

BEFORE THE  
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM ON:

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control  
Board Order No. R9-2007-0001  
Permit CAS0108758  
Parts D.1.d.(7)-(8), D.1.g., D.3.a.(3), D.3.a.(5),  
D.5, E.2.f, E.2.g, F.1, F.2, F.3, I.1, I.2, I.5,  
J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii & x-xv, and L.

Filed June 20, 2008, by the County of  
San Diego, Cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar,  
Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, Poway,  
San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Chula  
Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas,  
Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon  
Grove, National City, Oceanside, San Diego,  
and Vista, Claimants.

Case No.: 07-TC-09

*Discharge of Stormwater Runoff -  
Order No. R9-2007-0001*

STATEMENT OF DECISION  
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE  
SECTION 17500 ET SEQ.; TITLE 2,  
CALIFORNIA CODE OF  
REGULATIONS, DIVISION 2,  
CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7.

*(Adopted on March 26, 2010)*

**STATEMENT OF DECISION**

The Commission on State Mandates (“Commission”) heard and decided this test claim during a regularly scheduled hearing on March 26, 2010. Tim Barry, John VanRhyn, Helen Peak, Shawn Hagerty and James Lough appeared on behalf of the claimants. Elizabeth Jennings appeared on behalf of the State Water Resources Control Board. Carla Shelton and Susan Geanacou appeared on behalf of the Department of Finance.

The law applicable to the Commission’s determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code section 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission adopted the staff analysis to partially approve the test claim at the hearing by a vote of 6-1.

**Summary of Findings**

The test claim, filed by the County of San Diego and several cities, alleges various activities related to reducing stormwater pollution in compliance with a permit issued by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, a state agency.

The Commission finds that the following activities in the permit (as further specified on pp. 122-132 below) are a reimbursable state-mandated new program or higher level of service within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution:

- street sweeping (permit part D.3.a(5));
- street sweeping reporting (part J.3.a.(3)(c) x-xv);
- conveyance system cleaning (part D.3.a.(3));
- conveyance system cleaning reporting (J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii));
- educational component (part D.5.a.(1)-(2) & D.5.b.(1)(c)-(d) & D.5.(b)(3));
- watershed activities and collaboration in the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (part E.2.f & E.2.g);
- Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (parts F.1., F.2. & F.3);
- program effectiveness assessment (parts I.1 & I.2);
- long-term effectiveness assessment (part I.5) and
- all permittee collaboration (part L.1.a.(3)-(6)).

The Commission also finds that the following test claim activities are not reimbursable because the claimants<sup>1</sup> have fee authority sufficient (within the meaning of Gov. Code § 17556, subd. (d)) to pay for them: hydromodification management plan (part D.1.g) and low-impact development (parts D.1.d.(7) & D.1.d.(8)), as specified below.

Further, the Commission finds the following would be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines:

- Any fees or assessments approved by the voters or property owners for any activities in the permit, including those authorized by Public Resources Code section 40059 for street sweeping or reporting on street sweeping, and those authorize by Health and Safety Code section 5471, for conveyance-system cleaning, or reporting on conveyance-system cleaning; and
- Any proposed fees that are not subject to a written protest by a majority of parcel owners and that are imposed for street sweeping.
- Effective January 1, 2010, fees imposed pursuant to Water Code section 16103 only to the extent that a local agency voluntarily complies with Water Code section 16101 by developing a watershed improvement plan pursuant to Statutes 2009, chapter 577, and the Regional Board approves the plan and incorporates it into the test claim permit to satisfy the requirements of the permit.

## **BACKGROUND**

The claimants allege various activities for reducing stormwater pollution in compliance with a permit issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, (Regional Board), a state agency. Before discussing the specifics of the permit, an overview of the permit's purpose, and municipal stormwater pollution in general, puts the permit in context.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this analysis, claimants and the permit term “copermittees” are used interchangeably, even though two of the copermittees (the San Diego Unified Port District and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) are not claimants. The following are the claimants and copermittees that are subject to the permit requirements: Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, County of San Diego.

## Municipal Stormwater

The purpose of the permit is to specify “requirements necessary for the copermittees<sup>2</sup> to reduce the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).” Each of the copermittees or dischargers “owns or operates a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4),<sup>3</sup> through which it discharges urban runoff into waters of the United States within the San Diego region.”

Stormwater<sup>4</sup> runoff flowing untreated from urban streets directly into creeks, streams, rivers, lakes and the ocean, creates pollution, as the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal has stated:

Storm water runoff is one of the most significant sources of water pollution in the nation, at times “comparable to, if not greater than, contamination from industrial and sewage sources.” [Citation omitted.] Storm sewer waters carry suspended metals, sediments, algae-promoting nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), floatable trash, used motor oil, raw sewage, pesticides, and other toxic contaminants into streams, rivers, lakes, and estuaries across the United States. [Citation omitted.] In 1985, three-quarters of the States cited urban storm water runoff as a major cause of waterbody impairment, and forty percent reported construction site runoff as a major cause of impairment. Urban runoff has been named as the foremost cause of impairment of surveyed ocean waters. Among the sources of storm water contamination are urban development, industrial facilities, construction sites, and illicit discharges and connections to storm sewer systems.<sup>5</sup>

Because of these stormwater pollution problems described by the Ninth Circuit, both California and the federal government regulate stormwater runoff.

## California Law

The California Supreme Court summarized the state statutory scheme and regulatory agencies applicable to this test claim as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup> “Copermittees” are entities responsible for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit conditions pertaining to their own discharges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (b)(1).)

<sup>3</sup> Municipal separate storm sewer system means a conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains): (i) Owned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body (created by or pursuant to State law) having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, storm water, or other wastes, including special districts under State law such as a sewer district, flood control district or drainage district, or similar entity, or an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization, or a designated and approved management agency under section 208 of the CWA that discharges to waters of the United States; (ii) Designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water; (iii) Which is not a combined sewer; and (iv) Which is not part of a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) as defined at 40 CFR 122.2. (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (b)(8).)

<sup>4</sup> Storm water means “storm water runoff, snow melt runoff, and surface runoff and drainage.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (b)(13).)

<sup>5</sup> *Environmental Defense Center, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A.* (2003) 344 F.3d 832, 840-841.

In California, the controlling law is the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne Act), which was enacted in 1969. (Wat. Code, § 13000 et seq., added by Stats.1969, ch. 482, § 18, p. 1051.) Its goal is “to attain the highest water quality which is reasonable, considering all demands being made and to be made on those waters and the total values involved, beneficial and detrimental, economic and social, tangible and intangible.” (§ 13000.) The task of accomplishing this belongs to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards; together the State Board and the regional boards comprise “the principal state agencies with primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality.” (§ 13001.)

Whereas the State Board establishes statewide policy for water quality control (§ 13140), the regional boards “formulate and adopt water quality control plans for all areas within [a] region” (§ 13240).<sup>6</sup>

In California, wastewater discharge requirements established by the regional boards are the equivalent of the NPDES permits [national pollutant discharge elimination system] required by federal law. (§ 13374).<sup>7</sup>

As to waste discharge requirements, section 13377 of the California Water Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the state board or the regional boards shall, as required or authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, issue waste discharge requirements and dredged or fill material permits which apply and ensure compliance with all applicable provisions of the act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary, thereto, together with any more stringent effluent standards or limitations necessary to implement water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses, or to prevent nuisance.

Much of what the Regional Board does, especially that pertains to permits like the one in this claim, is based in the federal Clean Water Act.

#### Federal Law

The Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) was amended in 1972 to implement a permitting system for all discharges of pollutants<sup>8</sup> from point sources<sup>9</sup> to waters of the United States, since

---

<sup>6</sup> *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 613, 619.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at page 621. State and regional board permits allowing discharges into state waters are called “waste discharge requirements.” (Wat. Code, § 13263).

<sup>8</sup> According to the federal regulations, “Discharge of a pollutant” means: (a) Any addition of any “pollutant” or combination of pollutants to “waters of the United States” from any “point source,” or (b) Any addition of any pollutant or combination of pollutants to the waters of the “contiguous zone” or the ocean from any point source other than a vessel or other floating craft which is being used as a means of transportation. This definition includes additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channeled by man; discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances owned by a State, municipality, or other person which do not lead to a treatment works; and discharges through pipes, sewers, or other

discharges of pollutants are illegal except under a permit.<sup>10</sup> The permits, issued under the national pollutant discharge elimination system, are called NPDES permits. Under the CWA, each state is free to enforce its own water quality laws so long as its effluent limitations<sup>11</sup> are not “less stringent” than those set out in the CWA (33 USCA 1370). The California Supreme Court described NPDES permits as follows:

Part of the federal Clean Water Act is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), “[t]he primary means” for enforcing effluent limitations and standards under the Clean Water Act. (*Arkansas v. Oklahoma*, *supra*, 503 U.S. at p. 101, 112 S.Ct. 1046.) The NPDES sets out the conditions under which the federal EPA or a state with an approved water quality control program can issue permits for the discharge of pollutants in wastewater. (33 U.S.C. § 1342(a) & (b).) In California, wastewater discharge requirements established by the regional boards are the equivalent of the NPDES permits required by federal law. (§ 13374.)<sup>12</sup>

In the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code, §§ 13370 et seq.), the Legislature found that the state should implement the federal law in order to avoid direct regulation by the federal government. The Legislature requires the permit program to be consistent with federal law, and charges the State and Regional Water Boards with implementing the federal program (Wat. Code, §§ 13372 & 13370). The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) incorporates the regulations from the U.S. EPA for implementing the federal permit program, so both the Clean Water Act and U.S. EPA regulations apply to California’s permit program (Cal.Code Regs., tit. 23, § 2235.2).

When a Regional Board adopts an NPDES permit, it must adopt as stringent a permit as U.S. EPA would have (federal Clean Water Act, § 402 (b)). As the California Supreme Court stated:

The federal Clean Water Act reserves to the states significant aspects of water quality policy (33 U.S.C. § 1251(b)), and it specifically grants the states authority

---

conveyances, leading into privately owned treatment works. This term does not include an addition of pollutants by any “indirect discharger.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.2.)

<sup>9</sup> A point source is “any discernible, confined and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, or vessel or other floating craft, from which pollutants are or may be discharged.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

<sup>10</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.21 (a). The section applies to U.S. EPA-issued permits, but is incorporated into section 123.25 (the state program provision) by reference.

<sup>11</sup> *Effluent limitation* means any restriction imposed by the Director on quantities, discharge rates, and concentrations of “pollutants” which are “discharged” from “point sources” into “waters of the United States,” the waters of the “contiguous zone,” or the ocean. (40 C.F.R. § 122.2.)

<sup>12</sup> *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, *supra*, 35 Cal.4th 613, 621. State and regional board permits allowing discharges into state waters are called “waste discharge requirements” (Wat. Code, § 13263).

to “enforce any effluent limitation” that is not “*less stringent*” than the federal standard ( *id.* § 1370, italics added). It does not prescribe or restrict the factors that a state may consider when exercising this reserved authority, and thus it does not prohibit a state-when imposing effluent limitations that are *more stringent* than required by federal law-from taking into account the economic effects of doing so.<sup>13</sup>

Actions that dischargers must implement as prescribed in permits are commonly called “best management practices” or BMPs.<sup>14</sup>

Stormwater was not regulated by U.S. EPA in 1973 because of the difficulty of doing so. This exemption from regulation was overturned in *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Costle* (1977) 568 F.2d 1369, which ordered U.S. EPA to require NPDES permits for stormwater runoff. By 1987, U.S. EPA still had not adopted regulations to implement a permitting system for stormwater runoff. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals explained the next step as follows:

In 1987, to better regulate pollution conveyed by stormwater runoff, Congress enacted Clean Water Act § 402(p), 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), “Municipal and Industrial Stormwater Discharges.” Sections 402(p)(2) and 402(p)(3) mandate NPDES permits for stormwater discharges “associated with industrial activity,” discharges from large and medium-sized municipal storm sewer systems, and certain other discharges. Section 402(p)(4) sets out a timetable for promulgation of the first of a two-phase overall program of stormwater regulation.<sup>15</sup>

NPDES permits are required for “A discharge from a municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population of 250,000 or more.”<sup>16</sup> The federal Clean Water Act specifies the following criteria for municipal storm sewer system permits:

- (i) may be issued on a system- or jurisdiction-wide basis;
- (ii) shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewers; and
- (iii) shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, *supra*, 35 Cal.4th 613, 627-628.

<sup>14</sup> Best management practices are “schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures, and other management practices to prevent or reduce the pollution of “waters of the United States.” BMPs also include treatment requirements, operating procedures, and practices to control plant site runoff, spillage or leaks, sludge or waste disposal, or drainage from raw material storage.” (40 CFR § 122.2.)

<sup>15</sup> *Environmental Defense Center, Inc. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, *supra*, 344 F.3d 832, 841-842.

<sup>16</sup> 33 USCA section 1342 (p)(2)(C).

<sup>17</sup> 33 USCA section 1342 (p)(3)(B).

In 1990, U.S. EPA adopted regulations to implement Clean Water Act section 402(p), defining which entities need to apply for permits and the information to include in the permit application. The permit application must propose management programs that the permitting authority will consider in adopting the permit. The management programs must include the following:

[A] comprehensive planning process which involves public participation and where necessary intergovernmental coordination, to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable using management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions which are appropriate.<sup>18</sup>

### General State-Wide Permits

In addition to the regional stormwater permit at issue in this claim, the State Board has issued two general statewide permits,<sup>19</sup> as described in the permit as follows:

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, the Regional Board is responsible for enforcing the General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit, SWRCB Order 99-08 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 (General Construction Permit) and the General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit, SWRCB Order 97-03 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000001 (General Industrial Permit), and each municipal Copermittee is responsible for enforcing its local permits, plans, and ordinances, which may require the implementation of additional BMPs than required under the statewide general permits.

The State and Regional Boards have statutory fee authority to conduct inspections to enforce the general statewide permits.<sup>20</sup>

### The Regional Board Permit (Order No. R9-2007-001, Permit CAS0108758)

Under Part A, “Basis for the Order,” the permit states:

This Order Renews National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0108758, which was first issued on July 16, 1990 (Order No. 90-42), and then renewed on February 21, 2001 (Order No. 2001-01). On August 25, 2005, in accordance with Order NO. 2001-01, the County of San Diego, as the Principal Permittee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for renewal of their MS4 Permit.

Attachment B of the permit (part 7(q)) states that “This Order expires five years after adoption.” Attachment B also says (part 7 (r)) that the terms and conditions of the permit “are automatically

---

<sup>18</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(2)(iv).

<sup>19</sup> A general permit means “an NPDES ‘permit’ issued under [40 CFR] §122.28 authorizing a category of discharges under the CWA within a geographical area.” (40 CFR § 122.2.)

<sup>20</sup> Water Code section 13260, subdivision (d)(2)(B)(i) - (iii).

continued pending issuance of a new permit if all requirements of the federal NPDES regulations on the continuation of the expired permits (40 CFR 122.6) are complied with.”<sup>21</sup>

Part J.2.d. of the permit requires the Principal Permittee (County of San Diego) to “submit to the Regional Board, no later than 210 days in advance of the expiration of this order, a report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) as an application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.” The permit specifies the contents of the ROWD.

