability at highway crossings. These procedures are geomorphically based and have historically been used to inform bridge and culvert design and to ensure that these structures are not impacted by decreased lateral and vertical stability (FHWA, 2001; FHWA, 2006). Maintaining lateral and vertical stability will not only protect highway structures but will serve the broader interest of maintaining stable stream form and function.

These hydromodification requirements are risk based and reflect the concept that stable channels (as determined from a Level 1 rapid analysis) do not have to undergo any further analysis and that hydrology-based design standards are protective.

If stream channels are determined to be laterally and or vertically unstable, the analysis procedures are much more rigorous and the mitigation measures are potentially more extensive. There is support in the literature for the type of tiered, risk-based approach taken in this Order (Booth, 1990; Watson, 2002; Bledsoe, 2002; Bledsoe et al., 2008).

California Senate Bill 857 (2006) amended Article 3.5 of the Streets and Highways Code to require the Department to assess and remediate barriers to passage of anadromous fish at stream crossings along the State Highway System. The bill also requires the Department to, among other things, prepare an annual report to the legislature on the status of the Department’s efforts in locating, assessing, and remediating barriers to fish passage. Waters of the State supporting the beneficial use of fish migration could be adversely impacted by improperly designed or maintained stream crossings, or through natural channel evolution processes. Accordingly, this Order requires the Department to also submit the annual report required under SB 857 to the State Water Board.
Low Impact Development (LID)
On January 20, 2005, the State Water Board adopted sustainability as a core value for all California Water Boards' activities and programs, and directed State Water Board staff to consider sustainability in all future policies, guidelines, and regulatory actions. Sustainability can be achieved through appropriate implementation of the LID techniques required by this Order.

The proper implementation of LID techniques not only results in water quality protection benefits and a reduction of land development and construction costs, but also enhances property values, and improves habitat, aesthetic amenities, and quality of life (USEPA, 2007). Further, properly implemented LID techniques reduce the volume of runoff leaving a newly developed or re-developed area thereby lowering the peak rate of runoff, and thus minimizing the adverse effects of hydromodification on stream habitat (SWRCB, 2007). The requirements of this Order facilitate the implementation of LID strategies to protect water quality, reduce runoff volume, and to promote sustainability.

Unlike traditional storm water management, which collects and conveys storm water runoff through storm drains, pipes, or other conveyances to a centralized storm water facility, LID takes a different approach by using site design and storm water management to maintain the site’s pre-development runoff rates and volumes. The goal of LID is to mimic a site’s pre-development hydrology by using design techniques that infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, and detain runoff close to the source of rainfall. LID has been a proven approach in other parts of the country and is seen in California as an alternative to conventional storm water management.

LID is a tool that can be used to better manage natural resources and limit the pollution delivered to waterways. To achieve optimal benefits, LID needs to be integrated with watershed planning and appropriate land use programs. LID by itself will not deliver all the water quality outcomes desired; however, it does provide enhanced storm water treatment and mitigates increased volume and flow rates (SWRCB, 2007).

This Order approaches LID through source control design principles, site design principles and storm water treatment and infiltration principles. Source control and site design principles are required as applicable to provide enough flexibility such that projects are not forced to include inappropriate or impractical measures. Not all of the storm water treatment and infiltration principles identified in the Order are required to be implemented but are listed in order of preference with the most environmentally protective and effective alternatives listed first.

BMP Development and Implementation
The Department has developed a BMP program for control of pollutants from existing facilities and for new and reconstructed facilities. This BMP program includes development, construction, maintenance and evaluation of BMPs, and investigation of new BMPs. The goal of BMP implementation is to control the discharge of pollutants to the applicable standards.
While erosion control BMPs are typically used on construction sites, some are used as permanent, post-construction BMPs. Typical erosion control BMPs involve use of straw or fiber rolls and mats. These rolls and mats are often held together by synthetic mesh or netting. Synthetic materials are persistent in the environment and have been found to be a source of pollutants, trash (Brzozowski, 2009), and hazard to wildlife through entrapment (Brzozowski, 2009; Barton and Kinkead, 2005; Walley et al, 2005; Stuart et al, 2001). For erosion control products used as permanent, post-construction BMPs, this Order requires the use of biodegradable materials, and the removal of any temporary erosion control products containing synthetic materials when they are no longer needed. Biodegradable materials are required in erosion control products used by the Departments of Transportation in the states of Delaware and Iowa (Brzozowski, 2009). Use of synthetic (plastic) materials is also prohibited through a Standard Condition in Streambed Alteration Agreements by the California Department of Fish and Game, Region 1 (Van Hattem, personal communication, 2009).

Potential Unintended Public Health Concerns Associated with Structural BMPs
The Department worked collaboratively with the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) on a comprehensive, multi-component monitoring program of more than 120 structural BMPs for mosquito production (Department, 2004). The data revealed that certain BMPs may unintentionally create habitat suitable for mosquitoes and other vectors. The California Health and Safety Code prohibits landowners from knowingly providing habitat for or allowing the production of mosquitoes and other vectors, and gives local vector control agencies broad inspection and abatement powers. This Order requires the Department to comply with applicable provisions of the Health and Safety Code and to cooperate and coordinate with CDPH and local mosquito and vector control agencies on vector control issues in the Department’s MS4.

Construction
The Department’s construction activities were previously regulated under the MS4 permit (Order 99-06-DWQ), which required the Department to comply with the substantive provisions of the CGP but not the requirement to file separate notices of intent for each construction project. Some Regional Water Boards have had difficulty enforcing the provisions of the CGP when enrollment under that permit is not required. This Order requires the Department to file for separate coverage for each construction project under the CGP. This change is expected to increase the Department’s accountability for discharges from construction sites and improve the ability of the Regional Water Boards to take enforcement actions as necessary.

Though discharges from construction activities are not regulated under this Order, any discharges from a site occurring after completion of construction (i.e. post-construction discharges) are fully subject to the requirements of this Order.

Some Department construction-related activities such as roadway and parking lot repaving and resurfacing may mobilize pollutants, even though they may not trigger coverage under the CGP. Such activity may discharge pollutants to the environment, however. BMPs for the control of such discharges are specified in the Department’s Project Planning and Design Guide and in the California Stormwater Quality Association
The Department is required to implement BMPs to control such discharges.

Because some Department construction projects may not involve grading or land disturbance of one acre or more, these smaller projects do not trigger requirements to enroll under the Construction General Permit. This Order requires the Department to implement BMPs to control discharges from such projects to the MEP. Failure to implement appropriate BMPs is a violation of this Order.

Maintenance Program Activities
Preservation of vegetation is an effective method for the control of pollutants in runoff; however the Department must control vegetation in its rights-of-way for purposes of traffic safety and nuisance. The Department currently implements a vegetation control program with a stated purpose of minimizing the use of agricultural chemicals and maximizing the use of appropriate native and adapted vegetation for erosion control, filtering of runoff, and velocity control.

