

**California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region**

**Waste Discharge Requirements for
Discharges of Runoff from the
Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems
(MS4s)**

**Draining the Watershed of the County of Orange,
The Incorporated Cities of Orange County, and
The Orange County Flood Control District
Within the San Diego Region**

**Order No. R9-2009-0002
NPDES NO. CAS0108740**

December 16, 2009

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION**

9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100, San Diego, California 92123-4340

Phone • (858) 467-2952 • Fax (858) 571-6972

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego>

To request copies of the Orange County Municipal Storm Water Permit, please contact Ben Neill, Water Resources Control Engineer at (858) 467 – 2983, bneill@waterboards.ca.gov

Documents also are available at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego>

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR
DISCHARGES OF RUNOFF FROM THE
MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS (MS4s)
DRAINING THE WATERSHED OF
THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, THE INCORPORATED CITIES OF
ORANGE COUNTY, AND THE ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD
CONTROL DISTRICT WITHIN THE SAN DIEGO REGION**

Adopted by the
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region
on December 16, 2009

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN DIEGO REGION
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92123-4340
Telephone (858) 467-2952**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor
LINDA S. ADAMS, Agency Secretary, California Environmental Protection Agency



**California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region**

David King	<i>Vice Chair</i>	Recreation / Wildlife
Eric Anderson		Irrigated Agriculture
Wayne Rayfield		Water Quality
Grant Destache		Industrial Water Use
George Loveland		Water Supply
Marc Luker		Undesignated (Public)

David W. Gibson, *Executive Officer*
Michael P. McCann, *Assistant Executive Officer*

This permit was prepared under the direction of

David T. Barker P.E., *Chief, Water Resource Protection Branch*

by

Jimmy G. Smith, *Senior Environmental Scientist*
Ben Neill, *Water Resource Control Engineer*
Chad Loflen, *Environmental Scientist*

Table of Contents

FINDINGS:

A. BASIS FOR THE ORDER.....	1
B. REGULATED PARTIES.....	1
C. DISCHARGE CHARACTERISTICS.....	2
D. RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	6
E. STATUTE AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS	12
F. PUBLIC PROCESS.....	17

DISCHARGE and LEGAL PROVISIONS:

A. PROHIBITIONS AND RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS.....	18
B. NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES	19
C. NON-STORM WATER ACTION LEVELS	21
D. STORM WATER ACTION LEVELS	25
E. LEGAL AUTHORITY.....	26

PROGRAM PROVISIONS:

F. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (JRMP)	28
1.DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMPONENT	28
2.CONSTRUCTION COMPONENT	48
3.EXISTING DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT	54
4.ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION.....	69
5.PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMPONENT	72
G. WATERSHED RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	73
H. FISCAL ANALYSIS.....	77
I. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS.....	78

REPORTING and PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

J. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING.....	79
K. REPORTING	83
L. MODIFICATION OF PROGRAMS	90
M. PRINCIPAL COPERMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	90
N. RECEIVING WATERS AND MS4 DISCHARGE MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.....	90
O. STANDARD PROVISIONS, REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, AND NOTIFICATIONS.....	91

Attachment A – Basin Plan Prohibitions

Attachment B – Standard Provisions, Reporting Requirements, and Notifications

Attachment C – Definitions

Attachment D – Scheduled Submittal Summary and Reporting Checklist Requirements

Attachment E – Receiving Waters And MS4 Discharge Monitoring And Reporting
Program No. R9-2009-0002

Attachment F – Data

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

A. BASIS FOR THE ORDER

1. This Order is based on the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the Water Code, commencing with Section 13000), applicable State and federal regulations, all applicable provisions of statewide Water Quality Control Plans and Policies adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin adopted by the Regional Board, the California Toxics Rule, and the California Toxics Rule Implementation Plan.
2. This Order reissues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0108740, which was first adopted by the Regional Board on July 16, 1990 (Order No. 90-38), and then reissued on August 8, 1996 (Order No. 96-03) and February 13, 2002 (Order No. R9-2002-01). On August 21, 2006, in accordance with Order No. R9-2002-01, the County of Orange, as the Principal Copermittee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for reissuance of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Permit.
3. This Order is consistent with the following precedential Orders adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) addressing MS4 NPDES Permits: Order 99-05, Order WQ-2000-11, Order WQ 2001-15, Order WQO 2002-0014, and Order WQ-2009-0008 (*SWRCB/OCC FILE A-1780*).
4. The Fact Sheet / Technical Report for the Order No. R9-2009-0002, NPDES No. CAS0108740, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds of the County of Orange, the Incorporated Cities of Orange County, and the Orange County Flood Control District Within the San Diego Region includes cited regulatory and legal references and additional explanatory information and data in support of the requirements of this Permit. This information, including any supplements thereto, and any response to comments on the Tentative Orders, is hereby incorporated by reference into these findings.

B. REGULATED PARTIES

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

violation of a water quality standard; or (4) an MS4 which is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States (waters of the U.S).

Table 1. Municipal Copermittees

1. City of Aliso Viejo	8. City of Mission Viejo
2. City of Dana Point	9. City of Rancho Santa Margarita
3. City of Laguna Beach	10. City of San Clemente
4. City of Laguna Hills	11. City of San Juan Capistrano
5. City of Laguna Niguel	12. County of Orange
6. City of Laguna Woods	13. Orange County Flood Control District
7. City of Lake Forest	

C. DISCHARGE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Runoff discharged from an MS4 contains waste, as defined in the California Water Code (CWC), and pollutants that adversely affect the quality of the waters of the State. The discharge of runoff from an MS4 is a “discharge of pollutants from a point source” into waters of the U.S. as defined in the CWA.
2. MS4 storm water and non-storm water discharges are likely to contain pollutants that cause or threaten to cause a violation of water quality standards, as outlined in the Regional Board’s Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan). Storm water and non-storm water discharges from the MS4 are subject to the conditions and requirements established in the San Diego Basin Plan for point source discharges. These surface water quality standards must be complied with at all times, irrespective of the source and manner of discharge.
3. The most common categories of pollutants in runoff include total suspended solids, sediment, pathogens (e.g., bacteria, viruses, protozoa); heavy metals (e.g., copper, lead, zinc and cadmium); petroleum products and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons; synthetic organics (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, and PCBs); nutrients (e.g., nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers); oxygen-demanding substances (decaying vegetation, animal waste); detergents; and trash.
4. The discharge of pollutants and/or increased flows from MS4s may cause or threaten to cause the concentration of pollutants to exceed applicable receiving water quality objectives and/or impair or threaten to impair designated beneficial uses resulting in a condition of pollution (i.e., unreasonable impairment of water quality for designated beneficial uses), contamination, or nuisance.
5. Pollutants in runoff can threaten and adversely affect human health. Human illnesses have been clearly linked to recreating near storm drains flowing to coastal waters. Also, runoff pollutants in receiving waters can bioaccumulate in the tissues of invertebrates and fish, which may be eventually consumed by humans.

6. Runoff discharges from MS4s often contain pollutants that cause toxicity to aquatic organisms (i.e., adverse responses of organisms to chemicals or physical agents ranging from mortality to physiological responses such as impaired reproduction or growth anomalies). Toxic pollutants impact the overall quality of aquatic systems and beneficial uses of receiving waters.
7. The Copermitttees discharge runoff into lakes, drinking water reservoirs, rivers, streams, creeks, bays, estuaries, coastal lagoons, the Pacific Ocean, and tributaries thereto within one of the eleven hydrologic units (San Juan Hydrologic Unit) comprising the San Diego Region as shown in Tables 2a and 2b. Some of the receiving water bodies have been designated as impaired by the Regional Board and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in 2006 pursuant to CWA section 303(d). Also shown in the Tables are the watershed management areas (WMAs) as defined in the Regional Board report, Watershed Management Approach, January 2002.

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

Regional Board Watershed Management Area (WMA)	Hydrologic Area (HA) or Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) of the San Juan Hydrologic Unit	Major Receiving Water Bodies	303(d) Pollutant(s)/stressor or Water Quality Effect¹
Laguna Coastal Streams	Laguna HA, excluding Aliso HSA and Dana Point HSA	Laguna Canyon Creek, Pacific Ocean	Bacterial indicators Sediment toxicity
Aliso Creek	Aliso HSA	Aliso Creek, English Canyon, Pacific Ocean	Toxicity Phosphorus Bacterial indicators Benzo[b]fluoranthene Dieldrin Sediment Toxicity
Dana Point Coastal Streams	Dana Point HSA	Dana Point Harbor, Salt Creek, Pacific Ocean	Bacterial indicators
San Juan Creek	Mission Viejo HA	San Juan Creek, Trabuco Creek, Oso Creek, Canada Gobernadora, Bell Canyon, Verdugo Canyon, Pacific Ocean	Bacterial indicators DDE Chloride Sulfates Total dissolved solids

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

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

Regional Board Watershed Management Area (WMA)	Hydrologic Area (HA) or Hydrologic Subarea (HSA) of the San Juan Hydrologic Unit	Major Receiving Water Bodies	303(d) Pollutant(s)/stressor or Water Quality Effect ¹
San Clemente Coastal Streams	San Clemente HA	Prima Deshecha, Segunda Deshecha, Pacific Ocean	Bacterial indicators Phosphorus Turbidity
San Mateo Creek	San Mateo HA	San Mateo Creek, Christianitos Creek, Pacific Ocean	

Table 2b. Common Watersheds and Municipalities

Municipality	Laguna Coastal Streams	Aliso Creek	Dana Point Coastal Streams	San Juan Creek	San Clemente Coastal Streams	San Mateo Creek
Aliso Viejo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Dana Point			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Laguna Beach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Laguna Hills *		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Laguna Niguel		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Laguna Woods *		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Lake Forest *		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Mission Viejo		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Rancho Santa Margarita				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
San Clemente					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
San Juan Capistrano				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
County of Orange *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Orange County Flood Control District *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

8. Trash is a persistent pollutant which can enter receiving waters from the MS4 resulting in accumulation and transport in receiving waters over time. Trash poses a serious threat to the Beneficial Uses of the receiving waters, including, but not limited to, human health, rare and endangered species, navigation and human recreation.
9. The Copermittees' water quality monitoring data submitted to date documents persistent violations of Basin Plan water quality objectives for various runoff-related pollutants (fecal coliform bacteria, total suspended solids, turbidity, metals, etc.) at

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

10. When natural vegetated pervious ground cover is converted to impervious surfaces such as paved highways, streets, rooftops, and parking lots, the natural absorption and infiltration abilities of the land are lost. Therefore, runoff leaving a developed area is significantly greater in runoff volume, velocity, and peak flow rate than pre-development runoff from the same area. Runoff durations can also increase as a result of flood control and other efforts to control peak flow rates. Increased volume, velocity, rate, and duration of runoff, and decreased natural clean sediment loads, greatly accelerate the erosion of downstream natural channels. Significant declines in the biological integrity and physical habitat of streams and other receiving waters have been found to occur with as little as a 3-5 percent conversion from natural to impervious surfaces. The increased runoff characteristics from new development must be controlled to protect against increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.
11. Development creates new pollution sources as human population density increases and brings with it proportionately higher levels of car emissions, car maintenance wastes, municipal sewage, pesticides, household hazardous wastes, pet wastes, trash, etc. which can either be washed or directly dumped into the MS4. As a result, the runoff leaving the developed urban area is significantly greater in pollutant load than the pre-development runoff from the same area. These increased pollutant loads must be controlled to protect downstream receiving water quality.
12. Development and urbanization especially threaten environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs), such as water bodies designated as supporting a RARE beneficial use (supporting rare, threatened or endangered species) and CWA 303(d)-impaired water bodies. Such areas have a much lower capacity to withstand pollutant shocks than might be acceptable in other areas. In essence, development that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may become significant in a particularly sensitive environment. Therefore, additional control to reduce storm water pollutants from new and existing development may be necessary for areas adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA.
13. Although dependent on several factors, the risks typically associated with properly managed infiltration of runoff (especially from residential land use areas) are not significant. The risks associated with infiltration can be managed by many techniques, including (1) designing landscape drainage features that promote infiltration of runoff, but do not "inject" runoff (injection bypasses the natural processes of filtering and transformation that occur in the soil); (2) taking reasonable

steps to prevent the illegal disposal of wastes; (3) protecting footings and foundations; (4) ensuring that each drainage feature is adequately maintained in perpetuity; and (5) pretreatment.

14. Non-storm water (dry weather) discharge from the MS4 is not considered a storm water (wet weather) discharge and therefore is not subject to regulation under the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) standard from CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(iii), which is explicitly for “Municipal ... *Stormwater Discharges* (emphasis added)” from the MS4. Non-storm water discharges, per CWA 402(p)(3)(B)(ii), are to be effectively prohibited. Such dry weather non-storm water discharges have been shown to contribute significant levels of pollutants and flow in arid, developed Southern California watersheds and are to be effectively prohibited under the Clean Water Act.
15. Non-storm water discharges to the MS4 granted an influent exception [i.e., which are exempt from the effective prohibition requirement set forth in CWA section 402(p)(3)(B)(ii)] under 40 CFR 122. 26 are included within this Order. Any exempted discharges identified by Copermittees as a source of pollutants are subsequently required to be *addressed* (emphasis added) as illicit discharges through prohibition and incorporation into existing IC/ID programs. The Copermittees have identified landscape irrigation, irrigation water and lawn water, previously exempted discharges, as a source of pollutants and conveyance of pollutants to waters of the United States.

D. RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

1. General

- a. This Order specifies requirements necessary for the Copermittees to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). However, since MEP is a dynamic performance standard, which evolves over time as runoff management knowledge increases, the Copermittees’ runoff management programs must continually be assessed and modified to incorporate improved programs, control measures, best management practices (BMPs), etc. in order to achieve the evolving MEP standard. Absent evidence to the contrary, this continual assessment, revision, and improvement of runoff management program implementation is expected to ultimately achieve compliance with water quality standards in the Region.
- b. The Copermittees have generally been implementing the jurisdictional runoff management programs required pursuant to Order No. 2002-01 since February 13, 2003. Prior to that, the Copermittees were regulated by Order No. 96-03 since August 8, 1996. Runoff discharges, however, continue to cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards as evidenced by the Copermittees monitoring results.

- c. This Order contains new or modified requirements that are necessary to improve Copermittees' efforts to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff to the MEP and achieve water quality standards. Some of the new or modified requirements, such as the revised Watershed Runoff Management Program section, are designed to specifically address high priority water quality problems. Other new or modified requirements address program deficiencies that have been noted during audits, report reviews, and other Regional Board compliance assessment activities.
- d. Updated Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plans (JRMPs) and Watershed Runoff Management Plans (WRMPs), which describe the Copermittees' runoff management programs in their entirety, are needed to guide the Copermittees' runoff management efforts and aid the Copermittees in tracking runoff management program implementation. It is practicable for the Copermittees to update the JRMPs and WRMPs within one year, since significant efforts to develop these programs have already occurred.
- e. Pollutants can be effectively reduced in storm water runoff by the application of a combination of pollution prevention, source control, and treatment control BMPs. Pollution prevention is the reduction or elimination of pollutant generation at its source and is the best "first line of defense." Source control BMPs (both structural and non-structural) minimize the contact between pollutants and flows (e.g., rerouting run-on around pollutant sources or keeping pollutants on-site and out of receiving waters). Treatment control BMPs remove pollutants that have been mobilized by wet-weather or dry-weather flows.
- f. Runoff needs to be addressed during the three major phases of urban development (planning, construction, and use) in order to reduce the discharge of pollutants from storm water to the MEP, effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges and protect receiving waters. Development which is not guided by water quality planning policies and principles can unnecessarily result in increased pollutant load discharges, flow rates, and flow durations which can negatively impact receiving water beneficial uses. Construction sites without adequate BMP implementation result in sediment runoff rates which greatly exceed natural erosion rates of undisturbed lands, causing siltation and impairment of receiving waters. Existing development generates substantial pollutant loads which are discharged in runoff to receiving waters.
- g. Annual reporting requirements included in this Order are necessary to meet federal requirements and to evaluate the effectiveness and compliance of the Copermittees' programs.
- h. This Order establishes Storm Water Action Levels (SALs) for selected pollutants based on USEPA Rain Zone 6 (arid southwest) Phase I MS4 monitoring data for pollutants in storm water. The SALs were computed as the 90th percentile of the data set, utilizing the statistical based population approach, one of three

approaches recommended by the California Water Board's Storm Water Panel in its report, 'The Feasibility of Numerical Effluent Limits Applicable to Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Municipal, Industrial and Construction Activities (June 2006). SALs are identified in Section D of this Order. Copermittees shall implement a timely, comprehensive, cost-effective storm water pollution control program to reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water from the permitted areas so as not to exceed the SALs. Exceedance of SALs may indicate inadequacy of programmatic measures and BMPs required in this Order.

2. Development Planning

- a. The Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SSMP) requirements contained in this Order are consistent with Order WQ-2000-11 adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) on October 5, 2000. In the precedential order, the State Board found that the design standards, which essentially require that runoff generated by 85 percent of storm events from specific development categories be infiltrated or treated, reflect the MEP standard. The order also found that the SSMP requirements are appropriately applied to the majority of the Priority Development Project categories contained in Section D.1 of this Order. The State Board also gave Regional Water Quality Control Boards the needed discretion to include additional categories and locations, such as retail gasoline outlets (RGOs), in SSMPs.
- b. Controlling runoff pollution by using a combination of onsite source control and site design BMPs augmented with treatment control BMPs before the runoff enters the MS4 is important for the following reasons: (1) Many end-of-pipe BMPs (such as diversion to the sanitary sewer) are typically ineffective during significant storm events. Whereas, onsite source control BMPs can be applied during all runoff conditions; (2) End-of-pipe BMPs are often incapable of capturing and treating the wide range of pollutants which can be generated on a sub-watershed scale; (3) End-of-pipe BMPs are more effective when used as polishing BMPs, rather than the sole BMP to be implemented; (4) End-of-pipe BMPs do not protect the quality or beneficial uses of receiving waters between the pollutant source and the BMP; and (5) Offsite end-of-pipe BMPs do not aid in the effort to educate the public regarding sources of pollution and their prevention.
- c. Use of Low-Impact Development (LID) site design BMPs at new development, redevelopment and retrofit projects can be an effective means for minimizing the impact of storm water runoff discharges from the development projects on receiving waters. LID is a site design strategy with a goal of maintaining or replicating the pre-development hydrologic regime through the use of design techniques. LID site design BMPs help preserve and restore the natural hydrologic cycle of the site, allowing for filtration and infiltration which can greatly reduce the volume, peak flow rate, velocity, and pollutant loads of storm water runoff. Current runoff management, knowledge, practices and technology have

resulted in the use of LID BMPs as an acceptable means of meeting the storm water MEP standard.