The permit is divided into 16 sections. It prohibits discharges from MS4s that contain pollutants that “have not been reduced to the maximum extent practicable” as well as discharges “that cause or contribute to the violation of water quality standards.” The permit also prohibits non-storm water discharges unless they are authorized by a separate NPDES permit, or fall within specified exemptions. The copermitttees are required to “establish, maintain, and enforce adequate legal authority to control pollutant discharges into and from its MS4 through ordinance, statute, permit, contract or similar means.” The copermitttees are also required to develop and implement an updated Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) for their jurisdictions that meets the requirements specified in the permit as well as a Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (watersheds are defined in the permit) and a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program, each of which are to be assessed annually and reported on. Annual fiscal analyses are also required of the copermitttees. The principal permittee has additional responsibilities, as specified.

The Regional Board prepared a 115-page Fact Sheet/Technical Report for this permit in which are listed, among other things, Regional Board findings, the federal law, and the reasons for the various permit requirements.

The 2001 version of the Regional Board’s permit (treated as prior law in this analysis) was challenged by the Building Industry Association of San Diego County, among others. They alleged that the permit provisions violate federal law because they prohibit the municipalities from discharging runoff from storm sewers if the discharge would cause a water body to exceed the applicable water quality standard established under state law.<sup>22</sup> The court held that the Clean Water Act’s “maximum extent practicable” standard did not prevent the water boards from including provisions in the permit that required municipalities to comply with state water quality standards.<sup>23</sup>

Attached to the claimants’ February 2009 comments is a document entitled “Comparison Between the Requirement of Tentative Order 2001-01, the Federal NPDES Storm Water Regulations, the Existing San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (Order 90-42), and Previous Drafts of the San Diego Municipal Stormwater Permit” that compares the 2001 permit with the 1990 and earlier permits. One of the document’s conclusions regarding the 2001 permit is: “40% of the requirements in Tentative Order 2001-01 which ‘exceed the federal regulations’ are based

---

<sup>21</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 2235.4.

<sup>22</sup> *Building Industry Assoc. of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 880.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at page 870.



almost exclusively on (1) guidance documents developed by USEPA and (2) SWRCB's [State Board's] orders describing statewide precedent setting decision on MS4 permits."

### **Claimants' Position**

Claimants assert that various parts of the Regional Board's 2007 permit constitute a reimbursable state mandate within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6, and Government Code section 17514. The parts of the permit pled by claimants are quoted below:

## **I. Regional Requirements for Urban Runoff Management Programs**

### **A. Copermittee collaboration**

Parts F.2. and F.3. (F. Regional Urban Runoff Management Program) of the permit provide:

Each Copermittee shall collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop, implement, and update as necessary a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program. The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall meet the requirements of section F of this Order, reduce the discharge of pollutants<sup>24</sup> from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent urban runoff<sup>25</sup> discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards.<sup>26</sup> The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum: [¶]...[¶]

2. Develop the standardized fiscal analysis method required in section G of this Order.<sup>27</sup>

3. Facilitate the assessment of the effectiveness of jurisdictional, watershed,<sup>28</sup> and regional programs.

---

<sup>24</sup> Pollutant is defined in Attachment C of the permit as "Any agent that may cause or contribute to the degradation of water quality such that a condition of pollution or contamination is created or aggravated."

<sup>25</sup> Urban Runoff is defined in Attachment C of the permit as "All flows in a storm water conveyance system and consists of the following components: (1) storm water (wet weather flows) and (2) non-storm water illicit discharges (dry weather flows).

<sup>26</sup> Water Quality Standards is defined in Attachment C of the permit as "The beneficial uses (e.g., swimming, fishing, municipal drinking water supply, etc.) of water and the water quality objectives necessary to protect those uses.

<sup>27</sup> Section G requires the permittees to "collectively develop a standardized method and format for annually conducting and reporting fiscal analyses of their urban runoff management programs in their entirety (including jurisdictional, watershed, and regional activities)." Specific components of the method and time tables are specified in the permit (Permit parts G.2 & G.3).

<sup>28</sup> Watershed is defined in Attachment C of the permit as "That geographical area which drains to a specified point on a water course, usually a confluence of streams or rivers (also known as a drainage area, catchment, or river basin)."

Part L (All Copermittee Collaboration) of the Permit states:

1. Each Copermittee collaborate [sic] with all other Copermittees regulated under this Order to address common issues, promote consistency among Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Programs and Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs, and to plan and coordinate activities required under this Order.

a. Management structure – All Copermittees shall jointly execute and submit to the Regional Board no later than 180 days after adoption of this Order, a Memorandum of Understanding, Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement which at a minimum:

- (1) Identifies and defines the responsibilities of the Principal Permittee<sup>29</sup> and Lead Watershed Permittees;<sup>30</sup>
- (2) Identifies Copermittees and defines their individual and joint responsibilities, including watershed responsibilities;
- (3) Establishes a management structure to promote consistency and develop and implement regional activities;
- (4) Establishes standards for conducting meetings, decision-making, and cost-sharing.
- (5) Provides guidelines for committee and workgroup structure and responsibilities;
- (6) Lays out a process for addressing Copermittee non-compliance with the formal agreement;
- (7) Includes any and all other collaborative arrangements for compliance with this order.

Claimants stated that the Copermittees' costs to comply with this activity for fiscal year 2007-2008 was \$260,031.29.

**B. Copermittee collaboration – Regional Residential Education Program Development and Implementation**

Part F.1 of the Permit provides:

The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum:

1. Develop and implement a Regional Residential Education Program. The program shall include:
  - a. Pollutant specific education which focuses educational efforts on bacteria, nutrients, sediment, pesticides, and trash. If a different pollutant is determined to be more critical for the education program, the pollutant can be substituted for one of these pollutants.
  - b. Education efforts focused on the specific residential sources of the pollutants listed in section F.1.a.

---

<sup>29</sup> The Principal Permittee is the County of San Diego.

<sup>30</sup> According to the permit: “Watershed Copermittees shall identify the Lead Watershed Permittee for their WMA [Watershed Management Area].”

Claimants stated that the Copermittees' costs to comply with this activity was \$131,250 in fiscal year 2007-2008.

### C. Hydromodification<sup>31</sup>

Part D.1.g. of the Permit (D. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, 1. Development Planning Component, g. Hydromodification – Limits on Increases of Runoff Discharge Rates and Durations) states:

#### g. HYDROMODIFICATION – LIMITATIONS ON INCREASES OF RUNOFF DISCHARGE RATES AND DURATIONS

Each Copermittee shall collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop and implement a hydromodification management plan (HMP) to manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all priority development projects,<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Hydromodification is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “The change in the natural watershed hydrologic processes and runoff characteristics (i.e., interception, infiltration, overland flow, interflow and groundwater flow) caused by urbanization or other land use changes that result in increased stream flows and sediment transport. In addition, alteration of stream and river channels, installation of dams and water impoundments, and excessive streambank and shoreline erosion are also considered hydromodification, due to their disruption of natural watershed hydrologic processes.”

Hydromodification is also defined as changes in the magnitude and frequency of stream flows as a result of urbanization, and the resulting impacts on the receiving channels in terms of erosion, sedimentation and degradation of in-stream habitat.” *Draft Hydromodification Management Plan for San Diego County*, page 4. <[http://www.projectcleanwater.org/pdf/susmp/sd\\_hmp\\_2009.pdf](http://www.projectcleanwater.org/pdf/susmp/sd_hmp_2009.pdf)> as of May 28, 2009 .

<sup>32</sup> According to the permit, “Priority Development Projects” are: a) all new Development Projects that fall under the project categories or locations listed in section D.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 that falls under the project categories or locations listed in section D.1.d.(2).

[¶]...[¶] [Part D.1.d.(2):] (2) Priority Development Project Categories (a) Housing subdivisions of 10 or more dwelling units. This category includes single-family homes, multi-family homes, condominiums, and apartments. (b) Commercial developments greater than one acre. This category is defined as any development on private land that is not for heavy industrial or residential uses where the land area for development is greater than one acre. The category includes, but is not limited to: hospitals; laboratories and other medical facilities; educational institutions; recreational facilities; municipal facilities; commercial nurseries; multi-apartment buildings; car wash facilities; mini-malls and other business complexes; shopping malls; hotels; office buildings; public warehouses; automotive dealerships; airfields; and other light industrial facilities. (c) Developments of heavy industry greater than one acre. This category includes, but is not limited to, manufacturing plants, food processing plants, metal working facilities, printing plants, and fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.). (d) 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. (e) Restaurants. This

where such increased rates and durations are likely to cause increased erosion<sup>33</sup> of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses<sup>34</sup> and stream habitat due to increased erosive force. The HMP, once approved by the Regional Board, shall be incorporated into the local SUSMP [Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan]<sup>35</sup> and implemented by each Copermittee so that post-project runoff discharge rates and durations shall not exceed estimated pre-project discharge rates and durations where the increased discharge rates and durations will result in increased potential for

---

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 shall meet all SUSMP requirements except for structural treatment BMP and numeric sizing criteria requirement D.1.d.(6)(c) and hydromodification requirement D.1.g. (f) 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.

(g) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). All development located within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA (where discharges 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% 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. (h) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more or with 15 or more parking spaces and potentially exposed to urban 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. (i) 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. (j) 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.

<sup>33</sup> Erosion is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “When land is diminished or worn away due to wind, water, or glacial ice. Often the eroded debris (silt or sediment) becomes a pollutant via storm water runoff. Erosion occurs naturally but can be intensified by land clearing activities such as farming, development, road building and timber harvesting.”

<sup>34</sup> Beneficial Uses is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “the uses of water necessary for the survival or well being of man, plants, and wildlife. These uses of water serve to promote tangible and intangible economic, social, and environmental goals. ... “Beneficial Uses” are equivalent to “Designated Uses” under federal law.” (Wat. Code, § 13050, subd. (f).)

<sup>35</sup> The Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “A plan developed to mitigate the impacts of urban runoff from Priority Development Projects.”

erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the discharge rates and durations.

(1) The HMP shall:

(a) Identify a standard for channel segments which receive urban runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects. The channel standard shall maintain the pre-project erosion and deposition characteristics of channel segments receiving urban runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects as necessary to maintain or improve the channel segments' stability conditions.

(b) Utilize continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record to identify a range of runoff flows for which Priority Development Project post-project runoff flow rates and durations<sup>36</sup> shall not exceed pre-project runoff flow rates and durations,<sup>37</sup> where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the flow rates and durations. The lower boundary of the range of runoff flows identified shall correspond with the critical channel flow<sup>38</sup> 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.

(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 runoff flow rates and durations for the range of runoff flows identified under section D.1.g.(1)(b), where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the flow rates and durations, and (2) do not result in channel conditions which do not meet the channel standard developed under section D.1.g.(1)(a) for channel segments downstream of Priority Development Project discharge points.

---

<sup>36</sup> Flow duration is defined in Attachment C of the permit as "The long-term period of time that flows occur above a threshold that causes significant sediment transport and may cause excessive erosion damage to creeks and streams (not a single storm event duration). ... Flow duration within the range of geomorphologically significant flows is important for managing erosion.

<sup>37</sup> Attachment C of the permit defines "Pre-project or pre-development runoff conditions (discharge rates, durations, etc.) as "Runoff conditions that exist onsite immediately before the planned development activities occur. This definition is not intended to be interpreted as that period before any human-induced land activities occurred. This definition pertains to redevelopment as well as initial development."

<sup>38</sup> Critical channel flow, according to Attachment C of the permit, is "the channel flow that produces the critical shear stress that initiates bed movement or that erodes the toe of channel banks. When measuring  $Q_c$  [critical channel flow], it should be based on the weakest boundary material – either bed or bank."

- (d) Include other performance criteria (numeric or otherwise) for Priority Development Projects as necessary to prevent urban runoff from the projects from increasing erosion of channel beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.
  - (e) Include a review of pertinent literature.
  - (f) Include a protocol to evaluate potential hydrograph change impacts to downstream watercourses from Priority Development Projects.
  - (g) Include a description of how the Copermittees will incorporate the HMP requirements into their local approval processes.
  - (h) 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.
  - (i) Include technical information supporting any standards and criteria proposed.
  - (j) 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.
  - (k) Include a description of pre- and post-project monitoring and other program evaluations to be conducted to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the HMP.
  - (l) Include mechanisms for addressing cumulative impacts within a watershed on channel morphology.
  - (m) Include information on evaluation of channel form and condition, including slope, discharge, vegetation, underlying geology, and other information, as appropriate.
- (2) The HMP may include implementation of planning measures (e.g., buffers and restoration activities, including revegetation, use of less-impacting facilities at the point(s) of discharge, etc.) to allow expected changes in stream channel cross sections, vegetation, and discharge rates, velocities, and/or durations without adverse impacts to channel beneficial uses. Such measures shall not include utilization of non-naturally occurring hardscape materials such as concrete, riprap, gabions, etc.
- (3) Section D.1.g.(1)(c) does not apply to Development Projects<sup>39</sup> where the project discharges stormwater runoff into channels or storm drains where the preexisting channel or storm drain conditions result in minimal potential for erosion or other impacts to beneficial uses. Such situations may include discharges into channels that are concrete-lined or significantly hardened (e.g.,

---

<sup>39</sup> Development projects, according to Attachment C of the permit, are “New development or redevelopment with land disturbing activities; structural development, including construction or installation of a building or structure, the creation of impervious surfaces, public agency projects, and land subdivision.”

with rip-rap, sackrete, etc.) downstream to their outfall in bays or the ocean; underground storm drains discharging to bays or the ocean; and construction of projects where the sub-watersheds below the projects' discharge points are highly impervious (e.g., >70%) and the potential for single-project and/or cumulative impacts is minimal. Specific criteria for identification of such situations shall be included as a part of the HMP. However, plans to restore a channel reach may reintroduce the applicability of HMP controls, and would need to be addressed in the HMP.

(4) HMP Reporting

The Copermittees shall collaborate to report on HMP development as required in section J.2.a of this Order.<sup>40</sup>

(5) HMP Implementation

180 days after approval of the HMP by the Regional Board, each Copermittee shall incorporate into its local SUSMP and implement the HMP for all applicable Priority Development Projects. Prior to approval of the HMP by the Regional Board, the early implementation of measures likely to be included in the HMP shall be encouraged by the Copermittees.

(6) Interim Hydromodification Criteria for Projects Disturbing 50 Acres or More

Within 365 days of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees shall collectively identify an interim range of runoff flow rates for which Priority Development Project post-project runoff flow rates and durations shall not exceed pre-project runoff flow rates and durations (Interim Hydromodification Criteria), where the increased discharge flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in flow rates and durations. Development of the Interim Hydromodification Criteria shall include identification of methods to be used by Priority Development Projects to exhibit compliance with the criteria, including continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record. Starting 365 days after adoption of this Order and until the final Hydromodification Management Plan standard and criteria are implemented, each Copermittee shall require Priority Development Projects disturbing 50 acres or more to implement hydrologic controls to manage post-project runoff flow rates and durations as required by the Interim Hydromodification Criteria. Development Projects disturbing 50 acres or more are exempt from this requirement when:

- (a) the project would discharge into channels that are concrete-lined or significantly hardened (e.g., with rip-rap, sackrete, etc.) downstream to their outfall in bays or the ocean;

---

<sup>40</sup> Section J.2.a of the permit requires collaborating with other copermittees to develop the HMP, and submitting it for approval by the Regional Board. Part J.2.a also includes timelines for HMP completion and approval.

(b) the project would discharge into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean; or

(c) the project would discharge to a channel where the watershed areas below the project's discharge points are highly impervious (e.g. >70%).