Notwithstanding the Department’s commitment to reduce the use of agricultural chemicals, the Department reported a total amount of 208,549 pounds of herbicide used in the 2008-2009 Storm Water Management Program Annual Report (Department (2010); CTSW-RT-10-182-32.1). Reported reasons for increased herbicide usage included:

1. Local weather conditions, such as increased rainfall, leading to increased weed production.
2. The need to address new mandates for fire suppression (fuel abatement) adjacent to roadways.
3. Requests from local cities and counties.
4. Increase in or outbreaks of noxious weeds in areas adjacent to farmland.

This Order contains detailed requirements for the control of vegetation and reporting requirements for the use of agricultural chemicals.

The Department’s maintenance facilities discharge pollutants to the MS4. This Order requires the Department to prepare Facility Pollution Prevention Plans (FPPPs) for all maintenance facilities. The Department is also required to implement BMP programs at each facility as necessary and periodically inspect each facility.

Spill cleanup is part of the Department’s maintenance program. This Order requires the Department to ensure that spills on its rights-of-way are fully and appropriately cleaned up, and to provide appropriate notifications to local municipalities which may be affected by the spill. The Department is also required to notify the appropriate Regional Water Board of any spill with the potential to impact receiving waters.

This Order requires the Department to monitor and clean storm drain inlets when they have reached 50 percent capacity. The Department must initiate procedures contained
in an Illegal Connection/Illlicit Discharge (IC/ID) and Illegal Dumping Response Plan where storm water structures are found to contain excessive material resulting from illegal dumping, and it must determine if enhanced BMPs are needed at the site.

This Order requires the Department to implement the BMPs and other requirements of the SWMP and this Order to reduce and eliminate IC/IDs. It also requires the Department to prepare a Storm Drain System Survey Plan and an Illegal Dumping Response Plan.

Facilities Operations
There is potential for the discharge of pollutants from Department facilities during rain events. The discharge of pollutants from facilities not covered by the IGP will be reduced to the MEP through the appropriate implementation of BMPs.

This Order requires the Department to file an NOI for coverage under the IGP for industrial facilities as specified in Attachment 1 of the IGP. This requirement is expected to increase the Department’s accountability for discharges from industrial facilities and improve the ability of the Regional Water Boards to take enforcement actions as necessary.

Department Activities Outside the Department’s Right-of-Way
Facilities and operations outside the Department’s rights-of-way may support various Department activities. Facilities may include concrete or asphalt batch plants, staging areas, concrete slurry processing or other material recycling operations, equipment and material storage yards, material borrow areas, and access roads. Facilities may be operated by the Department or by a third party. The Department is required to include provisions in its contracts that require the contractor to obtain and comply with applicable permits for facilities and operations outside the Department’s right-of-way when these facilities are active for the primary purpose of accommodating Department activities.

Non-Department Projects and Activities
Non-Department projects and activities include construction projects or other activities conducted by a third party within the Department’s right-of-way. The Department is responsible for runoff from all non-Department projects and activities in its rights-of-way unless a separate permit is issued to the other entity. At times, local municipalities or private developers may undertake construction projects or other activities within the Department’s right-of-way. The Department may exercise control or oversight over these third party projects or activities through encroachment permits or other means. This Order sets project planning and design requirements for non-Department projects.

Management Activities for Non-Storm Water Discharges
Non-storm water discharges are dry weather flows that do not originate from precipitation events. Non-storm water discharges are illicit discharges and are prohibited by the federal regulations (40 C.F.R., § 122.26 (d)(2)(iv)(B)(1)) unless exempted or separately permitted. Procedures for prohibiting illicit discharges and illegal connections, and for responding to illegal dumping and spills are needed to prevent environmental damage and must be described in the SWMP.
Training and Public Education

Education is an important element of municipal storm water runoff management programs. USEPA (2005) finds that “An informed and knowledgeable community is crucial to the success of a storm water management program since it helps ensure the following: Greater support for the program as the public gains a greater understanding of the reasons why it is necessary and important, [and] greater compliance with the program as the public becomes aware of the personal responsibilities expected of them and others in the community, including the individual actions they can take to protect or improve the quality of area waters.”

USEPA also states “The public education program should use a mix of appropriate local strategies to address the viewpoints and concerns of a variety of audiences and communities, including minority and disadvantaged communities, as well as children.”

This Order requires the Department to implement a Training and Public Education program. The Training and Public Education program focuses on three audiences: Department employees, Department contractors, and the general public. The Department must implement programs for all three audiences. The Training and Public Education program is considered a BMP and an analysis of its effectiveness is needed.

Program Evaluation

This Order requires the Department to evaluate the effectiveness and adequacy of the storm water program on an annual basis. This includes both water quality monitoring and a self-audit of the program. The audit is intended to determine the effectiveness of the storm water and non-storm water programs through the evaluation of factors and program components such as:

1. Storm water and non-storm water discharges, including pollutant concentrations from locations representative of the Department’s properties, facilities, and activities;
2. Maintenance activity control measures;
3. Facility pollution prevention plans;
4. Permanent control measures; and
5. Highway operation control measures.

In addition to water quality monitoring and the self-audit, the Department must perform an Overall Program Effectiveness Evaluation each year to determine the effectiveness of the program in achieving environmental and water quality objectives. The scope of the evaluation is expected to increase each year in response to the continuing collection of environmental monitoring data.

Reporting

Comprehensive reporting is needed to determine compliance with this Order and to track the effectiveness of the Department’s storm water program over time. A summary of the reports required from the Department is presented in Attachment IX of the Order. The
State Water Board and Regional Water Boards have the authority under various sections of the California Water Code to request additional information as needed.

The Department must track, assess and report on program implementation to ensure its effectiveness. In addition to the individual reports referenced above, the Department is required to submit an annual report to the State Water Board by October 01 of each year. The Annual Report must evaluate compliance with permit conditions, evaluate and assess the effectiveness of BMPs, summarize the results of the monitoring program, summarize the activities planned for the next reporting cycle, and, if necessary, propose changes to the SWMP.

**Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)**

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires States to identify waters (“impaired” water bodies) that do not meet water quality standards after applying certain required technology-based effluent limits. States are required to compile this information in a list and submit the list to the USEPA for review and approval. This list is known as the Section 303(d) list of impaired waters.

As part of the listing process, States are required to prioritize waters/watersheds for future development of TMDLs. A TMDL is defined as the sum of the individual waste load allocations (WLAs) for point sources of pollution, plus the load allocations (LAs) for nonpoint sources of pollution, plus the contribution from background sources of pollution and a margin of safety. The State Water Board and Regional Water Boards have ongoing efforts to monitor and assess water quality, to prepare the Section 303(d) list, and to subsequently develop TMDLs.