- d. Retail Gasoline Outlets (RGOs) are significant sources of pollutants in storm water runoff. RGOs are points of convergence for motor vehicles for automotive related services such as repair, refueling, tire inflation, and radiator fill-up and consequently produce significantly higher loadings of hydrocarbons and trace metals (including copper and zinc) than other developed areas.
- e. Industrial sites are significant sources of pollutants in runoff. Pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from industrial sites are similar or exceed pollutant concentrations and loads in runoff from other land uses, such as commercial or residential land uses. As with other land uses, LID site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs are needed at industrial sites in order to meet the MEP standard. These BMPs are necessary where the industrial site is larger than 10,000 square feet. The 10,000 square feet threshold is appropriate, since it is consistent with requirements in other Phase I NPDES storm water regulations throughout California.
- f. If not properly designed or maintained, certain BMPs implemented or required by municipalities for runoff management may create a habitat for vectors (e.g. mosquitoes and rodents). Proper BMP design and maintenance to avoid standing water, however, can prevent the creation of vector habitat. Nuisances and public health impacts resulting from vector breeding can be prevented with close collaboration and cooperative effort between municipalities, the Orange County Vector Control District, and the California Department of Public Health during the development and implementation of runoff management programs.
- g. The increased volume, velocity, frequency and discharge duration of storm water runoff from developed areas has the potential to greatly accelerate downstream erosion, impair stream habitat in natural drainages, and negatively impact beneficial uses. Development and urbanization increase pollutant loads in storm water runoff and the volume of storm water runoff. Impervious surfaces can neither absorb water nor remove pollutants and thus lose the purification and infiltration provided by natural vegetated soil. Hydromodification measures for discharges to hardened channels are needed for the future restoration of the hardened channels to their natural state, thereby restoring the chemical, physical, and biological integrity and Beneficial Uses of local receiving waters.

3. Construction and Existing Development

- a. In accordance with federal NPDES regulations and to ensure the most effective oversight of industrial and construction site discharges, discharges of runoff from industrial and construction sites are subject to dual (State and local) storm water regulation. Under this dual system, each Copermitttee is responsible for enforcing its local permits, plans, and ordinances, and the Regional Board is

responsible for enforcing the General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit, State Board Order 99-08 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 (General Construction Permit) and the General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit, State Board Order 97-03 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000001 (General Industrial Permit) and any reissuance of these permits. NPDES municipal regulations require that municipalities develop and implement measures to address runoff from industrial and construction activities. Those measures may require the implementation of additional BMPs than are required under the statewide general permits for activities subject to both State and local regulation.

- b. Identification of sources of pollutants in runoff (such as municipal areas and activities, industrial and commercial sites/sources, construction sites, and residential areas), development and implementation of BMPs to address those sources, and updating ordinances and approval processes are necessary for the Copermittees to ensure that discharges of pollutants from its MS4 in storm water are reduced to the MEP and that non-storm water discharges are not occurring. Inspections and other compliance verification methods are needed to ensure minimum BMPs are implemented. Inspections are especially important at high risk areas for pollutant discharges.
- c. Historic and current development makes use of natural drainage patterns and features as conveyances for runoff. Urban streams used in this manner are part of the municipalities MS4 regardless of whether they are natural, anthropogenic, or partially modified features. In these cases, the urban stream is both an MS4 and receiving water.
- d. As operators of the MS4s, the Copermittees cannot passively receive and discharge pollutants from third parties. By providing free and open access to an MS4 that conveys discharges to waters of the U.S., the operator essentially accepts responsibility for discharges into the MS4 that it does not prohibit or control. These discharges may cause or contribute to a condition of contamination or a violation of water quality standards.
- e. Waste and pollutants which are deposited and accumulate in MS4 drainage structures will be discharged from these structures to waters of the U.S. unless they are removed. These discharges may cause or contribute to, or threaten to cause or contribute to, a condition of pollution in receiving waters. For this reason, pollutant discharges from storm water into MS4s must be reduced using a combination of management measures, including source control, and an effective MS4 maintenance program must be implemented by each Copermittee.
- f. Enforcement of local runoff related ordinances, permits, and plans is an essential component of every runoff management program and is specifically required in the federal storm water regulations and this Order. Each Copermittee is individually responsible for adoption and enforcement of ordinances and/or policies, implementation of identified control measures/BMPs needed to prevent

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

- g. Public participation during the development of runoff management programs is necessary to ensure that all stakeholder interests and a variety of creative solutions are considered.
- h. Retrofitting existing development with storm water treatment controls, including LID, is necessary to address storm water discharges from existing development that may cause or contribute to a condition of pollution or a violation of water quality standards. Although SSMP BMPs are required for redevelopment, the current rate of redevelopment will not address water quality problems in a timely manner. Cooperation with private landowners is necessary to effectively identify, implement and maintain retrofit projects for the preservation, restoration, and enhancement of water quality.

4. Watershed Runoff Management

- a. Since runoff within a watershed can flow from and through multiple land uses and political jurisdictions, watershed-based runoff management can greatly enhance the protection of receiving waters. Such management provides a means to focus on the most important water quality problems in each watershed. By focusing on the most important water quality problems, watershed efforts can maximize protection of beneficial use in an efficient manner. Effective watershed-based runoff management actively reduces pollutant discharges and abates pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems. Watershed-based runoff management that does not actively reduce pollutant discharges and abate pollutant sources causing or contributing to watershed water quality problems can necessitate implementation of the iterative process outlined in section A.3 of the Tentative Order. Watershed management of runoff does not require Copermittees to expend resources outside of their jurisdictions. Watershed management requires the Copermittees within a watershed to develop a watershed-based management strategy, which can then be implemented on a jurisdictional basis.

- b. Some runoff issues, such as general education and training, can be effectively addressed on a regional basis. Regional approaches to runoff management can improve program consistency and promote sharing of resources, which can result in implementation of more efficient programs.
- c. It is important for the Copermittes to coordinate their water quality protection and land use planning activities to achieve the greatest protection of receiving water bodies. Copermittie coordination with other watershed stakeholders, especially the State of California Department of Transportation, the United States Department of Defense, and water and sewer districts, is also important.

E. STATUTE AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Receiving Water Limitations (RWL) language specified in this Order is consistent with language recommended by the USEPA and established in State Board Water Quality Order 99-05, *Own Motion Review of the Petition of Environmental Health Coalition to Review Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-03, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108740*, adopted by the State Board on June 17, 1999. The RWL in this Order require compliance with water quality standards, which for storm water discharges is to be achieved through an iterative approach requiring the implementation of improved and better-tailored BMPs over time. Compliance with receiving water limits based on applicable water quality standards is necessary to ensure that MS4 discharges will not cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards and the creation of conditions of pollution.
2. The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan), identifies the following beneficial uses for surface waters in Orange County: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN)², Agricultural Supply (AGR), Industrial Process Supply (PROC), Industrial Service Supply (IND), Ground Water Recharge (GWR), Contact Water Recreation (REC1), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE), Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH), Hydropower Generation (POW), and Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL). The following additional beneficial uses are identified for coastal waters of Orange County: Navigation (NAV), Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM), Estuarine Habitat (EST), Marine Habitat (MAR), Aquaculture (AQUA), Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR), Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN), and Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL).
3. This Order is in conformance with State Board Resolution No. 68-16, *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*, and the federal Antidegradation Policy described in 40 CFR 131.12.

² Subject to exceptions under the "Sources of Drinking Waters" Policy (Resolution No. 89-33)

4. Section 6217(g) of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires coastal states with approved coastal zone management programs to address non-point pollution impacting or threatening coastal water quality. CZARA addresses five sources of non-point pollution: agriculture, silviculture, urban, marinas, and hydromodification. This NPDES permit addresses the management measures required for the urban category, with the exception of septic systems. The adoption and implementation of this NPDES permit relieves the Copermittee from developing a non-point source plan, for the urban category, under CZARA. The Regional Board addresses septic systems through the administration of other programs.
5. Section 303(d)(1)(A) of the CWA requires that “Each state must identify those waters within its boundaries for which the effluent limitations...are not stringent enough to implement any water quality standard (WQS) applicable to such waters.” The CWA also requires states to establish a priority ranking of impaired water bodies known as Water Quality Limited Segments and to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for such waters. This priority list of impaired water bodies is called the Section 303(d) List. The current Section 303(d) List was approved by the State Board on October 25, 2006. On June 28, 2007 the 2006 303(d) list for California was given final approval by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).
6. This Order does not constitute an unfunded local government mandate subject to subvention under Article XIII B, Section (6) of the California Constitution for several reasons, including, but not limited to, the following. First, this Order implements federally mandated requirements under federal Clean Water Act section 402. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3)(B).) Second, the local agency Copermittees’ obligations under this Order are similar to, and in many respects less stringent than, the obligations of non-governmental and new dischargers who are issued NPDES permits for storm water and non-storm water discharges. Third, the local agency Copermittees have the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for compliance with this Order. Fourth, the Copermittees have requested permit coverage in lieu of compliance with the complete prohibition against the discharge of pollutants contained in federal Clean Water Act section 301, subdivision (a) (33 U.S.C. § 1311(a)) and in lieu of numeric restrictions on their storm water discharges. Fifth, the local agencies’ responsibility for preventing discharges of waste that can create conditions of pollution or nuisance from conveyances that are within their ownership or control under State law predates the enactment of Article XIII B, Section (6) of the California Constitution. Likewise, the provisions of this Order to implement total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) are federal mandates. The federal Clean Water Act requires TMDLs to be developed for water bodies that do not meet federal water quality standards. (33 U.S.C. sec. 1313(d).) Once the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or a state develops a TMDL, federal law requires that permits must contain effluent limitations consistent with the assumptions of any applicable wasteload allocation. (40 C.F.R. sec. 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).)

7. Runoff treatment and/or mitigation must occur prior to the discharge of runoff into receiving waters. Treatment BMPs must not be constructed in waters of the U.S. or State unless the runoff flows are sufficiently pretreated to protect the values and functions of the water body. Federal regulations at 40 CFR 131.10(a) state that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a designated use for any waters of the U.S. Authorizing the construction of an runoff treatment facility within a water of the U.S., or using the water body itself as a treatment system or for conveyance to a treatment system, would be tantamount to accepting waste assimilation as an appropriate use for that water body. Furthermore, the construction, operation, and maintenance of a pollution control facility in a water body can negatively impact the physical, chemical, and biological integrity, as well as the beneficial uses, of the water body. Without federal authorization (e.g., pursuant to Clean Water Act Section 404), waters of the U.S. may not be converted into, or used as, waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Similarly, waste discharge requirements pursuant to California Water Code Section 13260 are required for the conversion or use of waters of the State as waste treatment or conveyance facilities. Diversion from waters of the U.S./State to treatment facilities and subsequent return to waters of the U.S. is allowable, provided that the effluent complies with applicable NPDES requirements.
8. The issuance of waste discharge requirements and an NPDES permit for the discharge of runoff from MS4s to waters of the U.S. is exempt from the requirement for preparation of environmental documents under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Division 13, Chapter 3, section 21000 et seq.) in accordance with the CWC section 13389.
9. Multiple water bodies in Orange County have been identified as impaired and placed on the 303(d) list. In 2004, Bacteria Impaired Waters TMDL Project II included six bacteria impaired shorelines in Dana Point Harbor and San Diego Bay: Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park, B Street, G Street Pier, Tidelands Park, and Chula Vista Marina in San Diego Bay. Since then, only Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park in San Diego Bay can be confirmed as still impaired by indicator bacteria. On June 11, 2008 the Regional Board adopted a Basin Plan amendment to incorporate *Bacteria Impaired Waters TMDL Project II for San Diego Bay and Dana Point Harbor Shorelines*. On June 16, 2009, the State Board approved the Basin Plan amendment. This action meets requirements of section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Basin Plan amendment process is authorized under section 13240 of the Water Code. The State's Office of Administrative Law (OAL) approved the TMDLs on September 15, 2009. The effective date of the TMDLs is the date of OAL approval. USEPA approved the TMDLs on October 26, 2009.
10. Storm water discharges from developed and developing areas in Orange County are significant sources of certain pollutants that cause, may be causing, threatening to cause or contributing to water quality impairment in the waters of Orange County.

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

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

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

11. This Order incorporates only those MS4 Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) developed in TMDLs that have been adopted by the Regional Water Board and have been approved by the State Board, Office of Administrative Law and U.S. EPA. Approved TMDL WLAs are to be addressed using water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) calculated as numeric limitations (either in the receiving waters and/or at the point of MS4 discharge) and/or as BMPs. In most cases, the numeric limitation must be achieved to ensure the adequacy of the BMP program. Waste load

allocations for storm water and non-storm water discharges have been included within this Order only if the TMDL has received all necessary approvals. This Order establishes WQBELs and conditions consistent with the requirements and assumptions of the WLAs in the TMDLs as required by 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B).

A TMDL is the total amount of a particular pollutant that a water body can receive and still meet Water Quality Standards (WQSS), which are comprised of Water Quality Objectives (WQOs), Beneficial Uses and the States Policy on Maintaining High Quality Waters³. The WQOs serve as the primary basis for protecting the associated Beneficial Use. The Numeric Target of a TMDL interprets and applies the numeric and/or narrative WQOs of the WQSS as the basis for the WLAs. This Order addresses TMDLs through Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) that must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of the WLA⁴. Federal guidance⁵ states that when adequate information exists, storm water permits are to incorporate numeric water quality based effluent limitations. In most cases, the numeric target(s) of a TMDL are a component of the WQBELs. When the numeric target is based on one or more numeric WQOs, the numeric WQOs and underlying assumptions and requirements will be used in the WQBELs as numeric effluent limitations by the end of the TMDL compliance schedule, unless additional information is required. When the numeric target interprets one or more narrative WQOs, the numeric target may assess the efficacy and progress of the BMPs in meeting the WLAs and restoring the Beneficial Uses by the end of the TMDL compliance schedule.

This Order fulfills a component of the TMDL Implementation Plan adopted by this Regional Board on June 11, 2008 for indicator bacteria in Baby Beach by establishing WQBELs expressed as both BMPs to achieve the WLAs and as numeric limitations⁶ for the City of Dana Point and the County of Orange. The establishment of WQBELs expressed as BMPs should be sufficient to achieve the WLA specified in the TMDL. The Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) and Numeric Targets are the necessary metrics to ensure that the BMPs achieve appropriate concentrations of bacterial indicators in the receiving waters.

³ State Water Resources Control Board, Resolution No. 68-16

⁴ 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)

⁵ USEPA, *Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits*, 61 FR 43761, August 26, 1996

⁶ The Waste Load Allocations are defined in Resolution No. R9-2008-0027, A Resolution to Adopt an Amendment to the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9)* to Incorporate Total Maximum Daily Loads for Indicator Bacteria, Baby Beach in Dana Point Harbor and Shelter Island Shoreline Park in San Diego Bay.

12. This Order requires each Copermitttee to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water into its MS4. However, historically pollutants have been identified as present in dry weather non-storm water discharges from the MS4s through 303(d) listings, monitoring conducted by the Copermitttees under Order No. R9-2002-0001, and there are others expected to be present in dry weather non-storm water discharges because of the nature of these discharges. This Order includes action levels for pollutants in non-storm water, dry weather, discharges from the MS4 designed to ensure that the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized discharges of non-storm water in the MS4 is being complied with. Action levels in the Order are based upon numeric or narrative water quality objectives and criteria as defined in the Basin Plan, the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California (Ocean Plan), and the State Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). An exceedance of an action level requires specified responsive action by the Copermitttees. This Order describes what actions the Copermitttees must take when an exceedance of an action level is observed. Exceedances of non-storm water action levels do not alone constitute a violation of this Order but could indicate non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 or other prohibitions established in this Order. Failure to undertake required source investigation and elimination action following an exceedance of 2a non-storm water action level (NAL or action level) is a violation of this Order. The Regional Board recognizes that use of action levels will not necessarily result in detection of all unauthorized sources of non-storm water discharges because there may be some discharges in which pollutants do not exceed established action levels. However, establishing NALs at levels appropriate to protect water quality standards is expected to lead to the identification of significant sources of pollutants in dry weather non-storm water discharges.
13. In addition to federal regulations cited in the Fact Sheet / Technical Report for the Order NO. R9-2009-0002, monitoring and reporting required under Order No. R9-2009-0002 is required pursuant to authority under CWC section 13383.

F. PUBLIC PROCESS

1. The Regional Board has notified the Copermitttees, all known interested parties, and the public of its intent to consider adoption of an Order prescribing waste discharge requirements that would serve to renew an NPDES permit for the existing discharge of runoff.
2. The Regional Board has held public hearings on April 11, 2007, February 13, 2008, July 1, 2009, and November 18, 2009 and heard and considered all comments pertaining to the terms and conditions of this Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Copermittees, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code (CWC) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations adopted thereunder, must each comply with the following:

A. PROHIBITIONS AND RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

1. Discharges into and from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) in a manner causing, or threatening to cause, a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance (as defined in CWC section 13050), in waters of the state are prohibited.
2. Storm water discharges from MS4s containing pollutants which have not been reduced to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) are prohibited.⁷
3. Discharges from MS4s that cause or contribute to the violation of water quality standards (designated beneficial uses, water quality objectives developed to protect beneficial uses, and the State policy with respect to maintaining high quality waters) are prohibited.
 - a. Each Copermittee must comply with section A.3 and section A.4 as it applies to Prohibition 5 in Attachment A of this Order through timely implementation of control measures and other actions to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges in accordance with this Order, including any modifications. If exceedance(s) of water quality standards persist notwithstanding implementation of this Order, the Copermittee must assure compliance with section A.3 and section A.4 as it applies to Prohibition 5 in Attachment A of this Order by complying with the following procedure:
 - (1) Upon a determination by either the Copermittee or the Regional Board that storm water MS4 discharges are causing or contributing to an exceedance of an applicable water quality standard, the Copermittee must notify the Regional Board within 30 days and thereafter submit a report to the Regional Board that describes best management practices (BMPs) that are currently being implemented and additional BMPs that will be implemented to prevent or reduce any pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards. The report may be incorporated in the Annual Report unless the Regional Board directs an earlier submittal. The report must include an implementation schedule. The Regional Board may require modifications to the report;

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

- (2) Submit any modifications to the report required by the Regional Board within 30 days of notification;
 - (3) Within 30 days following approval of the report described above by the Regional Board, the Copermittee must revise its Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and monitoring program to incorporate the approved modified BMPs that have been and will be implemented, the implementation schedule, and any additional monitoring required; and
 - (4) Implement the revised Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program and monitoring program in accordance with the approved schedule.
- b. The Copermittee must repeat the procedure set forth above to comply with the receiving water limitations for continuing or recurring exceedances of the same water quality standard(s) unless directed to do otherwise by the Regional Board Executive Officer.
 - c. Nothing in section A.3 must prevent the Regional Board from enforcing any provision of this Order while the Copermittee prepares and implements the above report.
4. In addition to the above prohibitions, discharges from MS4s are subject to all Basin Plan prohibitions cited in Attachment A to this Order.

B. NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES

1. Each Copermittee must effectively prohibit all types of non-storm water discharges into its MS4 unless such discharges are either authorized by a separate National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit; or not prohibited in accordance with sections B.2 and B.3 below.
2. The following categories of non-storm water discharges are not prohibited unless a Copermittee or the Regional Board identifies the discharge category as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. Where the Copermittee(s) have identified a category as a source of pollutants, the category shall be addressed as an illicit discharge and prohibited through ordinance, order or similar means. The Regional Board may identify categories of discharge that either requires prohibition or other controls. For such a discharge category, the Copermittee, under direction of the Regional Board, must either prohibit the discharge category or develop and implement appropriate control measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 and report to the Regional Board pursuant to Section K.1 and K.3 of this Order.
 - a. Diverted stream flows;
 - b. Rising ground waters;
 - c. Uncontaminated ground water infiltration [as defined at 40 CFR 35.2005(20)] to

- MS4s;
- d. Uncontaminated pumped ground water⁸;
 - e. Foundation drains⁸;
 - f. Springs;
 - g. Water from crawl space pumps⁸;
 - h. Footing drains⁸;
 - i. Air conditioning condensation;
 - j. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands;
 - k. Water line flushing^{9,10};
 - l. Discharges from potable water sources not subject to NPDES Permit No. CAG679001, other than water main breaks;
 - m. Individual residential car washing; and
 - n. Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges¹¹.
3. Emergency fire fighting flows (i.e., flows necessary for the protection of life or property) do not require BMPs and need not be prohibited. As part of the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP), each Copermittee must develop and implement a program to address pollutants from non-emergency fire fighting flows (i.e., flows from controlled or practice blazes and maintenance activities) identified by the Copermittee to be significant sources of pollutants to waters of the United States.
- a. Building fire suppression system maintenance discharges (e.g. sprinkler line flushing) contain waste. Therefore, such discharges are to be prohibited by the Copermittees as illicit discharges through ordinance, order, or similar means.
4. Each Copermittee must examine all dry weather effluent analytical monitoring results collected in accordance with section F.4 of this Order and Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R9-2009-0002 to identify water quality problems which may be the result of any non-prohibited discharge category(ies) identified above in section B.2. Follow-up investigations must be conducted as necessary to identify and control, pursuant to section B.2, any non-prohibited discharge category(ies) listed above.

⁸ Requires enrollment under Order R9-2008-002. Discharges into the MS4 require authorization from the owner and operator of the MS4 system.

⁹ This exemption does not include fire suppression sprinkler system maintenance and testing discharges. Those discharges may be regulated under Section B.3.

¹⁰ Requires enrollment under Order R9-2002-0020.

¹¹ Including saline swimming pool discharges directly to a saline water body.

C. NON-STORM WATER DRY WEATHER ACTION LEVELS

1. Each Copermittee, beginning no later than May 1, 2011, shall implement the non-storm water dry weather action level (NAL) monitoring as described in Attachment E of this Order.
2. In response to an exceedance of an NAL, each Copermittee must investigate and identify the source of the exceedance in a timely manner. However, if any Copermittee identifies exceedances of NALs that prevent them from adequately conducting source investigations in a timely manner, then the Copermittees may submit a prioritization plan and timeline that identifies the timeframe and planned actions to investigate and report their findings on all of the exceedances. Following the source investigation and identification, the Copermittees must submit an action report dependant on the source of the pollutant exceedance as follows:
 - a. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as natural (non-anthropogenically influenced) in origin and in conveyance into the MS4; then the Copermittee shall report their findings and documentation of their source investigation to the Regional Board within fourteen days of the source identification.
 - b. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as an illicit discharge or connection, then the Copermittees must eliminate the discharge to their MS4 and report the findings, including any enforcement action(s) taken, and documentation of the source investigation to the Regional Board within fourteen days of the source identification. If the Copermittee is unable to eliminate the source of discharge within fourteen days, then the Copermittee must submit, as part of their action report, their plan and timeframe to eliminate the source of the exceedance. Those dischargers seeking to continue such a discharge must become subject to a separate NPDES permit prior to continuing any such discharge.
 - c. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as an exempted category of non-storm water discharge, then the Copermittees must determine if this is an isolated circumstance or if the category of discharges must be addressed through the prevention or prohibition of that category of discharge as an illicit discharge. The Copermittee must submit their findings in including a description of the steps taken to address the discharge and the category of discharge, to the Regional Board for review with the next subsequent annual report. Such description shall include relevant updates to or new ordinances, orders, or other legal means of addressing the category of discharge. The Copermittees must also submit a summary of their findings with the Report of Waste Discharge.
 - d. If the Copermittee identifies the source of the exceedance as a non-storm water discharge in violation or potential violation of an existing separate NPDES permit

- (e.g. the groundwater dewatering permit), then the Copermittee must report, within three business days, the findings to the Regional Board including all pertinent information regarding the discharger and discharge characteristics.
- e. If the Copermittee is unable to identify the source of the exceedance after taking and documenting reasonable steps to do so, then the Copermittee must identify the pollutant as a high priority pollutant of concern in the tributary subwatershed, perform additional focused sampling and update their programs within a year to reflect this priority. The Copermittee's annual report shall include these updates to their programs including, where applicable, updates to their watershed workplans (Section G.2), retrofitting consideration (Section F.3.d) and program effectiveness work plans (Section J.4).
 - f. The Copermittees or any interested party, may evaluate existing NALs and propose revised NALs for future Board consideration.
3. An exceedance of an NAL does not alone constitute a violation of the provisions of this Order, but an exceedance of an NAL may indicate lack of compliance with the requirement that Copermittees effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4 or other prohibitions set forth in Sections A and B of this Order. Failure to timely implement required actions specified in this Order following an exceedance of an NAL constitutes a violation of this Order. However, neither compliance with NALs nor compliance with required actions following observed exceedances, excuses any non-compliance with the requirement to effectively prohibit all types of unauthorized non-storm water discharges into the MS4s or any non-compliance with the prohibitions in Sections A and B of this Order. NALs provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the prohibition of non-storm water discharges and of the appropriateness of exempted non-storm water discharges. During any annual reporting period in which one or more exceedances of NALs have been documented the Copermittee must submit with their next scheduled annual report, a report describing whether and how the observed exceedances did or did not result in a discharge from the MS4 that caused, or threatened to cause or contribute to a condition of pollution, contamination, or nuisance in the receiving waters.
 4. Monitoring of effluent will occur at the end-of-pipe prior to discharge into the receiving waters, with a focus on Major Outfalls, as defined in 40 CFR 122.26(B 5-6) and Attachment E of this Order. The Copermittees must develop their monitoring plans to sample a representative percentage of major outfalls and identified stations within each hydrologic subarea. At a minimum, outfalls that exceed any NALs once during any year must be monitored in the subsequent year. Any station that does not exceed an NAL for 3 years may be replaced with a different station.

5. Each Copermittee shall monitor for the non-storm water dry weather action levels, which are incorporated into this Order as follows:

a. Action levels for discharges to inland surface waters:

Table 4.a.1: General Constituents

Parameter	Units	AMAL	MDAL	Instantaneous Maximum	Basis
Fecal Coliform	MPN/ 100 ml	200 ^A 400 ^B	-		BPO
Enterococci	MPN/ 100 ml	33	-	104 ^C	BPO/OP
Turbidity	NTU	-	20		BPO
pH	Units	Within limit of 6.5 to 8.5 at all times			BPO
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Not less than 5.0 in WARM waters and not less than 6.0 in COLD waters			BPO
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	-	1.0	See MDEL	BPO
Total Phosphorus	mg/L	-	0.1	See MDEL	BPO
Methylene Blue Active Substances	mg/L	-	0.5	See MDEL	BPO

A – Based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period

B – No more than 10 percent of total samples may exceed 400 per 100 ml during any 30 day period

C – This Value has been set to Ocean Plan Criteria for Designated Beach Areas

BPO – Basin Plan Objective

OP – Ocean Plan

MDAL – Maximum Daily Action Level

AMAL – Average Monthly Action Level

Table 4.a.2: Priority Pollutants

Parameter	Units	Freshwater (CTR)		Saltwater (CTR)	
		MDAL	AMAL	MDAL	AMAL
Cadmium	ug/L	*	*	16	8
Copper	ug/L	*	*	5.8	2.9
Chromium III	ug/L	*	*	-	-
Chromium VI (hexavalent)	ug/L	16	8.1	83	41
Lead	ug/L	*	*	14	2.9
Nickel	ug/L	*	*	14	6.8
Silver	ug/L	*	*	2.2	1.1
Zinc	ug/L	*	*	95	47

CTR – California Toxic Rule

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cadmium (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(0.7852[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 2.715) \\ \text{Chromium III (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(0.8190[\ln(\text{hardness})] + .6848) \\ \text{Copper (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(0.8545[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 1.702) \\ \text{Lead (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(1.273[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 4.705) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nickel (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(.8460[\ln(\text{hardness})] + 0.0584) \\ \text{Silver (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(1.72[\ln(\text{hardness})] - 6.52) \\ \text{Zinc (Total Recoverable)} &= \exp(0.8473[\ln(\text{hardness})] + 0.884) \end{aligned}$$

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

Table 4.b: General Constituents

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

A – Based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period

B – No more than 10 percent of total samples may exceed 400 per 100 ml during any 30 day period

C – Designated Beach Areas

OP – California Ocean Plan 2005

BPO – Basin Plan Objective

MDAL – Maximum Daily Action Level

AMAL – Average Monthly Action Level

c. Action levels for discharges to the surf zone:

Table 4.c: General Constituents

Parameter	Units	AMAL	MDAL	Instantaneous Maximum	Basis
Total Coliform	MPN/100 ml	1,000	-	10,000 1,000 ^A	OP
Fecal Coliform	MPN/100 ml	200 ^B	-	400	OP
Enterococci	MPN/100 ml	35	-	104 ^C	OP

A – Total coliform density shall not exceed 1,000 per 100 ml when the ratio of fecal/total coliform exceeds 0.1

B – During any 30 day period

C – Designated Beach Areas

OP – California Ocean Plan 2005

D. STORM WATER ACTION LEVELS

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

Table 5. Storm Water Action Levels

Pollutant	Action Level
Turbidity (NTU)	126
Nitrate & Nitrite total (mg/L)	2.6
P total (mg/L)	1.46
Cd total (µg/L)	3.0
Cu total (µg/L)	127
Pb total (µg/L)	250
Ni total (µg/L)	54
Zn total (µg/L)	976

2. The end-of-pipe assessment points for the determination of SAL compliance are all major outfalls, as defined in 40 CFR 122.26(b)(5) and (b)(6). The Copermitttees must develop their monitoring plans to sample a representative percent of the major outfalls within each hydrologic subarea. At a minimum, outfalls that exceed SALs must be monitored in the subsequent year. Any station that does not exceed an SAL for 3 years may be replaced with a different station. SAL samples must be 24 hour time weighted composites.
3. The absence of SAL exceedances does not relieve the Copermitttees from implementing all other required elements of this Permit.
4. This Permit does not regulate natural sources and conveyances of constituents listed in Table 5. To be relieved of the requirements to prioritize pollutant/watershed combinations for BMP updates and to continue monitoring a station, the Copermitttee must demonstrate that the likely and expected cause of the SAL exceedance is not anthropogenic in nature.
5. The SALs will be reviewed and updated at the end of every permit cycle. The data collected pursuant to D.2 above can be used to create SALs based upon local data.

It is the goal of the SALs, through the iterative and MEP process, to have outfall storm water discharges meet all applicable water quality standards.

E. LEGAL AUTHORITY

- 1.** Each Copermittee must establish, maintain, and enforce adequate legal authority to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 through ordinance, statute, permit, contract or similar means. Nothing herein shall authorize a Co-Permittee or other discharger regulated under the terms of this order to divert, store or otherwise impound water if such action is reasonably anticipated to harm downstream water right holders in the exercise of their water rights. This legal authority must, at a minimum, authorize the Copermittee to:
 - a.** Control the contribution of pollutants in discharges of runoff associated with industrial and construction activity to its MS4 and control the quality of runoff from industrial and construction sites. This requirement applies both to industrial and construction sites which have coverage under the statewide general industrial or construction storm water permits, as well as to those sites which do not. Grading ordinances must be updated and enforced as necessary to comply with this Order;
 - b.** Prohibit all identified illicit discharges not otherwise allowed pursuant to section B.2;
 - c.** Prohibit and eliminate illicit connections to the MS4;
 - d.** Control the discharge of spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other than storm water to its MS4;
 - e.** Require compliance with conditions in Copermittee ordinances, permits, contracts or orders (i.e., hold dischargers to its MS4 accountable for their contributions of pollutants and flows);
 - f.** Utilize enforcement mechanisms to require compliance with Copermittee storm water ordinances, permits, contracts, or orders;
 - g.** Control the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements among Copermittees. Control of the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the shared MS4 to another portion of the MS4 through interagency agreements with other owners of the MS4 such as the State of California Department of Transportation, the United States Department of Defense, or Native American Tribes is encouraged;
 - h.** Carry out all inspections, surveillance, and monitoring necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with local ordinances and permits and with this Order, including the prohibition on illicit discharges to the MS4. This means the Copermittee must have authority to enter, monitor, inspect, take measurements, review and copy records, and require regular reports from industrial facilities discharging into its MS4, including construction sites;
 - i.** Require the use of BMPs to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants into MS4s from storm water to the MEP; and

- j. Require documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants to the MS4 to the MEP.
2. Each Copermittee must submit within 365 days of adoption of this Order, a statement certified by its chief legal counsel that the Copermittee has taken the necessary steps to obtain and maintain full legal authority to implement and enforce each of the requirements contained in 40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(A-F) and this Order except for the updated requirements for low impact development and hydromodification in section F.1. Each Copermittee must submit as part of its updated SSMP, a statement certified by its chief legal counsel that the Copermittee has taken the necessary steps to obtain and maintain full legal authority to implement and enforce the low impact development and hydromodification requirements in section F.1. These statements must include:
 - a. Identification of all departments within the jurisdiction that conduct runoff related activities, and their roles and responsibilities under this Order. Include an up to date organizational chart specifying these departments and key personnel.
 - b. Citation of runoff related ordinances and the reasons they are enforceable;
 - c. Identification of the local administrative and legal procedures available to mandate compliance with runoff related ordinances and therefore with the conditions of this Order;
 - d. A description of how runoff related ordinances are implemented and appealed; and
 - e. Description of whether the municipality can issue administrative orders and injunctions or if it must go through the court system for enforcement actions.

F. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (JRMP)

Each Copermittee must implement all requirements of section F of this Order no later than 365 days after adoption of the Order, unless otherwise specified in this Order.

Prior to 365 days after adoption of the Order, each Copermittee must at a minimum implement its Jurisdictional RMP document, as the document was developed and amended to comply with the requirements of Order No. R9-2002-001.

Each Copermittee must develop and implement an updated JRMP for its jurisdiction.

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

1. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMPONENT

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

a. GENERAL PLAN

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

b. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

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

c. APPROVAL PROCESS CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

For all proposed Development Projects, each Copermittee during the planning process, and prior to project approval and issuance of local permits, must prescribe the necessary requirements so that Development Project discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 will be reduced to the MEP, will not cause or

contribute to a violation of water quality standards, and will comply with Copermittee's ordinances, permits, plans, and requirements, and with this Order. Performance Criteria: Discharges from each approved development project must be subject to the following management measures:

- (1) Source control BMPs that reduce storm water pollutants of concern in runoff, including prevention of illicit discharges into the MS4; prevention of irrigation runoff; storm drain system stenciling or signage; properly designed outdoor material storage areas; properly designed outdoor work areas; and properly designed trash storage areas;
- (2) The following LID BMPs listed below shall be implemented at all Development Projects where applicable and feasible.
 - (a) Conserve natural areas, including existing trees, other vegetation, and soils.
 - (b) Construct streets, sidewalks, or parking lot aisles to the minimum widths necessary, provided that public safety is not compromised.
 - (c) Minimize the impervious footprint of the project.
 - (d) Minimize soil compaction to landscaped areas.
 - (e) Minimize disturbances to natural drainages (e.g., natural swales, topographic depressions, etc.)
 - (f) Disconnect impervious surfaces through distributed pervious areas.
- (3) Buffer zones for natural water bodies, where feasible. Where buffer zones are infeasible, require project proponent to implement other buffers such as trees, access restrictions, etc;
- (4) Measures necessary so that grading or other construction activities meet the provisions specified in section F.2 of this Order; and
- (5) Submittal of proof of a mechanism under which ongoing long-term maintenance of all structural post-construction BMPs will be conducted.
- (6) Infiltration and Groundwater Protection

To protect groundwater quality, each Copermittee must apply restrictions to the use of treatment control BMPs that are designed to primarily function as centralized infiltration devices (such as large infiltration trenches and infiltration basins). Such restrictions must be designed so that the use of such infiltration treatment control BMPs must not cause or contribute to an exceedance of groundwater quality objectives. At a minimum, each treatment control BMP designed to primarily function as a centralized infiltration device must meet the restrictions below, unless it is demonstrated that a restriction is not necessary to protect groundwater quality. The Copermittees may collectively or individually develop alternative restrictions on the use of

- treatment control BMPs which are designed to primarily function as centralized infiltration devices. Alternative restrictions developed by the Copermittees can partially or wholly replace the restrictions listed below. The restrictions are not intended to be applied to small infiltration systems dispersed throughout a development project.
- (a) Runoff must undergo pretreatment such as sedimentation or filtration prior to infiltration;
 - (b) All dry weather flows containing significant pollutant loads must be diverted from infiltration devices and treated through other BMPs;
 - (c) Pollution prevention and source control BMPs must be implemented at a level appropriate to protect groundwater quality at sites where infiltration treatment control BMPs are to be used;
 - (d) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must be adequately maintained so that they remove storm water pollutants to the MEP;
 - (e) The vertical distance from the base of any infiltration treatment control BMP to the seasonal high groundwater mark must be at least 10 feet. Where groundwater basins do not support beneficial uses, this vertical distance criteria may be reduced, provided groundwater quality is maintained;
 - (f) The soil through which infiltration is to occur must have physical and chemical characteristics (such as appropriate cation exchange capacity, organic content, clay content, and infiltration rate) which are adequate for proper infiltration durations and treatment of runoff for the protection of groundwater beneficial uses;
 - (g) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must not be used for areas of industrial or light industrial activity; areas subject to high vehicular traffic (25,000 or greater average daily traffic on main roadway or 15,000 or more average daily traffic on any intersecting roadway); automotive repair shops; car washes; fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.); nurseries; and other high threat to water quality land uses and activities as designated by each Copermittee unless first treated or filtered to remove pollutants prior to infiltration and a comprehensive site-specific evaluation has been conducted; and
 - (h) Infiltration treatment control BMPs must be located a minimum of 100 feet horizontally from any water supply wells.
- (7) Where feasible, landscaping with native or low water species shall be preferred in areas that drain to the MS4 or to waters of the United States.

**d. STANDARD STORM WATER MITIGATION PLANS (SSMPs) – APPROVAL PROCESS
CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

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

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

Priority Development Projects are:

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

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

the entire development.