Claimants stated that the total cost of this activity is \$1.05 million, of which \$630,000 was spent in fiscal year 2007-2008, and the remaining \$420,000 will be spent in fiscal year 2008-2009.

#### **D. Low-Impact Development<sup>41</sup> (“LID”) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (“SMUSP”)**

Part D.1.d. of the Permit (D. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, 1. Development Planning Component, d. Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans – Approval Process Criteria and Requirements for Priority Development Projects), paragraphs (7) and (8) state as follows:

##### (7) Update of SUSMP BMP Requirements

The Copermittees shall collectively review and update the BMP requirements that are listed in their local SUSMPs. At a minimum, the update shall include removal of obsolete or ineffective BMPs, addition of LID and source control BMP<sup>42</sup> requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of sections D.1.d.(4)<sup>43</sup> and D.1.d.(5),<sup>44</sup> and addition of LID BMPs that can be used for treatment, such as bioretention cells, bioretention swales, etc. The update shall also add appropriate LID BMPs to any tables or discussions in the local SUSMPs addressing pollutant removal efficiencies of treatment control BMPs.<sup>45</sup> In addition, the update shall

---

<sup>41</sup> Low Impact Development (LID) is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “A storm water management and land development strategy that emphasizes conservation and the use of on-site natural features integrated with engineered, small-scale hydrologic controls to more closely reflect pre-development hydrologic functions.”

<sup>42</sup> Source Control BMPs are defined in Attachment C of the permit as “Land use or site planning practices, or structural or nonstructural measures that aim to prevent urban runoff pollution by reducing the potential for contamination at the source of pollution. Source control BMPs minimize the contact between pollutants and urban runoff.”

<sup>43</sup> Part D.1.d.(4) of the permit includes LID BMP requirements: “Each Copermittee shall require each Priority Development Project to implement LID BMPs which will collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects:” The Permit lists various LID site design BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects, and other LID BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects “where applicable and feasible.”

<sup>44</sup> Part D.1.d.(5), regarding “Source control BMP Requirements” requires permittees to require each Priority Development Project to implement source control BMPs that must “Minimize storm water pollutants of concern in urban runoff” and include five other specific criteria.

<sup>45</sup> A treatment control BMP, according to Attachment C of the permit, is “Any engineered system designed to remove pollutants by simple gravity settling of particulate pollutants,



include review, and revision where necessary, of treatment control BMP pollutant removal efficiencies.

(8) Update of SUSMPs to Incorporate LID and Other BMP Requirements

(a) In addition to the implementation of the BMP requirements of sections D.1.d.(4-7) within one year of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees shall also develop and submit an updated Model SUSMP that defines minimum LID and other BMP requirements to be incorporated into the Copermittees' local SUSMPs for application to Priority Development Projects. The purpose of the updated Model SUSMP shall be to establish minimum standards to maximize the use of LID practices and principles in local Copermittee programs as a means of reducing stormwater runoff. It shall meet the following minimum requirements:

- i. Establishment of LID BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(4) above.
- ii. Establishment of source control BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(5) above.
- iii. Establishment of treatment control BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(6) above.
- iv. Establishment of siting, design, and maintenance criteria for each LID and treatment control BMP listed in the Model SUSMP, so that implemented LID and treatment control BMPs are constructed correctly and are effective at pollutant removal and/or runoff control. LID techniques, such as soil amendments, shall be incorporated into the criteria for appropriate treatment control BMPs.
- v. Establishment of criteria to aid in determining Priority Development Project conditions where implementation of each LID BMP listed in section D.1.d.(4)(b) is applicable and feasible.
- vi. Establishment of a requirement for Priority Development Projects with low traffic areas and appropriate or amendable soil conditions to construct a portion of walkways, trails, overflow parking lots, alleys, or other low-traffic areas with permeable surfaces, such a pervious concrete, porous asphalt, unit pavers, and granular materials.
- vii. Establishment of restrictions on infiltration of runoff from Priority Development Project categories or Priority Development Project areas that generate high levels of pollutants, if necessary.

(b) The updated Model SUSMP shall be submitted within 18 months of adoption of this Order. If, within 60 days of submittal of the updated Model SUSMP, the Copermittees have not received in writing from the Regional Board either

(1) a finding of adequacy of the updated Model SUSMP or (2) a modified schedule for its review and revision, the updated Model SUSMP shall be deemed adequate, and the Copermittees shall implement its provisions in accordance with section D.1.d.(8)(c) below.

---

filtration, biological uptake, media absorption or any other physical, biological, or chemical process.”

(c) Within 365 days of Regional Board acceptance of the updated Model SUSMP, each Copermitttee shall update its local SUSMP to implement the requirements established pursuant to section D.1.d.(8)(a). In addition to the requirements of section D.1.d.(8)(a), each Copermitttee's updated local SUSMP shall include the following:

- i. A requirement that each Priority Development Project use the criteria established pursuant to section D.1.d.(8)(a) to demonstrate applicability and feasibility, or lack thereof, of implementation of the LID BMPs listed in section D.1.d.(4)(b).
- ii. A review process which verifies that all BMPs to be implemented will meet the designated siting, design, and maintenance criteria, and that each Priority Development Project is in compliance with all applicable SUSMP requirements.

Claimants stated that the total cost of this activity is \$52,200 to be spent in fiscal year 2007-2008.

### **E. Long Term Effectiveness Assessment**

Part I.5 (I. Program Effectiveness Assessment) of the permit states:

#### 5. Long-term Effectiveness Assessment

- a. Each Copermitttee shall collaborate with the other Copermitttees to develop a Longterm Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA), which shall build on the results of the Copermitttees' August 2005 Baseline LTEA. The LTEA shall be submitted by the Principal Permittee to the Regional Board no later than 210 days in advance of the expiration of this Order.
- b. The LTEA shall be designed to address each of the objectives listed in section I.3.a.(6) of this Order, and to serve as a basis for the Copermitttees' Report of Waste Discharge for the next permit cycle.
- c. The LTEA shall address outcome levels 1-6, and shall specifically include an evaluation of program implementation to changes in water quality (outcome levels 5 and 6).<sup>46</sup>
- d. The LTEA shall assess the effectiveness of the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program in meeting its objectives and its ability to answer the five core management questions. This shall include assessment of the frequency of monitoring conducted through the use of power analysis and other pertinent statistical methods. The power analysis shall identify the frequency and intensity of sampling needed to identify a 10% reduction in the concentration of constituents causing the high priority water quality problems within each watershed over the next permit term with 80% confidence.
- e. The LTEA shall address the jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs, with an emphasis on watershed assessment.

The claimants state that this activity is budgeted to cost \$210,000.

---

<sup>46</sup> See footnote 50, page 21.

## II. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program

### A. Street Sweeping

Part D.3.a.(5) of the Permit (D.3 Existing Development Component, a. Municipal) provides:

#### (5) Sweeping of Municipal Areas

Each Copermittee shall implement a program to sweep improved (possessing a curb and gutter) municipal roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities. The program shall include the following measures:

(a) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least two times per month.

(b) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least monthly.

(c) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept as necessary, but no less than once per year.

Part J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv (J. Reporting, 3. Annual Reports, a. jurisdictional urban runoff management program annual reports (3) Minimum contents (c) Municipal) requires annual reports to include the following:

x. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.

xi. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.

xii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating low volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.

xiii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles swept.

xiv. Identification of the number of municipal parking lots, the number of municipal parking lots swept, and the frequency of sweeping.

xv. Amount of material (tons) collected from street and parking lot sweeping.

Claimants state the following costs for this activity: in fiscal year 2007-2008: Equipment: \$2,080,245, Staffing: \$1,014,321, Contract costs: \$382,624; for 2008-2009: Equipment: \$3,566,139 (for 2008-2012), Staffing \$1,054,893 (4% increase), Contract costs: \$382,624.

## B. Conveyance System Cleaning

Part D.3.a.(3) of the Permit (D.3. Existing Development Component, a. Municipal) provides:

### (3) Operation and Maintenance of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System and Structural Controls

(a) Each Copermitttee shall implement a schedule of inspection and maintenance activities to verify proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges to or from its MS4s and related drainage structures.

(b) Each Copermitttee shall implement a schedule of maintenance activities for the MS4 and MS4 facilities (catch basins, storm drain inlets, open channels, etc). The maintenance activities shall, at a minimum, include:

i. Inspection at least once a year between May 1 and September 30 of each year<sup>47</sup> for all MS4 facilities that receive or collect high volumes of trash and debris. All other MS4 facilities shall be inspected at least annually throughout the year.

ii. 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.

iii. Any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of design capacity shall be cleaned in a timely manner. Any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning shall be cleaned of any accumulated trash and debris immediately. Open channels shall be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter<sup>48</sup> in a timely manner.

iv. Record keeping of the maintenance and cleaning activities including the overall quantity of waste removed.

v. Proper disposal of waste removed pursuant to applicable laws.

vi. Measures to eliminate waste discharges during MS4 maintenance and cleaning activities.

Part J.3.a.(3)(c) iv-viii (J. Reporting, 3. Annual Reports, a. jurisdictional urban runoff management program annual reports (3) Minimum contents (c) Municipal) requires annual reports to include the following:

iv. Identification of the total number of catch basins and inlets, the number of catch basins and inlets inspected, the number of catch basins and inlets found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the number of catch basins and inlets cleaned.

v. Identification of the total distance (miles) of the MS4, the distance of the MS4 inspected, the distance of the MS4 found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the distance of the MS4 cleaned.

---

<sup>47</sup> According to Attachment C of the permit, May 1 through September 30 is the dry season.

<sup>48</sup> Attachment C of the permit defines “anthropogenic litter” as “trash generated from human activities, not including sediment.”

- vi. Identification of the total distance (miles) of open channels, the distance of the open channels inspected, the distance of the open channels found with anthropogenic litter, and the distance of open channels cleaned.
- vii. Amount of waste and litter (tons) removed from catch basins, inlets, the MS4, and open channels, by category.
- viii. Identification of any MS4 facility found to require inspection less than annually following two years of inspection, including justification for the finding.

The claimants state that this activity costs \$3,456,087 in fiscal year 2007-2008, and increases 4% in subsequent years.

### **C. Program Effectiveness Assessment**

Part I.1 and I.2 of the permit states:

#### 1. Jurisdictional

a. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, each Copermittee shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

(1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:

(a) Each significant jurisdictional activity/BMP or type of jurisdictional activity/BMP implemented;

(b) Implementation of each major component of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (Development Planning, Construction, Municipal, Industrial/Commercial, Residential, Illicit Discharge<sup>49</sup> Detection and Elimination, and Education); and

(c) Implementation of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.

(2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above.

(3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6<sup>50</sup> to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

---

<sup>49</sup> Illicit discharge, as defined in Attachment C of the permit, is “any discharge to the MS4 that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit and discharges resulting from firefighting activities [40 C.F.R. 122.26 (b)(2)].”

<sup>50</sup> Effectiveness assessment outcome levels are defined in Attachment C of the permit as follows: Effectiveness assessment outcome level 1 – Compliance with Activity-based Permit Requirements – Level 1 outcomes are those directly related to the implementation of specific activities prescribed by this Order or established pursuant to it. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 2 – Changes in Attitudes, Knowledge, and Awareness – Level 2 outcomes are measured as increases in knowledge and awareness among target audiences such as residents, business, and municipal employees. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 3 – Behavioral

(4) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

(5) Utilize Implementation Assessment,<sup>51</sup> Water Quality Assessment,<sup>52</sup> and Integrated Assessment,<sup>53</sup> where applicable and feasible.

b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, each Copermittee shall annually review its jurisdictional activities or BMPs to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order. The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Jurisdictional activities/BMPs that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable jurisdictional activities/BMPs shall 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 contributed to by MS4 discharges, jurisdictional activities or BMPs applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

c. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each Copermittee shall report on its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff

---

Changes and BMP Implementation – Level 3 outcomes measure the effectiveness of activities in affecting behavioral change and BMP implementation. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 4 – Load Reductions – Level 4 outcomes measure load reductions which quantify changes in the amounts of pollutants associated with specific sources before and after a BMP or other control measure is employed. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 5 – Changes in Urban Runoff and Discharge Quality – Level 5 outcomes are measured as changes in one or more specific constituents or stressors in discharges into or from MS4s. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 6 – Changes in Receiving Water Quality – Level 6 outcomes measure changes to receiving water quality resulting from discharges into and from MS4s, and may be expressed through a variety of means such as compliance with water quality objectives or other regulatory benchmarks, protection of biological integrity [i.e., ecosystem health], or beneficial use attainment.

<sup>51</sup> Implementation Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to determine the effectiveness of copermittee programs and activities in achieving measureable targeted outcomes, and in determining whether priority sources of water quality problems are being effectively addressed.”

<sup>52</sup> Water Quality Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to evaluate the condition of non-storm water discharges, and the water bodies which receive these discharges.”

<sup>53</sup> Integrated Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment to be conducted to evaluate whether program implementation is properly targeted to and resulting in the protection and improvement of water quality.”

Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of sections I.1.a and I.1.b above.

## 2. Watershed

a. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4)<sup>54</sup> shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

(1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:

- (a) Each Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented;
- (b) Each Watershed Education Activity implemented; and
- (c) Implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.

(2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above.

(3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6 to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in sections I.2.a.(1)(a) and I.2.a.(1)(b) above, where applicable and feasible.

(4) Utilize outcome levels 1-4 to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, where applicable and feasible.

(5) Utilize outcome levels 5 and 6 to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, focusing on the high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed. These assessments shall attempt to exhibit the impact of Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation on the high priority water quality problem(s) within the watershed.

(6) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

(7) Utilize Implementation Assessment, Water Quality Assessment, and Integrated Assessment, where applicable and feasible.

b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, the watershed Copermittees shall annually review their Watershed Water Quality Activities, Watershed Education Activities, and other aspects of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as

---

<sup>54</sup> Table 4 of the permit divides the copermittees into nine watershed management areas. For example, the San Luis Rey River watershed management area lists the city of Oceanside, Vista and the County of San Diego as the responsible watershed copermittees. Table 4 also lists the hydrologic units and major receiving water bodies.

necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order.<sup>55</sup> The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities shall be replaced or improved upon by implementation of more effective Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities. Where monitoring data exhibits persistent water quality problems that are caused or contributed to by MS4 discharges, Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

c. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4) shall report on its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of section I.2.a and I.2.b above.

Claimants state that this activity in I.1. and I.2 costs \$392,363 in fiscal year 2007-2008, is expected to increase to \$862,293 in fiscal year 2008-2009, and is expected to increase 4% annually thereafter.

#### **D. Educational Surveys and Tests**

Part D.5 of the permit (under D. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program) states:

##### 5. Education Component

Each Copermittee shall implement an education program using all media as appropriate to (1) measurably increase the knowledge of the target communities regarding MS4s, impacts of urban 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 pollutant releases to MS4s and the environment. At a minimum, the education program shall meet the requirements of this section and address the following target communities:

- Municipal Departments and Personnel
- Construction Site Owners and Developers
- Industrial Owners and Operators
- Commercial Owners and Operators
- Residential Community, General Public, and School Children

##### a. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

(1) Each Copermittee shall educate each target community on the following topics where appropriate:

---

<sup>55</sup> Section A is “Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations.”