TMDLs are developed by either the Regional Water Boards or USEPA in response to Section 303(d) listings. TMDLs developed by Regional Water Boards include implementation provisions and can be incorporated as Basin Plan amendments. TMDLs developed by USEPA typically contain the total load and load allocations required by Section 303(d), but do not contain comprehensive implementation provisions. Subsequent steps after Regional Water Board TMDL development are: approval by the State Water Board, approval by the Office of Administrative Law, and ultimately, approval by USEPA.

The Department has been assigned mass based and concentration based WLAs for constituents contributing to a TMDL in specific regions. The Department is subject to TMDLs in the North Coast, San Francisco Bay, Central Coast, Los Angeles, Central Valley, Lahontan, Santa Ana, and San Diego Regions. These TMDLs are summarized in Table 1.
Table 1. Department Statewide TMDLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Body</th>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>USEPA Approved/Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Coast Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, Lower HA</td>
<td>Temperature &amp; Sediment</td>
<td>December 18, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, Middle Fork, Eden Valley and Round Valley HSAs</td>
<td>Temperature &amp; Sediment</td>
<td>December 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, Middle Main HA</td>
<td>Temperature &amp; Sediment</td>
<td>December 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, North Fork HA</td>
<td>Sediment &amp; Temperature</td>
<td>December 30, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, South Fork HA</td>
<td>Sediment &amp; Temperature</td>
<td>December 16, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel River, Upper Main HA</td>
<td>Sediment &amp; Temperature</td>
<td>December 29, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>March 16, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gualala River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>November 29, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath River</td>
<td>Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, Nutrient, &amp; Microcystin</td>
<td>December 28, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost River</td>
<td>Nitrogen and Biochemical Oxygen Demand</td>
<td>December 30, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad River</td>
<td>Sediment &amp; Turbidity</td>
<td>December 21, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattole River</td>
<td>Sediment &amp; Temperature</td>
<td>December 21, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarro River</td>
<td>Temperature &amp; Sediment</td>
<td>December 27, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyo River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 16, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Creek</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 30, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>August 11, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta River</td>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen &amp; Temperature</td>
<td>January 26, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Mile River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 20, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity River, South Fork HA</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Duzen River &amp; Yager Creek</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>December 16, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco Bay Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>January 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Bay</td>
<td>Pathogens</td>
<td>December 18, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>March 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>February 12, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Creek</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>September 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Creek</td>
<td>Diazinon &amp; Pesticide Toxicity</td>
<td>May 16, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Coast Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo River (includes Carbonera Lompico, Shingle Mill Creeks)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>February 19, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Bay (includes Chorro Creek, Los Osos Creek, and the Morro Bay Estuary)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>January 20, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Body</td>
<td>Pollutant</td>
<td>USEPA Approved/Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballona Creek</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>August 1, 2002 &amp; February 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legg Lake</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles River</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>July 24, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado Lake</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu Creek Watershed</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>June 26, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolon Slough and Beardsley Wash</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>August 1, 2002 &amp; February 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura River Estuary</td>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>February 27, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballona Creek, Ballona Estuary, and Sepulveda Channel</td>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>March 26, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Beaches of Ventura County (Kiddie Beach and Hobie Beach)</td>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>December 18, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu Creek and Lagoon</td>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>January 10, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina del Rey, Harbor Back Basins, Mother’s Beach</td>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>March 18, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Bay Beaches during Dry &amp; Wet Weather</td>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>June 19, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballona Creek</td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>December 22, 2005 and reaffirmed on October 29, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calleguas Creek and its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon</td>
<td>Metals and Selenium</td>
<td>March 26, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos</td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>March 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles River</td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>December 22, 2005 and October 29, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel River</td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>March 26, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado Lake</td>
<td>Eutrophic, Algae, Ammonia, and Odors (Nutrient)</td>
<td>March 11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Reach 3</td>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>June 18, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballona Creek Estuary</td>
<td>Toxic Pollutants</td>
<td>December 22, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina del Rey Harbor</td>
<td>Toxic Pollutants</td>
<td>March 16, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calleguas Creek its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon</td>
<td>Organochlorine Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls, and Siltation</td>
<td>March 14, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Valley Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Creek, Bear Creek, Sulphur Creek and Harley Gulch</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>February 7, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>September 21, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta</td>
<td>Methylmercury</td>
<td>October 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lahontan Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Sediment and Nutrients</td>
<td>August 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Water Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Body</th>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>USEPA Approved/Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truckee River</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>September 16, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado River Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Storm Water Channel</td>
<td>Bacterial Indicators</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Ana Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>Nutrients for Hydrological Conditions</td>
<td>September 25, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake</td>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>September 30, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhine Channel Area of the Lower Newport Bay</td>
<td>Chromium and Mercury</td>
<td>June 14, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Creek and New Port Bay</td>
<td>Metals (Cadmium, Copper, Lead, &amp; Zinc)</td>
<td>June 14, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Creek Watershed and the Upper &amp; Lower Newport Bay</td>
<td>Organochlorine (DDT, Chlordane, Dieldrin, PCBs, and Toxaphene)</td>
<td>June 14, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chollas Creek</td>
<td>Diazinon</td>
<td>November 3, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chollas Creek</td>
<td>Dissolved Copper, Lead, and Zinc</td>
<td>December 18, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Creek</td>
<td>Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>March 22, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1 – Revised Twenty Beaches and Creek in the San Diego Region (Including Tecolote Creek)</td>
<td>Indicator Bacteria</td>
<td>June 22, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the TMDL-based requirements of this Order have been imposed to comply with 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), the requirements are not subject to the MEP standard. The Department must implement all controls necessary to meet the WLAs or LAs included with the TMDL, or to meet the specifically assigned actions to implement the TMDL. Implementation requirements for some of the TMDLs are contained in the Regional Water Board Basin Plans and adopted orders and are incorporated into this Order by reference (see Attachment IV). TMDLs approved during the term of this Order are expected to be incorporated into this Order through a reopener.

Pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), the effluent limitations for NPDES permits must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the state and approved by EPA. In addition, Water Code section 13263, subdivision (a), requires that waste discharge requirements implement any relevant water quality control plans. Where effluent limitations are expressed as BMPs, there should be adequate demonstration in the administrative record of the permit that the BMPs will be sufficient to comply with the WLAs.  

---

8 On November 12, 2010, USEPA issued a revision to a November 22, 2002, memorandum, recommending that “where the TMDL includes WLAs for stormwater sources that provide numeric pollutant load or numeric surrogate pollutant parameter objectives, the WLA should, where feasible, be translated into numeric WQBELs
This Order requires the Department to comply with all TMDLs listed in Attachment IV. Attachment IV identifies TMDLs adopted by the Regional Water Boards and approved by the State Water Board and USEPA that assign the Department a Waste Load Allocation (WLA) or that specify the Department as a responsible party. In addition, Attachment IV identifies TMDLs established by USEPA that specify the Department as a responsible party or that identify NPDES permitted storm water sources or point sources generally, or identify roads generally, as subject to the TMDL. For many of the TMDLs, WLAs, LAs, effluent limitations, implementation requirements, and monitoring requirements are specified in the adopted and approved Regional Water Board Basin Plans, which are incorporated by reference as enforceable parts of this Order. The Order additionally requires the Department to prepare a TMDL Status Review report with each Annual Report.