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

(2) Priority Development Project Categories

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

- (a) New development projects that create 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces (collectively over the entire project site) including commercial, industrial, residential, mixed-use, and public projects. This category includes development projects on public or private land which fall under the planning and building authority of the Copermittees.
- (b) Automotive repair shops. This category is defined as a facility that is categorized in any one of the following Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes: 5013, 5014, 5541, 7532-7534, or 7536-7539.
- (c) Restaurants. This category is defined as a facility that sells prepared foods and drinks for consumption, including stationary lunch counters and refreshment stands selling prepared foods and drinks for immediate consumption (SIC code 5812), where the land area for development is greater than 5,000 square feet. Restaurants where land development is less than 5,000 square feet must meet all SSMP requirements except for structural treatment BMP and numeric sizing criteria requirement F.1.d.(6) and hydromodification requirement F.1.h.
- (d) All hillside development greater than 5,000 square feet. This category is defined as any development which creates 5,000 square feet of impervious surface which is located in an area with known erosive soil conditions, where the development will grade on any natural slope that is twenty-five percent or greater.
- (e) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). All development located within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA (where discharges

¹³ Pollutant generating Development Projects are those projects that generate pollutants at levels greater than natural background levels.

from the development or redevelopment will enter receiving waters within the ESA), which either creates 2,500 square feet of impervious surface on a proposed project site or increases the area of imperviousness of a proposed project site to 10 percent or more of its naturally occurring condition. "Directly adjacent" means situated within 200 feet of the ESA. "Discharging directly to" means outflow from a drainage conveyance system that is composed entirely of flows from the subject development or redevelopment site, and not commingled with flows from adjacent lands.

- (f) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more or with 15 or more parking spaces and potentially exposed to runoff. Parking lot is defined as a land area or facility for the temporary parking or storage of motor vehicles used personally, for business, or for commerce.
- (g) Street, roads, highways, and freeways. This category includes any paved surface that is 5,000 square feet or greater used for the transportation of automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and other vehicles.
- (h) Retail Gasoline Outlets (RGOs). This category includes RGOs that meet the following criteria: (a) 5,000 square feet or more or (b) a projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 100 or more vehicles per day.

(3) Pollutants of Concern

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

(4) Low Impact Development BMP Requirements

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

(a) The following LID BMPs must be implemented:

- (i) Each Copermittee must require LID BMPs or make a finding of infeasibility for each Priority Development Project in accordance with the LID waiver program in Section F.1.d.(8);

- (ii) Each Copermittee must incorporate formalized consideration, such as thorough checklists, ordinances, and/or other means, of LID BMPs into the plan review process for Priority Development Projects;
 - (iii) The review of each Priority Development Project must include an assessment of potential collection of storm water for on-site or off-site reuse opportunities;
 - (iv) The review of each Priority Development Project must include an assessment of techniques to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff close to the source of runoff; and
 - (v) Within 2 years after adoption of this Order, each Copermittee must review its local codes, policies, and ordinances and identify barriers therein to implementation of LID BMPs. Following the identification of these barriers to LID implementation, where feasible, the Copermittee must take, by the end of the permit cycle, appropriate actions to remove such barriers.
- (b) The following LID BMPs must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects where technically feasible as required below:
- (i) Maintain or restore natural storage reservoirs and drainage corridors (including depressions, areas of permeable soils, swales, and ephemeral and intermittent streams.
 - (ii) Projects with landscaped or other pervious areas must, where feasible, drain runoff from impervious areas (rooftops, parking lots, sidewalks, walkways, patios, etc) into pervious areas prior to discharge to the MS4. The amount of runoff from impervious areas that is to drain to pervious areas shall not exceed the total capacity of the project's pervious areas to infiltrate or treat runoff, taking into consideration the pervious areas' geologic and soil conditions, slope, and other pertinent factors.
 - (iii) Projects with landscaped or other pervious areas must, where feasible, properly design and construct the pervious areas to effectively receive and infiltrate or treat runoff from impervious areas, prior to discharge to the MS4. Soil compaction for these areas shall be minimized. The amount of the impervious areas that are to drain to pervious areas must be based upon the total size, soil conditions, slope, and other pertinent factors.
 - (iv) Projects with low traffic areas and appropriate soil conditions must construct walkways, trails, overflow parking lots, alleys, or other low-traffic areas with permeable surfaces, such as pervious concrete, porous asphalt, unit pavers, and granular materials.
- (c) To protect ground water resources any infiltration LID BMPs must comply with Section F.1.(c)(6).

(d) LID BMPs sizing criteria:

- (i) LID BMPs shall be sized and designed to ensure onsite retention without runoff, of the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the County of Orange's 85th Percentile Precipitation Map¹⁴ ("design capture volume");
- (ii) If onsite retention LID BMPs are technically infeasible per section F.1.d.(7)(b), LID biofiltration BMPs may treat any volume that is not retained onsite by the LID BMPs. The LID biofiltration BMPs must be designed for an appropriate surface loading rate to prevent erosion, scour and channeling within the BMP. Due to the flow through design of biofiltration BMPs, the total volume of the BMP, including pore spaces and prefilter detention volume, must be sized to hold at least 0.75 times the design storm volume that is not retained onsite by LID retention BMPs;
- (iii) If it is shown to be technically infeasible to treat the remaining volume up to and including the design capture volume using LID BMPs (retention or biofiltration), the project must implement conventional treatment control BMPs in accordance with Section F.1.d.(6) below and must participate in the LID waiver program in Section F.1.d.(7).

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

(5) Source Control BMP Requirements

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

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

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

(6) Treatment Control BMP Requirements¹⁵

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

- (a) All treatment control BMPs for a single Priority Development Project must collectively be sized to comply with the following numeric sizing criteria:
 - (i) Volume-based treatment control BMPs must be designed to mitigate (infiltrate, filter, or treat) the volume of runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event, as determined from the County of Orange's 85th Percentile Precipitation Isopluvial Map¹⁶; or
 - (ii) Flow-based treatment control BMPs must be designed to mitigate (infiltrate, filter, or treat) either: a) the maximum flow rate of runoff produced from a rainfall intensity of 0.2 inch of rainfall per hour, for each hour of a storm event; or b) the maximum flow rate of runoff produced by the 85th percentile hourly rainfall intensity (for each hour of a storm event), as determined from the local historical rainfall record, multiplied by a factor of two.
- (b) Treatment control BMPs for all Priority Development Projects must mitigate (treat through infiltration, settling, filtration or other unit processes) the required volume or flow of runoff from all developed portions of the project, including landscaped areas.
- (c) All treatment control BMPs must be located so as to remove pollutants from runoff prior to its discharge to any waters of the U.S. Multiple Priority Development Projects may use shared treatment control BMPs as long as construction of any shared treatment control BMP is completed prior to the use or occupation of any Priority Development Project from which the treatment control BMP will receive runoff.
- (d) All treatment control BMPs for Priority Development Projects must, at a minimum:
 - (i) Be ranked with high or medium pollutant removal efficiency for the project's most significant pollutants of concern, as the pollutant removal efficiencies are identified in the Copermittees' Model

¹⁵ This section only applies to those PDPs not implementing LID capable of meeting the design storm criteria for the entire site and meeting technical infeasibility eligibility. Low-Impact Development (LID) and other site design BMPs that are correctly designed to effectively remove pollutants from runoff are considered treatment control BMPs.

¹⁶ The isopluvial map is available from the County of Orange. The map can also be found as Figure A-1 Exhibit 7.II in the Model WQMP (September 2003), page 105 of 157 at http://www.ocwatersheds.com/StormWater/PDFs/2003_DAMP/2003_DAMP_Section_7_New_Development_Significant_Redevelopment.pdf.

SSMP. Treatment control BMPs with a low removal efficiency ranking must only be approved by a Copermittee when a feasibility analysis has been conducted which exhibits that implementation of treatment control BMPs with high or medium removal efficiency rankings are infeasible for a Priority Development Project or portion of a Priority Development Project.

- (ii) Be correctly sized and designed so as to remove storm water pollutants to the MEP.
- (e) Target removal of pollutants of concern from runoff.
- (f) Be implemented close to pollutant sources, and prior to discharging into waters of the U.S.
- (g) Not be constructed within a waters of the U.S. or waters of the State.
- (h) Include proof of a mechanism under which ongoing long-term maintenance will be conducted to ensure proper maintenance for the life of the project. The mechanisms may be provided by the project proponent or Copermittee.
- (i) Be designed and implemented with measures to avoid the creation of nuisance or pollution associated with vectors, such as mosquitoes, rodents, and flies.

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

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

- (a) Prior to implementation, the LID waiver program must clearly exhibit that it will not allow PDPs to result in a net impact (after consideration of any mitigation and in-lieu payments) from pollutant loadings over and above the impact caused by projects meeting LID requirements;
- (b) For each PDP participating, a technical feasibility analysis must be included demonstrating that it is technically infeasible to implement LID BMPs that comply with the requirements of Section F.1.(d)(4). The

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

- (i) Locations that cannot meet the infiltration and groundwater protection requirements in section F.1.c.(6). Where infiltration is technically infeasible, the project must still examine the feasibility of other onsite retention LID BMPs;
 - (ii) Smart growth and infill or redevelopment locations where the density and/or nature of the project would create significant difficulty for compliance with the onsite volume retention requirements; and
 - (iii) Other site, geologic, soil or implementation constraints identified in the Copermittees updated local SSMP document.
- (c) The LID waiver program must include mechanisms to verify that each Priority Development Project participating in the program is in compliance with all applicable SSMP requirements;
- (d) The LID waiver program must develop and implement a review process verifying that the BMPs to be implemented meet the designated design criteria. The review process must also verify that each Priority Development Project participating in the program is in compliance with all applicable SSMP requirements.
- (e) The LID waiver program must include performance standards for treatment control BMPs specified in compliance with section F.1.(d)(6).
- (f) Each PDP that participates in the LID waiver program must mitigate for the pollutant loads expected to be discharged due to not implementing the LID BMPs in section F.1.d.(4). Mitigation projects must be implemented within the same hydrologic subarea as the PDP. Mitigation projects outside of the hydrologic subarea but within the same hydrologic unit may be approved provided that the project proponent demonstrates that mitigation projects within the same hydrologic subarea are infeasible and that the mitigation project will address similar beneficial use impacts as expected from the PDPs pollutant load types and amount. Offsite mitigation projects may include green streets projects, existing development retrofit projects, retrofit incentive programs, regional BMPs and stream restoration. Project applicants seeking to utilize these

alternative compliance provisions may propose other offsite mitigation projects, which the Copermittees may approve if they meet the requirements of this subpart.

- (g) A Copermittee may choose to implement a pollutant credit system as part of the LID waiver program provided that such a credit system clearly exhibits that it will not allow PDPs to result in a net impact from pollutant loadings over and above the impact caused by projects meeting LID requirements. Any credit system that a Copermittee chooses to implement must be submitted to the Executive Officer for review and approval as part of the waiver program.
- (h) The LID waiver program shall include a storm water mitigation fund developed by the Copermittee(s) to be used for water quality improvement projects which may serve in lieu of the PDP's required mitigation in section F.1.d.(8)(e). The LID waiver program's storm water mitigation fund shall, at a minimum, identify;
 - (i) The entity or entities that will manage the storm water mitigation fund (i.e., assume full responsibility);
 - (ii) The range and types of acceptable projects for which storm water mitigation funds may be expended;
 - (iii) The entity or entities that will assume full responsibility for each water quality improvement project, including its successful completion; and
 - (iv) How the dollar amount of storm water mitigation fund contributions will be determined. In-lieu payments must be proportional to the additional pollutant load discharged by not fully implementing LID.
- (i) Each Copermittee must notify the Regional Board in their annual report of each PDP choosing to participate in the LID waiver program. The annual report must include the following information:
 - (i) Name of the developer of the participating PDP;
 - (ii) Site location;
 - (iii) Reason for LID waiver including technical feasibility analysis;
 - (iv) Description of BMPs implemented;
 - (v) Total amount deposited, if any, into the storm water mitigation fund described in section F.1.d.(8)(f);
 - (vi) Water quality improvement project(s) proposed to be funded; and
 - (vii) Timeframe for implementation of water quality improvement projects.

(8) Site Design and Treatment Control BMP Design Standards

As part of its local SSMP, each Copermittee must develop and require Priority

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

(9) Implementation Process

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

(10) Treatment BMP Review

- (a) The Copermittees must review and update the BMPs that are listed in their local SSMPs as options for treatment control during the third year of implementation of this Order. At a minimum, the update must include removal of obsolete or ineffective BMPs and addition of LID BMPs that can be used for treatment, such as bioretention cells, bioretention swales, etc. The update must also add appropriate LID BMPs to any tables or discussions in the local SSMPs addressing pollutant removal efficiencies of treatment control BMPs. In addition, the update must include review and revision where necessary of treatment control BMP pollutant removal efficiencies.
 - (b) The update must incorporate findings from BMP effectiveness studies conducted by the Copermittees for projects funded wholly or in part by the State Board or Regional Board.
 - (c) Each Copermittee must implement a mechanism for annually incorporating findings from local treatment BMP effectiveness studies (e.g., ones conducted by, or on-behalf of, public agencies in Orange County) into SSMP project reviews and permitting
- (11) Where a development project, greater than 100 acres in total project size or smaller than 100 acres in size yet part of a larger common plan of

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

e. BMP CONSTRUCTION VERIFICATION

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

f. BMP MAINTENANCE TRACKING

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

conveyed to all appropriate parties when there is a change in project or site ownership.

- (3) Each Copermittee must verify that approved post-construction BMPs are operating effectively and have been adequately maintained by implementing the following measures:
- (a) An annual inventory of all approved BMPs within the Copermittee's jurisdiction. LID BMPs implemented on a lot by lot basis at a single family residential home, such as rainbarrels, are not required to be tracked or inventoried. The inventory must also include all BMPs approved for Priority Development Projects since July 2001;
 - (b) The designation of high priority BMPs. High-priority designation must include consideration of BMP size, recommended maintenance frequency, likelihood of operational and maintenance issues, location, receiving water quality, and other pertinent factors;
 - (c) Verify implementation, operation, and maintenance of BMPs by inspection, self-certification, surveys, or other equally effective approaches with the following conditions:
 - (i) The implementation, operation, and maintenance of at least 90 percent of approved and inventoried final project public and private SSMPs (a.k.a. WQMPs) must be verified annually. All post-construction BMPs shall be verified within every four year period;
 - (ii) Operation and maintenance verifications must be required prior to each rainy season;
 - (iii) All (100 percent) projects with BMPs that are high priority must be inspected by the Copermittee annually prior to each rainy season;
 - (iv) All (100 percent) public agency projects with BMPs must be inspected by the Copermittee annually;
 - (v) At least 50 percent of projects with drainage insert treatment control BMPs must be inspected by the Copermittee annually;
 - (vi) Appropriate follow-up measures (including re-inspections, enforcement, maintenance, etc.) must be conducted to ensure the treatment BMPs continue to reduce storm water pollutants as originally designed;
 - (vii) All inspections must verify effective operation and maintenance of the treatment control BMPs, as well as compliance with all ordinances, permits, and this Order; and
 - (viii) Inspections must note observations of vector conditions, such as mosquitoes. Where conditions are identified as contributing to mosquito production, the Copermittee must notify the Orange County Vector Control District.

g. ENFORCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SITES

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

h. HYDROMODIFICATION – LIMITATIONS ON INCREASES OF RUNOFF DISCHARGE RATES AND DURATIONS¹⁷

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

(1) The HMP must:

- (a) Identify a method for assessing susceptibility of channel segments which receive runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects. The geomorphic stability within the channel shall be assessed. A performance standard shall be created that ensures that the geomorphic stability within the channel not be compromised as a result of receiving runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects.
- (b) Utilize continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record (or other analytical method proposed by the Copermittees and deemed acceptable

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

by the Regional Board) to identify a range of runoff flows¹⁸ for which priority Development Project post-project runoff flow rates and durations shall not exceed pre-development (naturally occurring) runoff flow rates and durations by more than 10 percent, where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses. In addition, the identified range of runoff flow rates and durations must compensate for the loss of sediment supply due to the development. The lower boundary of the range of runoff flows identified shall correspond with the critical channel flow that produces the critical shear stress that initiates channel bed movement or that erodes the toe of channel banks. The identified range of runoff flows may be different for specific watersheds, channels, or channel reaches. In the case of an artificially hardened (concrete lined, rip rap, etc.) channel, the lower boundary of the range of runoff flows identified shall correspond with the critical channel flow that produces the critical shear stress that initiates channel bed movement or that erodes the toe of channel banks of a comparable soft-bottomed channel.

- (c) Require Priority Development Projects to implement hydrologic control measures so that Priority Development Projects' post-project runoff flow rates and durations (1) do not exceed pre-project (naturally occurring) runoff flow rates and durations by more than 10 percent for the range of runoff flows identified under section F.1.h.(1)(b), where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses; (2) do not result in channel conditions which do not meet the channel standard developed under section F.1.h.(1)(a) for channel segments downstream of Priority Development Project discharge points; and (3) compensate for the loss of sediment supply due to development.
- (d) Include other performance criteria (numeric or otherwise) for Priority Development Projects as necessary to prevent runoff from the projects from increasing and/or continuing unnatural rates of erosion of channel beds and banks, silt pollutants generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.
- (e) Include a review of pertinent literature.
- (f) Identify areas within the San Juan Hydrologic Unit where historic hydromodification has resulted in a negative impact to benthic macroinvertebrate and benthic periphyton by identifying areas with low or very low Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) scores.

¹⁸ The identified range of runoff flows to be controlled should be expressed in terms of peak flow rates of rainfall events, such as "10% of the pre-development 2-year runoff event up to the pre-project 10-year runoff event."

- (g) Include a protocol to evaluate potential hydrograph change impacts to downstream watercourses from Priority Development Projects. This protocol must include the use of the IBI score as a metric for assessing impacts and improvements to downstream watercourses.
 - (h) Include a description of how the Copermitttees will incorporate the HMP requirements into their local approval processes.
 - (i) Include criteria on selection and design of management practices and measures (such as detention, retention, and infiltration) to control flow rates and durations and address potential hydromodification impacts.
 - (j) Include technical information supporting any standards and criteria proposed.
 - (k) Include a description of inspections and maintenance to be conducted for management practices and measures to control flow rates and durations and address potential hydromodification impacts.
 - (l) Include a description of pre- and post-project monitoring and other program evaluation, including IBI score, to be conducted to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the HMP.
 - (m) Include mechanisms for assessing and addressing cumulative impacts within a watershed on channel morphology.
 - (n) Include information on evaluation of channel form and condition, including slope, discharge, vegetation, underlying geology, and other information, as appropriate.
- (2) In addition to the hydrologic control measures that must be implemented per section F.1.h.(1)(c), the HMP must include a suite of management measures to be used on Priority Development Projects to protect and restore downstream beneficial uses and prevent or further prevent adverse physical changes to downstream channels. The measures must be based on a prioritized consideration of the following elements in this order:
- (a) Hydrologic control measures;
 - (b) On-site management controls;
 - (c) Regional controls located upstream of receiving waters; and
 - (d) In-stream controls.

