

OC Coastline
Ocean water
R8

**California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region**

ORDER NO. R8-2002-0010
NPDES No. CAS618030

**Waste Discharge Requirements
for
the County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District
and
The Incorporated Cities of Orange County Within the Santa Ana Region
Areawide Urban Storm Water Runoff
Orange County**

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (hereinafter Regional Board) finds that:

1. The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act (CWA) added Section 402(p) establishing a framework for regulating municipal and industrial (including construction) storm water discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Section 402(p) of the CWA requires NPDES permits for storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) as well as other designated storm water discharges that are considered significant contributors of pollutants to waters of the United States. On November 16, 1990, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter EPA) amended its NPDES permit regulations (40 CFR Parts 122, 123 and 124) to describe permit application requirements for storm water discharges.
2. Prior to EPA's promulgation of the storm water permit regulations, the three counties (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino) and the incorporated cities within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Board requested areawide NPDES permits for urban storm water runoff. On July 13, 1990, the Regional Board adopted Order No. 90-71 for urban storm water runoff from urban areas in Orange County within the Santa Ana Region. The County of Orange was named as the principal permittee and the Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) and the incorporated cities were named as the co-permittees. Order No. 96-31, issued by the Regional Board on March 8, 1996, renewed the permit for another five years.
3. Order No. 96-31 expired on March 1, 2001. On September 1, 2000, the County of Orange Public Facilities and Resources Department (OCPRD) and the Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) in cooperation with the cities of Anaheim, Brea, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Cypress, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Laguna Woods, La Habra, La Palma, Lake Forest, Los Alamitos, Newport Beach, Orange, Placentia, Santa Ana, Seal Beach, Stanton, Tustin, Villa Park, Westminster, and Yorba Linda (hereinafter collectively referred to as permittees or dischargers), submitted NPDES Application No. CAS618030 and a Report of Waste Discharge for reissuance of their areawide storm water permit. In order to more effectively carry out the requirements of this order, the permittees have agreed that the County of Orange will continue as principal permittee and the OCFCD and the incorporated cities will continue as co-permittees. On March 5, 2001, Order No. 96-31, NPDES No.

CAS618030, was administratively extended in accordance with Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 9, §2235.4 of the California Code of Regulations.

4. The permittees serve a population of approximately 2.8 million, occupying an area of approximately 786 square miles (including unincorporated areas and the limits of 33 cities, 25 of which are within the jurisdiction of this Regional Board; two of the cities, Laguna Woods and Lake Forest, are within both the San Diego and Santa Ana Regional Boards' jurisdictions). The permitted area is shown on Attachment A. The permittees have jurisdiction over and /or maintenance responsibility for storm water conveyance systems within Orange County. The County's systems include an estimated 400 miles of storm drain systems. A major portion of the urbanized areas of Orange County drains into waterbodies within this Regional Board's jurisdiction. In certain cases, where a natural streambed is modified to convey storm water flows, the conveyance system becomes both an MS4 and a receiving water. The major storm drain systems and drainage areas in Orange County, which are within this Region, are shown on Attachment B. A portion of the Orange County drainage area is within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Regional Board and is regulated under an order issued by that Board.
5. Storm water outfalls from the MS4 systems in Orange County enter, or are tributary to, various water bodies of the Region. The permitted area can be subdivided into five tributary watersheds: the San Gabriel River drainage area, the Huntington Harbour and Bolsa Bay drainage area, the Santa Ana River drainage area, the Newport Bay drainage area, and the Irvine and Newport Coast Areas of Special Biological Significance (see Attachment B). These watersheds are tributary to the Pacific Ocean. The surface water bodies in Orange County include:

Inland Surface Streams

- a. Santa Ana River, Reaches 1 and 2,
- b. Silverado Creek (tributary to Santiago Creek),
- c. Santiago Creek, Reaches 1, 2, 3, and 4 (tributary to the Santa Ana River),
- d. San Diego Creek, Reaches 1 and 2 (tributary to Newport Bay),
- e. San Joaquin Freshwater Marsh (tributary to San Diego Creek),
- f. All other tributaries to these Creeks: Bonita Creek, Serrano Creek, Peters Canyon Wash, Hicks Canyon Wash, Bee Canyon Wash, Borrego Canyon Wash, Agua Chinon Wash, Laguna Canyon Wash, Rattlesnake Canyon Wash, Sand Canyon Wash, Black Star Creek, Carbon Canyon Creek, Coyote Creek and other tributaries.

Bays, Estuaries, and Tidal Prisms

- a. Anaheim Bay,
- b. Sunset Bay,
- c. Bolsa Bay and Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve,
- d. Lower and Upper Newport Bay,

- e. Tidal Prism of Santa Ana River (to within 1000 feet of Victoria Street) and Newport Slough, Santa Ana Salt Marsh,
- f. Tidal Prism of San Gabriel River (River Mouth to Marina Drive),
- g. Tidal Prisms of Flood Control Channels Discharging to Coastal or Bay Waters (e.g. Huntington Harbour).

Ocean Waters

Nearshore Zone

- a. San Gabriel River to Poppy Street in Corona Del Mar,
- b. Poppy Street to Southeast Regional Boundary.

Offshore Zone

- a. Waters between Nearshore Zone and Limit of State Waters.

Lakes and Reservoirs

- a. Anaheim Lakes,
- b. Irvine Lake (Santiago Reservoir),
- c. Laguna, Peters Canyon, and Rattlesnake Reservoirs.

The beneficial uses of these water bodies include: municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial service and process supply, groundwater recharge, navigation, hydropower generation, water contact recreation, non-contact water recreation, commercial and sportfishing, warm freshwater and limited warm freshwater habitats, cold freshwater habitat, preservation of biological habitats of special significance, wildlife habitat, preservation of rare, threatened or endangered species, marine habitat, shellfish harvesting, spawning, reproduction and development of aquatic habitats, and estuarine habitat. The ultimate goal of this storm water management program is to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

- 6. The Santa Ana River Basin is the major watershed within the jurisdiction of the Regional Board. The lower Santa Ana River Basin (downstream from Prado Basin) includes the Orange County drainage areas and the Upper Santa Ana River Basin includes the San Bernardino and the Riverside drainage areas. Generally, the San Bernardino County drainage areas drain to the Riverside County drainage areas, and Riverside County drainage areas discharge to Orange County.
- 7. Within the Region, runoff from the San Bernardino County areas is generally conveyed to the Riverside County areas through the Santa Ana River or other drainage channels tributary to the Santa Ana River. These flows are then discharged to Reach 2 of the Santa Ana River through Prado Basin (Reach 3 of the Santa Ana River). Most of the flow in Reach 2 is recharged in Orange County. During wet weather, some of the flow is discharged to the Pacific Ocean through Reach 1 of the Santa Ana River.

8. The three county areas within this Region are regulated under three areawide permits for urban storm water runoff. These areawide NPDES permits are:
- a. Orange County, NPDES No. CAS618030;
 - b. Riverside County, NPDES No. CAS618033; and,
 - c. San Bernardino County, NPDES No. CAS618036.

For an effective watershed management program, cooperation and coordination among the regulators, the municipal permittees, the public, and other entities are essential.

9. Studies conducted by the EPA, the states, flood control districts and other entities indicate the following major sources for urban storm water pollution nationwide:
- a. Industrial sites where appropriate pollution control and best management practices (BMPs)¹ are not implemented;
 - b. Construction sites where erosion and siltation controls and BMPs are not implemented; and,
 - c. Urban runoff where the drainage area is not properly managed.

10. A number of permits were adopted to address pollution from the sources identified in Finding 9, above. The State Board issued two statewide general NPDES permits: one for storm water runoff from industrial activities (NPDES No. CAS000001, General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit) and a second one for storm water runoff from construction activities (NPDES No. CAS000002, General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit). Industrial activities (as identified in 40 CFR 122.26(b)(14)) and construction sites of five acres or more, are required to obtain coverage under these statewide general permits. The permittees have developed project conditions of approval requiring coverage under the State's General Permit for new developments to be implemented at the time of grading or building permit issuance for construction sites on five acres or more and at the time of local permit issuance for industrial facilities. The State Board also adopted Order No. 99-06-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000003, for storm water runoff from facilities (including freeways and highways) owned and/or operated by Caltrans. The Regional Board adopted Order 99-11, NPDES No. CAG018001, for concentrated animal feeding operations, including dairies. The Regional Board also issues individual storm water permits for certain industrial facilities within the Region. Currently there are 22 individual storm water NPDES permits; 8 of these facilities are located in the Orange County area. Additionally, for a number of facilities that discharge process wastewater and storm water, storm water discharge requirements are included with the facilities' NPDES permit for process wastewater.

11. In most cases, the industries and construction sites covered under the Statewide General Industrial and Construction Permits discharge into storm drains and/or flood control facilities owned and operated by the permittees. These industries and construction sites are also regulated under local laws and regulations. A coordinated effort between the permittees and the

¹ Best Management Practices (BMPs) are water quality management practices that are maximized in efficiency for the control of storm water runoff pollution.

Regional Board staff is critical to avoid duplicative and overlapping efforts when overseeing the compliance of dischargers covered under the Statewide General Permits. As part of this coordination, the permittees have been notifying Regional Board staff when they observe conditions that pose a threat or potential threat to water quality, or when an industrial facility or construction activity that has failed to obtain required coverage under the appropriate general storm water permit.

12. The permittees have the authority to approve plans for residential, commercial, and industrial developments. If not properly controlled and managed, urbanization could result in the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff. Urban area runoff (Finding 9.c) may contain elevated levels of pathogens (bacteria, protozoa, viruses), sediment, trash, fertilizers (nutrients, compounds of nitrogen and phosphorus), pesticides (DDT, Chlordane, Diazinon, Chlorpyrifos), heavy metals (cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, zinc), and petroleum products (oil, grease, petroleum hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons). Storm water can carry these pollutants to rivers, streams, lakes, bays and the ocean (receiving waters).
13. Pollutants in urban runoff can impact the beneficial uses of the receiving waters and can cause or threaten to cause a condition of pollution or nuisance. Pathogens (from sanitary sewer overflows, septic system leaks, spills and leaks from portable toilets, pets, wildlife and human activities) can impact water contact recreation, non-contact water recreation and shellfish harvesting. Microbial contamination of the beaches from urban runoff and other sources has resulted in a number of health advisories issued by the Orange County Health Officer. Floatables (from trash) are an aesthetic nuisance and can be a substrate for algae and insect vectors. Oil and grease can coat birds and aquatic organisms, adversely affecting respiration and/or thermoregulation. Other petroleum hydrocarbon components can cause toxicity to aquatic organisms and can impact human health. Suspended and settleable solids (from sediment, trash, and industrial activities) can be deleterious to benthic organisms and may cause anaerobic conditions to form. Sediments and other suspended particulates can cause turbidity, clog fish gills and interfere with respiration in aquatic fauna. They can also screen out light, hindering photosynthesis and normal aquatic plant growth and development. Toxic substances (from pesticides, herbicides, petroleum products, metals, industrial wastes) can cause acute and/or chronic toxicity, and can bioaccumulate in organisms to levels that may be harmful to human health. Nutrients (from fertilizers, confined animal facilities, pets, birds) can cause excessive algal blooms. These blooms can lead to problems with taste, odor, color and increased turbidity, and can depress the dissolved oxygen content, leading to fish kills.
14. A major portion of Orange County is urbanized with residential, commercial and industrial developments. Urban development increases impervious surfaces and storm water runoff volume and velocity and decreases vegetated, pervious surface available for infiltration of storm water. Increase in runoff volume and velocity can cause scour, erosion (sheet, rill and/or gully), aggradation (raising of a streambed from sediment deposition) and can change fluvial geomorphology, hydrology and aquatic ecosystems. The local agencies (the permittees) are the owners and operators of the MS4 systems and have established appropriate legal authority to control some but not all discharges to these systems (see Finding 16). The permittees have established appropriate legal authority to control discharges into the MS4 systems. They adopted grading and/or erosion control ordinances, guidelines and best management practices

(BMPs) for municipal, commercial, and industrial activities, and a drainage area management plan (DAMP). The permittees must exercise a combination of these programs, policies, and legal authority to ensure that pollutant loads resulting from urbanization are properly controlled and managed.

15. This order regulates urban storm water runoff from areas under the jurisdiction of the permittees. Urban storm water runoff includes those discharges from residential, commercial, industrial and construction areas within the permitted area and excludes discharges from feedlots, dairies, and farms (also see Finding 16). Storm water discharges consist of surface runoff generated from various land uses in all the hydrologic drainage areas that discharge into the water bodies of the U.S. The quality of these discharges varies considerably and is affected by land use activities, basin hydrology and geology, season, the frequency and duration of storm events, and the presence of illicit² disposal practices and illegal connections.
16. The permittees may lack legal jurisdiction over storm water discharges into their systems from some State and Federal facilities, utilities and special districts, Native American tribal lands, waste water management agencies and other point and non-point source discharges otherwise permitted by the Regional Board. The Regional Board recognizes that the permittees should not be held responsible for such facilities and/or discharges. Similarly, certain activities that generate pollutants present in storm water runoff may be beyond the ability of the permittees to eliminate. Examples of these include operation of internal combustion engines, atmospheric deposition, brake pad wear, tire wear and leaching of naturally occurring minerals from local geography.
17. This order is intended to regulate the discharge of pollutants in urban storm water runoff from anthropogenic (generated from human activities) sources within the jurisdiction and control of the permittees and is not intended to address background or naturally occurring pollutants or flows.
18. Water quality assessments conducted by Regional Board staff have identified a number of beneficial use impairments due, in part, to urban runoff. Section 303(b) of the CWA requires each of the regional boards to routinely monitor and assess the quality of waters of the region. If this assessment indicates that beneficial uses and/or water quality objectives are not met, then that waterbody must be listed under Section 303(d) of the CWA as an impaired waterbody. The 1998 water quality assessment listed a number of water bodies within the Region under Section 303(d) as impaired waterbodies. In the Orange County area, these include: (1) San Diego Creek, Reach 1 (listed for sedimentation/siltation, metals, nutrients, pesticides); (2) San Diego Creek, Reach 2 (listed for sedimentation/siltation, nutrients, metals, unknown toxicity); (3) Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve (listed for sedimentation/siltation, metals, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides); (4) Lower Newport Bay (listed for metals, pesticides, pathogens, nutrients, priority organics); (5) Anaheim Bay (listed for metals, pesticides); (6) Huntington Harbour (listed for metals, pesticides, pathogens); (7) Santiago Creek, Reach 4 (listed for salinity, TDS, chlorides); and (8) Silverado Creek (listed for pathogens, salinity, TDS,

² Illicit Disposal means any disposal, either intentionally or unintentionally, of material or waste that can pollute storm water or create a nuisance.

chlorides). For some of these impaired waterbodies, one of the listed causes of impairment is urban runoff.