Where complete implementation requirements have not been specified in the TMDLs or otherwise approved by the Regional Water Boards as of the date of adoption of this Order, it is necessary that specific requirements and clear deliverables be developed to ensure consistency of this permit with assigned WLAs and to provide clear and enforceable conditions for the Department. It is expected that Regional Water Boards will develop such specific TMDL permit requirements, in consultation with the Department as necessary, within one year of the effective date of this Order and that Attachment IV will be reopened consistent with provision E.11.c. for incorporation of such requirements into the Order. In order to be incorporated into Attachment IV, TMDL specific permit requirements developed by the Regional Water Board staff must be accompanied by a statement of how the requirements implement the TMDL, how the effluent limitations and conditions are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any applicable WLA, and, where a BMP-based approach to permit limitations is selected, how these will achieve the goal of the TMDL.

The requirements of this Order, including the implementation requirements contained in the TMDL implementation plans which are incorporated by reference, are expected to be sufficient to implement the WLAs in each TMDL for which the Department has been assigned a WLA.

Attachment IV incorporates TMDL-specific permit requirements for the sediments and nutrients TMDL for Lake Tahoe. The TMDL requires the Department to meet pollutant load reduction requirements and to develop and implement a comprehensive Pollutant Load Reduction Plan (PLRP).

in the applicable stormwater permits.” The revision further stated, however, that the permitting authority’s decision as to how to express water quality based effluent limitations (WQBELs), i.e. as numeric effluent limitations or BMPs, would be based on an analysis of the specific facts and circumstances surrounding the permit. USEPA has since invited comment on the revisions to the memorandum and will be making a determination as to whether to “either retain the memorandum without change, to reissue it with revisions, or to withdraw it.” http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sw_tmdlwla_comments_pdf
Attachment IV specifies that the Department must reduce fine sediment particle (FSP), total phosphorus (TP), and total nitrogen (TN) loads by 10%, 7%, and 8%, respectively, by September 30, 2016. It additionally specifies that the load reductions shall be measured in accordance with the processes outlined in the Lake Clarity Crediting Program Handbook. The Lahontan Regional Water Board developed the Lake Clarity Crediting Program to establish protocols for accounting and tracking pollutant load reductions within the urban environment. The Lake Clarity Crediting Handbook defines one Lake Clarity Credit as equal to $1 \times 10^{16}$ fine sediment particles, providing a water quality metric that is directly related to the Lake Tahoe TMDL primary pollutant of concern.

On February 9, 2011 the Lahontan Regional Water Board Executive Officer issued the Department an Order to submit a technical report in accordance with California Water Code Section 13267 requiring the development of jurisdiction-specific baseline load estimates for the Lake Tahoe TMDL pollutants of concern. The submitted baseline pollutant load estimate provides the basis for translating percentage based pollutant load reduction requirements defined by the TMDL into jurisdiction-specific, particle and mass-based pollutant load reduction requirements. The baseline basin-wide pollutant loads for the TMDL reflect conditions as of water year 2003/2004 (October 1, 2003 – September 30, 2004), hereafter referred to as “baseline.” The Department has estimated its baseline fine sediment particle load to be $3.72 \times 10^{19}$ particles. To meet the required 10% fine sediment particle load reduction, the Department must reduce its fine sediment particle load to $3.35 \times 10^{18}$ fine sediment particles, a difference of $3.70 \times 10^{18}$ fine sediment particles. Dividing the needed fine sediment particle reduction ($3.70 \times 10^{18}$) by the Lake Clarity Credit definition ($1 \times 10^{16}$ fine sediment particles per Credit) results in the requirement for the Department to earn 370 Lake Clarity Credits which is reflected in Attachment IV.

Consistent with the TMDL provisions, Attachment IV also requires the Department to develop, implement, and maintain a PLRP to guide stormwater activities and project implementation. The PLRP will describe how proposed operations and maintenance activities, capital improvements, facilities retrofit projects, and other actions are expected to meet required pollutant load reduction requirements. The PLRP lays out Department Plans to achieve required pollutant load reductions for the first five year period. The PLRP will be updated in 2017 to demonstrate how the Department will achieve pollutant load reduction requirements for the second five-year TMDL implementation period. The PLPR will also describe what areas or “catchments” the Department plans to perform load reduction activities and claim Lake Clarity Credits. The process of proposing Lake Clarity Credit awards is described as “catchment registration” in the Lake Clarity Crediting Program Handbook.

Attachment IV additionally requires submission of a Progress Report documenting pollutant load reductions and the preparation and submission of a Stormwater Monitoring Plan for review and approval by the Regional Water Board.
Region Specific Requirements

The Regional Water Boards have identified specific areas within their Regions requiring special conditions (Attachment V). These special conditions are needed to account for the unique value of the resource(s) within the Region, special pollutant or pollution control issues within the Region, or storm water management and compliance issues applicable to the Region. These special requirements need not be applied statewide but are applicable only to Department discharges within the Regions as specified in Attachment V. Region specific requirements are included for the North Coast, San Francisco Bay, and Lahontan Regional Water Boards.

North Coast Region
1. Sediment. Region specific requirements addressing sediment discharges in sediment-impaired watersheds in the North Coast Region are based on the “Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation Policy Statement for Sediment-Impaired Receiving Waters in the North Coast Region,” as included in the Basin Plan and Resolution No. R1-2004-0087. The Policy requires the use of NPDES permits and waste discharge requirements to achieve compliance with sediment-related water quality standards. The requirements in Attachment V to systematically inventory, prioritize, control, monitor, and adapt, as well as to include a time schedule in the annual District Workplan, are consistent with region-wide excess sediment control regulations.

The sediment requirements are intended to reduce the adverse impacts of excessive sediment discharges to sediment-impaired waters, including impacts to the cold water salmonid fishery and the COLD, COMM, RARE, SPWN, and MIGR beneficial uses. The beneficial uses associated with the cold water salmonid fishery are often the most sensitive to sediment discharges. Risks to salmonids from excessive sediment are well documented in scientific literature and include:
- the filling of pools and subsequent reduction in available in-stream salmonid habitat;
- burial of spawning gravels;
- gill abrasion and death due to extremely high turbidity levels;
- reduction in macroinvertebrate populations available as food for salmonids; and
- alterations in channel geometry to a wider, shallower channel which is subject to increases in solar heating.