Where stream channels are adjacent to, or are to be modified as part of a Priority Development Project, management measures must include buffer zones and setbacks. Under no circumstances will in-stream controls include the use of non-naturally occurring hardscape materials such as concrete,

- riprap, gabions, etc. The suite of management measures shall also include stream restoration as a viable option to achieve the channel standard in section F.1.h.(1)(a).
- (3) Each individual Copermitee has the discretion to not require Section F.1.h. at Priority Development Projects where the project:
- (a) Discharges storm water runoff into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean; or
 - (b) Discharges storm water runoff into conveyance channels whose bed and bank are concrete lined all the way from the point of discharge to ocean waters, enclosed bays, estuaries, or water storage reservoirs and lakes.
- (4) HMP Reporting and Implementation
- (a) Within 2 years of adoption of the Order, the Copermitees shall submit to the Regional Board a draft HMP that has been reviewed by the public, including the analysis that identifies the appropriate limiting range of flow rates per section F.1.h.(1)(b).
 - (b) Within 180 days of receiving Regional Board comments on the draft HMP, the Copermitees shall submit a final HMP that addressed the Regional Board's comments.
 - (c) Within 90 days of receiving a finding of adequacy from the Executive Officer, each Copermitee shall incorporate and implement the HMP for all Priority Development Projects.
 - (d) Prior to approval of the HMP by the Regional Board, the early implementation measures likely to be included in the HMP shall be encouraged by the Copermitees.
- (5) Interim Hydromodification Criteria

Within one year of adoption of this Order, each Copermitee must ensure that all Priority Development Projects are implementing the following criteria by comparing the pre-development (naturally occurring) and post-project flow rates and durations using a continuous simulation hydrologic model such as US EPA's Hydrograph Simulation Program-Fortran (HSPF):

- (a) For flow rates from 10 percent of the 2-year storm event to the 5 year storm event, the post-project peak flows shall not exceed pre-development (naturally occurring) peak flows.
- (b) For flow rates from the 5 year storm event to the 10 year storm event the post-project peak flows may exceed pre-development (naturally

occurring) flows by up to 10 percent for a 1-year frequency interval.

The interim hydromodification criteria do not apply to Priority Development Projects where the project discharges (1) storm water runoff into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean, or (2) storm water runoff into conveyance channels whose bed and bank are concrete lined all the way from the point of discharge to ocean waters, enclosed bays, estuaries, or water storage reservoirs and lakes.

Within one year of adoption of this Order, each Copermitttee must submit a signed, certification statement to the Regional Board verifying implementation of the interim hydromodification criteria.

- (6) No part of section F.1.h shall alleviate the Copermitttees responsibilities for implementing Low Impact Development BMPs as required under section F.1.d.(4).

i. TRAINING AND EDUCATION

(1) Municipal Departments and Personnel Education

Municipal Development Planning: Each Copermitttee must implement an education program so that its planning and development review staffs and contractors (and Planning Boards and Elected Officials, if applicable) have an understanding of:

- (a) Federal, State, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects;
- (b) The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization); and
- (c) Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including:
 - (i) Storm water management plan development and review;
 - (ii) Local sensitive water bodies, including 303(d)-impairments and ESAs;
 - (iii) Methods to control downstream erosion impacts;
 - (iv) Identification of pollutants of concern;
 - (v) Site design BMP techniques;
 - (vi) Source control BMPs;
 - (vii) Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern; and
 - (viii) Public health concerns related to storm water management infrastructure.

(2) Project Applicants, Developers, Contractors, Property Owners, and other Responsible Parties

- (a) Each Copermittee must implement a New Development / Redevelopment education program using all media as appropriate to:
- (i) Measurably increase the knowledge of the target communities regarding MS4s, impacts of runoff on receiving waters, and potential BMP solutions for the target audience; and
 - (ii) To measurably change the behavior of target communities and thereby reduce pollutant releases to MS4s and the environment.
- (b) Each Copermittee must educate each target community on the following topics where appropriate:
- (i) The importance of educating all construction workers in the field about storm water issues and BMPs through formal or informal training;
 - (ii) Federal, State, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to new development and redevelopment activities;
 - (iii) Site design, source control, pollution prevention, and treatment BMPs;
 - (iv) General runoff concepts; and
 - (v) Other topics of local importance, including local water quality conditions, impaired waterbodies and environmentally sensitive areas.

2. CONSTRUCTION COMPONENT

Each Copermittee must implement a construction program which meets the requirements of this section, prevents illicit discharges into the MS4, implements and maintains structural and non-structural BMPs to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff from construction sites to the MS4, reduces construction site discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents construction site discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

a. ORDINANCE UPDATE

Within 365 days of adoption of this Order, each Copermittee must review and update its grading ordinances and other ordinances as necessary to achieve full compliance with this Order, including requirements for the implementation of all designated BMPs and other measures.

b. SOURCE IDENTIFICATION

Each Copermittee must maintain an updated watershed based inventory of all construction sites within its jurisdiction. The use of an automated database system, such as Geographical Information Systems (GIS) is required.

c. SITE PLANNING AND PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS

Each Copermittee must incorporate consideration of potential water quality impacts prior to approval and issuance of construction and grading permits.

- (1) Each construction and grading permit must require proposed construction sites to implement designated BMPs and other measures so that illicit discharges into the MS4 are prevented and storm water pollutants discharged from the site will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable and will not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards.
- (2) Prior to permit issuance, the project proponent's runoff management plan (or equivalent construction BMP plan) must be required to comply, and reviewed to verify compliance, with the local grading ordinance, other applicable local ordinances, and this Order.
- (3) Prior to permit issuance, each Copermittee must verify that project proponents subject to California's statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated With Construction Activities, (hereinafter General Construction Permit), have existing coverage under the General Construction Permit.

d. BMP IMPLEMENTATION

- (1) Designate BMPs: Each Copermittee must designate a minimum set of BMPs and other measures to be implemented at all construction sites. The designated minimum set of BMPs must include:
 - (a) Management Measures:
 - (i) Pollution prevention, where appropriate;
 - (ii) Development and implementation of a site-specific runoff management plan;
 - (iii) Minimization of areas that are cleared and graded to only the portion of the site that is necessary for construction;
 - (iv) Minimization of exposure time of disturbed soil areas;
 - (v) Minimization of grading during the wet season and correlation of grading with seasonal dry weather periods to the extent feasible;
 - (vi) Limitation of grading to a maximum disturbed area as determined by each Copermittee before either temporary or permanent erosion controls are implemented to prevent storm water pollution. The Copermittee has the option of temporarily increasing the size of

disturbed soil areas by a set amount beyond the maximum, if the individual site is in compliance with applicable storm water regulations and the site has adequate control practices implemented to prevent storm water pollution;

- (vii) Temporary stabilization and reseeded of disturbed soil areas as rapidly as feasible;
- (viii) Wind erosion controls;
- (ix) Tracking controls;
- (x) Non-stormwater management measures to prevent illicit discharges and control storm water pollution sources;
- (xi) Waste management measures;
- (xii) Preservation of natural hydrologic features where feasible;
- (xiii) Preservation of riparian buffers and corridors where feasible;
- (xiv) Evaluation and maintenance of all BMPs, until removed; and
- (xv) Retention, reduction, and proper management of all storm water pollutant discharges on site to the MEP standard.

(b) Erosion and Sediment Controls:

- (i) Erosion prevention. Erosion prevention is to be used as the most important measure for keeping sediment on site during construction;
- (ii) Sediment controls. Sediment controls are to be used as a supplement to erosion prevention for keeping sediment on-site during construction;
- (iii) Slope stabilization must be used on all active slopes during rain events regardless of the season and on all inactive slopes during the rainy season and during rain events in the dry season; and
- (iv) Permanent revegetation or landscaping as early as feasible.

(c) Designate enhanced BMPs¹⁹ for 303(d) impairments and ESAs: Each Copermitttee must implement, or require implementation of, enhanced measures to address the exceptional threat to water quality posed by all construction sites tributary to CWA section 303(d) water body segments impaired for sediment or turbidity. Each Copermitttee must also implement, or require implementation of, enhanced, site-specific measures for construction sites within or adjacent to or discharging directly to coastal lagoons, the ocean, or other receiving waters within environmentally sensitive areas (as defined in Attachment C of this Order).

- (i) Active Sediment Treatment (AST): Each Copermitttee must require implementation of advanced treatment for sediment at construction

¹⁹ Enhanced BMPs are control actions specifically targeted to the pollutant or condition of concern and of higher quality and effectiveness than the minimum control measures otherwise required. Enhanced in this Order means better, not simply more, BMPs.

sites (or portions thereof) that are determined by the Copermittee to be an exceptional threat to water quality. In evaluating the threat to water quality, the following factors must be considered by the Copermittee:

- [a] Soil erosion potential or soil type;
- [b] The site's slopes;
- [c] Project size and type;
- [d] Sensitivity of receiving water bodies;
- [e] Proximity to receiving water bodies;
- [f] Non-storm water discharges;
- [g] Ineffectiveness of other BMPs;
- [h] Proximity and sensitivity of aquatic threatened and endangered species of concern;
- [i] Known effects of AST chemicals; and
- [j] Any other relevant factors.

- (d) Implement BMPs: Each Copermittee must implement, or require the implementation of, the designated minimum BMPs and any additional measures necessary to comply with this Order at each construction site within its jurisdiction year round. BMP implementation requirements, however, can vary based on wet and dry seasons. Dry season BMP implementation must plan for and address unseasonal rain events that may occur during the dry season (May 1 through September 30).

e. INSPECTION OF CONSTRUCTION SITES

Each Copermittee must conduct construction site inspections for compliance with its ordinances (grading, storm water, etc.), permits (construction, grading, etc.), and this Order. Priorities for inspecting sites must consider the nature and size of the construction activity, topography, and the characteristics of soils and receiving water quality.

- (1) During the wet season, each Copermittee must inspect at least biweekly (every two weeks), all construction sites within its jurisdiction meeting any of the following criteria:
- (a) All sites 30 acres or more in size with rough grading or active slopes occurring during the wet season;
 - (b) All sites one acre or more, and tributary to a CWA section 303(d) water body segment impaired for sediment or within or directly adjacent to, or discharging directly to, the ocean or a receiving water within an ESA; and
 - (c) Other sites determined by the Copermittees or the Regional Board as a significant threat to water quality. In evaluating threat to water quality, the following factors must be considered: (1) soil erosion potential; (2) site

slope; (3) project size and type; (4) sensitivity of receiving water bodies; (5) proximity to receiving water bodies; (6) non-storm water discharges; (7) past record of non-compliance by the operators of the construction site; and (8) any other relevant factors.

- (2) During the wet season, each Copermittee must inspect at least monthly, all construction sites with one acre or more of soil disturbance not meeting the criteria specified above in section F.2.e.(1).
- (3) During the wet season, each Copermittee must inspect construction sites less than one acre in size as needed to ensure compliance with its ordinances and this Order.
- (4) Each Copermittee must inspect all construction sites as needed during the dry season. Sites meeting the criteria in section F.2.e.(1) must be inspected at least once in August or September each year.
- (5) Re-inspections: Based upon site inspection findings, each Copermittee must implement all follow-up actions (i.e., re-inspection, enforcement) necessary to comply with this Order. Reinspection frequencies must be determined by each Copermittee based upon the severity of deficiencies, the nature of the construction activity, and the characteristics of soils and receiving water quality.
- (6) Inspections of construction sites must include, but not be limited to:
 - (a) Check for coverage under the General Construction Permit (Notice of Intent (NOI) and/or Waste Discharge Identification No.) during initial inspections;
 - (b) Assessment of compliance with Copermittee ordinances and permits related to runoff, including the implementation and maintenance of designated minimum BMPs;
 - (c) Assessment of BMP effectiveness;
 - (d) Visual observations for non-storm water discharges, potential illicit connections, and potential discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff;
 - (e) Education and outreach on storm water pollution prevention, as needed; and
 - (f) Creation of a written or electronic inspection report.
- (7) The Copermittees must track the number of inspections for each inventoried construction site throughout the reporting period to verify that each site is inspected at the minimum frequencies required.

f. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION SITES

- (1) Each Copermittee must develop and implement an escalating enforcement

process that achieves prompt corrective actions at construction sites for violations of the Copermittee's water quality protection permit requirements and ordinances. This enforcement process must include authorizing the Copermittee's construction site inspectors to take immediate enforcement actions when appropriate and necessary. The enforcement process must include appropriate sanctions such as stop work orders, non-monetary penalties, fines, bonding requirements, and/or permit denials for non-compliance.

- (2) Each Copermittee must be able to respond to complaints received from third-parties and to ensure the Regional Board that corrective actions have been implemented.

g. REPORTING OF NON-COMPLIANT SITES

- (1) In addition to the notification requirements in Attachment B, each Copermittee must notify the Regional Board when the Copermittee issues a stop work order or other high level enforcement to a construction site in its jurisdiction as a result of storm water violations.
- (2) Each Copermittee shall annually notify the Regional Board, prior to the commencement of the wet season, of all construction sites with alleged violations. Information may be provided as part of the JRMP annual report if submitted prior to the rainy season. Information provided shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - (a) WDID number if enrolled under the General Construction Permit
 - (b) Site Location, including address
 - (c) Current violations or suspected violations

h. TRAINING AND EDUCATION

- (1) Municipal Staff and Contractors: Requirements for municipal staff and contractors are described in the Municipal Component section of this Order.
- (2) Construction Site Owner / Operator Responsibilities:

As early in the planning and development process as possible and all through the permitting and construction process, each Copermittee must implement a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, and other responsible parties. The education program must provide an understanding of the topics listed below, as appropriate for the audience being educated.

- (a) The importance of educating all construction workers in the field about storm water issues and BMPs through formal or informal training;

- (b) Federal, State, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to construction and grading activities;
- (c) Site design, source control, pollution prevention, and treatment BMPs;
- (d) General runoff concepts; and
- (e) Other topics of local importance, including local water quality conditions, impaired waterbodies and environmentally sensitive areas.

3. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

a. MUNICIPAL

Each Copermittee must implement a municipal program which meets the requirements of this section, prevents illicit discharges into the MS4, reduces municipal discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents municipal discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

(1) Source Identification / Inventory

Each Copermittee must maintain an updated watershed-based inventory of municipal areas and activities. The inventory must include the name, address (if applicable), and a description of the area/activity; which pollutants are potentially generated by the area/activity; whether the area/activity is adjacent to an ESA; and identification of whether the area/activity is tributary to a CWA section 303(d) water body segment and generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired. The use of an automated database system, such as Geographical Information Systems (GIS) is required when applicable.

(2) General BMP Implementation

- (a) Pollution Prevention: Each Copermittee must implement pollution prevention methods in its municipal program and must require their use by appropriate municipal departments, personnel, and contractors, where appropriate.
- (b) Designate Minimum BMPs: Each Copermittee must designate a minimum set of BMPs for all municipal areas and activities. The designated minimum BMPs for municipal areas and activities must be area or activity specific as appropriate. BMPs must be designated for special events that are expected to generate significant trash and litter.
- (c) Designate BMPs for ESAs and 303(d) Impairments: Each Copermittee must designate enhanced measures for municipal areas and activities tributary to CWA section 303(d) impaired water body segments when an area or activity generates pollutants for which the water body segment is

impaired. Each Copermittee must also designate additional controls for municipal areas and activities within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to coastal lagoons, the ocean, or other receiving waters within environmentally sensitive areas (as defined in Attachment C of this Order).

- (d) Implement BMPs: Each Copermittee must implement, or require the implementation of, the designated minimum and enhanced BMPs and any additional measures necessary based on its inventory to comply with this Order for each municipal area or activity within its jurisdiction.

(3) BMP Implementation for Management of Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers

Each Copermittee must implement BMPs to reduce the contribution of storm water pollutants associated with the application, storage, and disposal of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers from municipal areas and activities to MS4s and receiving waters. Such BMPs must include, at a minimum:

- (a) Educational activities, permits, certifications and other measures for municipal applicators and distributors;
- (b) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) measures that rely on non-chemical solutions;
- (c) The use of native vegetation;
- (d) Schedules for irrigation and chemical application; and
- (e) The collection and proper disposal of unused pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers.

(4) BMP implementation for Flood Control Structures

- (a) Each Copermittee must implement procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving water bodies.
- (b) Each Copermittee must include water quality protection measures, where feasible, when retrofitting existing flood control structural devices.
- (c) Each Copermittee must evaluate its existing flood control devices, identify devices causing or contributing to a condition of pollution, identify measures to reduce or eliminate the structure's effect on pollution, and evaluate the feasibility of retrofitting the structural flood control device. The inventory and evaluation must be completed by and submitted to the Regional Board in the 2nd year JRMP Annual Report.

(5) BMP Implementation for Sweeping of Municipal Areas

Where municipal area sweeping is implemented as an MS4 BMP for municipal roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities, each Copermittee must design and implement the program based on the following criteria:

- (a) Optimize pickup of trash and debris based on land uses, trash collection schedules, seasonal factors (e.g., special events, tourism, etc.) and inspections of municipal areas/activities.

(6) Operation and Maintenance of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) and Structural Controls

- (a) Treatment Controls: Each Copermittee must implement a schedule of inspection and maintenance activities to verify proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls designed to reduce storm water pollutant discharges to or from its MS4s and related drainage structures.
- (b) MS4 and Facilities: Each Copermittee must implement a schedule of maintenance activities for the MS4 and MS4 facilities (catch basins, storm drain inlets, open channels, etc). The maintenance activities must, at a minimum, include:
 - (i) Inspection and removal of accumulated waste at least once a year between May 1 and September 30 of each year for all MS4 facilities;
 - (ii) Additional cleaning as necessary between October 1 and April 30 of each year for facilities that receive or collect high volumes of trash and debris;
 - (iii) Following two years of inspections, any MS4 facility that requires inspection and cleaning less than annually may be inspected as needed, but not less than every other year;
 - (iv) Open channels must be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner;
 - (v) Record keeping of the maintenance and cleaning activities including the overall quantity of waste removed;
 - (vi) Proper disposal of waste removed pursuant to applicable laws; and
 - (vii) Measures to eliminate waste discharges during MS4 maintenance and cleaning activities.

(7) Infiltration From Sanitary Sewer to MS4/Provide Preventive Maintenance of Both

- (a) Each Copermittee must implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to MS4s through thorough, routine preventive maintenance of the MS4. Each Copermittee that operates both a municipal sanitary sewer system and a MS4 must implement controls and measures to prevent and eliminate infiltration of seepage from the municipal sanitary sewers to the MS4s that must include overall sanitary sewer and MS4 surveys and thorough, routine preventive maintenance of both.

(b) Each Copermittee must implement controls to limit infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to municipal separate storm sewer systems where necessary. Such controls must include:

- (i) Adequate plan checking for construction and new development,
- (ii) Incident response training for municipal employees that identify sanitary sewer spills;
- (iii) Code enforcement inspections;
- (iv) MS4 maintenance and inspections;
- (v) Interagency coordination with sewer agencies; and
- (vi) Proper education of municipal staff and contractors conducting field operations on the MS4 or municipal sanitary sewer (if applicable).