Table 3. Education

<b>Laws, Regulations, Permits, &amp; Requirements</b>	<b>Best Management Practices</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (Except Construction).</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities</li> <li>• Regional Board’s General NPDES Permit for Ground Water Dewatering</li> <li>• Regional Board’s 401 Water Quality Certification Program</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Utility Vault Permit</li> <li>• Requirements of local municipal permits and ordinances (e.g., storm water and grading ordinances and permits)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution prevention and safe alternatives</li> <li>• Good housekeeping (e.g., sweeping impervious surfaces instead of hosing)</li> <li>• Proper waste disposal (e.g., garbage, pet/animal waste, green waste, household hazardous materials, appliances, tires, furniture, vehicles, boat/recreational vehicle waste, catch basin/ MS4 cleanout waste)</li> <li>• Non-storm water disposal alternatives (e.g., all wash waters)</li> <li>• Methods to minimized the impact of land development and construction</li> <li>• Erosion prevention</li> <li>• Methods to reduce the impact of residential and charity car-washing</li> <li>• Preventive Maintenance</li> <li>• Equipment/vehicle maintenance and repair</li> <li>• Spill response, containment, and recovery</li> <li>• Recycling</li> <li>• BMP maintenance</li> </ul>
<b>General Urban Runoff Concepts</b>	<b>Other Topics</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters</li> <li>• Distinction between MS4s and sanitary sewers</li> <li>• BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID, source control, and treatment control</li> <li>• Short-and long-term water quality impacts associated with urbanization (e.g., land-use decisions, development, construction)</li> <li>• Non-storm water discharge prohibitions</li> <li>• How to conduct a storm water inspections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public reporting mechanisms</li> <li>• Water quality awareness for Emergency/ First Responders</li> <li>• Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination observations and follow-up during daily work activities</li> <li>• Potable water discharges to the MS4</li> <li>• Dechlorination techniques</li> <li>• Hydrostatic testing</li> <li>• Integrated pest management</li> <li>• Benefits of native vegetation</li> <li>• Water conservation</li> <li>• Alternative materials and designs to maintain peak runoff values</li> <li>• Traffic reduction, alternative fuel use</li> </ul>

(2) Copermittee educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and “allowable” behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources.

## b. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

### (1) Municipal Departments and Personnel Education

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

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects;
- ii. The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization);
- iii. How to integrate LID BMP requirements into the local regulatory program(s) and requirements; and
- iv. Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including:

[1] Storm water management plan development and review;

[2] Methods to control downstream erosion impacts;

[3] Identification of pollutants of concern;

[4] LID BMP techniques;

[5] Source control BMPs; and

[6] Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern.

(b) Municipal Construction Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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:

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to construction and grading<sup>56</sup> activities.
- ii. 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).
- iii. Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities.
- iv. The Copermittee’s inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application.
- v. Current advancements in BMP technologies.
- vi. SUSMP Requirements including treatment options, LID BMPs, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms.

---

<sup>56</sup> Attachment C of the permit defines grading as “the cutting and/or filling of the land surface to a desired slope or elevation.”

(c) Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities - Each Copermittee shall train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at least once a year. Training shall cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and reviewing monitoring data.

(d) Municipal Other Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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.

(2) New Development and Construction Education

As early in the planning and development process as possible and all through the permitting and construction process, each Copermittee shall implement a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties. The education program shall provide an understanding of the topics listed in Sections D.5.b.(1)(a) and D.5.b.(1)(b) above, as appropriate for the audience being educated. The education program shall also educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, and other responsible parties on the importance of educating all construction workers in the field about stormwater issues and BMPs through formal or informal training.

(3) Residential, General Public, and School Children Education

Each Copermittee shall collaboratively conduct or participate in development and implementation of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities. The plan shall evaluate use of mass media, mailers, door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.

Claimants state that this activity in D.5 will cost \$62,617 in fiscal year 2007-2008, and is expected to increase to \$171,319 in fiscal year 2008-2009, and rise 4% annually thereafter.

**III. Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program**

**A. Copermittee Collaboration**

Parts E.2.f and E.2.g of the permit state:

2. Each Copermittee shall collaborate with other Copermittees within its WMA(s) [Watershed Management Area] as in Table 4 below to develop and implement an updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program for each watershed. Each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall meet the requirements of section E of this Order, reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. At a minimum, each Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall include the elements described below: [¶]...[¶]

f. Watershed Activities<sup>57</sup>

(1) The Watershed Copermittees shall identify and implement Watershed Activities that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. Watershed Activities shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities. These activities may be implemented individually or collectively, and may be implemented at the regional, watershed, or jurisdictional level.

(a) Watershed Water Quality Activities are activities other than education that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. A Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented on a jurisdictional basis must be organized and implemented to target a watershed's high priority water quality problems or must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements of section D of this Order.

(b) Watershed Education Activities are outreach and training activities that address high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(2) A Watershed Activities List shall be submitted with each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan (WURMP) and updated annually thereafter. The Watershed Activities List shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities, along with a description of how each activity was selected, and how all of the activities on the list will collectively abate sources and reduce pollutant discharges causing the identified high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(3) Each activity on the Watershed Activities List shall include the following information:

- (a) A description of the activity;
- (b) A time schedule for implementation of the activity, including key milestones;
- (c) An identification of the specific responsibilities of Watershed Copermittees in completing the activity;
- (d) A description of how the activity will address the identified high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed;
- (e) A description of how the activity is consistent with the collective watershed strategy;
- (f) A description of the expected benefits of implementing the activity; and
- (g) A description of how implementation effectiveness will be measured.

(4) Each Watershed Copermittee shall implement identified Watershed Activities pursuant to established schedules. For each Permit year, no less than two Watershed Water Quality Activities and two Watershed Education Activities shall be in an active implementation phase. A Watershed Water Quality Activity is in an active implementation phase when significant pollutant load reductions, source

---

<sup>57</sup> In their rebuttal comments submitted in February 2009, claimants mention part E.(3) of the permit that requires a detailed description of each activity on the Watershed Activities List. Part E.(3), however, was not in the test claim so staff makes no findings on it.

abatement, or other quantifiable benefits to discharge or receiving water quality can reasonably be established in relation to the watershed's high priority water quality problem(s). Watershed Water Quality Activities that are capital projects are in active implementation for the first year of implementation only. A Watershed Education Activity is in an active implementation phase when changes in attitudes, knowledge, awareness, or behavior can reasonably be established in target audiences.

g. Copermittee Collaboration

Watershed Copermittees shall collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs. Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings.

Claimants state that the copermittees' staffing costs for watershed program implementation in fiscal year 2007-2008 is \$1,033,219 and is expected to increase to \$1,401,765 in fiscal year 2008-2009, and are expected to increase four percent annually. For consultant services, the costs are \$599,674 in fiscal year 2007-2008 and are expected to be \$657,101 in 2008-2009, and are expected to rise five percent annually. For Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation, claimants allege that the cost in fiscal year 2008-2009 is \$1,053,880.

Claimants filed a 60-page rebuttal to Finance's and the State Board's comments on February 9, 2009, which is addressed in the analysis below.

Claimant County of San Diego filed comments on the draft staff analysis in January 2010 that disagrees with the findings regarding fee authority for certain permit activities involving development. These arguments are discussed further below.

### **State Agency Positions**

**Department of Finance:** In comments filed November 16, 2008, Finance alleges that the permit does not impose a reimbursable mandate within the meaning of section 6 of article XIII B of the California Constitution because the permit conditions are required by federal laws so they are not reimbursable pursuant to Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c). Finance asserts that the State and Regional Water Boards "act on behalf of the federal government to develop, administer, and enforce the NPDES program in compliance with Section 402 of the CWA." Finance also states that more activities were included in the 2007 permit than the prior permit because "it appears ... they were necessary to comply with federal law."

Finance also argues that the claimants had discretion over the activities and conditions to include in the permit application. The copermittees elected to use "best management practices" to identify alternative practices to reduce water pollution. Since the local agencies proposed the activities to be included in the permit, the requirements are a downstream result of the local agencies' decision to include the particular activities in the permit. Finance cites the *Kern* case,<sup>58</sup> which held that if participation in the underlying program is voluntary, the resulting new consequential requirements are not reimbursable mandates.

---

<sup>58</sup> *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates (Kern High School Dist.)* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 727.

As to the claimants' identifying NPDES permits approved by other states to show the permit exceeds federal law, Finance states that this "demonstrates the variation envisioned by the federal authority in granting the administering agencies flexibility to address specific regional needs in the most practical manner."

Finally, Finance states that some local agencies are using fees for funding the claimed permit activities, so should the Commission find that the permit constitutes a reimbursable mandate, the fees should be considered as offsetting revenues.

Finance commented on the draft staff analysis in February 2010, echoing the comments of the State Board, which are summarized and addressed below.

**State Water Resources Control Board:** The State Board and Regional Board filed joint comments on the test claim on October 27, 2008, alleging that the permit is mandated on the local agencies by federal law, and that it is not unique to government because NPDES permits apply to private dischargers also. The State Board also states that the requirements are consistent with the minimum requirements of federal law, but even if the permit is interpreted as going beyond federal law, any additional state requirements are de minimis. In addition, the State Board alleges that the costs are not subject to reimbursement because most of the programs were proposed by the cities and County themselves, and because the claimants may comply with the permit requirements by charging fees and are not required to raise taxes.

The State Board further comments that the 2007 permit mirrors or is identical to the requirements in the 2001 permit, only providing more detail to the requirements already in existence and to implement the MEP performance standard. Like earlier permits, the 2007 permit implements the federal standard of reducing pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP (maximum extent practicable), but according to the State Board, "what *has* changed in successive permits is the level of specificity included in the permit to define what constitutes MEP." [Emphasis in original.] The State Board asserts that this level of specificity does not make the permit a state mandate, but that even if it is, the additional requirements are de minimis. The State Board also states that the local agencies have fee authority to pay for the permit requirements.

The State Board also addresses specific allegations in the test claim, as discussed below.

The State Board submitted comments on the draft staff analysis in January 2010, arguing that the test claim should not be reimbursable because (1) federal law requires local agencies to obtain NPDES permits from California Water Boards; (2) federal law mandates the permit that was issued, which is less stringent than permits for private industry; (3) the draft staff analysis incorrectly applies the *Hayes* case because the state did not shift the cost of the federal mandate to the local agencies; rather the federal mandate was imposed directly on local agencies and not on the state; (4) the permit provisions are not in addition to, but are required by federal law; (5) even though municipalities are singled out in the federal storm water law, the law is one of general application; and (6) potential limitations on the exercise of fee authority due to Proposition 218 do not invalidate claimants' fee authority because Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), does not require unlimited or unilateral fee authority. These arguments are addressed below.

## Interested Party Comments

**Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA):** In comments submitted February 4, 2009, BASMAA speaks generally about California’s municipal stormwater permitting program, stating that “increased requirements entail both new programs and higher levels of service.” BASMAA also states:

[T]he State essentially asserts that the federal minimum for stormwater permitting is anything one of its Water Boards says it is. Likewise, the State’s assertion that its ‘discretion to exceed MEP [the maximum extent practicable standard] originates in federal law’ and ‘requires [it], as a matter of law, to include other such permit provisions as it deems appropriate’ is nothing more than an oxymoron that begs the question of what the federal Clean Water Act actually mandates rather than allows a delegated state permit writer to require as a matter of discretion. [Emphasis in original.]

BASMAA emphasizes that the water boards have wide discretion in determining the content of a municipal stormwater permit beyond the federal minimum requirements, and says that the boards need to work “proactively and collaboratively” with local governments in “prioritizing and phasing in actions that realistically can be implemented given existing and projected local revenues.”

**League of California Cities (League) and California State Association of Counties (CSAC):**

The League and CSAC filed joint comments on the draft staff analysis on January 26, 2010, expressing support for it “and its recognition of the constraints placed on cities and counties with respect to adopting new or increased property-related fees.”

The League and CSAC disagree, however, with the finding that the hydromodification management plan (HMP, part D.1.g.), the requirement to include low impact development (LID) in the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) (part D.1.d.(7)-(8)), and parts of the education component (part D.5) are not reimbursable because the claimants have fee authority (under Gov. Code, § 66000 et seq., The Mitigation Fee Act) sufficient to pay for them. The League and CSAC point out examples where a city or county constructs a priority development project for which no third party is available upon whom to assess a fee. They also assert that for these city or county projects, a nexus requirement cannot be demonstrated “because no private development impact have generated the need for the projects.”

## COMMISSION FINDINGS

The courts have found that article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution<sup>59</sup> recognizes the state constitutional restrictions on the powers of local government to tax and spend.<sup>60</sup> “Its

---

<sup>59</sup> Article XIII B, section 6, subdivision (a), provides:

- (a) Whenever the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the State shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse that local government for the costs of the program or increased level of service, except that the Legislature may, but need not, provide a subvention of funds for the following mandates: (1) Legislative mandates requested by the local agency affected. (2) Legislation defining a new

purpose is to preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are ‘ill equipped’ to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose.”<sup>61</sup> A test claim statute or executive order may impose a reimbursable state-mandated program if it orders or commands a local agency or school district to engage in an activity or task.<sup>62</sup>

In addition, the required activity or task must be new, constituting a “new program,” or it must create a “higher level of service” over the previously required level of service.<sup>63</sup>

The courts have defined a “program” subject to article XIII B, section 6, of the California Constitution, as one that carries out the governmental function of providing public services, or a law that imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts to implement a state policy, but does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.<sup>64</sup> To determine if the program is new or imposes a higher level of service, the test claim legislation must be compared with the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim legislation.<sup>65</sup> A “higher level of service” occurs when the new “requirements were intended to provide an enhanced service to the public.”<sup>66</sup>

Finally, the newly required activity or increased level of service must impose costs mandated by the state.<sup>67</sup>

The Commission is vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.<sup>68</sup> In making its

---

crime or changing an existing definition of a crime. (3) Legislative mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975, or executive orders or regulations initially implementing legislation enacted prior to January 1, 1975.

<sup>60</sup> *Kern High School Dist.*, *supra*, 30 Cal.4th 727, 735.

<sup>61</sup> *County of San Diego v. State of California (County of San Diego)*(1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

<sup>62</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 174.

<sup>63</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 878 (*San Diego Unified School Dist.*); *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835-836 (*Lucia Mar*).

<sup>64</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 874, (reaffirming the test set out in *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56; *Lucia Mar*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.)

<sup>65</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 878; *Lucia Mar*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

<sup>66</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 878.

<sup>67</sup> *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1284 (*County of Sonoma*); Government Code sections 17514 and 17556.



decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6, and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”<sup>69</sup>

The permit provisions in the test claim are discussed separately to determine whether they are reimbursable state-mandates.

**Issue 1: Is the permit subject to article XIII B, section 6, of the California Constitution?**

The issues discussed here are whether the permit provisions are an executive order within the meaning of Government Code section 17516, whether they are discretionary, whether they constitute a program, and whether they are a federal mandate or a state-mandated new program or higher level of service.

**A. Is the permit an executive order within the meaning of Government Code section 17516?**

The Commission has jurisdiction over test claims involving statutes and executive orders as defined by Government Code section 17516, which describes “executive order” for purposes of state mandates, as “any order, plan, requirement, rule, or regulation issued by any of the following: (a) The Governor. (b) Any officer or official serving at the pleasure of the Governor. (c) Any agency, department, board, or commission of state government.”<sup>70</sup>

The California Regional Water Board, San Diego Region, is a state agency.<sup>71</sup> The permit it issued is a plan for reducing water pollution, and contains requirements for local agencies toward that end. Therefore, the Commission finds that the permit is an executive order within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 and Government Code section 17516.

