

county of ventura

December 17, 2012

Jeanine Townsend, Clerk to the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street, 24th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814



Watershed Protection District
Tully Clifford, Director
Transportation Department
David Fleisch, Director

Engineering Services Department
Phil Nelson, Director

Water & Sanitation Department
R. Reddy Pakala, Director

Central Services Department
Janice Turner, Director

Subject: COMMENT LETTER – REVISED DRAFT PHASE II SMALL MS4 PERMIT

The County of Ventura appreciates the opportunity to comment on the revised Phase II Small MS4 Permit (Draft Phase II Permit). While the County of Ventura will not be subject to this Permit, key provisions will likely be precedential for future permit reissuances and, consequently, we are compelled to comment on this Draft Phase II Permit.

Receiving Water Limitations Language

The Receiving Water Limitations Provision (Provision D, pages 19-20) is an important and relevant issue for all permittees within the State. While the revised order does not modify Provision D per se, it addresses the issue (see Finding #38, page 38; Provision I, page 140; and the Fact Sheet, pages 25-26) by creating a reopener clause. We believe the State Water Board should not defer this issue until a later date (by the use of a reopener clause) and recommend that the State Water Board address this issue in this permit. Following the November 20, 2012 workshop, we believe the State Water Board has sufficient input and cause to develop a resolution. We understand that California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) offers its support and assistance to the State Water Board to address this issue.

We urge the State Water Board to direct staff to work with CASQA to revise the Receiving Water Limitation Language in Provision D now and not defer to a later point in time.

Attachment J – Central Coast Post-Construction Requirements

Our concerns with Attachment J are two-fold, policy/procedural and technical. First, we are concerned with the apparent escalation in permit requirements being conducted by the various Water Board permit writers in drafting provisions for land development. Over the last few years, we have seen the ratcheting up of land development requirements in each MS4 permit reissuance with regard for neither the impact/effectiveness of prior development requirements nor the key hydrologic principles of low impact development. This lack of a cogent and cohesive approach to standards has created an uneven playing field for communities and developers across



the State. Furthermore, the clear absence of any consensus within the State on what the requirements are for land development (particularly with respect to hydromodification management) is damaging to the credibility of the entire stormwater program.

Another policy/procedural-related issue is the timing of the inclusion of Region 3 requirements into the Draft Phase II Permit. By appending the Central Coast requirements and stating, "the Water Board expects to amend this Order to incorporate similar requirements for Permittees in the remainder of the State", the Water Board has introduced an entirely new set of rules with insufficient time for Phase I or II permittees to fully evaluate the potential impacts of these standards. At a minimum, we believe it prudent to allow a full five-year permit term to incorporate the requirements of Section E.12 to assess their effectiveness before charging off on a new set of requirements. As discussed below, there are significant technical issues in the Region 3 requirements and any revisions would require opening the Phase II permit to amend a regional requirement at the state level.

It is worth noting that the post-construction requirements contained in Section E.12 have been through a thorough two-year review process including CASQA professionals, environmental NGOs, Permittees, and Water Board staff. The result is a set of straightforward and implementable LID and baseline hydromodification controls accomplishing most or all of the Region 3 requirements. This direction is one that Phase 1 permittees could better follow.

With respect to technical issues, the magnitude and scope of the Region 3 requirements are not appropriate for the following reasons:

- The Region 3 requirements are not only the most stringent and complex in the State; they are also unique and entirely untested. For example, there is no demonstrated environmental benefit from retaining a 95th percentile storm event on small projects (15,000 sf and greater) in urban areas. It is well established that water quality control measures are most economical and efficient when they target small, frequent storm events that over time produce more total runoff than the larger, infrequent storms targeted for design of flood control facilities. Typically, design criteria for water quality control BMPs and baseline hydromodification controls are set to coincide with the "knee of the curve", i.e., the point of inflection where the magnitude of the event (and corresponding cost of facilities) increases more rapidly than the number of events captured. In other words, targeting design storms larger than this point will produce volume retention gains, but at considerable incremental cost. This approach is the very basis of the criteria in most Phase I MS4 permits and the draft Phase II permit for sizing stormwater control measures to capture the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm.



- The Central Coast sizing criteria was placed in the Region 3 requirements after the public review process was completed in that region. The sizing criteria uses an out-dated and incorrectly applied Water Environmental Federation MOP 23 approach that multiplies the retention/water quality volume by 1.963 in order to capture "all events up to and including" the 85th or 95th, as appropriate.
- The retention and hydromodification requirements, and some of the LID requirements, are inconsistent and go beyond those of existing or proposed statewide, regional, or local Phase I or Phase II MS4 permits in California. For example, thresholds for hydromodification requirements are much lower than existing or proposed permits (15,000 square feet and 22,500 square feet of created/replaced impervious surface for runoff retention and peak matching, respectively). Post-project vs. pre-project peak matching is required for the 2 through 10-year storm, which is beyond most existing requirements and more appropriate for flood control facilities. The technical basis for these requirements is unclear, and in the absence of demonstrated environmental benefit, there is no justification for the significant increased cost for their implementation.

Lastly, we are concerned about the inconsistent regulations creating inequitable conditions in the neighboring cities or adjacent counties, for example more stringent and technically unproven and infeasible post-construction requirements such as in Santa Barbara County versus those in Ventura County.

We urge you to delete direct references to the Central Coast Post-Construction Requirements, including Attachment J, from the Draft Phase II Permit.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Yours sincerely,



Jeff Pratt
Director