(8) Inspection of Municipal Areas and Activities

(a) At a minimum, each Copermittee must inspect the following high priority municipal areas and activities annually:

- (i) Roads, Streets, Highways, and Parking Facilities;
- (ii) Flood Management Projects and Flood Control Devices;
- (iii) Areas and activities tributary to a CWA section 303(d) impaired water body segment, where an area or activity generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired.
- (iv) Areas and activities within or adjacent to or discharging directly to coastal lagoons, the ocean, or other receiving waters within environmentally sensitive areas (as defined in Attachment C of this Order);
- (v) Municipal Facilities:
 - [a] Active or closed municipal landfills;
 - [b] Publicly owned treatment works (including water and wastewater treatment plants) and sanitary sewage collection systems;
 - [c] Solid waste transfer facilities;
 - [d] Land application sites;
 - [e] Corporate yards including maintenance and storage yards for materials, waste, equipment and vehicles; and
 - [f] Household hazardous waste collection facilities.
- (vi) Municipal airfields;
- (vii) Parks and recreation facilities;
- (viii) Special event venues following special events (festivals, sporting events, etc.);
- (ix) Power washing; and
- (x) Other municipal areas and activities that the Copermittee determines may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4.

(b) Other municipal areas and activities must be inspected as needed and in response to water quality data, valid public complaints, and findings from

municipal or contract staff.

- (c) Based upon site inspection findings, each Copermittee must implement all follow-up actions necessary to comply with this Order.

(9) Enforcement of Municipal Areas and Activities

Each Copermittee must enforce its storm water ordinance for all municipal areas and activities as necessary to maintain compliance with this Order.

(10) Training and Education

Each Copermittee must ensure that all municipal personnel and contractors that have responsibilities for selecting, implementing, and evaluating BMPs for municipal areas and activities are adequately trained and educated to perform such tasks.

(a) Municipal Departments and Personnel Education

- (i) Municipal Construction Activities: Each Copermittee must implement an education program that includes annual training prior to the rainy season so that its construction, building, code enforcement, and grading review staffs, inspectors, and other responsible construction staff have, at a minimum, an understanding of the following topics, as appropriate for the target audience:
- [a] Federal, State, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to construction and grading activities;
 - [b] The connection between construction activities and water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization and impacts from construction material such as sediment);
 - [c] Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities;
 - [d] The Copermittee's inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application;
 - [e] Current advancements in BMP technologies;
 - [f] SSMP Requirements including treatment options, site design, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms; and
 - [g] Other topics of local importance, including local water quality conditions, impaired water bodies, environmentally sensitive areas, and public health and disease vector issues associated with runoff.
- (ii) Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities: Each Copermittee must train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at

least once a year. Training must cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and review of monitoring data

- (iii) Municipal Other Activities: Each Copermittee must implement an education program so that municipal personnel and contractors performing activities which generate pollutants have an understanding of the activity specific BMPs for each activity to be performed.

b. COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL

Each Copermittee must implement a commercial / industrial program that meets the requirements of this section, prevents illicit discharges into the MS4, reduces commercial / industrial discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents commercial / industrial discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

(1) Source Identification

- (a) Each Copermittee must maintain an updated watershed-based inventory of all industrial and commercial sites/sources within its jurisdiction (regardless of ownership) that could contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4. The inventory must include the following minimum information for each industrial and commercial site/source: name; address; pollutants potentially generated by the site/source; and identification of whether the site/source is tributary to a Clean Water Act section 303(d) water body segment and generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired; and a narrative description including SIC codes which best reflects the principal products or services provided by each facility.

At a minimum, the following sites/sources must be included in the inventory:

- (i) Commercial Sites/Sources:
 - [a] Automobile repair, maintenance, fueling, or cleaning;
 - [b] Airplane repair, maintenance, fueling, or cleaning;
 - [c] Boat repair, maintenance, fueling, or cleaning;
 - [d] Equipment repair, maintenance, fueling, or cleaning;
 - [e] Automobile and other vehicle body repair or painting;
 - [f] Mobile automobile or other vehicle washing;
 - [g] Automobile (or other vehicle) parking lots and storage facilities;
 - [h] Retail or wholesale fueling;
 - [i] Pest control services;
 - [j] Eating or drinking establishments, including food markets;

- [k] Mobile carpet, drape or furniture cleaning;
- [l] Cement mixing or cutting;
- [m] Masonry;
- [n] Painting and coating;
- [o] Botanical or zoological gardens and exhibits;
- [p] Landscaping;
- [q] Nurseries and greenhouses;
- [r] Golf courses, parks and other recreational areas/facilities;
- [s] Cemeteries;
- [t] Pool and fountain cleaning;
- [u] Marinas;
- [v] Portable sanitary services;
- [w] Building material retailers and storage;
- [x] Animal facilities;
- [y] Mobile pet services;
- [z] Power washing services; and
- [aa] Other sites and sources with a history of un-authorized discharges to the MS4.

(ii) Industrial Sites/Sources:

- [a] Industrial Facilities, as defined at 40 CFR § 122.26(b)(14), including those subject to the General Industrial Permit or other individual NPDES permit;
- [b] Operating and closed landfills;
- [c] Facilities subject to SARA Title III; and
- [d] Hazardous waste treatment, disposal, storage and recovery facilities.

(iii) ESAs and 303(d) Listed Waterbodies: All other commercial or industrial sites/sources tributary to a CWA Section 303(d) impaired water body segment, where the site/source generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired. All other commercial or industrial sites/sources within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to coastal lagoons, the ocean, or other receiving waters within environmentally sensitive areas (as defined in Attachment C of this Order).

(iv) All other commercial or industrial sites/sources that the Copermitttee determines may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4.

(2) General BMP Implementation

(a) Pollution Prevention: Each Copermitttee must require the use of pollution prevention methods by industrial and commercial sites/sources.

- (b) Designate / Update Minimum BMPs: Each Copermittee must designate a minimum set of BMPs for all industrial and commercial sites/sources. Where BMPs have already been designated, each Copermittee must review its existing BMPs for adequacy. The designated minimum BMPs must be specific to facility types and pollutant-generating activities, as appropriate.
- (c) Designate Enhanced BMPs for ESAs and 303(d) Impairments: Each Copermittee must designate enhanced measures for industrial and commercial sites/sources tributary to CWA section 303(d) impaired water body segments (where a site/source generates pollutants for which the water body segment is impaired). Each Copermittee must also designate additional controls for industrial and commercial sites/sources within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to coastal lagoons, the ocean, or other receiving waters within environmentally sensitive areas (as defined in Attachment C of this Order).
- (d) Implement BMPs: Each Copermittee must implement, or require the implementation of, the designated minimum and enhanced BMPs and any additional measures necessary based on inspections, incident responses, and water quality data to comply with this Order at each industrial and commercial site/source within its jurisdiction.

(3) BMP Implementation for Mobile Businesses

- (a) Each Copermittee must develop and implement a program to reduce the discharge of storm water pollutants from mobile businesses to the MEP and to prohibit non-storm water discharges pursuant to Section B of this Order. Each Copermittee must keep as part of their commercial source inventory a listing of mobile businesses known to operate within its jurisdiction. The program must include:
 - (i) Development and implementation of minimum standards and BMPs to be required for each of the various types of mobile businesses;
 - (ii) Development and implementation of an enforcement strategy which specifically addresses the unique characteristics of mobile businesses;
 - (iii) Notification of those mobile businesses known to operate within the Copermittee's jurisdiction of the minimum standards and BMP requirements and local ordinances;
 - (iv) Development and implementation of an outreach and education strategy; and
 - (v) Inspection of mobile businesses as needed to implement the program.
- (b) If they choose to, the Copermittees may cooperate in developing and implementing their programs for mobile businesses, including sharing of mobile business inventories, BMP requirements, enforcement action

information, and education.

(4) Inspection of Industrial and Commercial Sites/Sources

Each Copermittee must conduct industrial and commercial site inspections for compliance with its ordinances, permits, and this Order.

(a) Inspection Procedures: Inspections must include but not be limited to:

- (i) Review of BMP implementation plans, if the site uses or is required to use such a plan;
- (ii) Review of facility monitoring data, if the site monitors its runoff;
- (iii) Check for coverage under the General Industrial Permit (Notice of Intent (NOI) and/or Waste Discharge Identification Number), if applicable;
- (iv) Assessment of compliance with Copermittee ordinances and permits related to runoff;
- (v) Assessment of BMP implementation, maintenance and effectiveness;
- (vi) Visual observations for non-storm water discharges, potential illicit connections, and potential discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff; and
- (vii) Education and training on storm water pollution prevention, as conditions warrant.

(b) Each Copermittee shall annually notify the Regional Board, prior to the commencement of the wet season, of all Industrial Sites and Industrial Facilities subject to the General Industrial Permit or other individual NPDES permit with alleged violations. Information may be provided as part of the JRMP annual report if submitted prior to the rainy season. Information provided shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (i) WDID number if enrolled under the General Industrial Permit;
- (ii) Site Location, including address;
- (iii) Current violations or suspected violations; and
- (iv) Past Violation history.

(c) Frequencies: At a minimum, 20 percent of the sites inventoried as required in section F.3.b.(1) above (excluding mobile sources and food facilities) must be inspected each year. Mobile businesses must be

inspected pursuant to the enforcement strategy developed pursuant to section F.3.b.(3). Other inspection frequencies must be based upon findings of the Copermittee's existing program and the following factors:

- (i) Type of activity (SIC code);
 - (ii) Materials used at the facility;
 - (iii) Wastes generated;
 - (iv) Pollutant discharge potential;
 - (v) Non-storm water discharges;
 - (vi) Size of facility;
 - (vii) Proximity to receiving water bodies;
 - (viii) Sensitivity of receiving water bodies;
 - (ix) Whether the facility is subject to the General Industrial Permit or an individual NPDES permit;
 - (x) Whether the facility has filed a No Exposure Certification/Notice of Non-Applicability;
 - (xi) Facility design;
 - (xii) Total area of the site, area of the site where industrial or commercial activities occur, and area of the site exposed to rainfall and runoff;
 - (xiii) The facility's compliance history; and
 - (xiv) Any other relevant factors.
- (d) Food Facilities: Each food facility must be inspected annually for compliance with the Copermittee's water quality ordinances and this Order. Each inspection of a food facility must, at a minimum, address the following concerns:
- (i) Trash storage and disposal;
 - (ii) Grease storage and disposal;
 - (iii) Washwater discharges to the MS4 (e.g., from floor mats, driveways, sidewalks, etc.);
 - (iv) Identification of outdoor sewer and MS4 connections; and
 - (v) Education of property managers when grease and/or trash facilities are shared by multiple facilities.
- (e) Third-Party Inspections: Each Copermittee may develop and implement a third party inspection program for verifying industrial and commercial site/source compliance with its ordinances, permits, and this Order. To the extent that third party inspections are conducted to fulfill the requirements of this Order, the Copermittee will be responsible for conducting and documenting quality assurance and quality control of the third-party inspections.
- (i) Each inspection conducted by a third-party must, at a minimum, result in the following:

- [a] Photo documentation of potential storm water violations identified during the third party inspection;
 - [b] Reporting to the Copermittee of identified significant potential violations, including imminent or observed illegal discharges, within 24 hours of the third party inspection;
 - [c] Reporting to the Copermittee of all inspection findings within one week of the inspection being conducted; and
 - [d] Copermittee follow-up and/or enforcement actions for identified potential storm water violations within two business days of the inspection or potential violation report receipt.
- (f) Based upon site inspection findings, each Copermittee must implement all follow-up actions and enforcement necessary to comply with this Order.
- (g) To the extent that the Regional Board has conducted an inspection of an industrial site during a particular year, the requirement for the responsible Copermittee to inspect this facility during the same year will be satisfied.
- (h) The Copermittees must track the number of inspections for the inventoried industrial and commercial sites/sources throughout the reporting period to verify that the sites/sources are inspected at the minimum frequencies listed in this Order.

(5) Enforcement of Industrial and Commercial Sites/Sources

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

(6) Training and Education for Owners and Operators of Commercial and Industrial Activities

- (a) Each Copermittee must implement an education program using all media as appropriate to (1) measurably increase the knowledge of owners and operators of commercial and industrial activities regarding MS4s, impacts of runoff on receiving waters, and potential BMP solutions for the target audience; and (2) to measurably change the behavior of target communities and thereby reduce storm water pollutant releases and eliminate prohibited non-storm water discharges to MS4s and the environment. At a minimum, the education program must meet the requirements of this section and address the following issues:
- (i) Laws, regulations, permits, & requirements;

- (ii) Best management practices;
- (iii) General runoff concepts; and
- (iv) Other topics, including public reporting mechanisms, water conservation, low-impact development techniques.

(b) BMP Notification: At least twice during the five-year period of this Order, each Copermittee must notify the owner/operator of each inventoried industrial and commercial site/source of the BMP requirements applicable to the site/source.

c. RESIDENTIAL

Each Copermittee must implement a residential program which meets the requirements of this section, prevents illicit discharges into the MS4, reduces residential discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents residential discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.

(1) Threat to Water Quality Prioritization

Each Copermittee must identify residential areas and activities that pose a high threat to water quality. At a minimum, these must include:

- (a) Automobile repair, maintenance, washing, and parking;
- (b) Home and garden care activities and product use (pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers);
- (c) Disposal of trash, pet waste, green waste, and household hazardous waste (e.g., paints, cleaning products);
- (d) Any other residential source that the Copermittee determines may contribute a significant pollutant load to the MS4;
- (e) Any residential areas tributary to a CWA section 303(d) impaired water body, where the residence generates pollutants for which the water body is impaired; and
- (f) Any residential areas within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to a coastal lagoon, the ocean, or other receiving waters within an environmentally sensitive area (as defined in Attachment C of this Order).

(2) BMP Implementation

- (a) Pollution Prevention: Each Copermittee must actively encourage the use of pollution prevention methods by residents.
- (b) Designate BMPs: Each Copermittee must designate minimum BMPs for high-threat-to-water quality residential areas and activities. The designated minimum BMPs for high-threat-to-water quality residential

areas and activities must be area or activity specific.

- (c) Hazardous Waste BMPs: Each Copermittee must facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil, toxic materials, and other household hazardous wastes. Such facilitation must include educational activities, public information activities, and establishment of collection sites operated by the Copermittee or a private entity. Curbside collection of household hazardous wastes is encouraged.
- (d) Implement BMPs: Each Copermittee must implement, or require implementation of, the designated minimum BMPs and any additional measures necessary to comply with Sections A and B of this Order.
- (e) Each Copermittee must implement, or require implementation of, BMPs for residential areas and activities that have not been designated a high threat to water quality, as necessary.

(3) Enforcement of Residential Areas and Activities

Each Copermittee must enforce its storm water ordinance for all residential areas and activities as necessary to maintain compliance with this Order.

(4) Evaluation of Oversight of Residential Areas and Activities

Each Copermittee must annually review the effectiveness of efforts to reduce residential discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 and eliminate illicit residential discharges into the MS4. The evaluation must consider findings from monitoring data, municipal employee comments, inspections, complaints, and other appropriate sources.

(5) Common Interest Areas (CIA) / Home Owner Association (HOA) Areas

Each Copermittee must implement measures specifically to ensure that runoff within common interest developments, including areas managed by associations, meets the objectives of this section and Order.

- (a) BMP Implementation: Each Copermittee must implement management measures based on a review of pertinent factors, including:
 - (i) Current maintenance duties and procedures used by CIA/HOA maintenance associations within its jurisdiction;
 - (ii) Whether streets and storm drains are publicly or privately owned within the CIA/HOA;
 - (iii) Whether the CIA/HOA area has been identified as a high priority residential area;
 - (iv) Proximity to 303(d)-listed waterbodies, the ocean, environmentally

- sensitive areas;
- (v) Evaluation of water quality monitoring data;
- (vi) Evaluation of existing illegal discharge/illicit connection activities;
- (vii) Other activities conducted or authorized by the HOA that may pose a significant risk to inland or coastal receiving waters.

- (b) Legal Authority and Enforcement: Within one year of adoption of this Order, each Copermittee must review its Municipal Code to determine the most appropriate method to implement and enforce runoff management measures within CIA/HOA areas.

(6) Residential Education Program

- (a) Each Copermittee must implement a Residential Education Program using all media as appropriate to (1) measurably increase the knowledge regarding MS4s, impacts of runoff on receiving waters, and potential BMP solutions for the target audience; and (2) to measurably change the behavior of target communities and thereby reduce storm water and eliminate prohibited non-storm water pollutant releases to MS4s and the environment.
- (b) Copermittee educational programs must emphasize underserved target audiences, residents and managers of CIA/HOA areas, high-risk behaviors, and “allowable” behaviors and discharges. At a minimum, the education program must meet the requirements of this section and address the following issues:
 - (i) Laws, regulations, permits, and requirements;
 - (ii) Best management practices;
 - (iii) General runoff concepts;
 - (iv) Existing water quality, including local water quality conditions, impaired waterbodies and environmentally sensitive areas; and
 - (v) Other topics, including public reporting mechanisms, water conservation, low-impact development techniques, and public health and disease vector issues associated with runoff.

d. Retrofitting Existing Development

Each Copermittee must develop and implement a retrofitting program which meets the requirements of this section. The goals of the existing development retrofitting program are to reduce impacts from hydromodification, promote LID, support riparian and aquatic habitat restoration, reduce the discharges of storm water pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. Where feasible, at the discretion of the Copermittee, the existing development retrofitting program may be coordinated with flood control projects and infrastructure

improvement programs.

(1) Source Identification

The Copermittee must identify and inventory existing developments (i.e. municipal, industrial, commercial, residential) as candidates for retrofitting. Potential retrofitting candidates must include but are not limited to:

- (a) Development that contributes pollutants of concern to a TMDL or a ESA;
- (b) Receiving waters channelized or otherwise hardened;
- (c) Development tributary to receiving waters that are channelized or otherwise hardened;
- (d) Developments tributary to receiving waters that are significantly eroded;
- (e) Developments tributary to an ASBS or SWQPA; and
- (f) Development that causes hydraulic constriction.

(2) Each Copermittee shall evaluate and rank the inventoried existing developments to prioritize retrofitting. Criteria for evaluation must include but is not limited to:

- (a) Feasibility;
- (b) Cost effectiveness;
- (c) Pollutant removal effectiveness;
- (d) Impervious area potentially treated;
- (e) Maintenance requirements;
- (f) Landowner cooperation;
- (g) Neighborhood acceptance;
- (h) Aesthetic qualities; and
- (i) Efficacy at addressing concern.

(3) Each Copermittee must consider the results of the evaluation in prioritizing work plans for the following year. Highly feasible projects expected to benefit water quality should be given a high priority to implement source control and treatment control BMPs. Where feasible, the retrofit projects should be designed in accordance with the SSMP requirements within sections F.1.d.(3) through F.1.d.(8). In addition, the Copermittee shall encourage retrofit projects to implement where feasible the Hydromodification requirements in Section F.1.h.