2. Riparian Vegetation Requirements. Region specific requirements to protect and restore riparian vegetation are based on the Water Quality Objective for temperature. The temperature objective states, in part, that the natural receiving water temperature shall not be altered unless it can be demonstrated that such alteration does not adversely affect beneficial uses. Removal of riparian vegetation associated with Department activities has the potential to decrease shade, increase solar radiation, and raise water temperatures, and may therefore cause an exceedance of the temperature objective.
The requirements in Attachment V direct the Department to protect and restore riparian vegetation to the greatest extent feasible. In many cases, activities involving the removal of riparian vegetation will require a 401 water quality certification, which will contain more specific conditions regarding the removal and/or establishment of vegetation.

These requirements are intended to prevent alterations to natural receiving water temperature from Department activities. The primary mechanism in which riparian vegetation influences water temperature is through the shade. Loss of riparian vegetation and the shade that it provides can lead to increased solar radiation, hotter water temperatures, and adverse impacts to beneficial uses. The beneficial uses most sensitive to increases in water temperature are often those associated with the cold water salmonid fishery. Risks to salmonids are well documented in scientific literature and include:

- reduced feeding rates and growth rates;
- impaired development of embryos and alevins;
- changes in the timing of life history events, such as upstream migration, spawning, and seaward migration;
- increased disease infection rates and disease mortality; and
- direct mortality.

San Francisco Bay Region
The Urban Runoff Management, Comprehensive Control Program section of the Basin Plan (Chapter 4.14) requires municipalities and local agencies, including the Department, to address existing water quality problems and prevent new problems associated with urban runoff through the development and implementation of a comprehensive control program focused on reducing current levels of pollutant loading to storm drains to the maximum extent practicable.

The Highway Runoff Control Program section of the Basin Plan (Chapter 4.14.2) requires the Department to manage and monitor pollutant sources from its right-of-way through development and implementation of a highway runoff management plan.

The Basin Plan comprehensive and highway runoff program requirements are designed to be consistent with federal regulations (40 C.F.R., §§ 122-124) and are implemented through issuance of NPDES permits to owners and operators of MS4s. A summary of the regulatory provisions is contained in Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations at section 3912. The Basin Plan identifies beneficial uses and establishes water quality objectives for surface waters in the Region, as well as effluent limitations and discharge prohibitions intended to protect those uses. The region-specific requirements in Attachment V of this Order implement the plans, policies, and provisions of the Regional Water Board’s Basin Plan.

1. Trash Load Reduction.
   a. Legal Authority. The following legal authorities apply to the trash load reduction requirements specified in Attachment V:

Federal NPDES regulations 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B) requires, "shall be based on a description of a program, including a schedule, to detect and remove (or require the discharger to the municipal storm sewer to obtain a separate NPDES permit for) illicit discharges and improper disposal into the storm sewer."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(2) requires, "a description of procedures to conduct on-going field screening activities during the life of the permit, including areas or locations that will be evaluated by such field screens."

Federal NPDES regulation 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(3) requires, "a description of procedures to be followed to investigate portions of the separate storm sewer system that, based on the results of the field screen, or other appropriate information, indicate a reasonable potential of containing illicit discharges or other sources of non-storm water."

Federal NPDES regulations 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(4) requires, "a description of procedures to prevent, contain, and respond to spills that may discharge into the municipal separate storm sewer."

San Francisco Bay Basin Plan, Chapter 4 – Implementation, Table 4-1 Prohibitions, Prohibition 7, which is consistent with the State Water Board’s Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Policy, Resolution 95-84, prohibits the discharge of rubbish, refuse, bark, sawdust, or other solid wastes into surface waters or at any place where they would contact or where they would be eventually transported to surface waters, including flood plain areas. This prohibition was adopted by the Regional Water Board in the 1975 Basin Plan, primarily to protect recreational uses such as boating.

b. Extent, Impacts, and Conclusions. Trash\(^9\) and litter are a pervasive problem near and in creeks and in San Francisco Bay having major impacts on the environment, including aquatic life and habitat in those waters. Ubiquitous, unacceptable levels of trash in waters of the San Francisco Bay Region warrant a comprehensive and progressive program of education, warning, and enforcement, and certain areas warrant consideration of structural controls and treatment. Trash in urban waterways of coastal areas can become marine debris, known to harm fish and

---

\(^9\) For the purposes of this provision, trash is defined to consist of litter and particles of litter. Man made litter is defined in California Government Code section 68055.1 (g): Litter means all improperly discarded waste material, including, but not limited to, convenience food, beverage, and other product packages or containers constructed of steel, aluminum, glass, paper, plastic, and other natural and synthetic materials, thrown or deposited on the lands and waters of the state, but not including the properly discarded waste of the primary processing of agriculture, mining, logging, sawmilling, or manufacturing.
wildlife and cause adverse economic impacts.\textsuperscript{10} It accumulates in streams, rivers, bays, and ocean beaches throughout the San Francisco Bay Region, particularly in urban areas.

Trash adversely affects numerous beneficial uses of waters, particularly recreation and aquatic habitat. Not all litter and debris delivered to streams are of equal concern with regard to water quality. Besides the obvious negative aesthetic effects, most of the harm of trash in surface waters is to wildlife in the form of entanglement or ingestion.\textsuperscript{11,12} Some elements of trash exhibit significant threats to human health, such as discarded medical waste, human or pet waste, and broken glass.\textsuperscript{13} Also, some household and industrial wastes can contain toxic batteries, pesticide containers, and fluorescent light bulbs containing mercury. Large trash items such as discarded appliances can present physical barriers to natural stream flow, causing physical impacts such as bank erosion. From a management perspective, the persistent accumulation of trash in a waterbody is of particular concern, and signifies a priority for prevention of trash discharges. Also of concern are trash hotspots where illegal dumping, littering, and/or accumulation of trash occur.

The narrative water quality objectives applicable to trash are Floating Material (Waters shall not contain floating material, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses), Settleable Material (Waters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses), and Suspended Material (Waters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses).

The Regional Water Board, at its February 11, 2009 hearing, adopted a resolution proposing that 26 waterbodies be added to the 303(d) list for trash. The adopted Resolution and supporting documents are contained in Attachment 10.1 – 303(d) Trash Resolution and Staff Report, Feb 2009.

Data collected by Regional Water Board staff using the SWAMP Rapid Trash Assessment (RTA) Protocol,\textsuperscript{14} over the 2003–2005 period,\textsuperscript{15} suggest that the current approach to managing trash in waterbodies is not reducing the adverse impact on beneficial uses. The levels of trash in the waters of the San Francisco Bay Region are high, even with the Basin Plan prohibitions and potentially large


\textsuperscript{14} SWAMP Rapid Trash Assessment Protocol, Version 8

\textsuperscript{15} SWAMP S.F. Bay Region Trash Report, January 23, 2007
fines. During dry weather conditions, a significant quantity of trash, particularly plastic, is making its way into storm drains and being transported downstream to San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean. On the basis of 85 surveys conducted at 26 sites throughout the Bay Area, staff have found an average of 2.93 pieces of trash for every foot of stream, and all the trash was removed when it was surveyed, indicating high return rates of trash over the 2003–2005 study period.