19. Federal regulations require that a total maximum daily load (TMDL) be established for each 303(d) listed waterbody for each of the pollutants causing impairment. The TMDL is the total amount of the problem pollutant that can be discharged while water quality standards in the receiving water are attained, i.e., water quality objectives are met and the beneficial uses are protected. It is the sum of the individual wasteload allocations (WLA) for point source inputs, load allocations (LA) for non-point source inputs and natural background, with a margin of safety. The TMDLs are the basis for limitations established in waste discharge requirements. TMDLs have been developed for sediment and nutrients for San Diego Creek and Newport Bay. A fecal coliform TMDL for Newport Bay has also been established. The WLAs from these TMDLs are included in this order. Dischargers to these water bodies are currently implementing these TMDLs. This order specifies the WLAs and includes requirements for the implementation of these WLAs.
20. The MS4s generally contain non-storm water flows such as irrigation runoff, runoff from non-commercial car washes, runoff from miscellaneous washing and cleaning operations, and other nuisance flows. Discharges of non-storm water containing pollutants into the MS4 systems and to waters of the U.S. are prohibited unless they are regulated under a separate NPDES permit, or are exempt, as indicated in Discharge Prohibitions, Section III.3 of this order.
21. Order No. 90-71 (first term permit) required the permittees to: (1) develop and implement the DAMP and a storm water and receiving water monitoring plan; (2) eliminate illegal³ and illicit discharges⁴ to the MS4s; and (3) enact the necessary legal authority to effectively prohibit such discharges. The overall goal of these requirements was to reduce pollutant loadings to surface waters from urban runoff to the maximum extent practicable (MEP)⁵. Order No. 96-31 (second term permit) required continued implementation of the DAMP and the monitoring plan, and required the permittees to focus on those areas that threaten beneficial uses.
22. This order (Order No. R8-2002-0010, third term permit) outlines additional steps for an effective storm water management program and specifies requirements to protect the beneficial uses of all receiving waters. This order requires the permittees to examine sources of pollutants in storm water runoff from activities which the permittees conduct, approve, regulate and/or authorize by issuing a license or permit.
23. The Report of Waste Discharge (the permit renewal application) included the following major documents:

³ Illegal discharge means any discharge (or seepage) to the municipal separate storm sewer that is not composed entirely of storm water except for the authorized discharges listed in Section III of this permit. Illegal discharges include the improper disposal of wastes into the storm sewer system.

⁴ Illicit Discharge means any discharge to the storm drain system that is prohibited under local, state, or federal statutes, ordinances, codes, or regulations. The term illicit discharge includes all non storm-water discharges except discharges pursuant to an NPDES permit, discharges that are identified in Section III, Discharge Limitations/Prohibitions, of this order, and discharges authorized by the Regional Board Executive Officer.

⁵ Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) means to the maximum extent feasible, taking into account considerations of synergistic, additive, and competing factors, including but not limited to, gravity of the problem, technical feasibility, fiscal feasibility, public health risks, societal concerns, and social benefits.

- a. A summary of status of current Storm Water Management Program;
 - b. A Proposed Plan of Storm Water Quality Management Activities for 2001-2006, as outlined in the Updated DAMP. The 2000 DAMP includes all the activities the permittees propose to undertake during the next permit term, goals and objectives of such activities, an evaluation of the need for additional source control and/or structural and non-structural BMPs and proposed pilot studies;
 - c. A Performance Commitment that includes new and existing program elements and compliance schedules necessary to implement controls that reduce pollutants to the maximum extent practicable;
 - d. A summary of procedures implemented to detect illegal discharges and illicit disposal practices;
 - e. A summary of enforcement procedures and actions taken to require storm water discharges to comply with the approved storm water management programs;
 - f. A summary of public agency activity, results of monitoring program, and program effectiveness; and,
 - g. A fiscal analysis.
24. The permittees own and/or operate facilities where industrial or related activities take place that may have an impact on storm water quality. Some of the permittees also enter into contracts with outside parties to carry out municipal related activities that may also have an impact on storm water quality. These facilities and related activities include, but are not limited to, street sweeping, catch basin cleaning, maintenance yards, vehicle and equipment maintenance areas, waste transfer stations, corporation and storage yards, parks and recreational facilities, landscape and swimming pool maintenance activities, storm drain system maintenance activities and the application of herbicides, algacides and pesticides. The permittees have prepared and implemented an environmental performance report for appropriate fixed public facilities under their jurisdiction, and identified best management practices for those activities found to require pollution prevention measures. Non-storm water discharges from these facilities and/or activities could also affect water quality. This order prohibits non-storm water discharges from public facilities, unless the discharges are exempt under Section III, Discharge Limitations, 3 & 5 of this order, or are permitted by the Regional Board under an individual NPDES permit. The second term permit required the permittees to prepare an Environmental Performance Reporting Program to identify significant issues and to implement corrective actions at municipal facilities and activities. Most of this work has been completed. However, this is a continuing process and this order requires the permittees to continue this process at least on an annual basis.
25. Successful implementation of the provisions and limitations in this order will require the cooperation of all the public agency organizations within Orange County having programs/activities that have an impact on storm water quality. A list of these organizations is included in Attachment C. As such, these organizations are expected to actively participate in implementing the Orange County NPDES Storm Water Program. The Regional Board has the discretion and authority to require non-cooperating entities to participate in this areawide permit

or obtain individual storm water discharge permits, pursuant to 40 CFR 122.26(a). The permittees have developed a Storm Water Implementation Agreement among the County, the cities and the Orange County Flood Control District. The Implementation Agreement establishes the responsibilities of each party and a funding mechanism for the shared costs, and recognizes the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

26. The major focus of storm water pollution prevention is the development and implementation of an appropriate DAMP, including best management practices (BMPs). The ultimate goal of the urban storm water management program is to support attainment of water quality objectives for the receiving waters and to protect beneficial uses through the implementation of the DAMP. The permittees developed and submitted a DAMP.
27. The DAMP is a dynamic document and the permittees have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, the various elements of the DAMP. A revised DAMP was included with the NPDES permit renewal application. This order requires the permittees to continue to implement the BMPs listed in the revised DAMP; update or modify the DAMP, when appropriate, consistent with the MEP and other applicable standards; and to effectively prohibit illegal and illicit discharges to the storm drain system.
28. Urban runoff contains pollutants from privately owned and operated facilities, such as residences, businesses, private and/or public institutions, and commercial establishments. Therefore, a successful storm water management plan should include the participation and cooperation of the public, businesses, the permittees and the regulators. The DAMP has a strong emphasis on public education.
29. The Orange County DAMP defined: (1) a management structure for the permittees' compliance effort; (2) a formal agreement to underpin cooperation; and (3) a detailed municipal effort to develop, implement, and evaluate various BMPs or control programs in the areas of public agency activities, public information, new development and construction, public works construction, industrial discharger identification, and illicit discharger/connection identification and elimination.
30. In order to characterize storm water discharges, to identify problem areas, to determine the impact of urban runoff on receiving waters, and to determine the effectiveness of the various BMPs, an effective monitoring program is critical. The principal permittee administers the monitoring program for the permittees. This program included storm water monitoring, receiving water monitoring, dry weather monitoring and sediment monitoring. The monitoring data indicate some spatial differences in water quality among Orange County's major watersheds. Based on these monitoring data, the monitoring program was revised in 1998 to focus on "warm spots" (areas where the pollutant concentrations were above the average for the watershed) and "special value" areas (critical aquatic resources). Another element of the monitoring program is the Reconnaissance and Source Identification component that targets areas that are known to exhibit unusually high levels of storm water pollutants. The 1998 monitoring program was approved and the data collection under this program will be completed by July 1, 2003. By January 1, 2003, the State Board is required by SB 72 (Water Code Section 13383.5) to develop a statewide municipal storm water monitoring program. By July 1, 2003, the permittees are required to develop a revised monitoring program as specified in the

monitoring and reporting program and consistent with any new requirements developed by the State Board.

31. In accordance with the Strategic Plan and Initiatives for the State and Regional Boards (June 22, 1995), the Regional Board recognizes the importance of an integrated watershed management approach. The Regional Board also recognizes that a watershed management program should integrate all related programs, including the storm water program and TMDL processes. Consistent with this approach, some of the municipal storm water monitoring programs have already been integrated into regional monitoring programs.
32. Illegal discharges to the storm drains can contribute to storm water and other surface water contamination. A reconnaissance survey of the municipal storm drain systems (open channels and underground storm drains) was completed by the permittees. The permittees also developed a program to prohibit illegal/illicit discharges to their storm drains and flood control facilities. Continued surveillance and enforcement of these programs are required to eliminate illicit discharges. The permittees have a number of mechanisms in place to eliminate illicit discharges to the MS4s, including construction, commercial, and industrial facility inspections, drainage facility inspections, water quality monitoring programs, and public education. The permittees also established a 24-hour water pollution problem reporting hotline. In February 1997, the permittees certified that they had completed a reconnaissance survey of the MS4s to detect and eliminate any illegal connections (undocumented or unpermitted connections to the MS4s). A reconnaissance survey is now being conducted as a part of the routine inspections of all MS4s.
33. The permittees have the authority to control pollutants in storm water discharges, to prohibit illegal connections and illicit discharges, to control spills, and to require compliance and carry out inspections of the storm drain systems within their jurisdictions. The permittees have various forms of legal authority in place, such as charters, State Code provisions for General Law cities, city ordinances, and applicable portions of municipal codes and the State Water Code, to regulate storm water/urban runoff discharges. In order to insure countywide consistency and to provide a legal underpinning to the entire Orange County storm water program, a model water quality ordinance was completed on August 15, 1994 and was adopted by all the permittees. The permittees are required by this order to review their existing enforcement authority to determine whether any additional legal authority is needed in order for permittees to administer civil and/or criminal penalties in enforcement actions for violations of the Water Quality Ordinance.
34. Pollution prevention techniques, appropriate planning processes and early identification of potential storm water impacts and mitigation measures can significantly reduce storm water pollution problems. The permittees should consider these impacts and appropriate mitigation measures in the planning procedures and in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process for specific projects, Master Plans, etc. The permittees already require a Water Quality Management Plan, which addresses permanent post-construction BMPs, in addition to the SWPPP, which is required by the statewide general permit for construction activity. The

permittees are encouraged to propose and participate in watershed wide and/or regional water quality management programs.

35. The permittees have developed inter-departmental training programs and have made commitments to conduct a certain number of these training programs during the term of this permit.
36. In accordance with the Clean Water Act and its implementing regulations, this order requires the permittees to develop and implement programs and policies necessary to reduce the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff to waters of the U. S. to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).
37. The legislative history and the preamble to the federal storm water regulations indicate that the Congress and the U.S. EPA were aware of the difficulties in regulating urban storm water runoff solely through traditional end-of-pipe treatment. However, it is the Regional Board's intent that this order require the implementation of best management practices to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, the discharge of pollutants in storm water from the MS4s in order to support attainment of water quality standards. This order, therefore, includes Receiving Water Limitations⁶ based upon water quality objectives, prohibits the creation of nuisance and requires the reduction of water quality impairment in receiving waters. In accordance with Section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act, this order requires the permittees to implement control measures, in accordance with the DAMP, that will reduce pollutants in storm water discharges to the maximum extent practicable. The Receiving Water Limitations similarly require the implementation of control measures to protect beneficial uses and attain water quality objectives of the receiving waters.
38. The Regional Board finds that the unique aspects of the regulation of storm water discharges through municipal storm sewer systems, including the intermittent nature of discharges, difficulties in monitoring and limited physical control over the discharge, will require adequate time to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs. Therefore, the order includes a procedure for determining whether storm water discharges are causing exceedances of receiving water limitations and for evaluating whether the DAMP must be revised in order to comply with this aspect of the order. The order establishes an iterative process to maintain compliance with the receiving water limitations.
39. The permittees are required to conduct inspections of construction sites, industrial facilities and commercial establishments. To avoid duplicative efforts, the permittees need not inspect facilities that have been inspected by Regional Board staff, if the inspection was conducted during the specified time period. Regional Board staff inspection data will be posted regularly on its internet site. It is anticipated that many of the inspections required under this order can and will be carried out by inspectors currently conducting inspections for the permittees (i.e., grading, building, code enforcement, etc.), during their normal duties.

⁶ Receiving Water Limitations are requirements included in the Orders issued by the Board to assure that the regulated discharge does not violate water quality standards established in the Basin Plan at the point of discharge to waters of the State.

40. A revised Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) was adopted by the Regional Board and became effective on January 24, 1995. The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for water bodies in the Santa Ana Region. The Basin Plan also incorporates by reference all State Board water quality control plans and policies, including the 1990 Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California (Ocean Plan) and the 1974 Water Quality Control Policy for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California (Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan).
41. The requirements contained in this order are necessary to implement the plans and policies described in Finding 40, above. These plans and policies contain numeric and narrative water quality standards for the water bodies in this Region. This order requires permittees to comply with load allocations for constituents with established load allocations for urban runoff, by implementing the necessary BMPs. Continuation of water quality/biota monitoring and analysis of the data are essential to better understand the impacts of storm water discharges on the water quality of the receiving water. The existing Basin Plan, or any further changes to the Basin Plan, may be grounds for the permittees to revise some or all of the DAMP and/or the ROWD.
42. Permittees will be required to comply with any applicable future water quality standards or discharge requirements that may be imposed by the EPA or State of California prior to the expiration of this order. This order may be reopened to include TMDLs and/or other requirements developed and adopted by the Regional Board.
43. The permittees may petition the Regional Board to issue a separate NPDES permit to any discharger of non-storm water into storm drain systems that they own or operate.
44. The permittees under the aegis of the TAC, and in collaboration with the City and County Attorneys, Orange County Sanitation District, the Orange County Building Industry Association, the Food Sanitation Advisory Council, and Western States Petroleum Association, developed an Enforcement Consistency Guide and a Water Quality Ordinance. All of the permittees adopted the Enforcement Consistency Guide and the Water Quality Ordinance. These documents establish legal authority for enforcing storm water ordinances and countywide uniformity in the enforcement actions.
45. It is important to control litter to eliminate trash and other materials in storm water runoff. In addition to the municipal ordinances prohibiting litter, the permittees participate or organize a number of other programs such as "Coastal Cleanup Day", "Pride Days", "Volunteer Connection Day", etc. The permittees also organize solid waste collection programs, household hazardous waste collections, and recycling programs to reduce litter and illegal discharges. Additionally, the permittees have installed debris booms at a number of locations.
46. The permittees are required to continue their drainage system inspection and maintenance program.
47. At a number of locations along the Orange County coast, elevated bacterial levels were detected during the summer of 1999 and 2000. One of the studies conducted to determine the source of bacterial contamination indicated that there is only a minor contribution to the bacterial problems from urban runoff. The permittees currently divert dry weather low flows from some of these areas to sanitary sewer systems on a temporary basis to address this bacterial problem.

A number of studies have been initiated to determine the source of this microbial contamination and to develop permanent remedial measures. This order requires the permittees to further investigate and address the coastal bacterial problems.