(4) When requiring retrofitting on existing development, the Copermittees will cooperate with private landowners to encourage retrofitting projects. The Copermittee may consider the following practices in cooperating and encouraging private landowners to retrofit their existing development:

- (a) Demonstration retrofit projects;
- (b) Retrofits on public land and easements;

- (c) Education and outreach;
 - (d) Subsidies for retrofit projects;
 - (e) Requiring retrofit projects as mitigation or ordinance compliance;
 - (f) Public and private partnerships; and
 - (g) Fees for existing discharges to the MS4.
- (5) The completed retrofit BMPs shall be tracked and inspected in accordance with section F.1.f.
- (6) Where constraints on retrofitting preclude effective BMP deployment on existing developments at locations critical to protect receiving waters, a Copermittee may propose a regional mitigation project to improve water quality. Such regional projects may include but are not limited to:
- (a) Regional water quality treatment BMPs;
 - (b) Urban creek or wetlands restoration and preservation;
 - (c) Daylighting and restoring underground creeks;
 - (d) Localized rainfall storage and reuse to the extent such projects are fully protective of downstream water rights;
 - (e) Hydromodification project; and
 - (f) Removal of invasive plant species.
- (7) A retrofit project or regional mitigation project may qualify as a Watershed Water Quality Activity provided it meets the requirements in section G. Watershed Runoff Management Program.

4. ILLICIT DISCHARGE DETECTION AND ELIMINATION

Each Copermittee must implement a program which meets the requirements of this section to actively detect and eliminate illicit discharges and disposal into the MS4. The program must address all types of illicit discharges and connections excluding those non-storm water discharges not prohibited by the Copermittee in accordance with section B of this Order.

a. PREVENT AND DETECT ILLICIT DISCHARGES AND CONNECTIONS

Each Copermittee must implement measures to prevent and detect illicit discharges to the MS4.

- (1) Legal Authority: Each Copermittee must retain legal authority to prevent and eliminate illicit discharges and connections to the MS4.
- (2) Inspections: Each Copermittee must include use of appropriate municipal personnel and contractors to assist in identifying illicit discharges and connections during their daily activities.

- (a) Inspections for illegal discharges and connections must be conducted during routine maintenance of all MS4 facilities.
- (b) Municipal staff and contractors conducting non-MS4 field operations must be trained to report suspected illegal discharges and connections to proper municipal staff.

b. MAINTAIN MS4 MAP

Each Copermittee must maintain an updated map of its entire MS4 and the corresponding drainage areas within its jurisdiction. The use of GIS is required. The accuracy of the MS4 map must be confirmed during dry weather field screening and analytical monitoring and must be updated at least annually. The GIS layers of the MS4 map must be submitted with the updated Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan within 365 days after adoption of this Order.

c. FACILITATE PUBLIC REPORTING OF ILLICIT DISCHARGES AND CONNECTIONS - PUBLIC HOTLINE

Each Copermittee must promote, publicize and facilitate public reporting of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges into or from MS4s. Each Copermittee must facilitate public reporting through development and operation of a public hotline. Public hotlines can be Copermittee-specific or shared by Copermittees. All storm water hotlines must be capable of receiving reports in both English and Spanish 24 hours per day and seven days per week.

d. DRY WEATHER FIELD SCREENING AND ANALYTICAL MONITORING

Each Copermittee must conduct dry weather field screening and analytical monitoring of MS4 outfalls and other portions of its MS4 within its jurisdiction to detect illicit discharges and connections in accordance with Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R9-2009-0002 in Attachment E of this Order.

e. INVESTIGATION / INSPECTION AND FOLLOW-UP

Each Copermittee must implement procedures to investigate and inspect portions of the MS4 that, based on the results of field screening, analytical monitoring, or other appropriate information, indicate a reasonable potential of containing illicit discharges, illicit connections, or other sources of pollutants in non-storm water.

- (1) Develop response criteria for data: Each Copermittee must develop, update, and use numeric criteria action levels (or other actions level criteria where appropriate) to determine when follow-up investigations will be performed in response to water quality monitoring. The criteria must include required

non-storm water action levels (see Section C) and a consideration of 303(d)-listed waterbodies and environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) as defined in Attachment C.

- (2) Respond to data: Each Copermittee must investigate portions of the MS4 for which water quality data or conditions indicates a potential illegal discharge or connection.
 - (a) Obvious illicit discharges (i.e. color, odor, or significant exceedances of action levels) must be investigated immediately.
 - (b) Field screen data: Within two business days of receiving dry weather field screening results that exceed action levels, the Copermittees must either initiate an investigation to identify the source of the discharge or document the rationale for why the discharge does not pose a threat to water quality and does not need further investigation. This documentation shall be included in the Annual Report.
 - (c) Analytical data: Within five business days of receiving analytical laboratory results that exceed action levels, the Copermittees must either initiate an investigation to identify the source of the discharge or document the rationale for why the discharge does not pose a threat to water quality and does not need further investigation. This documentation shall be included in the Annual Report.
- (3) Respond to notifications: Each Copermittee must respond to and resolve each reported incident (e.g., public hotline, staff notification, etc.) in a timely manner. Criteria may be developed to assess the validity of, and prioritize the response to, each report.

f. ELIMINATION OF ILLICIT DISCHARGES AND CONNECTIONS

Each Copermittee must take immediate action to initiate steps necessary to eliminate all detected illicit discharges, illicit discharge sources, and illicit connections after detection. Elimination measures may include an escalating series of enforcement actions for those illicit discharges that are not a serious threat to public health or the environment. Illicit discharges that pose a serious threat to the public's health or the environment must be eliminated immediately.

g. ENFORCE ORDINANCES

Each Copermittee must implement and enforce its ordinances, orders, or other legal authority to prevent illicit discharges and connections to its MS4 and to eliminate detected illicit discharges and connections to its MS4.

h. PREVENT AND RESPOND TO SEWAGE SPILLS (INCLUDING FROM PRIVATE LATERALS AND FAILING SEPTIC SYSTEMS) AND OTHER SPILLS

(1) Each Copermittee must implement management measures and procedures to prevent, respond to, contain and clean up all sewage (see below) and other spills that may discharge into its MS4 from any source (including private laterals and failing septic systems). Copermittees must coordinate with spill response teams to prevent entry of spills into the MS4 and contamination of surface water, ground water and soil. Each Copermittee must coordinate spill prevention, containment and response activities throughout all appropriate departments, programs and agencies so that maximum water quality protection is available at all times.

(2) Each Copermittee must develop and implement a mechanism whereby it is notified of all sewage spills from private laterals and failing septic systems into its MS4. Each Copermittee must implement management measures and procedures to prevent, respond to, and coordinate a response to contain and clean up sewage from any such notification.

i. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Each Copermittee must implement educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials.

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

Each Copermittee must incorporate a mechanism for public participation in the updating, development, and implementation of the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program.

G. WATERSHED RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

1. Lead Watershed Copermittee Identification

Watershed Copermittees shall identify the Lead Watershed Copermittee for their Watershed Management Area (WMA). The Lead Watershed Copermittees shall serve as liaisons between the Permittees and Regional Board, where appropriate.

2. Watershed Water Quality Workplan (Watershed Workplan)

The Watershed Workplan shall describe the Permittees' development and implementation of a collective watershed strategy to assess and prioritize the water quality problems within the watershed's receiving waters, identify and model sources of the highest priority water quality problem(s), develop a watershed-wide BMP implementation strategy to abate highest priority water quality problems, and a monitoring strategy to evaluate BMP effectiveness and changing water quality prioritization in the WMA.

The work plan shall, at a minimum:

- a.** Characterize the receiving water quality in the WMA. Characterization shall include use of regularly collected water quality data, reports, monitoring and analysis generated in accordance with the requirements of the Receiving Waters Monitoring and Reporting Program, as well as applicable information available from other public and private organizations.
- b.** Identify the highest priority water quality problem(s), in terms of constituents by location, in the WMA's receiving waters. Identified water quality problem(s) shall, at a minimum, give consideration to; TMDLs, receiving waters listed on the CWA section 303(d) list, waters with persistent violations of water quality standards, toxicity, or impacts to beneficial uses, and other pertinent conditions.
- c.** Identify the sources of the highest water quality problem(s) within the WMA. Efforts to determine such sources shall include, but not be limited to: use of information from the construction, industrial/commercial, municipal, and residential source identification programs required within the Jurisdictional Runoff Program (JRMP) of this Order; specific actions to model pollutant transport to receiving waters for the sake of identifying the source(s) point(s) of origin; water quality monitoring data collected as part of the Receiving Water Monitoring and Reporting Program required by this Order, and additional focused water quality monitoring to identify specific sources within the watershed.
- d.** Develop a watershed BMP implementation strategy to attain receiving water quality objectives in the identified highest priority water quality problem(s). The BMP implementation strategy shall include a schedule for implementation of the BMP projects to abate specific receiving water quality problems. BMPs not

contributing to measured pollutant reductions or improvements to water quality must be removed and replaced with alternative BMPs. Identified watershed water quality problems may be the result of jurisdictional discharges that will need to be addressed with BMPs applied in a specific jurisdiction in order to generate a benefit to the watershed.

- e. Develop a strategy to model and monitor improvements in receiving water quality directly resulting from implementation of the BMPs described in the Watershed Workplan. The modeling and monitoring strategy shall generate the necessary data to report on the measured pollutant reduction that results from proper BMP implementation. Monitoring shall, at a minimum, be conducted in the receiving water to demonstrate reduction in pollutant concentrations and progression towards attainment of receiving water quality objectives.
 - f. Establish a schedule for development and implementation of the Watershed strategy outlined in the Workplan. The schedule shall, at a minimum, include forecasted dates of planned actions to address Provisions E.2(a) through E.2(e) and dates for watershed review meetings through the remaining portion of this Permit cycle. Annual watershed workplan review meetings must be open to the public and appropriately publically noticed such that interested parties may come and provide comments on the watershed program.
3. **Watershed Workplan Implementation** – Watershed Copermittee’s shall begin implementing the Watershed Workplan within 60-days of acceptance by the Regional Board Executive Officer. If within 30 days of submittal, the Regional Board has not taken an action, the Workplan shall be deemed acceptable.
 4. **Copermittee Collaboration** – Watershed Copermittees shall collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Workplan. Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings.
 5. **Public Participation** – Watershed Copermittees shall implement a watershed-specific public participation mechanism within each watershed. A required component of the watershed-specific public participation shall be a minimum 30-day public review of the Watershed Workplan prior to submittal for acceptance by the Regional Board Executive Officer. Opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Watershed Workplan must occur before the workplan is implemented.
 6. **Watershed Workplan Review and Updates** – Watershed Copermittees shall review and update the Watershed Workplan annually to identify needed changes to the prioritized water quality problem(s) listed in the workplan. All updates to the Watershed Workplan shall be presented during an Annual Watershed Review Meeting. Annual Watershed Review Meetings shall occur once every calendar year and be conducted by the Watershed Copermittees. Annual Watershed Review Meetings shall be open to the public and adequately noticed. Individual Watershed Copermittees shall also review and modify their jurisdictional programs and JRMP

Annual Reports, as necessary, so that they are consistent with the updated Watershed Workplan.

7. Aliso Creek Watershed Runoff Management Plan (WRMP) Provisions

The following provisions apply to the Aliso Creek WRMP. Requirements in this subsection must supersede requirements prescribed by the Regional Board on October 18, 2005.²⁰

- a. Each Copermittee within the Aliso Creek Watershed must implement the monitoring and reporting program described in *Aliso Creek 13325 Directive, Revised Monitoring Program Design – Integration with NPDES Program*, December 2004 (Revised Aliso Creek Program).
- b. Each Copermittee must provide annual reports by March 1 of each year beginning in 2011 for the preceding annual period of January through December. The annual reports must contain the following information:
 - (1) Water quality data and assessment from the Revised Aliso Creek Program. Each municipality must implement the monitoring and reporting program described in the Revised Aliso Creek Program. All information submitted in the report must conform to a SWAMP-Compatible Quality Assurance Project Plan²¹. The report must contain an assessment of compliance with applicable water quality standards for each monitoring station. The report must include data in tabular and graphical form, and electronic data must be submitted to the Regional Board.
 - (2) Program Assessment. A description and assessment of each municipality's program implemented within the high-priority storm drain locations (as identified Revised Aliso Creek Program) to reduce discharges of indicator fecal bacteria/pathogens. Monitoring alone is not sufficient to assess progress of the municipal programs. Municipalities must demonstrate each year that their programs are effective and resulting in a reduction of bacteria sources.
 - (i) For structural and nonstructural management practices implemented, the assessment must contain a description of the

²⁰ On October 12, 2005, the Regional Board accepted proposed changes to the bacteria monitoring program that had been conducted since spring 2001 pursuant to an Investigative Order from the Regional Board's executive officer. The October 18, 2005, letter from the Regional Board's executive officer revised the Investigative Order and instituted the new monitoring and reporting requirements.

²¹ The State Water Resource Control Board (State Board) has prepared an electronic template for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPP) to assist in QAPP development, to provide a common format that will allow for review to be expedited, and to provide information on Surface Water Ambient Monitoring (SWAMP) consistency. Additional information and the template are available on-line at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/swamp/qapp.html>.

practice, capital and maintenance costs, expectations for effectiveness, date implemented, and any observed results.

- (ii) For structural and nonstructural management practices evaluated, the assessment must contain a description of the practice(s), conclusions from the evaluation, and whether and when the practice is planned for implementation by the municipality or group of municipalities.
- (3) Status Reports. Updates on high-priority storm drain areas. Status reports must be provided by each municipality that discuss the causes of impairment and subsequent management activities implemented within the reporting period in the high priority areas and the planned activities for the next reporting period.
- (4) Certification Statement. The technical reports submitted to the Regional Board must include the following certification statement signed by either the principal executive officer, ranking elected official, or duly authorized representative of that person:

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person(s) directly responsible for gathering the information, the information is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

- c. The annual reports must be submitted until the Regional Board determines they are no longer warranted. If requested by a municipality, the monitoring program may be modified or reduced by the Regional Board. The monitoring program and annual reporting may be modified in response to adopted TMDLs and additional Clean Water Act 303(d) listings for impairment.
- d. Municipalities must continue meeting on a quarterly basis to discuss efforts to reduce bacteria in the Aliso Creek watershed.

H. FISCAL ANALYSIS

- 1. Secure Resources:** Each Copermittee must secure the resources necessary to meet all requirements of this Order.
- 2. Annual Analysis:** Each Copermittee must conduct an annual fiscal analysis of the necessary capital and operation and maintenance expenditures necessary to accomplish the activities of the programs required by this Order. The analysis must include estimated expenditures for the reporting period, the preceding period, and the next reporting period.
 - a.** Each analysis must include a description of the source of funds that are proposed to meet the necessary expenditures, including legal restrictions on the use of such funds.
 - b.** Each analysis must include a narrative description of circumstances resulting in a 25 percent or greater annual change for any budget line items.
- 3. Annual Reporting:** Each Copermittee must submit its annual fiscal analysis with the annual JRMP report.

I. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS

The waste load allocations (WLAs) of fully approved and adopted TMDLs are incorporated as Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations on a pollutant by pollutant, watershed by watershed basis. Early TMDL requirements, including monitoring, may be required and inserted into this Order pursuant to Finding E.10

1. Baby Beach Bacterial Indicator TMDL Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations

- a. The Copermitees in the Baby Beach watershed shall implement BMPs capable of achieving the interim and final Bacterial Indicator Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) in discharges to Baby Beach as described in Table 6.

Table 6: TMDL Waste Load Reduction Milestones

<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>
Meet 50% wasteload reductions	3 years after effective date for dry weather
	7 years after effective date for wet weather
Meet 100% wasteload reductions	5 years after effective date for dry weather
	10 years after effective date for wet weather

- b. The Copermitees shall conduct necessary monitoring, as described in Attachment A to Resolution No. R9-2008-0027, and submit annual progress reports as part of their yearly reports.
- c. The following WLAs (Table 7) are to be met in Baby Beach receiving water by the end of the year 2019 for wet weather and 2014 for dry weather:

Table 7: Final Bacterial Indicator Waste Load Allocations for Baby Beach

<u>Bacterial Indicator</u>	<u>Waste Load Allocation</u>	
	Dry Weather (Billion MPN / Day)	Wet Weather (Billion MPN / 30 Days)
Total Coliform	0.86	3,254
Fecal Coliform	0.17	112
<i>Enterococcus</i>	0.03	114

MPN: Most Probable Number

- d. The Copermitees must meet the following Numeric Targets (Table 8) in Baby Beach receiving waters in order to meet the underlying assumptions of the TMDL. The Numeric Targets are to be met once 100 percent of the WLA reductions have been achieved (see Table 7 above).

Table 8: Final Bacterial Indicator Numeric Targets for Baby Beach

<u>Bacterial Indicator</u>	30-day geo mean (MPN / 100mL)	Single Sample Max (MPN / 100mL)
	Dry Weather only	Dry and Wet Weather
Total Coliform	1,000	10,000
Fecal Coliform	200	400
<i>Enterococcus</i>	35	104

MPN: Most Probable Number

J. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING

1. Jurisdictional Program Effectiveness Assessments

a. OBJECTIVES OF EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENTS

Beginning with the Annual Report due in 2011, each Copermittee must annually assess the effectiveness of its Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program (JRMP) implementation at meeting the following objectives:

- (1) Objective for 303(d) Waterbodies: Reduce storm water pollutant loadings.
 - (a) Each Copermittee must establish annual assessment measures or methods specifically for reducing discharges of storm water pollutants from its MS4 into each downstream 303(d)-listed water body for which that waterbody is impaired. Assessment measures must be developed for each of the six outcome levels described by CASQA.²²
 - (b) Each Copermittee must annually conduct each established assessment measure or method and evaluate the outcome. Each outcome must then be used to assess the effectiveness of implemented management measures toward reducing MS4 discharges of the specific pollutants causing or contributing to conditions of impairment.
 - (c) The assessment measures must target both water quality outcomes and the results of municipal enforcement activities.
- (2) Objective for Environmentally-Sensitive Areas: Prevent storm water MS4 discharges from causing or contributing to conditions of pollution, nuisance, or contamination.
 - (a) Each Copermittee must establish annual measures or methods specifically for assessing the effectiveness of its management measures for protecting downstream ESAs from adverse effects caused by discharges from its MS4. Assessment measures must be developed for each of the six outcome levels described by CASQA.
 - (b) Each Copermittee must annually implement each established assessment measure or method and evaluate the outcome. Each outcome must be used to assess the effectiveness of implemented management measures toward reducing MS4 discharges of the specific pollutants causing or contributing to conditions of impairment.
 - (c) The assessment measures must target both water quality outcomes and the results of municipal enforcement activities.
- (3) Objectives for major program component outcomes: Determined by Each

²² Effectiveness assessment outcome levels as defined by CASQA are defined in Attachment C of this Order. See "*Municipal Stormwater Program Effectiveness Assessment Guidance*" (CASQA, May 2007) for guidance for assessing program activities at the various outcome levels.

Copermittee.