A number of key conclusions can be made from the RTA study:

- Lower watershed sites have higher densities of trash.
- All watersheds studied in the San Francisco Bay Region have high levels of trash.
- There are trash source hotspots, usually associated with parks, schools, or poorly kept commercial facilities.
- Dry season deposition of trash, associated with wind and dry season runoff, contributes measurable levels of trash to downstream locations.
- The majority of trash is plastic at lower watershed sites where trash accumulates in the wet season. This suggests that urban runoff is a major source of floatable plastic found in the ocean and on beaches as marine debris.
- Parks that have more evident management of trash by city staff and local volunteers, including cleanup within the creek channel, have measurably less trash and higher RTA scores.

c. Short-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan. The Short-Term Trash Load Reduction Plan is intended to describe actions to incrementally reduce trash loads toward the 2016 requirement of a 40% reduction and eventual abatement of trash loads to receiving waters.

d. Baseline Trash Load and Trash Load Reduction Tracking Method. In order to achieve the incremental trash load reductions in an accountable manner, the Department will propose Baseline Trash Loads and a Trash Load Reduction Tracking Method. The Tracking will account for additional trash load reducing actions and BMPs implemented by the Department. The Department is also able to propose, with documentation, areas for exclusion from the Tracking Method accounting, by demonstrating that these areas already meet Discharge Prohibition A.3 and have no trash loads.

e. Minimum Full Trash Capture. Installation of full trash capture systems is MEP as demonstrated by the significant implementation of these systems in the Los Angeles region. The minimum full trash capture requirements in Attachment V of this Order represent a moderate initial step toward employing this tool for trash load reduction.

f. Long Term Trash Load Reduction. The Department will submit a plan to achieve a long term trash load reduction of 70% by 2019 and 100% reduction by 2024.
g. Costs of Trash Control. Costs for either enhanced trash management measure implementation or installation and maintenance of trash capture devices are significant, but when spread over several years, and when viewed on a per-capita basis, are reasonable. To meet Basin Plan and local MS4 requirements, trash capture devices have already been installed by other municipalities in the Bay Area.

Cost information on various trash capture devices is included in the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP) BMP Trash Toolbox (July 2007). The Toolbox contains cost information for both trash capture devices and enhanced trash management measure implementation, covers a broad range of options, and also discusses operation and maintenance costs.

2. Storm Water Pump Stations. In late 2005, Regional Water Board staff investigated an occurrence of low salinity and dissolved oxygen conditions in Old Alameda Creek (Alameda County) and Alviso Slough (Santa Clara County). In the case of Old Alameda Creek, discharge of black-colored water from the Alvarado pump station to the slough was observed at the time of the data collection on September 7, 2005, confirming dry weather urban runoff as the source of the violations of the 5 mg/L dissolved oxygen water quality objective. Such conditions were measured again on September 21, 2005.

On October 17, 2005, waters in Alviso Slough were much less saline than the salt ponds and had the lowest documented dissolved oxygen of the summer, suggesting a dry weather urban runoff source. The dissolved oxygen sag was detected surface to bottom at 2.3 mg/L at a salinity of less than 1 part per thousand (ppt), mid-day, when oxygen levels should be high at the surface. The sloughs have a typical depth of 6 feet.

Board staff’s investigations of these incidents, documented in a memorandum, found that “storm water pump stations, universally operated by automatic float triggers, have been confirmed as the cause in at least one instance, and may represent an overlooked source of controllable pollution to the San Francisco Bay Estuary and its tidal sloughs... [that] discharges of dry weather urban runoff from these pump stations are not being managed to protect water quality, and [that] surveillance monitoring has detected measurable negative water quality consequences of this current state of pump station management.”

Pump station discharges of dry weather urban runoff can cause violations of water quality objectives. These discharges are controllable point sources of pollution that are virtually unregulated. The Regional Water Board has determined that the measures included in Attachment V are necessary to address these discharges and water quality problems.

---

16 Internal Water Board Memo dated December 2, 2005: “Dry Weather Urban Weather Urban Runoff Causing or Contributing to Water Quality Violations: Low Dissolved Oxygen (DO) in Old Alameda Creek and Alviso Slough”
Lahontan Region

1. The Lahontan Basin Plan encourages the infiltration of storm water runoff to treat pollutants in discharges and mitigate the effects of increased runoff to surface waters from the addition of impervious surfaces. The 20-year, 1-hour design storm has been historically applied and accepted as an effective requirement to mitigate discharges of storm water to surface waters in the sensitive high mountain watersheds of the Lahontan Region. Water Board staff has estimated that facilities designed to treat or infiltrate the 20-year, 1-hour storm event effectively capture approximately 85 percent of the average annual runoff volume in the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, it is recognized that the natural environment provides adequate infiltration and/or treatment in areas where there is little or no connectively to surface waters. Therefore the Lahontan Water Board encourages the Department to focus implementation of storm water treatment facilities in those areas that discharge directly to surface waters to maximize water quality benefits. This requirement is applicable to existing highways and facilities in the Mammoth Lakes Area Hydrologic Unit.

2. The Natural Environment as Treatment (NEAT) study has helped identify the priority areas within the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit where storm water treatment and control measure implementation has the most benefit for water quality protection. Similarly, the NEAT study has helped identify those areas where there may be limited water quality benefits associated with implementing structural treatment and control measures. The NEAT approach is also applicable in other areas. This provision is needed to focus available resources on the areas where the most water quality benefit can be achieved.

3. The October 15 to May 1 grading prohibition is necessary to reduce erosion and sedimentation from disturbed areas within the sensitive high elevation areas within the Lahontan Region. These are areas where snow fall restricts the ability to control storm water pollution through the winter months. This requirement mitigates winter erosion issues by requiring disturbed soil areas to be winterized prior to the onset of snow, and allows for exceptions where there is a compelling need.

Regional Water Board Authorities

Regional Water Boards and their staff will oversee implementation and compliance with this Order. As appropriate, they will review reports, conduct inspections, and take enforcement actions on violations of this Order.

Cost of Compliance and Other MEP Considerations

General Cost Considerations in Storm Water Regulation and Management

The Department will incur incremental costs in implementing this Order, such as the cost of complying with the Order’s storm water treatment BMP, post-construction, hydromodification, Low Impact Development, and monitoring and reporting requirements.
The Department will also incur additional costs in following the iterative process as required by the Order. The cost of complying with TMDL waste load allocations is not considered since TMDLs are not subject to the MEP standard.

In adopting Order WQ 2000-11, the State Water Board found that cost is a relevant factor, among others such as feasibility and public acceptance, that should be considered in determining MEP. The State Water Board considered the costs in preparing this Order and has determined that the costs reflect the MEP standard. The State Water Board further found in adopting Order WQ 2000-11 that in considering the cost of compliance, it is also important to consider the costs of impairment; that is, the negative impact of pollution on the economy and the positive impact of improved water quality. So, while it is appropriate and necessary to consider the cost of compliance, it is also important to consider the larger economic impacts of implementation of the storm water management program.