48. The sampling data indicate the presence of elevated levels of pesticides in storm water runoff from urban areas. The permittees have developed and implemented a model plan entitled, "Management Guidelines for Use of Fertilizers and Pesticides". The permittees are required to review this plan to determine its effectiveness and to make any needed changes. TMDLs are being developed for some of these pesticides for the Newport Bay watershed.
49. Public education is an important part of storm water pollution prevention. The permittees have employed a variety of means to educate the public, business and commercial establishments, industrial facilities and construction sites, and in 1999 developed a long term public education strategy. The permittees are required to continue their efforts in public education programs.
50. The permittees established a taskforce consisting of the principal permittee, Building Industry Association, Association of General Contractors and Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors of California and developed "Best Management Practices for New Development Including Non-Residential Construction Projects (1-5 acres)". The permittees are implementing the BMPs from this guidance document and are requiring new developments and significant redevelopments to develop and implement appropriate Water Quality Management Plans. This order requires structural and non-structural BMPs for new developments and significant redevelopments, only if adequate regional and/or watershed wide management programs are not being implemented.
51. The Regional Board and the permittees recognize the importance of watershed management initiatives and regional planning and coordination in the development and implementation of programs and policies related to water quality protection. A number of such efforts are underway in which the permittees are active participants. This order encourages continued participation in such programs and policies. The Regional Board also recognizes that, in certain cases, diversion of funds targeted for certain monitoring programs to regional monitoring programs may be necessary. The Executive Officer is authorized to approve, after proper public notification and consideration of all comments received, the watershed management initiatives and regional planning and coordination programs and regional monitoring programs. The permittees are required to submit all documents, where appropriate, in an electronic format. All such documents will be posted at the Regional Board's website and all interested parties will be notified. In addition, the website will include the administrative and civil procedures for appealing any decision made by the Executive Officer.
52. The storm water regulations require public participation in the development and implementation of the storm water management program. As such, the permittees are required to solicit and consider all comments received from the public and submit copies of the comments to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board with the annual reports due on November 15. In response to public comments, the permittees may modify reports, plans, or schedules prior to submittal to the Executive Officer.
53. In accordance with California Water Code Section 13389, the issuance of waste discharge requirements for this discharge is exempt from those provisions of the California

Environmental Quality Act contained in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100), Division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

54. The permitted discharge is consistent with the anti-degradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and the State Board Resolution 68-16. This order requires implementation of programs (i.e., BMPs) to reduce the level of pollutants in the storm water discharges. The combination of programs and policies required to be implemented under this order for new and existing developments are designed to improve urban storm water quality.
55. The Regional Board has notified the permittees and interested parties of its intent to issue waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
56. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the permittees, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

I. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRINCIPAL PERMITTEE

The principal permittee shall be responsible for the overall program management and shall:

1. Conduct chemical and biological water quality monitoring, as required by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board.
2. Conduct inspections and maintain the storm drain systems within its jurisdiction.
3. Review and revise, if necessary, policies/ordinances necessary to establish legal authority as required by the Federal Storm Water Regulations.
4. Respond and/or arrange for responding to emergency situations, such as accidental spills, leaks, illicit discharges and illegal connections, etc., to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to storm drain systems and waters of the U.S. within its jurisdiction.
5. Take appropriate enforcement actions for illicit discharges to the MS4 systems owned or controlled by the principal permittee.
6. Prepare and submit to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board unified reports, plans, and programs as required by this order, including the annual report.

The activities of the principal permittee shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Coordinate and conduct Management Committee meetings on an as needed basis. The principal permittee will take the lead role in initiating and developing area-wide programs and activities necessary to comply with the NPDES Permit.
2. Coordinate permit activities and participate in any subcommittees formed as necessary to coordinate compliance activities with this order.

3. Provide technical and administrative support and inform the co-permittees of the progress of other pertinent municipal programs, pilot projects, research studies, etc.
4. Coordinate the implementation of area-wide storm water quality management activities such as public education, pollution prevention, household hazardous waste collection, etc.
5. Develop and implement mechanisms, performance standards, etc., to promote uniform and consistent implementation of BMPs among the permittees.
6. Pursue enforcement actions as necessary within its jurisdiction to ensure compliance with storm water management programs, ordinances and implementation plans, including physical elimination of undocumented connections and illicit discharges.
7. In conjunction with the other permittees, implement the BMPs listed in the DAMP, and take such other actions as may be necessary to meet the MEP standard.
8. Monitor the implementation of the plans and programs required by this order and determine their effectiveness in protecting beneficial uses.
9. Coordinate all the activities with the Regional Board, including the submittal of all reports, plans, and programs, as required under this order.
10. Obtain public input for any proposed management and implementation plans, where applicable.
11. Cooperate in watershed management programs and regional and/or statewide monitoring programs.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CO-PERMITTEES

The co-permittees shall be responsible for the management of storm drain systems within their jurisdictions and shall:

1. Implement management programs, monitoring programs, implementation plans and all BMPs outlined in the DAMP within each respective jurisdiction, and take any other actions as may be necessary to meet the MEP standard.
2. Coordinate among their internal departments and agencies, as appropriate, to facilitate the implementation of this Order and the DAMP.
3. Establish and maintain adequate legal authority, as required by the Federal Storm Water Regulations.
4. Conduct storm drain system inspections and maintenance in accordance with the criteria developed by the principal permittee.
5. Take appropriate enforcement actions for illicit discharges to the MS4 system owned or controlled by the co-permittee.

The co-permittees' activities shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Participate in a Management Committee comprised of the principal permittee and one representative of each co-permittee. The principal permittee will take the lead role in

initiating and developing area-wide programs activities necessary to comply with the NPDES Permit. The committee will meet on a regular basis (at least six times per year). Each permittee shall designate one official representative to the Management Committee.

2. Review, approve, implement, and comment on all plans, strategies, management programs, and monitoring programs, as developed by the principal permittee or any permittee subcommittee to comply with this order.
3. Pursue enforcement actions as necessary to ensure compliance with the storm water management programs, ordinances and implementation plans, including physical elimination of undocumented connections and illicit discharges.
4. Conduct and coordinate with the principal permittee any surveys and characterizations needed to identify the pollutant sources and drainage areas.
5. Submit storm drain system maps with periodic revisions, as necessary.
6. Respond to emergency situations, such as accidental spills, leaks, illicit discharges and illegal connections, etc., to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to storm drain systems and waters of the U.S.
7. Prepare and submit all required reports to the principal permittee in a timely manner.

III. DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS/PROHIBITIONS

1. In accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B) and 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(F), the permittees shall prohibit illicit/illegal discharges (non-storm water) from entering into the municipal separate storm sewer systems.
2. The discharge of storm water from the MS4s to waters of the United States containing pollutants that have not been reduced to the maximum extent practicable is prohibited.
3. The permittees shall effectively prohibit the discharge of non-storm water into the MS4s, unless such discharges are authorized by a separate NPDES permit or as otherwise specified in this provision. Certain discharges identified below need not be prohibited by the permittees. If, however, any of these discharges are identified by the permittees or the Executive Officer as a significant source of pollutants, coverage under the Regional Board's De Minimus permit may be required.
 - a. Discharges composed entirely of storm water,
 - b. Potable water line flushing and other potable water sources,
 - c. Air conditioning condensate,
 - d. Landscape irrigation, lawn garden watering and other irrigation waters,
 - e. Passive foundation drains,
 - f. Passive footing drains,
 - g. Water from crawl space pumps,
 - h. Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges,

- i. Non-commercial vehicle washing,
- j. Diverted stream flows,
- k. Rising ground waters and natural springs,
- l. Ground water infiltration as defined in 40 CFR 35.2005 (20) and uncontaminated pumped groundwater,
- m. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands,
- n. Emergency fire fighting flows (i.e., flows necessary for the protection of life and property) do not require BMPs and need not be prohibited. However, where possible, when not interfering with health and safety issues, BMPs should be considered (also see Section XIX, Provision 4),
- o. Waters not otherwise containing wastes as defined in California Water Code Section 13050 (d), and
- p. Other types of discharges identified and recommended by the permittees and approved by the Regional Board.

The Regional Board may add categories of non-storm water discharges that are not significant sources of pollutants or remove categories of non-storm water discharges listed above based upon a finding that the discharges are a significant source of pollutants.

- 4. For purposes of this order, a discharge may include storm water or other types of discharges, identified in Section III.3.
- 5. Non-storm water discharges from public agency activities into waters of the U.S. are prohibited unless the non-storm water discharges are permitted by an NPDES permit or are included in Section III.3. If permitting or immediate elimination of the non-storm water discharges is impractical, the permittees shall include in the Environmental Performance Report, a proposed plan to eliminate the non-storm water discharges in a timely manner.
- 6. The permittees shall reduce the discharge of pollutants, including trash and debris, from the storm water conveyance systems to the maximum extent practicable.
- 7. Discharges from the MS4s shall be in compliance with the applicable discharge prohibitions contained in Chapter 5 of the Basin Plan.
- 8. Discharges from the MS4s of storm water or non-storm water, for which a Permittee is responsible, shall not cause or contribute to a condition of nuisance, as that term is defined in Section 13050 of the Water Code.

IV. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

- 1. Discharges from the MS4s shall not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water quality standards (designated beneficial uses and water quality objectives) for surface waters or groundwaters.

2. The DAMP and its components shall be designed to achieve compliance with receiving water limitations. It is expected that compliance with receiving water limitations will be achieved through an iterative process and the application of increasingly more effective BMPs. The permittees shall comply with Sections III.2 and IV of this order through timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce pollutants in urban storm water runoff in accordance with the DAMP and other requirements of this order, including any modifications thereto.
3. If permittees continue to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, notwithstanding implementation of the DAMP and other requirements of this order, the permittees shall assure compliance with Sections III.2 and IV of this order by complying with the following procedure:
 - a. Upon a determination by either the permittees or the Executive Officer that the discharges from the MS4 systems are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable water quality standard, the permittees shall promptly notify and thereafter submit a report to the Executive Officer that describes BMPs that are currently being implemented and additional BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards. The report may be incorporated in the annual update to the DAMP, unless the Executive Officer directs an earlier submittal. The report shall include an implementation schedule. The Executive Officer may require modifications to the report;
 - b. Submit any modifications to the report required by the Executive Officer within 30 days of notification;
 - c. Within 30 days following approval by the Executive Officer of the report described above, the permittees shall revise the DAMP and monitoring program to incorporate the approved modified BMPs that have been and will be implemented, the implementation schedule, and any additional monitoring required; and,
 - d. Implement the revised DAMP and monitoring program in accordance with the approved schedule.

So long as the permittees have complied with the procedures set forth above and are implementing the revised DAMP, the permittees do not have to repeat the same procedure for continuing or recurring exceedances of the same receiving water limitations unless the Executive Officer determines it is necessary to develop additional BMPs.

V. IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT

1. By July 1, 2002, the existing Implementation Agreement shall be revised to include the cities that were not signatories to this agreement. A copy of the signature page and any revisions to the Agreement shall be included in the annual report.
2. By July 1, 2002, the permittees shall evaluate the storm water management structure and the Implementation Agreement and determine the need for any revision. The corresponding annual report shall include the findings of this review and a schedule for any needed revisions.

VI. LEGAL AUTHORITY/ENFORCEMENT

1. The permittees shall maintain adequate legal authority to control the contribution of pollutants to the MS4 by storm water discharges and enforce those authorities.
2. The permittees shall take appropriate enforcement actions against any violators of their Water Quality Ordinance, in accordance with the adopted/established guidelines and procedures. All enforcement actions shall be consistent with the Enforcement Consistency Guide.
3. Permittees' ordinances or other local regulatory mechanisms shall include sanctions to ensure compliance. Sanctions shall include but are not limited to: monetary penalties, non-monetary penalties, bonding requirements, and/or permit denials/revocations/stays for non-compliance. If the permittees' current ordinances do not have a provision for civil or criminal penalties for violations of their water quality ordinances, the permittees shall enact such ordinances by November 15, 2003.
4. By November 15, 2003, each permittee shall submit a statement, signed by legal counsel, that the permittee has obtained all necessary legal authority to comply with this Order through adoption of ordinances and/or municipal code modifications.
5. The permittees shall continue to provide notification to Regional Board staff regarding storm water related information gathered during site inspections of industrial and construction sites regulated by the Statewide General Storm Water Permits and at sites that should be regulated under the State's General Permits. The notification should include any observed violations of the General Permits, prior history of violations, any enforcement actions taken by the permittee, and any other relevant information.
6. By November 15, 2003, the permittees shall review their water quality ordinances and provide a report on the effectiveness of these ordinances and associated enforcement programs, in prohibiting the following types of discharges to the MS4s (the permittees may propose appropriate control measures in lieu of prohibiting these discharges, where the permittees are responsible for ensuring that dischargers adequately maintain those control measures):
 - a. Sewage, where a co-permittee operates the sewage collection system;
 - b. Wash water resulting from the hosing or cleaning of gas stations, auto repair garages, and other types of automobile service stations;
 - c. Discharges resulting from the cleaning, repair, or maintenance of any type of equipment, machinery, or facility, including motor vehicles, concrete mixing equipment, portable toilet servicing, etc.;
 - d. Wash water from mobile auto detailing and washing, steam and pressure cleaning, carpet cleaning, and other such mobile commercial and industrial activities;
 - e. Water from cleaning of municipal, industrial, and commercial sites, including parking lots, streets, sidewalks, driveways, patios, plazas, work yards and outdoor eating or drinking areas, etc.;

- f. Runoff from material storage areas or uncovered receptacles that contain chemicals, fuels, grease, oil; or other hazardous materials⁷;
 - g. Discharges of runoff from the washing of toxic materials⁸ from paved or unpaved areas;
 - h. Discharges of pool or fountain water containing chlorine, biocides, or other chemicals; pool filter backwash containing debris and chlorine;
 - i. Pet waste, yard waste, litter, debris, sediment, etc.; and,
 - j. Restaurant or food processing facility wastes such as grease, floor mat and trash bin wash water, food waste, etc.
7. The Principal Permittee shall, on or before July 1, 2002, develop a restaurant inspection program which shall, at a minimum, address:
- a. Oil and grease disposal to verify that these wastes are not poured onto a parking lot, street or adjacent catch basin;
 - b. Trash bin areas to verify that these areas are clean, the bin lids are closed, the bins are not filled with liquid and the bins have not been washed out;
 - c. Parking lot, alley, sidewalk and street areas to verify that floormats, filters and garbage containers are not washed in those areas and that no washwater is poured in those areas;
 - d. Parking lot areas to verify that they are cleaned by sweeping, not by hosing down and that the facility operator uses dry methods for spill cleanup; and,
 - e. Inspection of existing devices designed to separate grease from wastewater (e.g., grease traps or interceptors) to ensure adequate capacity and proper maintenance.

VII. ILLEGAL CONNECTIONS; LITTER, DEBRIS AND TRASH CONTROL

1. The permittees shall continue to prohibit all illegal connections to the MS4s through their ordinances, inspections, and monitoring programs. If routine inspections or dry weather monitoring indicate any illegal connections, they shall be investigated and eliminated or permitted within 120 days of discovery and identification.
2. All reports of spills, leaks, and/or illegal dumping shall be promptly investigated and, where appropriate, reported to the Executive Officer within 24 hours (those incidents which may pose an immediate threat to human health or the environment, e.g., sewage spills that could impact water contact recreation, an oil spill that could impact wild life, a hazardous substance spill where residents are evacuated, etc.) by phone or e-mail, with a written report within 5 days. At a minimum, all sewage spills above 1,000 gallons and all reportable quantities of hazardous waste spills as per 40CFR 117 and 302 shall be reported within 24 hours and all other spill incidents shall be included in the annual report. The permittees

⁷ Hazardous Material is defined as any substrate that poses a threat to human health or the environment due to its toxicity, corrosiveness, ignitability, explosive nature or chemical reactivity. These also include materials named by EPA to be reported if a designed quantity of the material is spilled into the waters of the United States or emitted into the environment.

⁸ Toxic Material is a chemical or a mixture that may present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

may propose a reporting program, including reportable incidents and quantities, jointly with other agencies, such as the County Health Care Agency, for approval by the Executive Officer.