- (a) Each Copermittee must annually develop objectives for each program component in Section F and the overall JRMP. The objectives must be established as appropriate in response to program implementation and evaluation of water quality and management practices.
 - (b) Assessment approaches for program implementation must include a mix of specific activities, general program components, and water quality data.
 - (c) The assessment measures must target both water quality outcomes and the results of municipal enforcement activities.
- (4) Objectives for actions taken to protect receiving water limitations in accordance with this Order.
- (a) Each Copermittee must develop and implement an effectiveness assessment strategy for each measure conducted in response to a determination to implement the “iterative” approach to prevent or reduce any storm water pollutants that are causing or contributing to the exceedance of water quality standards as outlined in this Order

b. ASSESSMENT REVIEW

- (1) Based on the results of the effectiveness assessments, each Copermittee must annually review its jurisdictional activities and BMPs to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize JRMP effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with this Order.
- (2) Each Copermittee must develop and annually conduct an Integrated Assessment²³ of each effectiveness assessment objective above (Section J.1.a) and the overall JRMP using a combination of outcomes as appropriate to the objectives.²⁴

2. Program Modifications

- a. Each Copermittee must develop and implement a plan and schedule to address program modifications and improvements identified during annual effectiveness assessments.
- b. Jurisdictional activities/BMPs that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable jurisdictional activities/BMPs must be replaced or improved upon by implementation of more effective jurisdictional activities/BMPs. Where monitoring data exhibits persistent water quality problems that are caused or

²³ Integrated assessment is defined in Attachment C. It is the process of evaluating whether program implementation is resulting in the protection or improvement of water quality. Integrated assessment combines assessments of program implementation and water quality.

²⁴ Not all program components need be addressed at each of the six outcome levels.

contributed to by MS4 discharges, jurisdictional activities or BMPs applicable to the water quality problems must be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

3. Effectiveness Assessment and Program Response Reporting

- a. Each Copermittee must include a description and summary of its annual and long-term effectiveness assessments within each Annual Report. Beginning with the Annual Report due in 2011, the Program Effectiveness reporting must include:
- (1) 303(d) waterbodies: A description and results of the annual assessment measures or methods specifically for reducing discharges of storm water pollutants from its MS4 into each 303(d)-listed waterbody;
 - (2) ESAs: A description and results of the annual assessment measures or methods specifically for managing discharges of pollutants from its MS4 into each downstream ESA;
 - (3) Other Program Components: A description of the objectives and corresponding assessment measures and results used to evaluate the effectiveness of each general program component. The results must include findings from both program implementation and water quality assessment where applicable;
 - (4) Receiving water protection: A description and results of the annual assessment measures or methods employed specifically for actions taken to protect receiving water limitations in accordance with Section A.3 of this Order;
 - (5) A description of the steps taken to use dry-weather and wet-weather monitoring data to assess the effectiveness of the programs for 303(d) impairments, ESAs, and general program components;
 - (6) A description of activities conducted in response to investigations of illicit discharge and illicit connection activities, including how each investigation was resolved and the pollutant(s) involved;
 - (7) Responses to effectiveness assessments: A description of each program modification, made in response to the results of effectiveness assessments conducted pursuant to Section J.1.a, and the basis for determining (pursuant to Section J.2.b.) that each modified activity and/or BMP represents an improvement with respect to reducing the discharge of storm water pollutants from the MS4.
 - (8) A description of the steps that will be taken to improve the Copermittee's ability to assess program effectiveness using measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, assessment methods, and outcome levels 1-6. Include a time schedule for when improvement will occur; and
 - (9) A description of the steps that will be taken to identify aspects of the Copermittee's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program that will be changed based on the results of the effectiveness assessment.

4. Work Plan

Each Copermittee must develop a work plan to address their high priority water quality problems in an iterative manner over the life of the permit. The goal of the work plan is to demonstrate a responsive and adaptive approach for the judicious and effective use of available resources to attack the highest priority problems. The work plan shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- a.** The problems and priorities identified during the assessment;
- b.** A list of priority pollutants and known or suspected sources;
- c.** A brief description of the strategy employed to reduce, eliminate or mitigate the negative impacts;
- d.** A description and schedule for new and/or modified BMPs. The schedule is to include dates for significant milestones;
- e.** A description of how the selected activities will address an identified high priority problem. This will include a description of the expected effectiveness and benefits of the new and/or modified BMPs;
- f.** A description of implementation effectiveness metrics;
- g.** A description of how efficacy results will be used to modify priorities and implementation; and
- h.** A review of past activities implemented, progress in meeting water quality standards, and planned program adjustments.

The Copermittee shall submit the work plan to the Regional Board within 365 days of adoption of the Order. Annual updates are also required and shall be included with the annual JRMP report. The Regional Board will assess the work plan for compliance with the specific and overall requirements of the Order. To increase effectiveness and efficiencies, Copermittees may combine their implementation efforts and work plans within a hydrologic area or sub area. Each Copermittee, however, maintains individual responsibility for developing and implementing an acceptable work plan.

K. REPORTING

The Copermittees may propose alternate reporting criteria and schedules, as part of their updated JRMP, for the Executive Officer's acceptance. The Copermittees shall submit the updated JRMP within 365 days after adoption of this Order.

1. Runoff Management Plans**a. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- (1) Copermittees: The written account of the overall program to be conducted by each Copermittee to meet the jurisdictional requirements of section F of this Order is referred to as the Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP). Each Copermittee must revise and update its existing JRMP so that it describes all activities the Copermittee will undertake to implement the requirements of this Order. Each Copermittee must submit its updated and revised JRMP to the Regional Board 365 days after adoption of this Order.
- (2) At a minimum, each Copermittee's JRMP must be updated and revised to demonstrate compliance with each applicable section of this Order.

b. WATERSHED WORKPLANS

- (1) Copermittees: The written account of the program conducted by each watershed group of Copermittees is referred to as the Watershed Workplan. Copermittees within each watershed shall be responsible for updating and revising each Watershed Workplan. Each Watershed Workplan shall be updated and revised to describe any changes in water quality problems or priorities in the WMAs, and any necessary change to actions Copermittees will take to implement jurisdictional or watershed BMPs to address those identified.
- (2) Lead Watershed Copermittee: Each Lead Watershed Permittee shall be responsible for coordinating the production of the Watershed Workplan, as well as coordinating Annual Watershed Review Meetings and public participation/public noticing in accordance with the requirements of this Order. The Lead Watershed Permittee shall submit the Watershed Workplan to the Principal.
- (3) Principal Copermittee: The Principal Permittee shall assemble and submit the Watershed Workplan to the Regional Board no later than 365 days after adoption of this Order, and shall be prepared to implement the workplan within 60 days of the Regional Board Executive Officer deeming the workplan acceptable.

- (4) Each Watershed Workplan shall, at a minimum, include:
- (a) Identification of the Lead Watershed Permittee for the watershed.
 - (b) An updated watershed map.
 - (c) Identification and description of all applicable water quality data, reports, analyses, and other information to be used to assess receiving water quality.
 - (d) Assessment and analysis of the watershed's water quality data, reports, analyses, and other information, used during identification and prioritization of the watershed's water quality problems.
 - (e) A prioritized list of water quality problems within the WMA including rationale explaining the method/logic used to determine prioritization.
 - (f) Identification of the likely sources, pollutant discharges, and/or other factors causing the high priority water quality problems within the WMA.
 - (g) A description of the strategy to be used to guide Copermittee implementation of BMPs either jurisdictionally or on a watershed-wide basis to abate the highest water quality problems
 - (h) A list of criteria used to evaluate BMP effectiveness and how it was applied.
 - (i) A GIS map of BMPs implemented and BMPs scheduled for implementation.
 - (j) A description of the public participation mechanisms to be used and the parties anticipated to be involved during the development and implementation of the Watershed Workplan.
 - (k) A description of Copermittee collaboration to accomplish development of the Watershed Workplan, including a schedule for Watershed meetings.
 - (l) A description of how TMDLs and 303(d)-listed water bodies were considered during prioritization of watershed water quality problems
 - (m) A description of the strategy to model and monitor improvement in receiving water quality directly resulting from implementation of the BMPs described in the Watershed Workplan.
 - (n) A scheduled annual Watershed Workplan Review Meeting once every calendar year. This meeting shall be open to the public.

2. Other Required Reports and Plans

a. SSMP UPDATES

- (1) Copermittees must submit their updated model SSMP in accordance with the applicable requirements of section F.1 with the JRMP two years after adoption of this Order.
- (2) Within 180 days of determination that the Model SSMP is in compliance with this Permit's provisions, each Copermittee must update their own local SSMP, and amended ordinances consistent with the model SSMP, and shall submit both (local SSMP and amended ordinances) to the Regional Board.
- (3) For SSMP-related requirements of Section F.1 with subsequent

implementation due dates, updated SSMPs must be submitted with the JRMP annual report covering the applicable reporting period.

b. REPORT OF WASTE DISCHARGE

The Principal Copermittee must submit to the Regional Board, no later than 210 days in advance of the expiration date of this Order, a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) as an application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements. The fourth annual report for this Order may serve as the ROWD, provided it contains the minimum information below.

At a minimum, the ROWD must include the following: (1) Proposed changes to the Copermittees' runoff management programs; (2) Proposed changes to monitoring programs; (3) Justification for proposed changes; (4) Name and mailing addresses of the Copermittees; (5) Names and titles of primary contacts of the Copermittees; and (6) Any other information necessary for the reissuance of this Order.

3. Annual Reports

a. JURISDICTIONAL RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (JRMP) ANNUAL REPORTS

- (1) Copermittees: Each Copermittee must generate individual JRMP Annual Reports which cover implementation of its jurisdictional activities during the past annual reporting period. Each Annual Report must verify and document compliance with this Order as directed in this section. Each Copermittee must retain records through 2015, available for review, that document compliance with each requirement of this Order. Each Copermittee must submit to the Principal Copermittee its individual JRMP Annual Report by the date specified by the Principal Copermittee. The reporting period for these annual reports must be the previous fiscal year. For example, the report submitted September 30, 2010 must cover the reporting period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.
- (2) Principal Copermittee: The Principal Copermittee is responsible for collecting and assembling each Copermittee's individual JRMP Annual Report. The Principal Copermittee must submit Unified JRMP Annual Reports to the Regional Board by September 30 of each year, beginning on September 30, 2011. The Unified JRMP Annual Report must contain the 13 individual JRMP Annual Reports.
- (3) Each JRMP Annual Report must contain, at a minimum, the following information:
 - (a) Information required to be reported annually in Section H (Fiscal Analysis) of this Order;

- (b) Information required to be reported annually in Section J (Program Effectiveness) of this Order;
- (c) The completed Reporting Checklist found in Attachment D, and
- (d) Information for each program component by watershed as described in the following Table 9:

Table 9. Annual Reporting Requirements

Program Component	Reporting Requirement
New Development	1. Updated relevant sections of the General Plan and environmental review process and a description of planned updates within the next annual reporting period, if applicable
	2. Revisions to the local SSMP, including where applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identification and summary of where the SSMP fails to meet the requirements of this Order; (b) Updated procedures for identifying pollutants of concern for each Priority Development Project; (c) Updated treatment BMP ranking matrix; and (d) Updated site design and treatment control BMP design standards;
	3. Verification that site design, source control, and treatment BMPs were required on all applicable Priority Development Projects;
	4. Description of the application of LID and site design BMPs in the planning and approval process;
	5. Description of projects subject to the local waiver provision for numeric sizing of treatment control BMP requirements;
	6. Description and summary of the LID site design BMP substitution program, if applicable;
	7. Description and summary of the process to verify compliance with SSMP requirements;
	8. Updates to the BMPs that are listed in the local SSMP as options for treatment control;
	9. Description of the treatment control maintenance tracking process and verification that the requirements of this Order were met during the reporting period; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Updated watershed-based database of approved treatment control BMPs and treatment control BMP maintenance within its jurisdiction, including updates to the list of high-priority treatment BMPs;
	10. Description of the process for identifying and evaluating hydrologic conditions of concern and requiring a suite of management measures within all Priority Development Projects to protect downstream beneficial uses and prevent adverse physical changes to downstream stream channels;
	11. Description of enforcement activities applicable to the new development and redevelopment component and a summary of the effectiveness of those activities;

Program Component	Reporting Requirement
Construction	1. Updated relevant ordinances and description of planned ordinance updates within the next annual reporting period, if applicable;
	2. A description of procedures used for identifying priorities for inspecting sites and enforcing control measures which consider the nature of the construction activity, topography, and the characteristics of soils and receiving water quality;
	3. Designated minimum and enhanced BMPs;
	4. Summary of the inspection program, including the following information: (a) Number and date of inspections conducted at each facility, including the facility address; (b) Number of facilities lacking adequate BMPs; (c) The BMP violations identified during the inspection by facility; (d) Number, date, and types of enforcement actions by facility; (e) Narrative description of inspection findings and follow-up activities for each facility;
Municipal	1. Updated source inventory;
	2. Changes to the designated municipal BMPs;
	3. Descriptions of procedures to assure that flood management projects assess the impacts on the water quality of receiving water bodies;
	4. Summary and assessment of BMPs implemented at retrofitted flood control structures, including: (a) List of projects with BMP retrofits; and (b) List and description of structures retrofitted without BMPs;
	5. Description and assessment of the municipal structural treatment control operations and maintenance activities, including: (a) Number of inspections and types of facilities; and (b) Summary of findings;
	6. Description of the municipal areas/facilities operations and maintenance activities, including: (a) Number and types of facilities maintained; (b) Amount of material removed and how that material was disposed; and (c) List of facilities planned for bi-annual inspections and the justification;
	7. Description of the municipal areas/programs inspection activities, including: (a) Number and date of inspections conducted at each facility; (b) Number of facilities lacking adequate BMPs; (c) The BMP violations identified during the inspection by facility; (d) Number, date and types of enforcement actions by facility; (e) Narrative description of inspection findings and follow-up activities for each facility;

Program Component	Reporting Requirement
	8. Description of activities implemented to address sewage infiltration into the MS4;
Commercial / Industrial	1. Annual inventory of commercial / industrial sources; 2. Summary of the inspection program, including the following information: (a) Number and date of inspections conducted at each facility including the facility address; (b) Number of facilities lacking adequate BMPs; (c) The BMP violations identified during the inspection by facility; (d) Number, date, and types of enforcement actions by facility; (e) Narrative description of inspection findings and follow-up activities for each facility; 3. Changes to designated minimum and enhanced BMPs; 4. A list of industrial sites, including each name, address, and SIC code, that the Copermittee suspects may require coverage under the General Industrial Permit, but has not submitted an NOI;
Residential	1. Updated minimum BMPs required for residential areas and activities;
	2. Quantification and summary of applicable runoff and storm water enforcement actions within residential areas and activities;
	3. Description of efforts to manage runoff and storm water pollution in common interest areas;
Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination	1. Changes to the legal authority to implement Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination activities; 2. Changes to the established investigation procedures; 3. Public reporting mechanisms, including phone numbers and web pages; 4. All data and assessments from the Dry Weather Effluent Analytical Monitoring activities; 5. Response criteria developed for water quality data and notifications; 6. Summaries of illicit discharges (including spills and water quality data events) and how each significant case was resolved; 7. A description of instances when field screening and analytical data exceeded action levels, but for which no investigation was conducted; 8. A description of enforcement actions taken in response to investigations of illicit discharges and a description of the effectiveness of those enforcement measures; 9. A description of controls to prevent infiltration of seepage from municipal sanitary sewers to municipal separate storm sewer systems;
Work Plan	Priorities, strategy, implementation schedule and effectiveness evaluation;

(4) Each JRMP Annual Report must also include the following information

regarding non-storm water discharges (see Section B.2. of this Order):

- (a) Identification of non-storm water discharge categories identified as a source of pollutants to waters of the U.S;
- (b) A description of ordinances, orders, or similar means to prohibit non-storm water discharge categories identified under section B.2 above ;
- (c) Identification of any control measures to be required and implemented for non-storm water discharge categories identified as needing said controls by the Regional Board; and
- (d) A description of a program to address pollutants from non-emergency fire fighting flows identified by the Copermittee to be significant sources of pollutants.

4. Interim Reporting Requirements

For the July 2009-June 2010 reporting period, the Jurisdictional RMP must be submitted on January 31, 2011. Each Jurisdictional RMP Annual Report submitted for this reporting period must, at a minimum, include comprehensive descriptions of all activities conducted to fully implement the Copermittees' Jurisdictional RMP documents, as those documents were developed to comply with the requirements of Order No. 2002-01. The Principal Copermittee must submit these documents in a unified manner, consistent with the unified reporting requirements of Order No. 2002-01.

5. Universal Reporting Requirements

All submittals must include an executive summary, introduction, conclusion, recommendations, and signed certified statement. Each Copermittee must submit a signed certified statement covering its responsibilities for each applicable submittal. The Principal Copermittee must submit a signed certified statement covering its responsibilities for each applicable submittal and the sections of the submittals for which it is responsible.

L. MODIFICATION OF PROGRAMS

Modifications of Jurisdictional Runoff Management Programs and/or Watershed Runoff Management Programs may be initiated by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board or by the Copermittees. Requests by Copermittees must be made to the Executive Officer, and must be submitted during the annual review process. Requests for modifications should be incorporated, as appropriate, into the Annual Reports or other deliverables required or allowed under this Order.

1. Minor Modifications: Minor modifications to Jurisdictional Runoff Management Programs, and/or Watershed Runoff Management Programs, may be accepted by the Executive Officer where the Executive Officer finds the proposed modification complies with all discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, and other requirements of this Order.
2. Modifications Requiring an Amendment to this Order: Proposed modifications that are not minor require amendment of this Order in accordance with this Order's rules, policies, and procedures.

M. PRINCIPAL COPERMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

Within 180 days of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees must designate the Principal Copermittee and notify the Regional Board of the name of the Principal Copermittee. The Principal Copermittee must, at a minimum:

1. Serve as liaison between the Copermittees and the Regional Board on general permit issues, and when necessary and appropriate, represent the Copermittees before the Regional Board.
2. Coordinate permit activities among the Copermittees and facilitate collaboration on the development and implementation of programs required under this Order.
3. Integrate individual Copermittee documents and reports into single unified documents and reports for submittal to the Regional Board as required under this Order.
4. Produce and submit documents and reports as required by section K of this Order and Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R9-2009-0002 in Attachment E of this Order.


N. RECEIVING WATERS AND MS4 DISCHARGE MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Pursuant to CWC section 13267, the Copermittees must comply with all the requirements contained in Receiving Waters and MS4 Discharge Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R9-2009-0002 in Attachment E of this Order.

O. STANDARD PROVISIONS, REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, AND NOTIFICATIONS

1. Each Copermittee must comply with Standard Provisions, Reporting Requirements, and Notifications contained in Attachment B of this Order. This includes 24 hour/5 day reporting requirements for any instance of non-compliance with this Order as described in section 5.e of Attachment B.
2. All plans, reports and subsequent amendments submitted in compliance with this Order must be implemented immediately (or as otherwise specified). All submittals by Copermittees must be adequate to implement the requirements of this Order.

I, David W. Gibson, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, on December 16, 2009.



David W. Gibson
Executive Officer