**B. Is the permit the result of claimants’ discretion?**

The permit requires claimants to undertake various activities to reduce stormwater pollution in compliance with a permit issued by the Regional Board.

The Department of Finance, in comments submitted November 6, 2008, asserts that the claimants “had the option to use best management practices that would identify alternative practices to reduce pollution in water to the maximum extent practicable” Finance asserts that the claimants proposed permit requirements when they submitted the application for the permit,

---

<sup>68</sup> *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 326, 331-334; Government Code sections 17551, 17552.

<sup>69</sup> *County of Sonoma, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1280, citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

<sup>70</sup> Section 17516 also states: ““Executive order” does not include any order, plan, requirement, rule, or regulation issued by the State Water Resources Control Board or by any regional water quality control board pursuant to Division 7 (commencing with Section 13000) of the Water Code.” The Second District Court of Appeal has held that this statutory language is unconstitutional. *County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates, supra*, 150 Cal.App.4th 898, 904.

<sup>71</sup> Water Code section 13200 et seq.

and that increased costs due to downstream activities of an underlying discretionary activity are not reimbursable.

Similarly, the State Board, in its October 27, 2008 comments, states that the copermitees proposed the concepts that were incorporated into and form the basis of the permit provisions for which they now seek reimbursement.

In rebuttal comments submitted February 9, 2009, claimants dispute that the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD, or permit application) “represents a copermitee proposal for 2007 Permit content or that the adopted 2007 Permit is ‘based on the ROWD.’” According to claimants, the 2007 permit provisions “were not taken directly from, nor are they generally consistent with the intent of, most of the specific ROWD content upon which the state contends they are based.”

In determining whether the permit provisions at issue are a downstream activity resulting from the discretionary decision by the local agencies, the following rule stated by the Supreme Court in the *Kern High School Dist.* case applies:

[A]ctivities undertaken at the option or discretion of a local government entity ... do not trigger a state mandate and hence do not require reimbursement of funds—even if the local entity is obliged to incur costs as a result of its discretionary decision to participate in a particular program or practice.<sup>72</sup>

The Commission finds that the permit activities at issue were not undertaken at the option or discretion of the claimants. The claimants are required by law to submit the NPDES permit application in the form of a Report of Waste Discharge.<sup>73</sup> Submitting it is not discretionary, as shown in the following federal regulation:

a) *Duty to apply.* (1) Any person<sup>74</sup> who discharges or proposes to discharge pollutants ... and who does not have an effective permit ... must submit a complete application to the Director in accordance with this section and part 124 of this chapter.<sup>75</sup>

Moreover, the ROWD (tantamount to an NPDES permit application) is required by California law, as follows: “Any person discharging pollutants or proposing to discharge pollutants to the navigable water of the United States within the jurisdiction of this state ... shall file a report of the discharge in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 13260 ...”<sup>76</sup> Thus, submitting the ROWD is not discretionary because the claimants are required to do so by both federal and California law.

---

<sup>72</sup> *Kern High School Dist.*, *supra*, 30 Cal.4th 727, 742.

<sup>73</sup> The Report of Waste Discharge is attachment 36 of the State Water Resources Control Board comments submitted October 2008.

<sup>74</sup> *Person* means an individual, association, partnership, corporation, municipality, State or Federal agency, or an agent or employee thereof (40 CFR § 122.2).

<sup>75</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.21 (a). The section applies to U.S. EPA-issued permits, but is incorporated into section 123.25 (the state program provision) by reference.

<sup>76</sup> Water Code section 13376.

In addition to federal and state law, the 2001 permit required submission of the ROWD. The 2007 permit, under Part A “Basis for the Order,” states: “On August 25, 2005, in accordance with Order No. 2001-01 [the 2001 Permit], the County of San Diego, as the Principal Permittee, submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for renewal of their MS4 Permit.”<sup>77</sup>

And although the ROWD provides a basis for some (but not all) of the 2007 permit provisions at issue in this test claim, there is a substantial difference between what was included in the claimants’ ROWD and the specific requirements the Regional Board adopted (e.g., copermittee collaboration, parts F.2., F.3 & L, Regional Residential Education Program Development, part F.1., Low Impact Development, part D.1.d(7)-(8), long-term effectiveness assessment, part I.5, program effectiveness assessment, parts I.1 & I.2, educational surveys and tests, part D.5, and the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, parts E.2.f & E.2.g). Other permit activities were not proposed in the ROWD (e.g., hydromodification, part D.1.g., street sweeping, parts D.2.a(5) & J.3.a(3)(c)x-xv, conveyance system cleaning, part D.3.a(3) & J.3.a(3)(c)iv-viii).

Because the claimants do not voluntarily participate in the NPDES program, the Commission finds that the *Kern High School Dist.* case does not apply to the permit, the contents of which are not the result of the claimants’ discretion.

**C. Does the permit constitute a program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution?**

As to whether the permit provisions in the test claim constitute a “program,” courts have defined a “program” for purposes of article XIII B, section 6, of the California Constitution, as one that carries out the governmental function of providing public services, or a law that imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts to implement a state policy, but does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.<sup>78</sup>

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, argues that the NPDES program is not a program because the NPDES permit program, and the stormwater requirements specifically, are not peculiar to local government in that industrial and construction facilities must also obtain NPDES stormwater permits.

The State Board reiterates this argument in its January 2010 comments, asserting that the draft analysis “fails to consider that private entities, as well as certain state . . . and . . . federal agencies also receive NPDES permits for storm water discharges.” The State Board and Finance also cite *City of Richmond v. Commission on State Mandates* (1998) 64 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1190, for the proposition that “where municipalities have separate but not more stringent requirements than private entities, there is no program subject to reimbursement.” Finance, in its February 2010 comments, asserts that “the requirements within the test claim permit apply generally to state and private dischargers.”

---

<sup>77</sup> The 2001 Permit is attached to the State Water Resources Control Board, comments submitted October 2008, Attachment 25.

<sup>78</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 874, (reaffirming the test set out in *County of Los Angeles v. State of California*, *supra*, 43 Cal.3d 46, 56; *Lucia Mar*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.)

Claimants, in their February 2009 rebuttal comments, disagree with the State Board and assert that an MS4 permit is unique to government and subject to unique regulations. Claimants cite the definition of an MS4 in 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(8) as “a conveyance or system of conveyances . . . owned or operated by a State, city, town, borough, county, parish, district, association, or other public body . . .” Claimants argue that prohibiting “non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewers”<sup>79</sup> is a uniquely government function that provides for the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens in a community. Claimants also point out that the federal regulations for MS4 permits are in 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d), while the regulations pertaining to private industrial dischargers are in 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(c), different regulations that apply the Best Available Technology standard rather than the Maximum Extent Practicable standard imposed on MS4s.

The Commission finds that the permit activities constitute a program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6. In *County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates*, the State Board argued that an NPDES permit<sup>80</sup> issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board does not constitute a “program.” The court dismissed this argument, stating: “[T]he applicability of permits to public and private dischargers does not inform us about whether a particular permit or an obligation thereunder imposed on local governments constitutes a state mandate necessitating subvention under article XIII B, section 6.”<sup>81</sup> In other words, whether the law regarding NPDES permits generally constitute a “program” within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 is not relevant. The only issue before the Commission is whether the permit in this test claim constitutes a program.

The permit activities in this claim (order no. R9-2007-001, NPDES no. CAS0108758) are limited to the local governmental entities specified in the permit. The permit defines the “permittees” as the County of San Diego and 18 incorporated cities, along with the San Diego Unified Port District and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.<sup>82</sup> No private entities are regulated under this permit, so it is not a law (or executive order) of general application. That fact distinguishes this claim from the *City of Richmond* case cited by Finance and the State Board, in which the workers’ compensation law was found to be one of general application. The same cannot be said of the permit in this claim (order no. R9-2007-001, NPDES no. CAS0108758) because no private entities are regulated by it.

Moreover, the permit provides a service to the public by preventing or abating pollution in waterways and beaches in San Diego County. As stated in the permit: “This order specifies requirements necessary for the Copermitees to reduce the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff to the maximum extent practicable.”

---

<sup>79</sup> 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p)(3).

<sup>80</sup> Los Angeles Regional Quality Control Board Order No. 01-182, Permit CAS004001. The Commission issued a decision on parts 4C2a, 4C2b, 4E and 4Fc3 of this permit (test claims 03-TC-09, 03-TC-19, 03-TC-20, 03-TC-21) at its July 31, 2009 hearing.

<sup>81</sup> *County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates* (2007) 150 Cal.App.4th 898, 919.

<sup>82</sup> The cities are Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista.

Thus, the permit carries out the governmental function of providing public services, and also imposes unique requirements on local agencies in San Diego County to implement a state policy that does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state. Therefore, the Commission finds that the permit is a program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.

**D. Are the permit provisions in the test claim a federal mandate or a state-mandated new program or higher level of service?**

The next issue is whether the parts of the permit alleged in the test claim are a state mandate, or federally mandated, as asserted by the State Board and the Department of Finance. If so, the permit would not constitute a state mandate. The California Supreme Court has stated that “article XIII B, section 6, and the implementing statutes ... by their terms, provide for reimbursement only of *state*-mandated costs, not *federally* mandated costs.”<sup>83</sup>

Also discussed is whether the permit is a new program or higher level of service. To determine whether the permit is a new program or higher level of service, the permit is compared to the legal requirements in effect immediately before its adoption, in this case, the 2001 permit.<sup>84</sup>

When analyzing federal law in the context of a test claim under article XIII B, section 6, the court in *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates* held that “[w]hen the federal government imposes costs on local agencies those costs are not mandated by the state and thus would not require a state subvention. Instead, such costs are exempt from local agencies’ taxing and spending limitations” under article XIII B.<sup>85</sup> When federal law imposes a mandate on the state, however, and the state “freely [chooses] to impose the costs upon the local agency as a means of implementing a federal program, then the costs are the result of a reimbursable state mandate regardless whether the costs were imposed upon the state by the federal government.”<sup>86</sup>

Similarly, Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c), states that the Commission shall not find “costs mandated by the state” if “[t]he statute or executive order imposes a requirement that is mandated by a federal law or regulation and results in costs mandated by the federal government, unless the statute or executive order mandates costs that exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”

In *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>87</sup> the court considered whether a state executive order involving school desegregation constituted a state mandate. The regulations required, for example, conducting mandatory biennial racial and ethnic surveys, developing a reasonably feasible plan every four years to alleviate and prevent segregation to include specifics

---

<sup>83</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 879-880, emphasis in original.

<sup>84</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 878; *Lucia Mar*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

<sup>85</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates* (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593, citing *City of Sacramento v. State of California*, *supra*, 50 Cal.3d 51, 76; see also, Government Code sections 17513 and 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>86</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1594.

<sup>87</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

elements, and taking mandatory steps to involve the community including public hearings. The state argued that its Executive Order did not mandate a new program because school districts in California have a constitutional duty to make an effort to eliminate racial segregation in the public schools. The court held that the executive order did require school districts to provide a higher level of service than required by federal constitutional or case law because the state requirements went beyond federal requirements imposed on school districts.<sup>88</sup> The court stated:

A review of the Executive Order and guidelines shows that a higher level of service is mandated because their requirements go beyond constitutional and case law requirements. ...[T]he executive Order and guidelines require specific actions ... [that were] required acts. These requirements constitute a higher level of service.<sup>89</sup>

In analyzing the permit under the federal Clean Water Act, we keep the following in mind. First, each state is free to enforce its own water quality laws so long as its effluent limitations are not “less stringent” than those set out in the Clean Water Act.<sup>90</sup> The federal Clean Water Act allows for more stringent state-imposed measures, as follows:

Permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers [¶]...[¶] (iii) shall require controls to reduce the discharges of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the ... State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants. (33 U.S.C.A. 1342 (p)(3)(B)(iii).)

Second, the California Supreme Court has acknowledged that an NPDES permit may contain terms that are federally mandated and terms that exceed federal law.<sup>91</sup>

**California in the NPDES program:** Under the federal statutory scheme, a stormwater permit may be administered by the Administrator of U.S. EPA or by a state-designated agency, but states are not required to have an NPDES program. Subdivision (b) of section 1324 of the federal Clean Water Act, which describes the NPDES program (and subdivision (p), which describes the requirements for the municipal stormwater system permits) states in part:

At any time after the promulgation of the guidelines required by subsection (i)(2) of section 1314 of this title, the Governor of each State desiring to administer its own permit program for discharges into navigable waters within its jurisdiction may submit to the Administrator [of U.S. EPA] a full and complete description of the program it proposes to establish and administer under State law or under an interstate compact. [Emphasis added.]

And the federal stormwater statute states that the permits:

[S]hall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and

---

<sup>88</sup> *Id.* at 173.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>90</sup> 33 U.S.C. section 1370.

<sup>91</sup> *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Board, supra*, 35 Cal.4th 613, 618, 628.

system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants. (33 USCA § 1342 (p)(3)(B)(iii). [Emphasis added].)

The federal statutory scheme indicates that California is not required to have its own NPDES program nor to issue stormwater permits. According to section 1342 (p) quoted above, the Administrator of U.S. EPA would do so if California had no program. The California Legislature, when adopting the NPDES program<sup>92</sup> to comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, stated the following findings and declaration in Water Code section 13370:

- (a) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act [citation omitted] as amended, provides for permit systems to regulate the discharge of pollutants ... to the navigable waters of the United States and to regulate the use and disposal of sewage sludge.
- (b) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, provides that permits may be issued by states which are authorized to implement the provisions of that act.
- (c) It is in the interest of the people of the state, in order to avoid direct regulation by the federal government, of persons already subject to regulation under state law pursuant to this division, to enact this chapter in order to authorize the state to implement the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and federal regulations and guidelines issued pursuant thereto, provided, that the state board shall request federal funding under the Federal Water Pollution Act for the purpose of carrying out its responsibilities under this program.

Based on this statute, in which California voluntarily adopts the permitting program, and on the federal statutes quoted above that authorize but do not expressly require states to have this program, the state has freely chosen<sup>93</sup> to effect the stormwater permit program. Further discussion in this analysis of federal “requirements” should be construed in the context of California’s choice to participate in the federal regulatory NPDES program.

Finance, in its February 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, states:

The state’s role as a permitting authority acting on behalf of the federal government negates the existence of a state mandate because the test claim permit is issued in compliance with federal law. ...[N]o state mandate exists if the state requirements, in the absence of state statute, would still be imposed upon local agencies by federal law.

Similarly, the State Board’s January 2010 comments argue that the *Hayes* case is distinguishable from this test claim because NPDES permits do not impose a federal mandate on the state. Rather, federal law requires municipalities to comply with the permit. The State Board also states:

---

<sup>92</sup> Water Code section 13374 states: “The term ‘waste discharge requirements’ as referred to in this division is the equivalent of the term ‘permits’ as used in the Federal water Pollution Control Act, as amended.”