3. The permittees shall continue to implement appropriate control measures to reduce and/or to eliminate the discharge of trash and debris to waters of the U.S. These control measures shall be reported in the annual report.
4. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall review their litter/trash control ordinances to determine the need for any revision. The permittees are encouraged to characterize trash, determine its main source(s) and develop and implement appropriate BMPs to control trash in urban runoff. The findings of this review shall be included in the annual report for 2002-2003.
5. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall determine the need for any additional debris control measures. The findings shall be included in the annual report for 2002-2003.

VIII. MUNICIPAL INSPECTIONS OF CONSTRUCTION SITES

1. Each permittee shall develop by October 15, 2002, an inventory of all construction sites within its jurisdiction for which building or grading permits are issued and activities at the site include: soil movement; uncovered storage of materials or wastes, such as dirt, sand or fertilizer; or exterior mixing of cementaceous products, such as concrete, mortar or stucco. Sites will be included regardless of whether the construction site is subject to the California Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Permit) or other individual NPDES permit. This database shall be updated prior to each rainy season thereafter. This inventory shall be maintained in a computer-based database system and shall include relevant information on site ownership, General Permit WDID # (if any), size, location, etc. Inclusion of a Geographical Information System (GIS) is recommended but not required.
2. To establish priorities for inspection requirements under this Order, the permittees shall prioritize construction sites within their jurisdiction as a high, medium or low threat to water quality. Evaluation of construction sites should be based on such factors as soil erosion potential, project size, proximity and sensitivity of receiving waters and any other relevant factors. At a minimum, high priority construction sites shall include: sites over 50 acres; sites over 5 acres that are tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) waters listed for sediment or turbidity impairments; and sites that are tributary to and within 500 feet of an area defined by the Ocean Plan as an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).
3. Each permittee shall conduct construction site inspections for compliance with its ordinances (grading, Water Quality Management Plans, etc.) and local permits (construction, grading, etc.). Inspections shall include a review of erosion control and BMP implementation plans and an evaluation of the effectiveness and maintenance of the BMPs identified. Inspection frequency will, at a minimum, include the following:
 - a. During the wet season (i.e., October 1 through April 30 of each year), all high priority sites are to be inspected, in their entirety, once a month. All medium priority sites are to be inspected at least twice during the wet season. All low priority sites are to be

inspected at least once during the wet season. When BMPs or BMP maintenance is deemed inadequate or out of compliance, an inspection frequency of once every week will be maintained until BMPs and BMP maintenance are brought into compliance. During the 2001-2002 wet season, prior to the development of the inventory database, all construction sites must be visited at least twice. If a site is deemed out of compliance, an inspection frequency adequate to bring the site into compliance must be maintained;

- b. During the dry season (i.e., May 1 through September 30 of each year), all construction sites shall be inspected at a frequency sufficient to ensure that sediment and other pollutants are properly controlled and that unauthorized, non-storm water discharges are prevented; and,
 - c. Information including, at a minimum, inspection dates, inspectors present and the results of the inspection, must be maintained in the database identified in Section VIII.1 or must be linked to that database. A copy of this database must be provided to the Regional Board with each annual report.
4. Each permittee shall enforce its ordinances and permits at all construction sites, as necessary, to maintain compliance with this Order. Sanctions for non-compliance must include: monetary penalties, bonding requirements and/or permit denial or revocation.
 5. Within 24 hours of discovery, each permittee shall provide oral or e-mail notification to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board of non-compliant sites within their jurisdiction that are determined to pose a threat to human health or the environment (e.g., sewage spills that could impact water contact recreation, an oil spill that could impact wildlife, a hazardous substance spill where residents are evacuated, etc.). Following oral notification, a written report must be submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board within 10 days, detailing the nature of the non-compliance, any corrective action taken by the site owner, other relevant information (e.g., past history of non-compliance, environmental damage resulting from the non-compliance, site owner responsiveness) and the type of enforcement that will be carried out by the permittee. Further, incidences of non-compliance shall be recorded along with the information noted in the written report and the final outcome/enforcement for the incident in the database identified in Sections VIII.1 and 3.c or must be linked to these databases.
 6. The inspectors responsible for ensuring compliance at construction sites shall be trained in and have an understanding of: federal, state and local water quality laws and regulations as they apply to construction and grading activities; the potential effects of construction and urbanization on water quality; and implementation and maintenance of erosion control BMPs and sediment control BMPs and the applicable use of both. Each permittee shall have adequately trained its inspection staff by October 15, 2002, and on an annual basis, prior to the rainy season, thereafter. Training programs should be coordinated with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and prior notification of training shall be provided to Regional Board staff. New hires or transfers that will be performing construction inspections for the permittees must be trained within one month of starting inspection duties.

7. The permittees need not inspect facilities already inspected by Regional Board staff if the inspection was conducted within the specified time period.

IX. MUNICIPAL INSPECTIONS OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

1. Each permittee shall develop by July 1, 2003, an inventory of industrial facilities within its jurisdiction with business permits or other authorization by permittees, that have the potential to discharge pollutants to the MS4. Facilities will be listed, regardless of whether the facility is subject to the California Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (General Industrial Permit) or other individual NPDES permit. This database must be updated on an annual basis. This inventory must be maintained in a computer-based database system and must include relevant information on ownership, SIC code(s), General Industrial Permit WDID # (if any), size, location, etc. Inclusion of a Geographical Information System (GIS) is recommended but not required.
2. To establish priorities for inspection requirements under this Order, the permittees shall prioritize industrial facilities within their jurisdiction as a high, medium or low threat to water quality. Evaluation of these facilities should be based on such factors as type of industrial activities (SIC codes), materials or wastes used or stored outside, pollutant discharge potential, facility size, proximity and sensitivity of receiving waters and any other relevant factors. At a minimum, a high priority shall be assigned to: facilities subject to section 313 of Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA); facilities requiring coverage under the General Industrial Permit; facilities with a high potential for, or history of, unauthorized, non-storm water discharges; and facilities that are tributary to, and within 500 feet of, an area defined by the Ocean Plan as an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).
3. Each permittee shall conduct industrial facility inspections for compliance with its ordinances and permits. Inspections shall include a review of material and waste handling and storage practices, pollutant control BMP implementation and maintenance and evidence of past or present unauthorized, non-storm water discharges. All high priority facilities identified in IX.2 shall be inspected and a report on these inspections shall be submitted by November 15, 2003 and a report of inspections during subsequent years shall be included in the annual report for that year.
4. After July 1, 2003, all high priority sites are to be inspected at least once a year; all medium priority sites are to be inspected at least once every two years; and all low priority sites are to be inspected at least once per permit cycle. In the event that inappropriate material or waste handling or storage practices are observed or there is evidence of past or present unauthorized, non-storm water discharges, an inspection frequency adequate to bring the site into compliance must be maintained (at a minimum, once a month). Once compliance is achieved, a minimum inspection frequency of once every four months will be maintained for the next calendar year.
5. By July 1, 2005, each permittee shall identify the remaining industrial facilities that do not have business permits or other authorization by the permittees. These facilities shall be

added to the database identified in Section IX.1 and shall be prioritized in accordance with the specifications identified in Section IX.2.

6. Information including, at a minimum, inspection dates, inspectors present and the results of the inspection must be maintained in the database identified in Section IX.1 or must be linked to that database. A copy of this database must be provided to the Regional Board with each annual report.
7. Each permittee shall enforce its ordinances and permits at all industrial facilities as necessary to maintain compliance with this Order. Sanctions for non-compliance must include: monetary penalties, bonding requirements and/or permit denial or revocation.
8. Within 24 hours, each permittee shall provide oral or e-mail notification to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board of non-compliant facilities within their jurisdiction that are determined to pose a threat to human health or the environment (e.g., sewage spills that could impact water contact recreation, an oil spill that could impact wildlife, a hazardous substance spill where residents are evacuated, etc.). Following oral notification, a written report must be submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board within 10 days, detailing the nature of the non-compliance, any corrective action taken by the site owner, other relevant information (e.g., past history of non-compliance, environmental damage resulting from the non-compliance, facility owner responsiveness) and the type of enforcement that will be carried out by the permittee. Further, incidences of non-compliance shall be recorded along with the information noted in the written report and the final outcome/enforcement for the incident, in the database identified in Section IX.1.
9. The inspectors responsible for ensuring compliance at industrial facilities shall be trained in and have an understanding of: federal, state and local water quality laws and regulations as they apply to industrial activities; the potential effects of industrial discharges and urbanization on water quality; and implementation and maintenance of pollutant control BMPs. Each permittee shall have adequately trained their inspection staff by July 1, 2003, and on an annual basis thereafter. Training programs should be coordinated with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and prior notification of training shall be provided to Regional Board staff. New hires or transfers that will be performing industrial inspections for the permittees must be trained within one month of starting inspection duties.
10. The permittees need not inspect facilities already inspected by Regional Board staff, if the inspection was conducted within the specified time period.

X. MUNICIPAL INSPECTIONS OF COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

1. Each permittee shall develop by July 1, 2003, an inventory of the following commercial facilities/companies listed below within its jurisdiction. This database must be updated on an annual basis. This inventory must be maintained in a computer-based database system and must include relevant information on ownership, size, location, etc. Inclusion of a Geographical Information System (GIS) is recommended but not required.

- a. Automobile mechanical repair, maintenance, fueling or cleaning;
 - b. Automobile and other vehicle body repair or painting;
 - c. Mobile automobile or other vehicle washing;
 - d. Mobile carpet, drape or furniture cleaning;
 - e. Mobile high pressure or steam cleaning;
 - f. Painting and coating;
 - g. Nurseries and greenhouses;
 - h. Landscape and hardscape installation;
 - i. Pool, lake and fountain cleaning;
 - j. Other commercial sites/sources that the Permittee determines may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4; and,
 - k. Any commercial sites or sources that are tributary to and within 500 feet of an area defined by the Ocean Plan as an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).
2. To establish priorities for inspection requirements under this Order, the permittees shall prioritize commercial facilities/companies within their jurisdiction as a high, medium or low threat to water quality based on such factors as the type, magnitude and location of the commercial activity, potential for discharge of pollutants to the MS4 and any history of unauthorized, non-storm water discharges.
 3. Each permittee shall conduct commercial facility inspections for compliance with its ordinances and permits. Inspections shall include a review of material and waste handling and storage practices, pollutant control BMP implementation and maintenance and evidence of past or present unauthorized, non-storm water discharges.
 4. After July 1, 2003, each permittee shall establish inspection frequencies and priorities as determined by the threat to water quality prioritization described in X.2. In the event that inappropriate material or waste handling or storage practices are observed, or there is evidence of past or present unauthorized, non-storm water discharges, an inspection frequency adequate to bring the site into compliance must be maintained.
 5. By July 1, 2004, all high priority sites shall be inspected at least once.

6. Information including, at a minimum, inspection dates, inspectors present and the results of the inspection must be maintained in the database identified in Section X.1 or must be linked to that database. A copy of this database must be provided to the Regional Board with each annual report.
7. Each permittee shall enforce its ordinances and permits at commercial facilities. Sanctions for non-compliance must include: monetary penalties, bonding requirements and/or permit denial or revocation.
8. Within 24 hours, each permittee shall provide oral or e-mail notification to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board of non-compliant facilities within their jurisdiction, that are determined to pose a threat to human health or the environment (e.g., sewage spills that could impact water contact recreation, an oil spill that could impact wildlife, a hazardous substance spill where residents are evacuated, etc.). Following oral notification, a written report must be submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board within 5 days. For incidents that do not pose a threat to human or environmental health, the permittees shall submit a written report within 30 days of the incident. All written reports shall detail the nature of the non-compliance, identify any corrective action taken by the site owner, note other relevant information (e.g., past history of non-compliance, environmental damage resulting from the non-compliance, facility owner responsiveness) and the type of enforcement that will be carried out by the permittee. Further, incidences of non-compliance shall be recorded along with the information noted in the written report and the final outcome/enforcement for the incident in the database identified in Section X.1.
9. The inspectors responsible for ensuring compliance at commercial facilities shall be trained in, and have an understanding of, Federal, State and local water quality laws and regulations as they apply to industrial and commercial activities; the potential effects of industrial discharge and urbanization on water quality; and implementation and maintenance of pollutant control BMPs. Each permittee shall have adequately trained their inspection staff by July 1, 2003 and on an annual basis thereafter. Training programs should be coordinated with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and prior notification of training shall be provided to Regional Board staff. New hires or transfers that will be performing commercial inspections for the permittees must be trained within one month of starting inspection duties.
10. The permittees need not inspect facilities already inspected by Regional Board staff if the inspection was conducted within the specified time period.

XI. SEPTIC SYSTEM FAILURES AND PORTABLE TOILET DISCHARGES

1. By July 1, 2003, the permittees, whose jurisdictions have 50 or more septic tank or sub-surface disposal systems in use, shall identify with the appropriate governing agency, a mechanism to determine the effect of septic system failures on storm water quality and a mechanism to address such failures.

2. By July 1, 2003, the principal permittee shall review the permittees' current oversight programs for portable toilets to determine the need for any revision.

XII. NEW DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING SIGNIFICANT RE-DEVELOPMENT)

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

1. By July 1, 2002, the permittees shall establish a mechanism to ensure (prior to issuance of any local permits or other approvals) that all construction sites that are required to obtain coverage under the State's General Storm Water Permit for construction sites have filed with the State Board a Notice of Intent to be covered by the relevant general permit.
2. Each permittee shall minimize the short and long-term impacts on receiving water quality from new developments and re-developments, as required in Section XII.B.1., below. In order to reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new developments and re-developments to the maximum extent practicable, permittees should, at a minimum:
 - a. Review General Plan/CEQA Processes
 - b. Modify the Project Approval Process
 - c. Conduct Public/Business Education
3. By December 19, 2002, the permittees shall review their planning procedures and CEQA document preparation processes to ensure that urban runoff-related issues are properly considered and addressed. If necessary, these processes should be revised by that date to consider and mitigate impacts to storm water quality. These changes may include revising the General Plan, modifying the project approval processes, including a section on urban runoff related water quality issues in an addendum CEQA checklist, and conducting training for project proponents. The findings of this review and the actions taken by the permittees shall be reported to the Regional Board by January 2, 2003. The following potential impacts shall be considered during CEQA review:
 - a. Potential impact of project construction on storm water runoff;
 - b. Potential impact of project's post-construction activity on storm water runoff;
 - c. Potential for discharge of storm water pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas;
 - d. Potential for discharge of storm water to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters;
 - e. Potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff to cause environmental harm; and,
 - f. Potential for significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas.