Many studies have been undertaken to assess the cost of compliance with storm water permits. Most studies have focused on municipal programs as opposed to “linear MS4s” or Departments of Transportation. A study by the Los Angeles Regional Water Board reported wide variability in the cost of compliance among municipal permit holders which was not easily explained (LARWQCB, 2003).

In 1999, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) reported on multiple studies it conducted to determine the cost of urban runoff management programs. A study of Phase II municipalities determined that the annual cost of the Phase II program was expected to be $9.16 per household. USEPA also studied 35 Phase I municipalities, finding costs to be similar to those anticipated for Phase II municipalities, at $9.08 per household annually (USEPA, 1999a).

A program cost study was also conducted by the Los Angeles Regional Water Board, where program costs reported in the municipalities’ annual reports were assessed. The Water Board estimated the average per household cost to implement the MS4 program in Los Angeles County was $12.50.

The State Water Board also commissioned a study by California State University, Sacramento to assess costs of the Phase I MS4 program. This study is current and includes an assessment of costs incurred by the City of Encinitas in implementing its program. Annual cost per household ranged from $18-46, with the City of Encinitas representing the upper end of the range (SWRCB, 2005). The cost of the City of Encinitas’ program is understandable, given the city’s coastal location, reliance on tourism, and additional costs resulting from a consent decree with environmental groups regarding its program. For these reasons, as well as the general recognition the city receives for implementing a superior program, the city’s program cost can be considered as the high end of the spectrum for municipal storm water management program costs.

The California Department of Finance (Finance, 2003) conducted a comprehensive review of the Department’s storm water program. Finance noted widely divergent compliance cost estimates produced by regulators and environmental organizations.
versus consultant’s estimates. Finance also had difficulty identifying compliance costs because of the way storm water activities are integrated with other functions and allocated among the different divisions within the Department, and because they are funded from different sources. Finance made three findings related to cost:

1. The projected costs of compliance are escalating.
2. Storm water compliance costs are integrated into many of the Department’s business processes and are not accurately tracked.
3. As storm water compliance costs increase, the amount of funding available for highway projects decreases, which reduces the number of projects that can be constructed.

The review concluded that balancing costs and benefits is a difficult policy decision and there should be a recognition of the trade-offs associated with resource allocation decisions given the Department’s limited resources.

It is important to note that storm water program costs are not all attributable to compliance with MS4 permits. Many program components and their associated costs existed before any MS4 permits were issued. For example, for the Department, storm drain maintenance, street sweeping and trash/litter collection costs cannot be solely or even principally attributable to MS4 permit compliance since these practices have long been implemented before the MS4 permit was issued. Even many structural BMPs (erosion protection, energy dissipation devices, detention basins etc.) are standard engineering practice for many projects and are not implemented solely to comply with permit provisions. Therefore, the true cost resulting from MS4 permit requirements is some fraction of the cost to operate and maintain the highway system.

The California State University, Sacramento study found that only 38% of program costs are new costs fully attributable to MS4 permits. The remainder of program costs was either pre-existing or resulted from enhancement of pre-existing programs (SWRCB, 2005). The County of Orange found that even lesser amounts of program costs are solely attributable to MS4 permit compliance, reporting that the amount attributable to implement its Drainage Area Management Plan is less than 20% of the total budget. The remaining 80% is attributable to pre-existing programs (County of Orange, 2007). Any increase in cost to the Department by the requirements of this Order will be incremental in nature.

Storm water management programs cannot be considered solely in terms of their costs. The programs must also be viewed in terms of their value to the public. For example, household willingness to pay for improvements in fresh water quality for fishing and boating has been estimated by USEPA to be $158-210 per household (USEPA, 1999a). This estimate can be considered conservative, since it does not include important considerations such as marine waters benefits, wildlife benefits, or flood control benefits. The California State University, Sacramento study corroborates USEPA’s estimates, reporting annual household willingness to pay for statewide clean water to be $180 (SWRCB, 2005). Though these costs may be assessed differently at the state level (for the Department) than at the municipal level, the results indicate that there is public
support for storm water management programs and that costs incurred by the Department to implement its storm water management program remain reasonable.

It is also important to consider the cost of not implementing a storm water management program. Urban runoff in southern California has been found to cause illness in people bathing near storm drains (Haile et al., 1996). A study of south Huntington Beach and north Newport Beach found that an illness rate of about 0.8% among bathers at those beaches resulted in about $3 million annually in health-related expenses (Lin, 2005). Extrapolation of such numbers to the beaches and other water contact recreation areas in the state would increase these numbers significantly.

Storm water runoff and its impact on receiving waters also impacts the tourism industry. The California Travel and Tourism Commission (2009) estimated that in 2008 direct travel spending in California was $97.6 billion directly supporting 924,000 jobs, with earnings of $30.6 billion. Travel spending in 2008 generated $1.6 billion in local taxes and $2.8 billion in state taxes. Impacts on tourism from storm water runoff (e.g. beach closures) can have a significant impact on the economy. The experience of Huntington Beach provides an example of the potential economic impact of poor water quality. Approximately 8 miles of Huntington Beach were closed for two months in the middle of summer of 1999, impacting beach visitation and the local economy.

Cost Considerations Relative to the Department

In written comments and before the Board, the Department has stated that the requirements of the first public drafts would impose prohibitive costs on the Department at a time of economic difficulty and limited resources. State Water Board staff has carefully considered the Department’s comments and revised the draft Tentative Order to continue to address critical water quality problems in consideration of the cost of compliance.

State Water Board staff completed a Draft Tentative Order and submitted it to the Department, USEPA, and the Natural Resources Defense Council for informal stakeholder review in the fall of 2010. Further review was provided by the Regional Water Boards. Staff revised the Draft Tentative Order to address the informal comments received and released it for public review on January 7, 2011 (Draft Tentative Order). Approximately 330 comments from 16 commenters were received on the Draft Tentative Order, and a public hearing was held on July 19, 2011. Staff further revised the Draft Tentative Order and released a Revised Draft Tentative Order on August 18, 2011 (Revised Draft Tentative Order). Approximately 220 comments from 33 commenters were received on the Revised Draft Tentative Order, and a State Water Board workshop was held on September 21, 2011. In each set of comments and before the Board, the Department expressed significant concerns with the cost of compliance with the Tentative Orders.
On October 6, 2011, the California Senate Select Committee on California Job Creation and Retention held a hearing on the economic impacts of the State Water Board’s three general or statewide storm water permits that were under renewal: the Phase II Small MS4 permit, the Industrial General Permit, and the Department’s MS4 permit. The Executive Director of the State Water Board testified at the hearing that the comments regarding cost of compliance with the permits were being considered carefully and that the three permits required substantial revision to address the comments. State Water Board staff held bi-weekly meetings with the Department in October through December 2011 to discuss their concerns. Revisions resulting from these meetings are contained in the Second Revised Draft Tentative Order which was released for public review on April 27, 2012 (Second Revised Draft Tentative Order).