<sup>93</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

This [draft staff analysis'] approach fails to recognize that NPDES storm water permits, whether issued by U.S. EPA or California's Water Boards, are designed to translate the general federal mandate into specific programs and enforceable requirements. Whether issued by U.S. EPA or the California's Water Boards, the federal NPDES permit will identify specific requirements for municipalities to reduce pollutants in their storm water to the maximum extent practicable. The federally required pollutant reduction is a federal mandate. ... The fact that state agencies have responsibility for specifying the federal permit requirements for municipalities does not indicate that requirements extend beyond federal law, as in *Long Beach*, or convert the federal mandate into a state mandate.<sup>94</sup>

The Commission disagrees. As discussed above, the federal Clean Water Act<sup>95</sup> authorizes states to impose more stringent measures than required by federal law. The California Supreme Court has also recognized that permits may include state-imposed, in addition to federally required measures.<sup>96</sup> Those state measures that may constitute a state mandate if they "exceed the mandate in ... federal law."<sup>97</sup> Thus, although California opted into the NPDES program, further analysis is needed to determine whether the state requirements exceed the federal requirements imposed on local agencies.

The permit provisions are discussed below in context of the following federal law governing stormwater permits: Clean Water Act section 402 (p) (33 USCA 1342 (p)(3)(B)) and Code of Federal Regulations, title 40, section 122.26. The federal stormwater statute states:

Permits for discharges from municipal storm sewers--

- (i) may be issued on a system- or jurisdiction-wide basis;
- (ii) shall include a requirement to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into the storm sewers; and
- (iii) shall require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions as the Administrator<sup>98</sup> or the State determines appropriate for the control of such pollutants. (33 USCA § 1342 (p)(3)(B)).

The issues are whether the parts of the permit in the test claim are federal mandates or state mandates, and whether they are a new program or higher level of service.

---

<sup>94</sup> State Board comments submitted January 2010.

<sup>95</sup> 33 U.S.C. sections 1370 and 1342 (p)(3)(B)(iii).

<sup>96</sup> *City of Burbank v. State Water Resources Control Board*, *supra*, 35 Cal.4th 613, 618, 628.

<sup>97</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (b). *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 173.

<sup>98</sup> Administrator means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, or an authorized representative. (40 CFR § 122.2.)



## **I. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program and Reporting (Parts D & J)**

Part D of the permit describes the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) of which each copermitttee “shall develop and implement” an updated version (p.15). Part J of the permit (“Reporting”) requires the JURMP to be updated and revised to include specified information. The test claim includes parts D.1.g (hydromodification management plan), D.1.d.(7)-(8) (low-impact development or LID), D3a(5) (street sweeping) and J.3.a(3)x-xv (reporting on street sweeping), D.3.a.(3) (conveyance system cleaning ) and J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii) (reporting on conveyance system cleaning), and D.5 (educational surveys and tests).

**Hydromodification (part D.1.g.):** Part D.1 of the permit is entitled “Development Planning.” Part D.1.g. requires developing and implementing, in collaboration with other copermitttees, a hydromodification management plan (HMP) “to manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects.”<sup>99</sup> Priority development projects can include both private projects, and municipal (city or county) projects. The purpose of the HMP is:

---

<sup>99</sup> According to the permit, Priority Development Projects are: a) all new Development Projects that fall under the project categories or locations listed in section D.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 that falls under the project categories or locations listed in section D.1.d.(2)..

[¶]...[¶] [Section D.1.d.(2):] (2) Priority Development Project Categories (a) Housing subdivisions of 10 or more dwelling units. This category includes single-family homes, multi-family homes, condominiums, and apartments. (b) Commercial developments greater than one acre. This category is defined as any development on private land that is not for heavy industrial or residential uses where the land area for development is greater than one acre. The category includes, but is not limited to: hospitals; laboratories and other medical facilities; educational institutions; recreational facilities; municipal facilities; commercial nurseries; multi-apartment buildings; car wash facilities; mini-malls and other business complexes; shopping malls; hotels; office buildings; public warehouses; automotive dealerships; airfields; and other light industrial facilities. (c) Developments of heavy industry greater than one acre. This category includes, but is not limited to, manufacturing plants, food processing plants, metal working facilities, printing plants, and fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.). (d) 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. (e) 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 shall meet all SUSMP requirements except for structural treatment BMP and numeric sizing criteria requirement D.1.d.(6)(c) and hydromodification requirement D.1.g. (f) 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. (g) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). All development located within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA (where discharges from the development or redevelopment

[T]o manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects, where such rates and durations are likely to cause increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

Hydromodification is defined in Attachment C of the permit as “The change in the natural watershed hydrologic processes and runoff characteristics (i.e., interception, infiltration, overland flow, interflow and groundwater flow) caused by urbanization or other land use changes that result in increased stream flows and sediment transport. In addition, alteration of stream and river channels, installation of dams and water impoundments, and excessive streambank and shoreline erosion are also considered hydromodification, due to their disruption of natural watershed hydrologic processes.”<sup>100</sup>

As detailed in the permit and on pages 12-17 above, the HMP must have specified content, including “a description of how the copermitees will incorporate the HMP requirements into their local approval processes.” Also required is collaborative reporting on the HMP and implementation 180 days after the HMP is approved by the Regional Water Board, with earlier implementation encouraged.

According to the State Board’s comments submitted in October 2008 the requirement to develop and implement a HMP is necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard. The Board states that “broad federal legal authority is contained in CWA sections 402(p)(3)(B)(ii)-(iii), CWA section 402(a), and in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.26 (d)(2)(i)(B)-(C), (E), and (F), 131.12, and 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(2), which states:

---

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% 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. (h) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more or with 15 or more parking spaces and potentially exposed to urban 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. (i) 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. (j) 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.

<sup>100</sup> It is also defined as “changes in the magnitude and frequency of stream flows as a result of urbanization, and the resulting impacts on the receiving channels in terms of erosion, sedimentation and degradation of in-stream habitat.” Draft Hydromodification Management Plan for San Diego County, page 4. <[http://www.projectcleanwater.org/pdf/susmp/sd\\_hmp\\_2009.pdf](http://www.projectcleanwater.org/pdf/susmp/sd_hmp_2009.pdf)> as of May 28, 2009.

(d) Application requirements for large and medium municipal separate storm sewer discharges. The operator<sup>101</sup> of a discharge<sup>102</sup> from a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer or a municipal separate storm sewer that is designated by the Director under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section, may submit a jurisdiction-wide or system-wide permit application. . . . Permit applications for discharges from large and medium municipal storm sewers or municipal storm sewers designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section shall include; [¶]...[¶]

(2) *Part 2.* Part 2 of the application shall consist of: [¶]...[¶]

(iv) *Proposed management program.* A proposed management program covers the duration of the permit. It shall include a comprehensive planning process which involves public participation and where necessary intergovernmental coordination, to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable using management practices, control techniques and system, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions which are appropriate. The program shall also include a description of staff and equipment available to implement the program. Separate proposed programs may be submitted by each coapplicant. Proposed programs may impose controls on a systemwide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls. Proposed programs will be considered by the Director when developing permit conditions to reduce pollutants in discharges to the maximum extent practicable. Proposed management programs shall describe priorities for implementing controls. Such programs shall be based on:

(A) A description of structural and source control measures to reduce pollutants from runoff from commercial and residential areas that are discharged from the municipal storm sewer system that are to be implemented during the life of the permit, accompanied with an estimate of the expected reduction of pollutant loads and a proposed schedule for implementing such controls. At a minimum, the description shall include: [¶]...[¶]

---

<sup>101</sup> “*Owner or operator* means the owner or operator of any “facility or activity” subject to regulation under the NPDES program.” (40 CFR § 122.2)

<sup>102</sup> “*Discharge* when used without qualification means the “discharge of a pollutant. *Discharge of a pollutant* means: (a) Any addition of any “pollutant” or combination of pollutants to “waters of the United States” from any “point source,” or (b) Any addition of any pollutant or combination of pollutants to the waters of the “contiguous zone” or the ocean from any point source other than a vessel or other floating craft which is being used as a means of transportation.

This definition includes additions of pollutants into waters of the United States from: surface runoff which is collected or channeled by man; discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances owned by a State, municipality, or other person which do not lead to a treatment works; and discharges through pipes, sewers, or other conveyances, leading into privately owned treatment works. This term does not include an addition of pollutants by any “indirect discharger.” (40 CFR § 122.2.)

(2) A description of planning procedures including a comprehensive master plan to develop, implement and enforce controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers which receive discharges from areas of new development and significant redevelopment. Such plan shall address controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers after construction is completed. ...

The State Board also cited the U.S. Supreme Court decision, *P.U.D. No. 1 v. Washington Department of Ecology* (1994) 511 U.S. 700, for the state's authority to regulate flow under the federal Clean Water Act in order to protect water quality standards.

In response, the claimants' February 2009 comments state that the permit's Fact Sheet did not cite any federal authorities to justify the HMP portion of the permit, and that none exists. Claimants also assert that no other jurisdiction in the United States that was surveyed for the claim has a permit that requires a HMP. Claimants call the HMP requirement a flood control measure that is not a requirement in any other permit outside of California, and that the HMP exceeds the federal requirements and constitutes a state mandate. Claimants also point to the language in section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(2) that they say is:

[A]imed directly at controlling pollutant discharges from an MS4 that originate in areas of new development. [The regulation] does not mention the need to include controls to reduce the *volume* of storm water discharged from these areas. ... controls designed only to limit volume are not expressly required.

As to the *P.U.D. No. 1 v. Washington Department of Ecology* decision cited by the State Board, the claimants distinguish it as being decided under section 401 of the Clean Water Act, wherein the permit was issued under section 402. Claimants state that the *P.U.D.* case recognized state authority under the Clean Water Act rather than a federal mandate.

The Commission agrees with claimants about the applicability of the *P.U.D.* case, which determined whether the state of Washington's environmental agency properly conditioned a permit for a federal hydroelectric project on the maintenance of specific minimum stream flows to protect salmon and steelhead runs. The U.S. Supreme Court determined that Washington could do so, but the decision was based on section 401 of the Clean Water Act, which involves certifications and wetlands. Even if the decision could be applied to section 402 NPDES permits, it merely recognized state authority to regulate flows. The issue here is not whether the state has authority to regulate flows, but whether a federal mandate requires it. This was not addressed in the *P.U.D.* decision.

Overall, there is nothing in the federal regulations that requires a municipality to adopt or implement a hydromodification plan. Thus, the HMP requirement in the permit "exceed[s] the mandate in that federal law or regulation."<sup>103</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>104</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>105</sup> to

---

<sup>103</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>104</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>105</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part D.1.g. of the permit is not a federal mandate.

All of part D.1.g. of the permit requires the HMP to have specified contents except part D.1.g.(2), which states that the HMP “*may* include implementation of planning measures ...” as specified. As the plain language of this part does not require the implementation of planning measures, the Commission finds that part D.1.g.(2) of the permit is not a state mandate.

The Commission also finds that HMP is not a state mandate for municipal (city or county) projects that are priority development projects, such as a hospital, laboratory or other medical facility, recreational facility, airfield, parking lot, street, road, highway, and freeway, a project over an acre, and a project located in an environmentally sensitive area.<sup>106</sup> Although these projects would be subject to the compliance with HMP requirements, there is no legal requirement to build municipal projects.<sup>107</sup> Thus, municipal projects are built by cities or counties voluntarily, and their decision triggers the requirements to comply with the HMP. In *Kern High School Dist.*,<sup>108</sup> the California Supreme Court decided whether the state must reimburse the costs of school site councils and advisory committees complying with the Brown (Open Meetings) Act for schools who participate in various school-related education programs. The court determined that participation in the underlying school site council program was not legally compelled and so mandate reimbursement was not required for the downstream compliance with the Brown Act. The court said:

Activities undertaken at the option or discretion of a local government entity (that is, actions undertaken without any legal compulsion or threat of penalty for nonparticipation) do not trigger a state mandate and hence do not require reimbursement of funds—even if the local entity is obliged to incur costs as a result of its discretionary decision to participate in a particular program or practice.<sup>109</sup>

As with the voluntary programs in *Kern*, there is no requirement for municipalities to undertake any of the priority development projects described in the permit. Thus, the Commission finds that the costs of complying with the HMP in part D.1.g., is not a state mandate for priority development projects undertaken by a city or county.

Based on the mandatory language of the remainder of part D.1.g. of the permit (except part D.1.g.(2) and except for municipal projects), the Commission finds that it is a state mandate on the claimants to do the following:

---

<sup>106</sup> The County of San Diego, in its January 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, raises the issue of its fee authority for municipal projects. The League of California Cities, in its January 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, also discusses municipal projects, citing examples “where a city or county constructs a Priority Development Project for which no third party is available to assess a fee against.”

<sup>107</sup> California Constitution, article XI, section 7. “A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.”

<sup>108</sup> *Kern High School Dist.*, *supra*, 30 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 727.

<sup>109</sup> *Kern High School Dist.*, *supra*, 30 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 727, 742.

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, where such increased rates and durations are likely to cause increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force. The HMP, once approved by the Regional Board, shall be incorporated into the local SUSMP [Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan] and implemented by each Copermittee so that post-project runoff discharge rates and durations shall not exceed estimated pre-project discharge rates and durations where the increased discharge rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the discharge rates and durations.

(1) The HMP shall:

(a) Identify a standard for channel segments which receive urban runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects. The channel standard shall maintain the pre-project erosion and deposition characteristics of channel segments receiving urban runoff discharges from Priority Development Projects as necessary to maintain or improve the channel segments' stability conditions.

(b) Utilize continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record to identify a range of runoff flows for which Priority Development Project post-project runoff flow rates and durations shall not exceed pre-project runoff flow rates and durations, where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the flow rates and durations. 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.

(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 runoff flow rates and durations for the range of runoff flows identified under section D.1.g.(1)(b), where the increased flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in the flow rates and durations, and (2) do not result in channel conditions which do not meet the channel standard developed under section D.1.g.(1)(a) for channel segments downstream of Priority Development Project discharge points.

(d) Include other performance criteria (numeric or otherwise) for Priority Development Projects as necessary to prevent urban runoff from the projects from increasing erosion of channel beds and banks, silt pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

- (e) Include a review of pertinent literature.
- (f) Include a protocol to evaluate potential hydrograph change impacts to downstream watercourses from Priority Development Projects.
- (g) Include a description of how the Copermittees will incorporate the HMP requirements into their local approval processes.
- (h) 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.
- (i) Include technical information supporting any standards and criteria proposed.
- (j) 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.
- (k) Include a description of pre- and post-project monitoring and other program evaluations to be conducted to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the HMP.
- (l) Include mechanisms for addressing cumulative impacts within a watershed on channel morphology.
- (m) Include information on evaluation of channel form and condition, including slope, discharge, vegetation, underlying geology, and other information, as appropriate.

¶...¶

(3) Section D.1.g.(1)(c) does not apply to Development Projects where the project discharges stormwater runoff into channels or storm drains where the preexisting channel or storm drain conditions result in minimal potential for erosion or other impacts to beneficial uses. Such situations may include discharges into channels that are concrete-lined or significantly hardened (e.g., with rip-rap, sackrete, etc.) downstream to their outfall in bays or the ocean; underground storm drains discharging to bays or the ocean; and construction of projects where the sub-watersheds below the projects' discharge points are highly impervious (e.g., >70%) and the potential for single-project and/or cumulative impacts is minimal. Specific criteria for identification of such situations shall be included as a part of the HMP. However, plans to restore a channel reach may reintroduce the applicability of HMP controls, and would need to be addressed in the HMP.

(4) HMP Reporting

The Copermittees shall collaborate to report on HMP development as required in section J.2.a of this Order.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Section J.2.a of the permit requires collaborating with other copermittees to develop the HMP, and submitting it for approval by the Regional Board. Part J.2.a also includes timelines for HMP completion and approval.