4. By July 1, 2004, the permittees shall review their watershed protection principles and policies in their General Plan or related documents (such as Development Standards, Zoning Codes, Conditions of Approval, Development Project Guidance) to ensure that these principals and policies are properly considered and are incorporated into these documents. The findings of this review and the actions taken by the permittees shall be reported to the Regional Board by November 15, 2004. These principles and policies should include, but not be limited to, the following considerations:
 - a. Limit disturbance of natural water bodies and drainage systems; conserve natural areas; protect slopes and channels; and minimize impacts from storm water and urban runoff on the biological integrity of natural drainage systems and water bodies;
 - b. Minimize changes in hydrology and pollutant loading; require incorporation of controls, including structural and non-structural BMPs, to mitigate the projected increases in pollutant loads and flows; ensure that post-development runoff rates and velocities from a site have no significant adverse impact on downstream erosion and stream habitat; minimize the quantity of storm water directed to impermeable surfaces and the MS4s; and maximize the percentage of permeable surfaces to allow more percolation of storm water into the ground;
 - c. Preserve wetlands, riparian corridors, and buffer zones and establish reasonable limits on the clearing of vegetation from the project site;
 - d. Encourage the use of water quality wetlands, biofiltration swales, watershed-scale retrofits, etc., where such measures are likely to be effective and technically and economically feasible;
 - e. Provide for appropriate permanent measures to reduce storm water pollutant loads in storm water from the development site; and,
 - f. Establish development guidelines for areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.
5. Each permittee shall provide the Regional Board with the draft amendment or revision when a pertinent General Plan element or the General Plan is noticed for comment in accordance with Govt. Code § 65350 et seq.
6. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall review and, as necessary, revise their current grading/erosion control ordinances in order to reduce erosion caused by new development or significant re-development projects.
7. The permittees shall, through conditions of approval, ensure proper maintenance and operation of any permanent flood control structures installed in new developments. The parties responsible for the maintenance and operation of the facilities and a funding mechanism for operation and maintenance, shall be identified prior to approval of the project.
8. By November 15, 2003, the principal permittee shall submit a proposal for a study to evaluate the effectiveness of a group of selected BMPs for controlling erosion during

new development. Based on the results of this study, one or more BMPs will be identified as (a) County-preferred BMP(s) for erosion control during new development. This proposal shall include details of the new development project site, the BMPs selected for the study, and a proposed schedule. The proposed and final BMP selection shall be approved by the Regional Board Executive Officer and the study shall be completed by the end of this permit term.

9. The permittees shall continue to implement the new development BMPs (DAMP, Appendix G) and BMPs for public works construction (DAMP, Appendix H).
10. Within six months of adoption of this order, the permittees shall review their DAMP to determine the need for:
 - a. Re-establishing the New Development Task Force
 - b. Establishing a Water Quality Plan verification program.

**B. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (WQMP) FOR URBAN RUNOFF
(FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT/SIGNIFICANT REDEVELOPMENT):**

1. By March 1, 2003, the permittees shall review their existing BMPs for New Developments (Appendix G of the DAMP) and submit for review and approval by the Executive Officer, a revised WQMP for urban runoff from new developments/significant re-developments for the type of projects listed below:
 - a. All significant re-development projects, where significant re-development is defined as the addition of 5,000 or more square feet of impervious surface on an already developed site. This includes additional buildings and/or structures, extension of existing footprint of a building, construction of parking lots, etc.
 - b. Home subdivisions of 10 units or more. This includes single family residences, multi-family residences, condominiums, apartments, etc.
 - c. Commercial and industrial developments of 100,000 square feet or more. This includes non-residential developments such as hospitals, educational institutions (to the extent the permittees have authority to regulate these developments), recreational facilities, mini-malls, hotels, office buildings, warehouses, and light & heavy industrial facilities.
 - d. Automotive repair shops (with SIC codes 5013, 5014, 5541, 7532-7534, 7536-7539).
 - e. Restaurants where the land area of development is 5,000 square feet or more.
 - f. All hillside developments on 10,000 square feet or more, which are located on areas with known erosive soil conditions or where the natural slope is twenty-five percent or more.
 - g. Developments of 2,500 square feet of impervious surface or more adjacent to (within 200 feet) or discharging directly into environmentally sensitive areas, such

as areas designated in the Ocean Plan as areas of special biological significance or waterbodies listed on the CWA Section 303(d) list of impaired waters.

- h. Parking lots of 5,000 square feet or more exposed to storm water. Parking lot is defined as a land area or facility for the temporary storage of motor vehicles.
2. The permittees are encouraged to include in the WQMP the development and implementation of regional and/or watershed management programs that address runoff from new development and significant re-development. The WQMP shall include BMPs for source control, pollution prevention, and/or structural treatment BMPs. For all structural treatment controls, the WQMP shall identify the responsible party for maintenance of the treatment system, and a funding source or sources for its operation and maintenance. The goal of the WQMP is to develop and implement practicable programs and policies to minimize the effects of urbanization on site hydrology, urban runoff flow rates or velocities and pollutant loads. This goal may be achieved through watershed-based structural treatment controls, in combination with site-specific BMPs. The WQMP shall reflect consideration of the following goals, which may be addressed through on-site-and/or watershed-based BMPs.
 - a. The pollutants in post-development runoff shall be reduced using controls that utilize best available technology (BAT) and best conventional technology (BCT).
 - b. The discharge of any listed pollutant to an impaired waterbody on the 303(d) list shall not cause an exceedence of receiving water quality objectives.
3. During the time that the WQMP is being revised, the permittees shall implement their existing requirements for new development (Appendix G of the DAMP). If the Executive Officer does not approve the revised WQMP by October 1, 2003, as meeting the goals proposed in XII.B.2, above and providing an equivalent or superior degree of treatment as the sized criteria outlined in XII.B.3.A, B and C, below, structural BMPs shall be required for all new development and significant redevelopment². Minimum structural BMPs must either be sized to comply with one of the following numeric sizing criteria or be deemed by the Principal Permittee to provide equivalent or superior treatment, either on a site basis or a watershed basis:

A. Volume

Volume-based BMPs shall be designed to infiltrate, filter, or treat either:

1. The volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour, 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the local historical rainfall record; or,
2. The volume of annual runoff produced by the 85th percentile, 24-hour rainfall event, determined as the maximized capture storm water volume for

² Where new development is defined as projects for which tentative tract or parcel map approval was not received by July 1, 2003 and new re-development is defined as projects for which all necessary permits were not issued by July 1, 2003. New development does not include projects receiving map approvals after July 1, 2003 that are proceeding under a common scheme of development that was the subject of a tentative tract or parcel map approval that occurred prior to July 1, 2003.

the area, from the formula recommended in Urban Runoff Quality Management, WEF Manual of Practice No. 23/ASCE Manual of Practice No. 87 (1998); or,

3. The volume of annual runoff based on unit basin storage volume, to achieve 80% or more volume treatment by the method recommended in California Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook – Industrial/Commercial (1993); or,
4. The volume of runoff, as determined from the local historical rainfall record, that achieves approximately the same reduction in pollutant loads and flows as achieved by mitigation of the 85th percentile, 24-hour runoff event;

OR

B. Flow

Flow-based BMPs shall be designed to infiltrate, filter, or treat either:

1. The maximum flow rate of runoff produced from a rainfall intensity of 0.2 inch of rainfall per hour; or,
2. The maximum flow rate of runoff produced by the 85th percentile hourly rainfall intensity, as determined from the local historical rainfall record, multiplied by a factor of two; or,
3. The maximum flow rate of runoff, as determined from the local historical rainfall record, that achieves approximately the same reduction in pollutant loads and flows as achieved by mitigation of the 85th percentile hourly rainfall intensity multiplied by a factor of two.

C. Groundwater Protection

Any structural infiltration BMPs shall meet the following minimum requirements:

1. Use of structural infiltration treatment BMPs shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of groundwater water quality objectives.
2. Source control and pollution prevention control BMPs shall be implemented to protect groundwater quality.
3. Structural infiltration treatment BMPs shall not cause a nuisance or pollution, as defined in Water Code Section 13050 .
4. The permittees may propose any equivalent sizing criteria for treatment BMPs or other controls that will achieve greater or substantially similar pollution control benefits. In the absence of approved equivalent sizing criteria, the permittees shall implement the above stated sizing criteria.
5. If a particular BMP is not technically feasible, other BMPs should be implemented to achieve the same level of compliance, or if the cost of BMP implementation greatly outweighs the pollution control benefits, the permittees may grant a waiver of the numeric sizing criteria. All waivers, along with waiver justification documentation,

must be reported to the Regional Board in writing within 30 days. The permittees may propose to establish an urban runoff fund to be used for urban water quality improvement projects within the same watershed that is funded by contributions from developers granted waivers. If it is determined by the Regional Board that waivers are being inappropriately granted, this Order may be reopened to modify these waiver conditions.

6. The obligation to install minimum structural BMPs at new development is met if, for a common scheme of development, BMPs are constructed with the requisite capacity to serve the entire common scheme, even if certain phases of the common scheme may not have BMP capacity located on that phase in accordance with the requirements specified above.

XIII. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

1. The permittees shall continue to implement the public education efforts already underway and shall implement the most effective elements of the comprehensive public and business education strategy contained in the Report of Waste Discharge/DAMP. By July 1, 2002, the permittees shall complete a public awareness survey to determine the effectiveness of the current public and business education strategy and provide a future action plan.
2. When feasible, the permittees shall participate in joint outreach with other programs including, but not limited to, the State of California Storm Water Quality Task Force, Caltrans and other municipal storm water programs to ensure that a consistent message on storm water pollution prevention is disseminated to the public. The permittees shall sponsor or staff a storm water table or booth at community, regional, and/or countywide events to distribute public education materials to the public. Each permittee shall participate in at least one event per year.
3. By March 1, 2002, the permittees shall establish a Public Education Committee to provide oversight and guidance for the implementation of the public education program. The Public Education Committee shall meet at least twice per year. The Public Education Committee shall make recommendations for any changes to the public and business education program. The goal of the public and business education program shall be to target 100% of the residents, including businesses, commercial and industrial establishments. Through use of local print, radio and television, the permittees must ensure that the public and business education program makes a minimum of 10 million impressions per year and that those impressions measurably increase the knowledge and measurably change the behavior of the targeted groups. By November 15, 2002, the Public Education Committee shall propose a study for measuring changes in knowledge and behavior as a result of the education program. Upon approval by the Regional Board Executive Officer, the study shall be completed by the end of the permit cycle. By July 1, 2002, the Public Education Committee shall develop BMP guidance for restaurants, automotive service centers and gasoline service stations for the industrial facility inspectors to distribute to these facilities during inspections. Further, for restaurant, automotive service centers and gasoline service station corporate chains, information is to be developed that will be provided to corporate

environmental managers during outreach visits that will take place twice during the permit term.

4. By July 1, 2002, the permittees shall develop public education materials to encourage the public to report (including a hotline number and web site to report) illegal dumping and unauthorized, non-storm water discharges from residential, industrial, construction and commercial sites into public streets, storm drains and other waterbodies; clogged storm drains; faded or missing catch basin stencils and general storm water and BMP information. This hotline and web site shall be included in the public and business education program and shall be listed in the governmental pages of all regional phone books.
5. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall develop BMP guidance for the control of those potentially polluting activities not otherwise regulated by any agency including guidelines for the household use of fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and other chemicals, and guidance for mobile vehicle maintenance, carpet cleaners, commercial landscape maintenance, and pavement cutting. These guidance documents shall be distributed to the public, trade associations, etc., through participation in community events, trade association meetings and/or mail.
6. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall conduct an evaluation to determine the best method of establishing a mechanism(s) for providing educational and General Industrial Permit materials to businesses within their jurisdiction.

XIV. MUNICIPAL FACILITIES/ACTIVITIES

1. Each permittee shall implement the recommendations in the Environmental Performance Report to ensure that public agency facilities and activities do not cause or contribute to a pollution or nuisance in receiving waters. By July 1 of each year, the permittees shall review all their activities and facilities to determine the need for any revisions to the Environmental Performance Reports. The annual report shall include the findings of this review and a schedule for any needed revisions. All revisions should consider a pollution prevention strategy to ensure that the public agency facilities and/or activities that are currently not required to obtain coverage under the State's general storm water permits reduce the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the U.S. to the maximum extent practicable.
2. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall complete an assessment of their flood control facilities to evaluate opportunities to configure and/or to reconfigure channel segments to function as pollution control devices and to optimize beneficial uses. These modifications may include in-channel sediment basins, bank stabilization, water treatment wetlands, etc. This shall be reported in the 2002-2003 annual report.
3. By July 1, 2002, the principal permittee shall develop and distribute model maintenance procedures for public agency activities such as street sweeping; catch basin stenciling; drainage facility inspection, cleaning and maintenance, etc. This shall be reported in the 2001-2002 annual report.

4. By July 1, 2002, the principal permittee shall develop and distribute BMP guidance for public agency and contract field operations and maintenance staff to provide guidance in appropriate pollution control measures, how to respond to spills and reports of illegal discharges, etc. This shall be reported in the 2001-2002 annual report.
5. At least on an annual basis, the principal permittee shall provide training to public agency staff and to contract field operations staff on fertilizer and pesticide management, model maintenance procedures, implementation of environmental performance reporting program and other pollution control measures. Each permittee shall attend at least three of these training sessions during the five year term of this permit (from 2001 to 2006).
6. By July 1, 2002, the principal permittee shall develop a model maintenance procedure for drainage facilities. This shall be included in the 2001-2002 annual report. Each permittee shall inspect, clean and maintain at least 80% of its drainage facilities on an annual basis, with 100% of the facilities included in a two-year period, using the model maintenance procedures developed by the principal permittee. This shall be included in the annual report.
7. By July 1, 2004, the permittees shall develop and submit for approval by the Executive Officer, a more aggressive program for cleaning out drainage facilities, including catch basins. This program should be based on a list of drainage facilities, prioritized on such factors as distance to receiving water, receiving water beneficial uses and impairments of beneficial uses, historical pollutant types and loads from past inspections/cleanings and the presence of downstream regional facilities that would remove the types of pollutants found in the drainage facility. Using this list, the permittees shall propose clean out schedules for all drainage facilities with a minimum frequency of once a year and a maximum frequency of monthly, during the storm season. The permittees should be prepared to implement the approved clean out program beginning with the 2004-2005 storm season.
8. By July 1, 2002, the permittees shall evaluate the applicability of the Environmental Performance Program to municipal maintenance contracts, contract for field maintenance operations, and leases. This shall be included in the 2001-2002 annual report.

XV. MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS/ACTIVITIES

1. This order authorizes the discharge of storm water runoff from construction projects that may result in land disturbance of five (5) acres or more (or less than five acres, if it is part of a larger common plan of development or sale which is five acres or more) that are under ownership and/or direct responsibility of any of the permittees. All permittee construction activities shall be in accordance with DAMP, Appendix H.
2. Prior to commencement of construction activities, the permittees shall notify the Executive Officer of the Regional Board of the proposed construction project. Upon completion of the construction project, the Executive Officer shall be notified of the completion of the project.
3. The permittees shall develop and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program that is specific for the construction project, prior to the

commencement of any of the construction activities. The SWPPP shall be kept at the construction site and released to the public and/or Regional Board staff upon request.

4. The SWPPP and the monitoring program for the construction projects shall be consistent with the requirements of the latest version of the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit.
5. The permittees shall give advance notice to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board of any planned changes in the construction activity, which may result in non-compliance with the latest version of the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit.
6. All other terms and conditions of the latest version of the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit shall be applicable.

XVI. SUB-WATERSHEDS AND TMDL IMPLEMENTATION

1. The permittees shall meet the following target load allocations for nutrients in urban runoff by implementing the BMPs contained in Appendix N (DAMP, Section 12) and in accordance with the approved TMDL implementation plan incorporated in the Basin Plan.

(This section intentionally left blank.)

Table 1. Seasonal Load Allocations of Total Nitrogen for the Newport Bay Watershed

Nutrient TMDL	1990-1997 Loading	2002 Summer Allocation (Apr-Sept) ⁵	2007 Summer Allocation (Apr-Sept) ⁵	2012 Winter Allocation (Oct-Mar) ^{4,5,6}
Newport Bay Watershed	lbs/year TN ^{1,2}	lbs/season TN	lbs/season TN	lbs/season TN
Wasteload Allocation				
Urban runoff	277,131 ³	20,785	16,628	55,442
		5 year target	10 year target	15 year target

¹ TIN = (NO₃+NH₃).