This section is a general discussion of the cost of compliance with the Second Revised Draft Tentative Order and of current expenditures by the Department to comply with the existing permit (Order 99-06-DWQ) (Existing Permit). It also discusses the more significant changes between the Revised Draft and Second Revised Draft Tentative Orders.

It is very difficult to precisely determine the true cost of implementation of the Department’s storm water management program as affected by this Order. Due to the extensive, distributed nature of the Department’s MS4, permit requirements that involve an unknown level of implementation or that depend on environmental variables that are as yet undefined, and the difficulty in isolating program costs attributable to permit compliance, only general conclusions can be drawn from this information.

The Department has made a number of estimates of the cost of complying with the Draft and Revised Draft Tentative Orders. Generally, the Department’s estimates are based on worst-case scenarios or the most restrictive interpretation of the Tentative Orders. In a presentation to a meeting of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) on June 22, 2011, the Department’s Chief Environmental Engineer, Scott McGowen estimated the annual cost of compliance at $281 million. This estimate was based on the January 7, 2011 Draft Tentative Order. At the July 19, 2011 public hearing, the Department estimated the annual compliance cost at approximately $450 million, based on the same January 7, 2011 Draft Tentative Order. At the September 21, 2011 State Water Board workshop, the Department estimated an annual compliance cost of $904 million, based on the requirements of the August 18, 2011 Revised Draft Tentative Order. It should be noted that the August 18 draft removed or modified a number of provisions that were expected to reduce the cost of compliance.

17 Caltrans NPDES Tentative Order, Natural Systems and Ecological Communities Subcommittee at the National Planning and Environmental Practitioners Meeting. AASHTO, June 22, 2011.
Annual expenditures for the Department’s storm water management program under the Existing Permit (DWQ 99-06) are provided in the Department’s annual reports. For fiscal years 2007-08 through 2010-11, the Department reported annual personal services and operating expenses of $93.8 million, $93.6 million, $75.2 million, and $89.2 million. These figures do not include the cost of capital improvements needed to comply with the permit.

State Water Board staff estimated the capital expenditures for the Existing Permit in two ways. First, the Department provided the number of post-construction storm water treatment BMPs installed in 2009-10 and 2010-11 along with typical unit costs for each BMP. In 2007-08, the Department spent approximately $74.7 million for 396 treatment BMPs, $104.5 million in 2009-10 for 667 treatment BMPs, and $75.7 million in 2010-11 for 506 treatment BMPs. The Department indicated that anomalies in the data for 2008-09 make them unreliable and they are therefore not included. The Department also indicated that the unit cost factors do not include costs for design, right-of-way and other related elements. The estimates therefore can be considered on the low side.

Second, capital expenditures were estimated from budget appropriations from the Department’s State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) as reported in the 2008-09 annual report. The SHOPP account is the primary source of funding for storm water-related capital expenses. Storm water compliance costs are not consistently reported in the annual reports; however, the 2008-09 annual report contains sufficient information to make an estimate. The capital value of the SHOPP “storm water mitigation element” for fiscal years 2009-10 through 2012-13 is $640 million, including capital outlay support, or about $160 million per year.

Using average personal services and operating expenses for the last four years ($88 million) and average annual programmed SHOPP funding, the Department’s expenditures to comply with the Existing Permit amount to approximately $248 million.

As stated above, the Department has estimated cost of compliance with the Draft Tentative and Revised Draft Tentative Orders variously at $281 to $904 million. These estimates are based on “worst case scenarios” and on the most restrictive interpretations of the Orders’ requirements. In preparing the Second Revised Tentative Order, staff worked to provide greater clarity and certainty to the Department on the scope of permit obligations and to eliminate compliance costs that were not expected to yield significant water quality benefits. With the exception of a lowering of the post-construction treatment threshold for non-highway facility projects from 10,000 square feet of new
impervious surface to 5,000 square feet\(^\text{18}\), no requirements have been added to the Second Revised Draft Tentative Order that would materially increase the cost of compliance over the Revised Draft Tentative Order. In contrast, a number of substantive requirements have been removed, replaced or modified from the Revised Draft Tentative Order with the goal of focusing the Department’s limited resources on the most significant water quality issues. These changes are expected to result in a lower cost of compliance with the Second Revised Draft Tentative Order as compared to the Revised Tentative Order. These include:

1. Water quality monitoring program
   a. Replaced random compliance-driven monitoring approach with a tiered approach focusing on ASBS and TMDL watersheds, and deferring to the monitoring requirements specified in the ASBS Special Protections and TMDLs
   b. Deleted sampling pool, water quality action levels, and response process flow chart
   c. Removed 29 constituents from the monitoring constituent list
   d. Limited the monitoring for new constituents to TMDL watersheds
   e. For sites with existing monitoring data, limited BMP retrofits to 15 percent of the highest priority sites
   f. Deleted the long-term monitoring program
   g. Deleted maintenance facility compliance monitoring

2. Project Planning and Design
   a. Raised the treatment threshold for highway projects from 5,000 square feet of new impervious surface to one acre
   b. Deleted the requirement for pilot Low Impact Development retrofits and effectiveness evaluations

3. Hydromodification
   a. Removed requirement for programmatic stream stability assessments and a retrofit implementation schedule
   b. Raised the risk assessment threshold for non-highway facility projects from 10,000 square feet of new impervious surface to one acre

4. Region Specific Requirements – removed, modified or scaled back requirements for the San Francisco Bay, Los Angeles, Central Valley, Lahontan, and San Diego Regional Water Boards with the goal of maximizing statewide consistency of requirements for the Department.

5. Construction Program – replaced requirement to inspect contractor operations outside the right-of-way with a requirement to include compliance language in its construction contracts

\(^{18}\) The threshold was lowered for consistency with the draft statewide Phase II Small MS4 General Permit and with regional MS4 permits.
6. TMDLs – Revised Attachment IV to more precisely identify the TMDLs applicable to the Department and shifted responsibility to prepare TMDL implementation plans from the Department to the Regional Water Boards.

7. ASBS – Added Attachment III to identify priority Department ASBS outfalls for installation of controls

8. Maintenance Program
   a. Deleted the requirement to report the amount of waste and debris removed from drainage inlets
   b. Replaced the site-by-site characterization of waste management sites with a programmatic characterization
   c. Deleted the requirement to prepare and implement a storm drain system survey plan
   d. Replaced quantitative measurements of trash and litter removal with estimated annual volumes

9. Non-Storm Water
   a. Deleted surveillance monitoring of agricultural return flows
   b. Deleted characterization monitoring of slope lateral drains

Though no firm conclusions or precise estimates can be drawn from this analysis, it is expected that the revisions to the Revised Draft Tentative Order will significantly reduce the cost of compliance.