(5) HMP Implementation

180 days after approval of the HMP by the Regional Board, each Copermittee shall incorporate into its local SUSMP and implement the HMP for all applicable Priority Development Projects. Prior to approval of the HMP by the Regional Board, the early implementation of measures likely to be included in the HMP shall be encouraged by the Copermittees.

(6) Interim Hydromodification Criteria for Projects Disturbing 50 Acres or More

Within 365 days of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees shall collectively identify an interim range of runoff flow rates for which Priority Development Project post-project runoff flow rates and durations shall not exceed pre-project runoff flow rates and durations (Interim Hydromodification Criteria), where the increased discharge flow rates and durations will result in increased potential for erosion or other significant adverse impacts to beneficial uses, attributable to changes in flow rates and durations. Development of the Interim Hydromodification Criteria shall include identification of methods to be used by Priority Development Projects to exhibit compliance with the criteria, including continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record. Starting 365 days after adoption of this Order and until the final Hydromodification Management Plan standard and criteria are implemented, each Copermittee shall require Priority Development Projects disturbing 50 acres or more to implement hydrologic controls to manage post-project runoff flow rates and durations as required by the Interim Hydromodification Criteria. Development Projects disturbing 50 acres or more are exempt from this requirement when:

- (a) The project would discharge into channels that are concrete-lined or significantly hardened (e.g., with rip-rap, sackcrete, etc.) downstream to their outfall in bays or the ocean;
- (b) The project would discharge into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean; or
- (c) The project would discharge to a channel where the watershed areas below the project's discharge points are highly impervious (e.g. >70%).

As to whether part D.1.g. of the permit (except for D.1.g.(2)) is a new program or higher level of service, the claimants, in their February 2009 comments, assert that it is.

The 2001 Permit only included general statements regarding the need to control downstream erosion with post construction BMPs. The 2007 Permit increased these requirements by requiring the copermittees to, among other things, draft and implement interim and long-term hydromodification plans, and impose specific, strict post construction BMPs on new development projects within their jurisdiction.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, argues that part D.1 “expands upon and makes more specific the hydromodification requirements in the 2001 Permit.”

Finance argues, in its February 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, that the entire permit is not a new program or higher level of service because additional activities, beyond those



required by the 2001 permit, are necessary for the claimants to continue to comply with the federal Clean Water Act and reduce pollutants to the Maximum Extent Practicable.

The Commission disagrees with Finance. This analysis measures the 2007 permit against the 2001 permit to determine which provisions are a new program or higher level of service. Under the standard urged by Finance, anything the state imposes under the permit would not be a new program or higher level of service. The Commission does not read the federal Clean Water Act so broadly. In *Building Industry Assoc. of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Board* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, the court held that the Clean Water Act's "maximum extent practicable" standard did not prevent the water boards from including provisions in the permit that required municipalities to comply with state water quality standards.<sup>111</sup>

The Regional Board prepared a Fact Sheet/Technical Report<sup>112</sup> for the permit that lists the federal authority and reasons the permit provisions were adopted. Regarding part D.1.g. of the permit, the Fact Sheet/Technical Report does not expressly mention the 2001 permit, but states:

This section of the Order expands the requirements for control of hydromodification caused by changes in runoff resulting from development and urbanization. Expansion of these requirements is needed due to the current lack of a clear standard for controlling hydromodification resulting from modification. While the Model SUSMP<sup>113</sup> [adopted in 2002] developed by the Copermittees requires project proponents to control hydromodification, it provides no standard or performance criteria for how this is to be achieved.

The Commission finds that part D.1.g. of the permit (except for D.1.g.(2)) with respect to private priority development projects is a new program or higher level of service. The Fact Sheet/Technical Report describes the section as an "expansion" of hydromodification control requirements. The 2001 permit (in part F.1.b.(2)(j)) included only the following on hydromodification:

Downstream Erosion – As part of the model SUSMP [Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan] and the local SUSMPs, the Copermittees shall develop criteria to ensure that discharges from new development and significant redevelopment maintain or reduce pre-development downstream erosion and protect stream habitat. At a minimum, criteria shall be developed to control peak storm water discharge rates and velocities in order to maintain or reduce pre-development downstream erosion and protect stream habitat. Storm water discharge volumes and durations should also be considered.

The requirements in the 2007 permit, however, are much more expansive and detailed, requiring development and implementation of a hydromodification management plan (HMP) to be approved by the Regional Board. And while the 2001 permit contained a broad description of

---

<sup>111</sup> *Building Industry Assoc. of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Board*, *supra*, 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 870.

<sup>112</sup> The Fact Sheet/Technical Report was attached to the test claim.

<sup>113</sup> According to the Fact Sheet/Technical Report, the Model SUSMP was completed and adopted in 2002.

the criteria required, part D.1.g. of the 2007 permit contains a detailed description of the contents of the HMP, including identifying standards for channel segments, using continuous simulation of the entire rainfall record to identify runoff flows, requiring priority development projects to implement hydrologic control measures, including other performance criteria for priority development projects to prevent urban runoff from the projects, and 9 other components to include in the HMP. Therefore, the Commission finds that part D.1.g. of the permit (except for D.1.g.(2)) is a new program or higher level of service over the 2001 permit.

In sum, the Commission finds that part D.1.(g) of the permit (except for D.1.g.(2)) is a state-mandated new program or higher level of service for private priority development projects. Reimbursement is not required for complying with the HMP for municipal priority development projects.

**B. Low Impact Development (LID) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (part D.1.d.):** Also under part D.1 “Development Planning” is part D.1.d, which requires the copermittees to review and update their SUSMPs (Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans)<sup>114</sup> and (in paragraphs 7 and 8) add low impact development (LID) and source control BMP requirements for each priority development project, and to implement the updated SUSMP, as specified on pages 17-19 above. The purpose of LID is to “collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects.” LID best management practices include draining a portion of impervious areas into pervious areas prior to discharge into the storm drain, and constructing portions of priority development projects with permeable surfaces (*Id.*)

According to the State Board’s comments submitted in October 2008, the requirement in part D.1.d. is necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard, and is supported by 40 C.F.R. section 122.26 (d)(2)(iv)(A)-(D), part of which is quoted in the discussion of hydromodification above. Part (d)(2)(iv)(A)(2) of the regulation requires part of the permit application to include:

(2) A description of planning procedures including a comprehensive master plan to develop, implement and enforce controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal separate storm sewers which receive discharges from areas of new development and significant redevelopment. Such plan shall address controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers after construction is completed.

The State Board asserts that these regulations “require municipalities to implement controls to reduce pollutants in urban runoff from new development and significant redevelopment, construction, and commercial, residential, industrial and municipal land uses or activities.” The Board cites a decision of the Washington Pollution Control Hearings Board that found that permit provisions to promote but not require low impact development “failed to satisfy the federal MEP standard and Washington state law because it ... did not require LID at the parcel and subdivision level.”

In their February 2009 rebuttal comments, the claimants assert: “while federal regulations require the large MS4 permits to include programs to reduce the discharge of pollutants from the

---

<sup>114</sup> The Permit defines the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan as “A plan developed to mitigate the impacts of urban runoff from Priority Development Projects.”

MS4 that originate in areas of new development, federal regulations do not require or even mention LID or LID principles.” And “while requiring post-construction controls that limit pollutant discharges originating in areas of new development is clearly within the requirements of Section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A), the 2007 Permit’s specific LID requirements are not.” Claimants also address the Washington State Pollution Control Board decision by noting that the Board’s decision “explicitly recognized that LID requirements are not federally mandated.” The claimants also point out EPA-issued NPDES permits in Washington, D.C. and Albuquerque, New Mexico that make no reference to LID.

The Commission finds nothing in the federal regulation (40 C.F.R. § 122.26) that requires local agencies to collectively review and update the BMP requirements listed in their SUSMPs, or to develop, submit and implement “an updated Model SUSMP” that defines minimum LID and other BMP requirements for incorporation into the SUSMPs. Thus, the LID requirements in the permit “exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>115</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>116</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>117</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part D.1.d. of the permit is not a federal mandate.

The Commission further finds that the LID requirements are not a state-mandated program for municipal projects for the same reason as discussed in the HMP discussion above: there is no requirement for cities or counties to build priority development projects, which would trigger the downstream requirement to comply with parts D.1.d.(7) and D.1.d.(8) of the permit, the LID portions of the permit.

As to non-municipal projects, however, because of the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that part D.1.d. of the permit is a state mandate for the claimants to do all of the following:

(7) Update of SUSMP BMP Requirements

The Copermittees shall collectively review and update the BMP requirements that are listed in their local SUSMPs. At a minimum, the update shall include removal of obsolete or ineffective BMPs, addition of LID and source control BMP requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of sections D.1.d.(4) and D.1.d.(5), and addition of LID BMPs that can be used for treatment, such as bioretention cells, bioretention swales, etc. The update shall also add appropriate LID BMPs to any tables or discussions in the local SUSMPs addressing pollutant removal efficiencies of treatment control BMPs. In addition, the update shall include review, and revision where necessary, of treatment control BMP pollutant removal efficiencies.

---

<sup>115</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>116</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>117</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

## (8) Update of SUSMPs to Incorporate LID and Other BMP Requirements

(a) In addition to the implementation of the BMP requirements of sections D.1.d.(4-7) within one year of adoption of this Order, the Copermittees shall also develop and submit an updated Model SUSMP that defines minimum LID and other BMP requirements to be incorporated into the Copermittees' local SUSMPs for application to Priority Development Projects. The purpose of the updated Model SUSMP shall be to establish minimum standards to maximize the use of LID practices and principles in local Copermittee programs as a means of reducing stormwater runoff. It shall meet the following minimum requirements:

- i. Establishment of LID BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(4) above.<sup>118</sup>
- ii. Establishment of source control BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(5) above.<sup>119</sup>
- iii. Establishment of treatment control BMP requirements that meet or exceed the minimum requirements listed in section D.1.d.(6) above.<sup>120</sup>
- iv. Establishment of siting, design, and maintenance criteria for each LID and treatment control BMP listed in the Model SUSMP, so that implemented LID and treatment control BMPs are constructed correctly and are effective at pollutant removal and/or runoff control. LID techniques, such as soil amendments, shall be incorporated into the criteria for appropriate treatment control BMPs.
- v. Establishment of criteria to aid in determining Priority Development Project conditions where implementation of each LID BMP listed in section D.1.d.(4)(b) is applicable and feasible.
- vi. Establishment of a requirement for Priority Development Projects with low traffic areas and appropriate or amendable soil conditions to construct a portion of 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.
- vii. Establishment of restrictions on infiltration of runoff from Priority Development Project categories or Priority Development Project areas that generate high levels of pollutants, if necessary.

---

<sup>118</sup> Part D.1.d.(4) of the permit includes LID BMP requirements: "Each Copermittee shall require each Priority Development Project to implement LID BMPs which will collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects." The Permit lists various LID site design BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects, and other LID BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects "where applicable and feasible."

<sup>119</sup> Part D.1.d.(5) of the permit lists source control BMP requirements.

<sup>120</sup> Part D.1.d.(6) of the permit lists treatment control BMP requirements.

(b) The updated Model SUSMP shall be submitted within 18 months of adoption of this Order. If, within 60 days of submittal of the updated Model SUSMP, the Copermittees have not received in writing from the Regional Board either (1) a finding of adequacy of the updated Model SUSMP or (2) a modified schedule for its review and revision, the updated Model SUSMP shall be deemed adequate, and the Copermittees shall implement its provisions in accordance with section D.1.d.(8)(c) below.

(c) Within 365 days of Regional Board acceptance of the updated Model SUSMP, each Copermittee shall update its local SUSMP to implement the requirements established pursuant to section D.1.d.(8)(a). In addition to the requirements of section D.1.d.(8)(a), each Copermittee's updated local SUSMP shall include the following:

- i. A requirement that each Priority Development Project use the criteria established pursuant to section D.1.d.(8)(a) to demonstrate applicability and feasibility, or lack thereof, of implementation of the LID BMPs listed in section D.1.d.(4)(b).
- ii. A review process which verifies that all BMPs to be implemented will meet the designated siting, design, and maintenance criteria, and that each Priority Development Project is in compliance with all applicable SUSMP requirements.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments on the test claim, argues that the requirements in part D.1.d.(7) of the permit are not a new program or higher level of service because they “merely add definition to the scope of the local SUSMP already required in the 2001 Permit (see Section F.1.b.(2)).” As to part D.1.d.(8), the State Board asserts that it:

[P]rovides a framework for the Copermittees to develop criteria to be used in the application of LID requirements to Priority Development Projects. The Copermittees must develop their LID programs through an update to the Model SUSMP, the document that guides (and guided the 2001 Permit cycle) post-construction BMP implementation at Priority Development Projects.

According to the State Board, these parts of the permit are not a new program or higher level of service because they merely add additional detail in implementing the same minimum federal MEP standard and add specificity to already existing BMPs.

The claimants, in their February 2009 comments, assert that by adding requirements and increasing the specificity of existing requirements, the 2007 LID permit requirements are a new program or higher level of service.

The Commission finds that part D.1.d.(7) is a new program or higher level of service because it calls for a collective review and update of BMP requirements listed in the claimants' SUSMPs (presumably those drafted under the 2001 permit) that was not required under the 2001 permit.

The Commission also finds that part D.1.d.(8) is a new program or higher level of service because it requires developing, submitting, and implementing “an updated Model SUSMP” that defines minimum LID and other BMP requirements for incorporation into the copermittees SUSMPs. Although the 2001 permit required adopting a Model SUSMP and local SUSMP, it

did not require developing and submitting an updated Model SUSMP with the specified LID BMP requirements.

In sum, the Commission finds that parts D.1.d.(7) and D.1.d.(8) of the 2007 permit constitute a state-mandated new program or higher level of service for private priority development projects. Reimbursement is not required for complying with the LID requirements for municipal priority development projects.

**C. Street sweeping and reporting (parts D.3.a.(5) & J.3.a(3)x-xv):** Part D.3 is entitled “Existing Development.” Part D.3.a.(5) requires regular street sweeping based on the amount of trash generated on the road, street, highway, or parking facility. Those identified as generating the highest volumes of trash are to be swept at least two times per month, those generating moderate volumes of trash are to be swept at least monthly, and those generating low volumes of trash are to be swept as necessary, but not less than once per year. The copermittees determine what constitutes high, moderate, and low trash generation.

In addition, section J.3.a.(3)(c) x-xv requires the copermittees, as part of their annual reporting, to identify the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads in each priority category, the total distance of curb-miles swept, the number of municipal parking lots and the number swept, the frequency of sweeping, and the tons of material collected from street and parking lot sweeping.

The State Board, in its comments submitted in October 2008, states that requiring minimum sweeping frequencies for streets determined by the copermittees to have high volumes of trash or debris is necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard. The State Board cites C.F.R. section 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B)-(C), (E) and (F) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.26(d)(2)(iv), and more specifically, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(1), which states that the proposed management program include “[a] description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls to reduce pollutants (including floatables) in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers.” Also, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(6) provides that the proposed management program include:

[a] description of a program to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer which will include, as appropriate, controls such as educational activities, permits, certifications, and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors, and controls for application in public right-of-ways and at municipal facilities.