² TN = (TIN + Organic N).

³ Estimated annual average (summer and winter loading).

⁴ Total nitrogen winter loading limit applies between October 1 and March 31 when the mean daily flow rate at San Diego Creek at Campus Drive is below 50 cubic feet per second (cfs), and when the mean daily flow rate in San Diego Creek at Campus Drive is above 50 cubic feet per second (cfs), but not as the result of precipitation.

⁵ Compliance to be achieved no later than this date. The Regional Board may require earlier compliance with these targets when it is feasible and reasonable.

⁶ Assumes 67 non-storm days.

Table 2. Annual Total Phosphorous Load Allocations For The Newport Bay Watershed

	2002 Allocation lbs/year TP ¹	2007 Allocation lbs/year TP ¹
TMDL	86,912	62,080
Urban areas	4,102	2,960

¹ Compliance to be achieved no later than this date. The Regional Board may require earlier compliance with these targets when it is feasible and reasonable.

Table 3. Annual Total Nitrogen Load Allocations For San Diego Creek, Reach 2 During Non-Storm Conditions.¹

	2012 Allocation lbs/day TN ²
TMDL	14 lbs/day (TN)
Waste Load Allocation (Urban runoff)	5.5 lbs/day (TN)

¹ Total nitrogen loading limit applies when the mean daily flow rate at San Diego Creek at Culver Drive is below 25 cubic feet per second (cfs), and when the mean daily flow rate in San Diego Creek at Culver Drive is above 25 cubic feet per second (cfs), but not as the result of precipitation.

² Compliance to be achieved no later than this date. The Regional Board may require earlier compliance with these targets when it is feasible and reasonable.

2. The permittees shall meet the following target load allocations for sediment in urban runoff by implementing the BMPs contained in Appendix N of the DAMP and the "March 1999 Technical Report on the Implementation of the TMDL for Sediment in the Newport Bay Watershed, the October 1999 Preliminary Sediment Load Allocation Analysis for San Diego Creek and Newport Bay, and the February 2000 Sediment Yield and Transport Investigation for San Diego Creek and Newport Bay".
 - a. The load allocations for sediment discharges to Newport Bay from urban areas shall not exceed 2,500 tons per year, implemented as a 10-year running annual average.
 - b. The load allocations for sediment discharges to San Diego Creek and its tributaries from urban areas shall not exceed 2,500 tons per year, implemented as a 10-year running annual average.
3. The permittees shall revise Appendix N of the DAMP to include implementation measures and schedules for further studies related to the TMDL for fecal coliform in Newport Bay, as set fourth in the January 2000, March 2000 and April 2000 Newport Bay Fecal Coliform TMDL Technical Reports submitted by the permittees.
4. This order may be reopened to include additional requirements based on new or revised TMDLs.

XVII. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/DAMP REVIEW

1. By July 1 of each year, the permittees shall evaluate the DAMP to determine whether any revisions are necessary in order to reduce pollutants in MS4 discharges to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the first annual review after adoption of this order shall include the following:
 - a. Review of the formal training needs of municipal employees
 - b. Review of coordinating meeting/training for the designated NPDES inspectors.
2. The annual report shall include the findings of this review and a schedule for any needed revisions or a copy of the amended DAMP with the proposed changes.

3. The permittees shall modify the DAMP, at the direction of the Regional Board Executive Officer, to, as necessary, incorporate additional provisions. Such provisions may include regional and watershed-specific requirements and/or waste load allocations developed and approved pursuant to the TMDL process.
4. The Permittee Committee shall meet at least six times a year to discuss issues related to permit implementation and regional and statewide issues. Each permittee's designated representative or a designated alternate should attend at least 75% of these meetings.

XVIII. FISCAL RESOURCES

1. The permittees shall prepare and submit a unified fiscal analysis to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board. The fiscal analysis shall be submitted with the Annual Report document no later than November 15th of each year and shall, at a minimum, include the following:
 - a. Each permittee's expenditures for the previous fiscal year,
 - b. Each permittee's budget for the current fiscal year,
 - c. A description of the source of funds, and
 - d. Each permittee's estimated budget for the next fiscal year.

XIX. PROVISIONS

1. All reports submitted by the permittees as per the requirements in this Order for the approval of the Executive Officer shall be publicly noticed and made available on the Regional Board's website, or through other means, for public review and comments. The Executive Officer shall consider all comments received prior to approval of the reports. Any unresolved significant issues shall be scheduled for a public hearing at a Regional Board meeting prior to approval by the Executive Officer.
2. The purpose of this Order is to require the implementation of best management practices to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 in order to support reasonable further progress towards attainment of water quality objectives.

Permittees shall demonstrate compliance with all the requirements in this order and specifically with Section III.2 Discharge Limitations and Section IV. Receiving Water Limitations, through timely implementation of their DAMP and any modifications, revisions, or amendments developed pursuant to this order approved by the Executive Officer or determined by the permittee to be necessary to meet the requirements of this order. The DAMP, as included in the Report of Waste Discharge, including any approved amendments thereto, is hereby made an enforceable component of this order.
3. The permittees shall, at a minimum, implement all elements of the DAMP. Where the dates in the DAMP are different than those of this order, the dates in this order shall prevail. Any proposed revisions to the DAMP shall be submitted with the Annual

Report to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board for review and approval. All approved revisions to the DAMP shall be implemented as per the time schedules approved by the Executive Officer. In addition to those specific controls and actions required by (1) the terms of this Order and (2) the DAMP, each permittee shall implement additional controls, if any are necessary, to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable as required by this Order.

4. The permittees shall comply with Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2002-0010, and any revisions thereto, which is hereby made a part of this order. The Executive Officer is authorized to revise the Monitoring and Reporting Program to allow the permittees to participate in regional, statewide, national or other monitoring programs in lieu of or in addition to Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2002-0010.
5. By November 15, 2002, the permittees, in coordination with the Orange County Fire Chiefs Association, shall develop a list of appropriate BMPs to be implemented to reduce pollutants from training activities, fire hydrant/sprinkler testing or flushing, non-emergency fire fighting and any BMPs feasible for emergency fire fighting flows.
6. The permittees should consult the Orange County Vector Control District to ensure that structural treatment systems are designed to minimize the potential for vector breeding.
7. Upon approval by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board, all plans, reports and subsequent amendments required by this order shall be implemented and shall become an enforceable part of this order. Prior to approval by the Executive Officer, these plans, reports and amendments shall not be considered as an enforceable part of this order.
8. The permittees shall report to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board:
 - a. Any enforcement actions and discharges of storm or non-storm water, known to the permittees, which may have an impact on human health or the environment,
 - b. Any suspected or reported activities on federal, state, or other entity's land or facilities, where the permittees do not have any jurisdiction, and where the suspected or reported activities may be contributing pollutants to waters of the US.(Also see reporting requirements in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2002-0010)
9. The permit application and special NPDES program requirements contained in 40 CFR 122.21 (a), (b), (d)(2), (f), (p); 122.41 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l); and 122.42 (c) are incorporated into this order by reference.

XX. PERMIT EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL


1. This order expires on January 18, 2007 and the permittees must file a Report of Waste Discharge (permit application) no later than 180 days in advance of such expiration date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements. The Report of Waste Discharge shall, at a minimum, include the following:

- a. Any revisions to the Drainage Area Management Plan including, but not limited to, all the activities the permittees propose to undertake during the next permit term, goals and objectives of such activities, an evaluation of the need for additional source control and/or structural BMPs, any proposed pilot studies, etc.;
 - b. Changes in land use and/or population including land use map updates;
 - c. Any significant changes to the storm drain systems, outfalls, detention or retention basins or dams and other controls including map updates of the storm drain systems; and,
 - d. Any new or revised program elements and compliance schedule(s) necessary to comply with Section IV of this order.
2. This Order may be modified, revoked or reissued prior to its expiration date for the following reasons:
 - a. To address significant changes in conditions identified in the technical reports required by the Regional Board which were unknown at the time of the issuance of this order;
 - b. To incorporate applicable requirements of statewide water quality control plans adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board or any amendments to the Basin Plan approved by the Regional Board, the State Board and, if necessary, by the Office of Administrative Law;
 - c. To comply with any applicable requirements, guidelines, or regulations issued or approved under the Clean Water Act, if the requirements, guidelines, or regulations contain different conditions or additional requirements than those included in this order; or,
 - d. To incorporate any requirements imposed upon the permittees through the TMDL process.
3. This order shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit pursuant to Section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, and shall become effective ten days after the date of its adoption, provided the Regional Administrator of the U. S. EPA has no objections. If the Regional Administrator objects to its issuance, the permit shall not become effective until such objection is withdrawn.
4. Order No. 96-31 is hereby rescinded.

I, Gerard Thibeault, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, on January 18, 2002.


Gerard J. Thibeault
Executive Officer

Project Area




April 1973
 Revised: July 1978
 Revised: August 1988

State of California
 REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
 Santa Ana Region (8)
 SANTA ANA HYDROLOGIC BASIN PLANNING AREA (SA)



January 18, 2002

Order No. 01-20
Attachment "B"



Order No. 01-20 (NPDES No. CAS618030)
The County of Orange, OCFC, and Incorporated Cities
Area Wide Urban Storm Water Runoff

Order No. R8-2002-0010

Attachment "C"

**LIST OF OTHER ENTITIES WITH THE POTENTIAL TO DISCHARGE
POLLUTANTS TO THE ORANGE COUNTY STORM WATER SYSTEM**

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 12
Southern Pacific Railroad
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company
Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station
Seal Beach Naval Reserve Center, Los Alamitos
U. S. Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro
National Forest Service

Universities and Colleges

University of California, Irvine
California State University, Fullerton
Chapman College
Coastline College
Cypress College
Fullerton College
Irvine Valley College
Golden West College
Orange Coast College
Rancho Santiago College

School Districts

Anaheim Elementary School District
Anaheim Union High School District
Brea-Olinda Unified School District
Buena Park Joint Union High School District
Centralia Elementary School District
Cypress Elementary School District
Fountain Valley Union High School District
Fullerton Joint Union High School District
Garden Grove Unified School District
Huntington Beach Elementary School District
Huntington Beach Union High School District
Irvine Unified Union High School District
La Habra Joint Union High School District
Los Alamitos Unified School District
Lowell Joint Union High School District
Magnolia Elementary School District
Newport-Mesa Unified School District

Ocean View Union High School District
Orange Unified School District
Placentia Unified School District
Santa Ana Unified School District
Savanna Union High School District
Tustin Unified School District
Westminster Union High School District
Yorba Linda Joint Union High School District

Hospitals

Anaheim General Hospital
Brea Community Hospital
Chapman General Hospital
Children's Hospital of Orange County, Orange
Coastal Communities Hospital, Santa Ana
Fairview Hospital
FHP Hospital, Fountain Valley
Fountain Valley Regional Hospital and Medical Center
Hoag Hospital, Newport Beach
Kaiser Foundation Hospital, Anaheim
Orange County Community Hospital, Buena Park
Pacifica Community Hospital, Huntington Beach
Placentia Linda Community Hospital
Santa Ana Hospital and Medical Center
St. Joseph's Hospital, Orange
U.C. Irvine Medical Center
Vencor Hospital of Orange County, Westminster
Whittier Hospital and Medical Center, Buena Park

Water/Wastewater Agencies

Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Irvine Ranch Water District
Los Aliso Water District
El Toro Water District
San Bernardino County Flood Control District
Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
L.A. County Department of Public Works
County Sanitation Districts of Orange County
Orange County Water District
Metropolitan Water District

**California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region**

**Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R8-2002-0010
NPDES No. CAS618030**

for
**the County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District,
and
Incorporated Cities of Orange County Within the Santa Ana Region
Areawide Urban Storm Water Runoff**

I. GENERAL

1. Revisions of the monitoring and reporting program are appropriate to ensure that the permittees are in compliance with requirements and provisions contained in this order. Revisions may be made under the direction of the Executive Officer at any time during the term, and may include a reduction or increase in the number of parameters to be monitored, the frequency of monitoring, or the number and size of samples collected.
2. The Executive Officer is authorized to allow the permittees to participate in statewide, national, or other monitoring programs in lieu of this monitoring program.
3. All sample collection, handling, storage, and analysis shall be in accordance with 40 CFR Part 136 or other methods approved by the Executive Officer.
4. The permittees are authorized to complement their monitoring data with other monitoring sources, provided the monitoring conditions and sources are similar to those in the Santa Ana Watershed.

II. OBJECTIVES

The 1999 Water Quality Monitoring Program prioritized selected monitoring locations in Orange County based on a list of Critical Aquatic Resources and "Warm Spots". This prioritization is based on an analysis of prior years' monitoring data and other available data. It is expected that data collection for the 1999 monitoring program will be completed by July 1, 2003. The permittees also participate in the Regional Monitoring Program for San Diego Creek Nutrient TMDL and other regional monitoring programs, such as those conducted by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. The overall goal of these monitoring programs is to develop and support an effective watershed management program. The following are the major objectives:

1. To develop and support an effective municipal urban runoff and non-point source control program.
2. To define water quality status, trends, and pollutants of concern associated with urban storm water and non-storm water discharges and their impact on the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

3. To characterize pollutants associated with urban storm water and non-storm water discharges and to assess the influence of urban land uses on water quality and the beneficial uses of receiving waters.
4. To identify significant water quality problems related to urban storm water and non-storm water discharges.
5. To identify other sources of pollutants in storm water and non-storm water runoff to the maximum extent possible (e.g., atmospheric deposition, contaminated sediments, other non-point sources, etc.)
6. To identify and prohibit illicit discharges.
7. To identify those waters, which without additional action to control pollution from urban storm water discharges, cannot reasonably be expected to attain or maintain applicable water quality standards required to sustain the beneficial uses in the Basin Plan (TMDL monitoring).
8. To evaluate the effectiveness of existing municipal storm water quality management programs, including an estimate of pollutant reductions achieved by the structural and nonstructural BMPs implemented by the permittees.
9. To evaluate costs and benefits of proposed municipal storm water quality control programs to the stakeholders, including the public.

The Regional Board recognizes that these objectives may not be attainable during this permit period and authorizes the Executive Officer to evaluate and to determine adequate progress toward meeting each objective.

III. MONITORING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

1. The permittees shall complete the 1999 Water Quality Monitoring Program.
2. The permittees shall revise, by July 1, 2003, their Water Quality Monitoring Program to include, at a minimum, the following monitoring components or their equivalence:
 - A. Mass Emissions Monitoring.
 - (1) The principal permittee shall monitor mass emissions in order to: (a) estimate the total mass emissions from the MS4; (b) assess trends in mass emissions over time; and (c) to determine if the MS4 is contributing to exceedances of water quality objectives or beneficial uses, by comparing results to the California Toxics Rule (CTR), Basin Plan, Ocean Plan and/or other relevant standards.

- (2) A minimum of seven mass emissions stations shall be placed at locations to include coastal outfalls at Huntington Harbor/Anaheim Bay, the coastline between Huntington Harbor and Newport Bay, Upper/Lower Newport Bay, the Crystal Cove Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), and north Orange County where surface flows have not been well-characterized (e.g., Fullerton Creek Channel, Carbon Creek Channel, or Coyote Creek). Additional locations should be based on large discharge volumes, large subwatershed drainage areas, and/or land use distribution.
- (3) Autosamplers shall be programmed to collect representative samples from the first storm event and two more storm events during the rainy season. A minimum of three dry-weather samples shall also be collected. Samples from the first rain event each year shall be analyzed for the entire suite of priority pollutants. All samples must be analyzed for metals, pH, TSS, TOC, pesticides/herbicides, and constituents which are known to have contributed to impairment of local receiving waters. Dry weather samples should also include an analysis for oil and grease. Sediments associated with mass emissions should be analyzed for constituents of concern.

B. Estuary/Wetlands Monitoring

- (1) The permittees shall monitor the Upper Newport estuary, Talbert Marsh, and Bolsa Chica wetlands areas to determine the effects of storm water and non-storm water runoff associated with increased urbanization on these systems.
- (2) Monitoring locations shall include representative areas surrounding channel outfalls and areas away from channel outfalls. Sampling strategies shall be designed to enable the determination of storm water and non-storm water effects on sediment chemistry, toxicity, benthic communities, nutrient status, and spatial extent of sediment fate within the estuarine environment. Additionally, other indicators of biological integrity should be evaluated, such as bird populations or endangered plant/animal species.

C. Water Column Toxicity Monitoring

- (1) Analyses for toxicity to freshwater and marine species shall be performed on mass emissions samples to determine the impacts of storm water and non-storm water runoff on toxicity of receiving waters.
- (2) *Ceriodaphnia dubia* and *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* fertilization shall be used to evaluate toxicity on the sample from the first rain event, plus one other wet weather sample and two dry weather samples.

- (3) Criteria shall be identified which will trigger the initiation of Toxicity Identification Evaluations (TIEs) and Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs).

D. Bacteriological/Pathogen Monitoring

- (1) The permittees shall obtain monitoring data from other entities (such as the Orange County Health Care Agency) and/or monitor representative areas along the Orange County coastline, as well as a minimum of six inland water bodies/channels, for total coliform, fecal coliform, and Enterococcus in order to determine the impacts of storm water and non-storm water runoff on loss of beneficial uses to receiving waters. Inland monitoring stations shall be located to include channels/creeks which are currently impaired for pathogens.
- (2) Where possible, data shall be obtained from monitoring efforts of Orange County Health Care Agency, POTWs, and/or other public or private agencies/entities. Monitoring shall be conducted directly by the permittees only to the extent that data gaps exist.

E. Bioassessment

- (1) The permittees shall cooperate with the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) in efforts to evaluate the biological index approach for Southern California and to design a research project for developing an Index of Biological Integrity (IBI) for the region.
- (2) The permittees shall coordinate with SCCWRP and the Regional Board to identify appropriate bioassessment station locations. Station selection and sampling scheme shall be identified in the revised Monitoring Program, and sampling should commence no later than October 2003.

F. Reconnaissance

- (1) The permittees shall develop new reconnaissance strategies to identify and prohibit illicit discharges. Where possible, the use of GIS to identify geographic areas with a high density of industries associated with gross pollution (e.g. electroplating industries, auto dismantlers) and/or locations subject to maximum sediment loss (e.g. new development) may be used to determine areas for intensive monitoring efforts. Additionally, the permittees shall coordinate with the Regional Board to develop a comprehensive database to include all enforcement actions for storm water violations and unauthorized, non-storm water discharges, that can then be used to more effectively target reconnaissance efforts.

G. Land Use Correlations

- (1) The permittees shall develop and implement strategies for determining the effects of land use on the quality of receiving waters. While it is recognized that a wide range of land uses exist across the region and within each subwatershed, one relationship that may be easily determined is the impact of development on sediment loading within receiving waters, since developed areas contribute relatively little sediment loading compared to areas under construction. Consequently, the permittees shall, at a minimum, analyze the impacts of increasing development and the conversion of agricultural land to the sediment loading of the Upper Newport Bay.
- (2) Where possible, data shall be obtained from monitoring efforts of other public or private agencies/entities (e.g., Caltrans, The Irvine Company).

H. TMDL/303(d) Listed Waterbody Monitoring

The Permittees shall continue to participate in the Regional Monitoring Program for the San Diego Creek Nutrient TMDL. In addition, strategies must be revised/developed to evaluate the impacts of storm water or non-storm water runoff on all impairments within the Newport Bay watershed and other 303(d) listed waterbodies. Since the 303(d) listing is dynamic, with new waterbodies and new impairments being identified over time, the permittees shall revise their monitoring plan to incorporate new information as it becomes available.

3. By July 1, 2003, the permittees shall develop and submit for approval of the Executive Officer, their revised Water Quality Monitoring Program, which should yield an integrated watershed-monitoring approach capable, to the maximum extent possible, of achieving the above-stated goals. In order to minimize cost and maximize benefits, it is highly recommended that this program be developed in cooperation with the SCCRWP, the Orange County Health Care Agency, neighboring coastal regions and/or other public or private agencies/entities. The development and implementation of the monitoring program shall be in accordance with the time schedules prescribed by the Executive Officer. At a minimum, the program shall include the following and any requirements developed by the State Board in accordance with Water Code Section 13383.5:

- A. Uniform guidelines for quality control, quality assurance, data collection and data analysis that conform to current US EPA standards.
- B. A mechanism for the collection, analysis and interpretation of existing data from local, regional or national monitoring programs. These data sources may be utilized to characterize different storm water sources; to determine pollutant generation, transport and fate; to develop a relationship between land use, development size, storm size and the event mean concentration of pollutants; to determine spatial and temporal variances in storm water quality and seasonal and other bias in the

collected data; and to identify any unique features of the Santa Ana Watershed. The permittees are encouraged to use data from similar studies, if available.

C. A description of the monitoring program, including:

- (1) The number of monitoring stations;
- (2) Monitoring locations within flood control channels, bays and estuaries, coastal areas, major outfalls, and other receiving waters;
- (3) Environmental indicators (e.g., ecosystem, biological, habitat, chemical, sediment, stream health, etc.) chosen for monitoring;
- (4) Parameters selected for field screening and for laboratory work;
- (5) Total number of samples to be collected from each station, frequency of sampling during wet and dry weather, short duration or long duration storm events, type of samples (grab, 24-hour composite, etc.), justification for composite versus discrete sampling, type of sampling equipment, quality assurance/quality control procedures followed during sampling and analysis, analysis protocols to be followed (including sample preparation and maximum reporting limits), and identity and qualifications of laboratories performing analyses;
- (6) A mechanism for analyzing the collected data and interpreting the results including protocols for handling of non-detects and 'outliers', an evaluation of the effectiveness of the management practices, and need for refinement of the management practices; and,
- (7) A description of the responsibilities of all the participants in this program including cost sharing.

IV. REPORTING

1. All progress reports and proposed strategies and plans required by this order shall be signed by the principal permittee, and copies shall be submitted to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board under penalty of perjury.
2. The permittees shall submit an **ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT** to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board and to the Regional Administrator of the U.S. EPA, Region 9, no later than November 15th, of each year. This progress report may be submitted in a mutually agreeable electronic format. At a minimum, annual progress report shall include the following:

- A. A review of the status of program implementation and compliance (or non-compliance) with the schedules contained in this order;
 - B. An assessment of the effectiveness of control measures established under the illicit discharge elimination program and the Drainage Area Management Plan. The effectiveness may be measured in terms of how successful the program has been in eliminating illicit/illegal discharges and reducing pollutant loads in storm water discharges;
 - C. An assessment of any storm water management program modifications made to comply with Clean Water Act requirements to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable;
 - D. A summary and analysis of monitoring results from the previous year and any changes to the monitoring program for the following year;
 - E. A fiscal analysis progress report as described in Section V., Provision, 25., of this order;
 - F. A draft workplan which describes the proposed implementation of the DAMP for next fiscal year. The workplan shall include clearly defined tasks, responsibilities, and schedules for implementation of the storm water program and each permittee actions for the next fiscal year;
 - G. Major changes in any previously submitted plans/policies; and
 - H. An assessment of the permittees compliance status with the Receiving Water Limitations, Section IV of the Order, including any proposed modifications to the DAMP if the Receiving Water Limitations are not fully achieved.
3. The permittees shall be responsible for the submittal to the principal permittee of all required information/materials needed to comply with this order in a timely manner. All such submittals shall be signed by a duly authorized representative of the permittee under penalty of perjury.

(This section intentionally left blank.)

V. REPORTING SCHEDULE

All reports required by this order shall be submitted to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board in accordance with the following schedule:

ITEM	COMPLETION DATE	REPORT DUE DATE
Review planning procedures and CEQA document preparation processes	December 19, 2002	January 2, 2003
Establish Public Education Committee	March 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Review DAMP	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Develop public education materials including reporting hot-line and web site	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Develop and update construction site, including site information, priority, and inspection information	October 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2003
Establish mechanism to ensure local permits for proposed construction sites and industrial facilities are conditioned upon proof of obtaining coverage under the state General Permit	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Develop and distribute model maintenance procedures for public agency activities	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Develop and distribute BMP guidance for public agency and contract field operations and maintenance staff	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Develop model maintenance procedures for drainage facilities	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Evaluate Environmental Performance Program applicability to municipal maintenance contracts, contract for field maintenance operations, and leases	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Review and revise current grading/erosion control ordinances	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003

Implementation Agreement Revision	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Litter/Trash Control Ordinance review	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Additional Debris Control Measures Determination	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Complete Public Awareness Survey	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Proposed Monitoring Program	July 1, 2003	July 1, 2003
Develop restaurant inspections program, which includes runoff, grease blockage and spill reduction aspects	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
Legal Authority & Enforcement Strategy Certification	November 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Review effectiveness of ordinances in prohibiting discharges to MS4's as listed in Section 7.	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Develop and update an industrial site database, including facility information, priority, and inspection information	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Develop and update a commercial site database, including facility information, priority, and inspection information	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Propose mechanism to determine effect of septic system failures on storm water quality and a mechanism to address failures	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Review oversight of portable toilets to determine need for any revision	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
BMP Guidance for Restaurants, Automotive Service Centers, and Gasoline Service Stations, developed by Public Education Committee	July 1, 2002	Nov 15, 2002
BMP Guidance for Control of Potential Polluting Activities not otherwise regulated	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003

Review existing BMPs for New Developments and Water Quality Management Plan to determine need for development of Water Quality Protection Plan	July 1, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Propose study of erosion control BMPs for new development	November 15, 2003	Nov 15, 2003
Incorporate watershed protection principles and policies into the General Plan	July 1, 2004	Nov 15, 2004
Report of Waste Discharge	180 days before permit expires	Dec. 1, 2005
Annual Report/Fiscal Analysis	November 15th of each year	Nov 15
Evaluate Storm Water Management structure and Implementation Agreement	July 1st of each year	Nov 15
Review Environmental Performance Reports	July 1st of each year	Nov 15
Provide training to public agency staff and to contract field operations staff	Annually	Nov 15
Re-evaluate monitoring program priorities based on previous year's data	Annually	Nov 15
Evaluate the DAMP	July 1st of each year	Nov 15
Permittee Committee meetings to discuss permit implementation and regional and state-wide issues	Held at least 6 times each year	Nov 15

Ordered by _____
Gerard J. Thibeault
Executive Officer
January 18, 2002

Composition and distribution of beach debris in Orange County, California

Shelly L. Moore, Dominic Gregorio¹, Michael Carreon²,
Stephen B. Weisberg, and Molly K. Leecaster³

ABSTRACT

Many studies have quantified the amount of debris collected along beach shoreline areas in various locations around the world. Only a few of those studies have been conducted in the United States, and they are largely limited to semi-quantitative efforts performed as part of volunteer clean-up activities. In this study, we quantified the distribution and types of beach debris by sampling 43 stratified random sites from Seal Beach to San Clemente on the Orange County, California, coast from August to September, 1998. An area of shoreline was delineated for each site that was 25 yards in length and extended from the water's edge to the first pavement or rocky cliff. All trash was collected by at least three people walking systematically along transects. In addition, a five-gallon bucket was used to sieve one bucket of sand at each site to collect and quantify the small items that were undetectable by visual examination. Based upon the survey data results, it was estimated that more than 106 million items, weighing approximately 13 tons, occur on Orange County shorelines. The most abundant items were pre-production plastic pellets, followed by foamed plastics and hard plastics. Debris density on the remote rocky shoreline was greater than that on high-use sandy beaches for most debris items. This finding partially reflects the periodic cleanup of high-use beaches by local municipalities, and also indicates that a high percentage of the observed debris was transported to the site from

waterborne sources. The amount of Orange County beach debris estimated by this study is 50 times that (excluding pre-production plastic pellets) collected in the California Coastal Cleanup Day. The difference appears to be attributable to Cleanup Day's focus on large, visible debris at a subset of high-use beaches that are periodically cleaned by mechanical combers.

INTRODUCTION

Beaches along the southern California coast are used extensively for a variety of recreational purposes, attracting almost 150 million visitors annually (Schiff *et al.* 1999). Recreational uses such as boating, swimming, surfing, sunbathing, and picnicking generate debris along the shoreline including food bags and wrappers, cups and utensils, trash bags, fast-food and other product containers, toys, fishing lures and floats, and plastic. In addition, southern California has the highest coastal population density of any area in the country (Culliton *et al.* 1988), providing an additional source of debris via urban runoff and maritime disposal (including accidental spills). Debris is one of the most highly visible expressions of human impact on the marine environment, which is one of

This picture not available at this time

Debris from an Orange County beach.

¹Southern California Marine Institute, 820 South Seaside Avenue
Terminal Island, CA 90731

²Divers Involved Voluntarily in Environmental Rehabilitation and
Safety, P. O. Box 241, Fullerton, CA 92834

³Present address: INEEL, Bechtel WBXT Idaho, LLC, P.O. Box
1625, Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3779

This page intentionally left blank

the factors that has led to the popularity of public cleanup efforts along the shoreline (Ribic *et al.* 1997). More than an aesthetic issue, debris can threaten marine mammals, birds, and turtles through ingestion and entanglement (Bjorndal *et al.* 1994, Fowler 1987, Robards 1993, Ryan 1987). Marine debris is also becoming a regulatory focal point. The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board recently implemented legal limitations, through the total maximum daily load (TMDL) process, on the amount of trash that local governments can allow to enter the ocean through storm drains.

Many studies have enumerated the types and amount of marine debris on beaches (Corbin and Singh 1993, Garrity and Levings 1993, Golik 1997, Golik and Gertner 1992, Lucas 1992, Ross *et al.* 1991, Ribic *et al.* 1997, Walker *et al.* 1997, Willoughby 1986), and a few studies have quantified subsurface nearshore debris (June 1990, Moore and Allen 2000). Most of the debris data for beaches outside of the United States have been collected through systematic, scientifically rigorous studies, while most of the information within the United States has been derived from volunteer beach cleaning efforts. Although cleaning efforts are valuable for removing debris from beaches, they provide only semi-quantitative estimates of debris. Here we present the first study to quantitatively assess the types and amount of debris on the California coast, with a secondary objective of describing how debris differs among shoreline types.

METHODS


Beach debris was surveyed and collected at 43 sites from Seal Beach to San Clemente on the Orange County, California, coast between August 2 and September 18, 1998 (Figure 1). Sites were selected using a stratified random design, stratified by shoreline type (rocky shoreline and sandy beach). Sample sites were selected randomly within the strata and a systematic component was overlaid to minimize clustering, following the sampling design used in the National Stream Survey (Overton 1987). Each stratum was subdivided into a series of sections (each identified by a count variable) of like-strata joined together into a stratum line. A partition was created for each stratum line, with the number of intervals in the partition equal to the sample size. The partition was placed over this stratum line by selecting a random starting point for the beginning of the first interval. Based upon this starting point, the intervals were defined as consecutive equal-width lengths. A simple random sample of one point was then chosen from within each interval. Each point was translated back to the

shoreline using the section count variable. The partition structure ensures systematic separation of the sampling, while the random selection of sites within partitions ensures an unbiased estimate of beach debris.

Each sample site was delineated as an area 25 yards in length that extends from the water's edge to the first pavement or rocky cliff. All trash at the site was collected by at least three people walking systematically along transects to ensure that all areas within the sample site were examined. All debris was bagged and transported to the laboratory for identification and quantification. In addition, a five-gallon bucket was used to sieve one bucket of sand at each site to quantify the small items that were undetectable by visual examination. In the laboratory, debris was sorted into the broad categories used by the Center for Marine Conservation during their Coastal Cleanup days (i.e., glass, metal, plastics, foamed plastics, rubber, paper, wood, and cloth). From each broad category, debris was further sorted into more specific subcategories (e.g., cups, plates, etc.), enumerated, and weighed. Within the specific categories, brand names were recorded, when possible, to establish cross-brand trends.

The total amount of debris along the Orange County coast was estimated by calculating a mean amount of trash for a 25-yard segment within each strata and then weighting those means by the relative amount of shoreline distance in each strata. Estimates for smaller debris collected by sieving were calculated using a similar methodology, after estimating the number of yards from the water's edge to the first pavement or rocky cliff for each site then extrapolating the abundance for each sample site area.

FIGURE 1. Sample sites for the Orange County beach debris study, August to September 1998.



RESULTS

More than 106 million items, weighing approximately 13 tons, were estimated to occur along the Orange County shoreline (Table 1). Three categories of plastics (pre-production plastic pellets, foamed plastics, and hard plastics) accounted for 99% of the total abundance and 51% of the total weight. Cigarette butts were fourth in abundance and accounted for less than 1% of the total abundance and weight. Cigarettes, candy, fast-food products, beer, and other beverages were the most identified brand-related debris (Table 2). Marlboro®, Starburst®, Jack in the Box®, Budweiser Light®, and Coca Cola® all led in their respective categories.

Most of the plastics encountered were in the form of small pieces of plastic (Table 3). Foamed plastic pieces accounted for 88% of the total foamed plastics and hard plastic pieces accounted for 50% of the total hard plastics. Of the whole plastic items, food and beverage items were the most abundant.

The distribution of debris differed among shoreline types. Sandy beaches are eight times more abundant than rocky shoreline in Orange County, but most debris did not reflect this ratio (Table 4). Foamed and hard plastics, glass, rubber, and animal droppings all occurred at higher proportions on rocky beaches. Pre-production plastic pellets, paper, wood, and cloth all occurred at higher proportions on sandy beaches. Cigarette butts and metal were found at approximately equal ratios between beach types.

DISCUSSION

The most abundant item found on southern California beaches was pre-production plastic pellets, which are probably lost in transport from the raw materials produc-

TABLE 2. Percent of total of top three brands in main brand categories collected on Orange County beaches, August to September, 1998.

Brand Name	Percent of Total	Percent of Market Share
Cigarette Products		
Marlboro	62	32.3
Camel	7	4.6
Benson & Hedges	7	<2.4
Candy Products		
Starburst	16	na
Snickers	13	na
Blow Pop	9	na
Fast-Food Products		
Jack in the Box	27	3.6
Carl's Jr.	19	1.9
KFC	12	<0.9
Beer Products		
Budweiser Light	27	12.9
Budweiser	16	18.3
Corona	7	2.0
Drink Products		
Coca Cola	16	20.6
Pepsi	15	14.2
Capri Sun	8	<1.2
na = Not available		

ers to the processors who mold the pellets into plastic products. The pellets, collected primarily through sieving the surface layers of sand, come in a variety of shapes (ovoid, cylindrical, etc.) and are typically less than 5 mm in diameter. Approximately one quadrillion of these pellets, representing 60 billion pounds of resin, are manufactured annually in the United States alone (U.S. EPA 1992). The presence of these pellets is not unique to U.S. beaches; Gregory (1977, 1978) estimated that approximately 1,000 tons of these pellets occur on New Zealand beaches.

The relative distribution of brand-name products in the debris we collected largely reflects the product's relative market share. For example, we collected 10 times more Marlboro cigarette butts than any other brand, consistent with Marlboro's 32% market share. Similarly, Budweiser and Budweiser Light dominated the beer debris category, as they do in sales. One exception to the high correlation between brand-related debris quantity and market share was in the fast-food container category. Industry leader McDonalds constituted less than 10% of the total debris measured, while Jack in the Box accounted for nearly three times that level. Perhaps the geographic distribution of fast-food restaurants in relation to Orange County beaches was responsible for the

TABLE 1. Estimated total abundance and weight of trash on Orange County beaches, August to September, 1998.

Debris Type	Abundance	Weight (lbs)
Pre-production plastic pellets	105,161,101	4,780
Foamed plastics	742,296	1,526
Hard plastics	642,020	7,910
Cigarette butts	139,447	344
Paper	67,582	870
Wood	27,919	4,554
Metal	23,500	3,015
Glass	22,195	1,944
Rubber	10,742	817
Pet and bird droppings	9,388	17
Cloth	5,949	1,432
Other	10,363	401

TABLE 3. Estimated total abundance of plastics on Orange County beaches, August to September, 1998.

Trash Type	Abundance
Foamed Plastics	
Foamed plastic pieces	652,639
Fast food containers	43,167
Other foamed plastics	25,415
Cups	10,595
Packaging material	9,940
Plates	270
Meat trays	180
Buoys	90
Total:	742,296
Plastics	
Plastic pieces	318,790
Caps and lids	88,548
Straws	84,990
Food bags and wrappers	58,394
Other plastic	48,799
Cups and utensils	9,641
Other plastic bags	7,164
Cigarette lighters	5,810
Beverage bottles	4,550
Trash bags	3,729
Toys	2,159
Buckets	1,973
Rope	1,848
Other bottles	1,563
Milk and water bottles	1,182
Diapers	1,003
Strapping bands	449
6-pack holders	321
Fishing line	321
Tampon applicators	301
Fishing lures and floats	281
Oil and lube bottles	114
Light sticks	90
Total:	642,020
Total Plastics	1,384,316

discrepancy in the amount of fast-food product debris collected compared to the brand's respective market share.

Four major sources have been identified as pathways in the transport of debris to the Orange County shoreline: (1) littering by beachgoers, (2) wind currents from upland sources, (3) runoff from land-based activities, and (4) overboard disposal from boating activities (including accidental spills). Each of these sources requires a different management action to effect a reduction in beach debris. Although our study was not designed to differentiate sources, our data suggest that water-based sources (runoff and overboard disposal) were more important than direct littering or wind. One line of evidence for this is that plastic

pellets were found in abundance on all shoreline areas and are unlikely to originate from littering or wind. The second line of evidence is the greater density of most debris items found on less-frequented rocky shoreline compared to the sandy beaches (Table 4). While this pattern was true for most debris, an exception was the greater amount of paper products, such as food wrappers, found on sandy beaches, suggesting that they were left by beachgoers.

The only previous quantification of debris on the Orange County shoreline was from data collected by volunteers during the annual California Coastal Cleanup Day. Their 1998 cleanup event occurred the week after the present survey was completed and their estimate of the amount of debris was 50 times lower than our data (Table 5). Moreover, our estimate for Orange County debris exceeded the California Coastal Cleanup Day estimate for the entire state.

The estimates provided by the two surveys differ for several reasons. First, the California Coastal Cleanup Day is conducted by volunteers whose purpose it is to clean the beach rather than to quantify debris. As a result, it is likely that some of the debris collected during this event was not recorded. Second, the volunteers focus their cleaning efforts on a subset of the coastline, which excludes the rocky shoreline where 10% of the debris was encountered in the present study. Third, the California Coastal Cleanup Day event focuses on many of the popular, easily accessible beaches that are regularly cleaned by mechanical combers. Moreover, the cleanup events usually cover only an area 1/4 to 1/2 of a mile from their starting locations (Mark Patrick, County of Orange, Harbors, Beaches, and Parks, personal communication), rather than the whole beach.

TABLE 4. Estimated total abundance of trash by beach type on Orange County beaches, August to September, 1998.

Debris Type	Beach Type		S:R Ratio
	Sandy	Rocky	
Percent of Shoreline	89	11	8:1
Pre-production plastic pellets	96,211,029	8,950,072	11:1
Foamed plastics	557,319	184,977	3:1
Hard plastics	424,257	217,763	2:1
Cigarette butts	124,422	15,025	8:1
Paper	64,729	2,853	23:1
Wood	25,611	2,308	11:1
Metal	20,468	3,032	7:1
Glass	4,055	18,140	1:4
Rubber	9,039	1,703	5:1
Pet and bird droppings	7,217	2,171	3:1
Cloth	5,529	420	13:1
Other	10,300	63	163:1
Total	97,463,975	9,398,527	10:1

TABLE 5. Comparison of abundance for the Orange County summer trash survey and Center for Marine Conservation 1998 California Coastal Cleanup Day.

Debris Type	Bight'98	Coastal Cleanup Day	
	Orange County	Orange County	California
Pre-production Plastic Pellets	105,161,101	-	-
Foamed Plastics	742,296	8,170	211,406
Hard Plastics	642,020	10,860	382,380
Cigarette Butts	139,447	6,717	309,910
Paper	67,582	2,504	133,335
Wood	27,919	720	27,136
Metal	23,500	1,456	110,201
Glass	22,195	1,033	94,333
Rubber	10,742	643	25,666
Pet and Bird Droppings	9,388	-	-
Cloth	5,949	317	10,620
Other	10,363	-	-
Total with pellets	106,862,502	32,420	1,304,987
Total without pellets	1,701,401	32,420	1,304,987

Another variable that could partially account for the discrepancy in the two survey results is that volunteers traditionally focus on larger, more visible debris to the exclusion of small, undetectable debris. To assess the impact of this variable, two beach sites (Salt Creek Beach and Sunset Beach) were sampled using the same methods as the present study. Sampling occurred immediately after the September 18, 1999, California Coastal Cleanup Day. While more than 8,000 pieces of debris were collected from these beaches as part of the cleanup effort, we estimated 67,795 pieces remaining (Table 6). Most of the remaining items were small; the majority of large items, such as glass bottles, were effectively removed by the California Coastal Cleanup Day volunteers.

TABLE 6. Comparison of beach debris amounts between Coastal Cleanup Day volunteers and the Orange County beach debris follow-up study.

Trash Type	Total abundance of beach debris			
	Sunset Beach		Salt Creek	
	CCD	OC*	CCD	OC*
No. of Volunteers	56	8	197	5
Total Weight (lbs)	137	106	405	35
Foamed plastics	313	19,219	1,057	6,336
Hard plastics	1,419	13,658	1,775	5,667
Cigarette butts	222	9,293	1,646	2,464
Paper	139	3,133	711	1,338
Wood	28	387	121	246
Metal	26	1,126	244	2,534
Glass	15	950	257	-
Rubber	67	282	157	387
Cloth	5	634	48	141
Total	2,234	46,682	6,016	19,113

CCD = Coastal Cleanup Day.
 OC = Orange County beach debris follow-up study.
 * Orange County beach debris follow-up study abundances are estimates of trash found in 1/2 mile based on a 25 yard sample.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bjorndal, K. A., A. B. Bolton and C. J. Laguerre. 1994. Ingestion of marine debris by juvenile sea turtles in coastal Florida habitats. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 28:154-158.
- Corbin, C. J. and J. G. Singh. 1993. Marine debris contamination of beaches in St. Lucia and Dominica. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 26:325-328.
- Culliton, T., M. Warren, T. Goodspeed, D. Remer, C. Blackwell and J. McDonough II. 1988. 50 years of population changes along the nation's coast. Coastal Trends Series, Report No. 2. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Strategic Assessments Branch. Rockville, MD.
- Fowler, C.W. 1987. Marine debris and northern fur seals: A case study. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 18:326-335.
- Garrity, S.D. and S.C. Levings. 1993. Marine Debris along the Caribbean coast of Panama. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 26:317-324.
- Golik, A. 1997. Debris in the Mediterranean Sea: Types, quantities, and behavior. pp. 7-14 in: J.M. Coe and D.B. Rogers (eds.), *Marine Debris: Sources, Impacts, and Solutions*. Springer-Verlag. New York, NY.

Golik, A. and Y. Gertner. 1992. Litter on the Israeli coastline. *Marine Environmental Research* 33:1-15.

Gregory, M.R. 1977. Plastic pellets on New Zealand beaches. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 8:82-84.

Gregory, M.R. 1978. Accumulation and distribution of virgin plastic granules on New Zealand beaches. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 12:399-414.

June, J.A. 1990. Type, source, and abundance of trawl-caught marine debris off Oregon, in the Eastern Bering Sea, and in Norton Sound in 1988. pp. 279-301 in: R.S. Shomura and M.L. Godfrey (eds.), Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Marine Debris, 2 - 7 April 1989, Honolulu Hawaii. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-154.

Lucas, Z. 1992. Monitoring persistent litter in the marine environment on Sable Island, Nova Scotia. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 24:192-199.

Moore, S.L. and M. J. Allen. 2000. Distribution of anthropogenic and natural debris on the mainland shelf of the Southern California Bight. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 40:83-88.

Overton, S.W. 1987. A Sampling and Analysis Plan for Streams, in the National Surface Water Survey Conducted by EPA. Technical Report No. 117. Department of Statistics, Oregon State University. Corvallis OR.

Ribic, C.A., S.W. Johnson and C.A. Cole. 1997. Distribution, type, accumulation, and source of marine debris in the United States, 1989-1993. pp. 35-47 in: J.M. Coe and D.B. Rogers (eds.), Marine Debris: Sources, Impacts, and Solutions. Springer-Verlag. New York, NY.

Robards, M.D. 1993. Plastic ingestion by North Pacific seabirds. U. S. Department of Commerce. NOAA-43ABNF203014. Washington, DC.

Ross, J.B., R. Parker and M. Strickland. 1991. A survey of shoreline litter in Halifax Harbour 1989. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 22:245-248.

Ryan, P. G. 1987. The effects of ingested plastic on seabirds: Correlations between plastic load and body condition. *Environmental Pollution* 46:119-125.

Schiff, K.C., S.B. Weisberg and J. H. Dorsey. 1999. Microbiological monitoring of marine recreational waters in southern California. pp. 179-186 in: S. Weisberg (ed.), Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Annual Report 1997-1998. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. Westminster, CA.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1992. Plastic Pellets in the Aquatic Environment: Sources and Recommendations. U.S. EPA 842-B-92-010. Washington, DC.

Walker, T.R., K. Reid, J.P.Y. Arnould and J. P. Croxall. 1997. Marine debris surveys at Bird Island, South Georgia 1990-1995. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 34:61-65.

Willoughby, N. G. 1986. Man-made litter on the shores of the Thousand Island Archipelago, Java. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 17:224-228.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank the following organizations and their volunteers/employees for assistance with this project: Divers Involved Voluntarily in Environmental Rehabilitation and Safety, Southern California Marine Institute, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Cabrillo Marine Aquarium, and the Long Beach Conservation Corps. We would also like to thank Mark Patrick for his assistance in the comparison with the 1999 Coastal Cleanup Day activities.