The State Board also cites section 122.44(d)(1)(i), which states as follows regarding NPDES permits: “limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State Water quality standard, including narrative criteria for water quality.” And section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(3) states that the proposed management program include “A description for operating and maintaining public streets, roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems, including pollutants discharged as a result of deicing activities.”

In their February 2009 rebuttal comments, the claimants point out that street sweeping as a BMP to control “floatables” is not required by federal law in that none of the federal regulations

specifically require street sweeping. The claimants quote the following from *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*:<sup>121</sup> “if the state freely chose to impose the costs upon the local agency as a means of implementing a federal program then the costs are the result of a reimbursable state mandate.”

The Commission agrees with claimants. The permit requires activities that fall within the federal regulations to include: “[a] description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls to reduce pollutants (including floatables) in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers.”<sup>122</sup> And they also require: “A description for operating and maintaining public streets, roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems...”<sup>123</sup>

Yet the more specific requirements in the permit include variable street sweeping schedules for areas impacted by different amounts of trash. They also require reporting on the amount of trash collected, which is not required by the federal regulations. These activities “exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>124</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>125</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>126</sup> to impose these requirements. Therefore, the Commission finds that parts D.3.a.(5) and J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv of the permit are not a federal mandate.

Because of the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission also finds part D.3.a(5) of the permit is a state mandate for the claimants to do all of the following:

(5) Sweeping of Municipal Areas

Each Copermittee shall implement a program to sweep improved (possessing a curb and gutter) municipal roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities. The program shall include the following measures:

(a) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least two times per month.

(b) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least monthly.

(c) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept as necessary, but no less than once per year.

---

<sup>121</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates, supra*, 11 Cal.App.4th 1564.

<sup>122</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(1).

<sup>123</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(3).

<sup>124</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>125</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California, supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>126</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates, supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

And as stated in part J.3.a(3)(c)x-xv (on p. 68) of the permit, the claimants report annually on:

- x. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xi. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating low volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xiii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles swept.
- xiv. Identification of the number of municipal parking lots, the number of municipal parking lots swept, and the frequency of sweeping.
- xv. Amount of material (tons) collected from street and parking lot sweeping.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, argues that requiring minimum street sweeping frequencies does not result in a new program or higher level of service. According to the State Board:

The 2001 Permit required Copermittees to perform street sweeping, but did not specify minimum frequencies. While the minimum frequencies may exceed some Copermittees' existing programs, the Claimants acknowledge that many Copermittees meet or exceed the mandatory requirements on a voluntary basis. To the extent the frequencies are already being met and the Permit imposes the same MEP standard as its predecessor ... the 2007 Permit does not impose a higher level of service.

In their February 2009 rebuttal comments, the claimants cite Government Code section 17565 to argue that whether or not they were sweeping streets at frequencies equal or more than the permit requires is not relevant. Government Code section 17565 states: "If a local agency ... at its option, has been incurring costs which are subsequently mandated by the state, the state shall reimburse the local agency ... for those costs incurred after the operative date of the mandate." The claimants also state that the 2001 permit did not in fact require street sweeping, "[a]t best it only included general statements regarding the need to control pollutants in streets and other impervious areas and, in any event, minimum frequencies were not required."

The Regional Board's Fact Sheet/Technical Report on part D.3.a.(5) of the 2007 permit states that street sweeping "has been added to ensure that the Copermittees are implementing this effective BMP at all appropriate areas."

The Commission finds that the street sweeping provision (part D.3.a.(5)) in the permit is a new program or higher level of service. The Commission agrees that Government Code section 17565 makes it irrelevant (for purposes of mandate reimbursement) whether or not claimants



were performing the activity prior to the permit, since voluntary activities do not affect reimbursement of an activity that is subsequently mandated by the state.

The 2001 permit, in part F.3.a.(3) and (4) stated:

(a) To establish priorities for oversight of municipal areas and activities required under this Order, each Copermittee shall prioritize each watershed inventory in F.3.a.2. above by threat to water quality and update annually. Each municipal area and activity shall be classified as high, medium, or low threat to water quality. In evaluating threat to water quality, each Copermittee shall consider (1) type of municipal area or activity; (2) materials used (3) wastes generated; (4) pollutant discharge potential; (5) non-storm water discharges; (6) size of facility or area; (7) proximity to receiving water bodies; (8) sensitivity of receiving water bodies; and (9) any other relevant factors.

(b) At a minimum, the high priority municipal areas and activities shall include the following:

(i) Roads, Streets, Highways, and Parking Facilities. [¶]...[¶]

F.3.a.(4) BMP Implementation (Municipal)

(a) Each Copermittee shall designate a set of minimum BMPs for high, medium, and low threat to water quality municipal areas and activities (as determined under section F.3.a.(3)). The designated minimum BMPs for high threat to water quality municipal areas and activities shall be area or activity specific as appropriate.

Street sweeping is not expressly required in this 2001 permit provision, nor does it specify any frequencies or required reporting. Thus, the Commission finds that part D.3.a.(5) of the 2007 permit that requires street sweeping, as specified, is a new program or higher level of service, as well as part J.3.a(3)x-xv that requires reporting on street-sweeping activities.

**D. Conveyance system cleaning and reporting (parts D.3.a.(3) & J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii)):** Also under part D.3 “Existing Development,” part D.3.a.(3) requires conveyance system cleaning, including the following:

- Verifying proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges to or from the MS4s and related drainage structures.
- Cleaning any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of the design capacity in a timely manner.
- Cleaning any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning of any accumulated trash and debris immediately.
- Cleaning open channels of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner.

In J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii), as part of the annual reporting requirements, copermittees shall provide a detailed accounting of the numbers of MS4 facilities in inventory, and the numbers of facilities inspected, exceeding cleaning criteria, and cleaned. In addition, copermittees must report by category tons of waste and litter removed from the facilities.

The State Board, in its comments submitted in October 2008, disagrees that the requirements exceed federal law, saying that “the same broad authorities applicable to the street sweeping requirement also apply to the conveyance system cleaning requirements.” According to the State Board, specificity in inspection and cleaning requirements is consistent with and supported by U.S. EPA guidance. Also, to the extent that permit requirements are more specific than the federal regulations, the State Board asserts that the requirements are an appropriate exercise of the San Diego Water Board’s discretion to define the MEP standard.

The claimants, in their February 2009 comments, state that “the requirements to inspect and perform maintenance to insure compliance with these standards is not limited by the ‘regular schedule of maintenance’ obligation but rather must be done as frequently as is necessary to comply with these specific standards.” Also, claimants note that the content and detail in the reporting is more than required by the 2001 permit. As to the MEP standard required by the federal regulations, claimants assert that the U.S. EPA documents cited by the State Board provide guidance, not mandates, and the permit Fact Sheet does not specifically set forth mandatory annual inspection and maintenance requirements. According to the claimants, the only mandatory requirement is that a maintenance program exist, and that the applicant provide an inspection schedule if maintenance depends on the results of inspections or occurs infrequently. Yet the 2007 permit includes “very specific requirements that go beyond the U.S. EPA guidance and are not included within the federal regulations.” Finally, claimants note that the State Board has acknowledged that the 2007 permit requirements are more specific than federal regulations, and cites the *Long Beach Unified School District* case to conclude that the specificity makes the requirements state mandates.

The Commission agrees with claimants. Like street sweeping, the permit requires conveyance system cleaning activities that fall within the federal regulations to include: “[a] description of maintenance activities and a maintenance schedule for structural controls to reduce pollutants (including floatables) in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers.”<sup>127</sup> And they also require: “A description for operating and maintaining public streets, roads and highways and procedures for reducing the impact on receiving waters of discharges from municipal storm sewer systems...”<sup>128</sup>

Yet the permit requirements are more specific. Part D.3.a.(3) requires verifying proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls, cleaning any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of the design capacity in a timely manner, cleaning any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning of any accumulated trash and debris immediately, and cleaning open channels of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner. In addition, the reporting in part J requires a detailed accounting of the numbers of MS4 facilities in inventory, and the numbers of facilities inspected, exceeding cleaning criteria, and cleaned, and reporting by category tons of waste and litter removed from the facilities. These activities, “exceed[s] the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>129</sup> As in *Long Beach*

---

<sup>127</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(1).

<sup>128</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(3).

<sup>129</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

*Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>130</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>131</sup> to impose these requirements. Therefore, the Commission finds that parts D.3.a.(3) and J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii of the permit are not a federal mandate.

Rather, the Commission finds that part D.3.a.(3) of the 2007 permit is a state mandate on the claimants to do the following:

- (a) Implement a schedule of inspection and maintenance activities to verify proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges to or from its MS4s and related drainage structures.
- (b) Implement a schedule of maintenance activities for the MS4 and MS4 facilities (catch basins, storm drain inlets, open channels, etc). The maintenance activities shall, at a minimum, include:
  - i. Inspection at least once a year between May 1 and September 30 of each year for all MS4 facilities that receive or collect high volumes of trash and debris. All other MS4 facilities shall be inspected at least annually throughout the year.
  - ii. 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.
  - iii. Any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of design capacity shall be cleaned in a timely manner. Any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning shall be cleaned of any accumulated trash and debris immediately. Open channels shall be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner.
  - iv. Record keeping of the maintenance and cleaning activities including the overall quantity of waste removed.
  - v. Proper disposal of waste removed pursuant to applicable laws.
  - vi. Measures to eliminate waste discharges during MS4 maintenance and cleaning activities.

The Commission also finds that part J.3.a.(3)(c) iv-viii is a state mandate to report the following information in the JURMP annual report:

- iv. Identification of the total number of catch basins and inlets, the number of catch basins and inlets inspected, the number of catch basins and inlets found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the number of catch basins and inlets cleaned.
- v. Identification of the total distance (miles) of the MS4, the distance of the MS4 inspected, the distance of the MS4 found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the distance of the MS4 cleaned.

---

<sup>130</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>131</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

- vi. Identification of the total distance (miles) of open channels, the distance of the open channels inspected, the distance of the open channels found with anthropogenic litter, and the distance of open channels cleaned.
- vii. Amount of waste and litter (tons) removed from catch basins, inlets, the MS4, and open channels, by category.
- viii. Identification of any MS4 facility found to require inspection less than annually following two years of inspection, including justification for the finding.

As to whether these provisions are a new program or higher level of service, the State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states that the 2001 permit contained “*more* frequent inspection and removal requirements than required in the 2007 Permit. It also contained record keeping requirements to document the facilities cleaned and the quantities of waste removed.” [Emphasis in original.]

Claimants, in their February 2009 comments, argue that the 2001 permit, in part F.3.a.(5) required each copermitee to ‘implement a schedule of maintenance activities at all structural controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges. By contrast, the 2007 permit requires each copermitee to ‘implement a schedule of **inspection and maintenance**’ and to ‘**verify proper operation of all municipal** structural controls....’ [Emphasis in original.] Claimants also point out that the 2007 permit requires copermitees to:

- Clean any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of the design capacity in a timely manner.
- Clean any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning of any accumulated trash and debris immediately.
- Clean open channels of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner.

According to claimants, these requirements were not included in the 2001 permit. Claimants also state that the requirement to inspect and perform maintenance “is not limited by the ‘regular schedule of maintenance’ obligation but rather must be done as frequently as is necessary to comply with these specific standards.”

As to reporting, claimants state that the language in part D.3.a.(3)(b)(iv),(v) and (vi) of the 2007 permit and part F.3.a.(5)(c)(iii), (iv) and (v) of the 2001 permit track each other, but part J.3.a.(3)(c) iv through viii detail the information that the reports must now contain that was not in the 2001 permit, such as identifying the number of catch basins and inlets, the number inspected, the number found with accumulated waste exceeding the cleaning criteria, the distance of the MS4 cleaned, and other detail.

In analyzing whether parts D.3.a.(3) and J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv) – (viii) are a new program or higher level of service, we compare those provisions to the prior permit and look at the Regional Board’s Fact Sheet/Technical Report, which states why Part D.3.a.(3) was added:

**Section D.3.a.(3)** ... requires the Copermitees to inspect and remove waste from their MS4s prior to the rainy season. Additional wording has been added to clarify the intent of the requirements. The Copermitees will be required to inspect all storm drain inlets and catch basins. This change will assist the Copermitees in determining which basins/inlets need to be cleaned and at what

priority. Removal of trash has been identified by the copermittees as a priority issue in their long-term effectiveness assessment. To address this issue, wording has been added to require the Copermittees, at a minimum, inspect [sic] and remove trash from all their open channels at least once a year.

The 2001 permit contained the following in part F.3.a.(5)(b) and (c):

- (b) Each Copermittee shall implement a schedule of maintenance activities for the municipal separate storm sewer system.
- (c) The maintenance activities must, at a minimum, include:
  - i. Inspection and removal of accumulated waste (e.g., sediment, trash, debris and other pollutants) between May 1 and September 30 of each year;
  - ii. Additional cleaning as necessary between October 1 and April 30 of each year;
  - iii. Record keeping of cleaning and the overall quantity of waste removed;
  - iv. Proper disposal of waste removed pursuant to applicable laws;
  - v. Measures to eliminate waste discharges during MS4 maintenance and cleaning activities.

The Commission finds that some provisions in the 2007 permit are the same as in the 2001 permit. Specifically, part D.3.a(3)(a) is not a new program or higher level of service because the 2001 permit also required maintenance and inspection in part F.3.a.(5)(b) and (c). The Commission also finds that part D.3.a.(3)(b)(i),(iv)- (vi) of the 2007 permit is the same as part F.3.a.(5)(c)(i)(iii) - (v) in the 2001 permit, both of which require:

- Annual inspection of MS4 facilities (D.3.a(3)(b)(i));
- Record keeping of the maintenance and cleaning activities including the overall quantity of waste removed (D.3.a(3)(b)(iv));
- Proper disposal of waste removed pursuant to applicable laws (D.3.a(3)(b)(v)); and
- Measures to eliminate waste discharges during MS4 maintenance and cleaning activities (D.3.a(3)(b)(vi)).

Therefore, the Commission finds that these provisions are not a new program or higher level of service.

The Commission also finds that part D.3.a.(3)(b)(ii) is not a new program or higher level of service. It gives the claimants the flexibility, after two years of inspections, to inspect MS4 facilities that require inspection and cleaning less than annually, but not less than every other year. Part F.3.a.(5)(c)(i) of the 2001 permit stated: “The maintenance activities must, at a minimum, include: i. inspection and removal of accumulated waste (e.g., sediment, trash, debris and other pollutants) between May 1 and September 30 of each year.” Potentially less frequent inspections under the 2007 permit is not a new program or higher level of service.

The Commission finds that part D.3.a.(3)(b)(iii) of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service on claimants to clean in a timely manner “Any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of design capacity.... Any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning shall be cleaned of any accumulated trash and debris immediately. Open channels shall be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely

manner.” This part contains specificity, e.g., a standard of accumulation greater than 33% of design capacity, which was not in the 2001 permit.

Further, the Commission finds that the reporting in part J.3.a.(3)(c) (iv) – (viii) is a new program or higher level of service. The 2001 permit did not require this information in the content of the annual reports.

**E. Educational component (part D.5):** Part D.5 requires the copermittees to perform the activities on pages 25-28 above, which can be summarized as:

- Implement an educational program so that copermittees’ planning and development review staffs (and planning board/elected officials, if applicable) understand certain laws and regulations related to water quality.
- Implement an educational program that includes annual training before the rainy season so that the copermittees’ construction, building, code enforcement, and grading review staffs, inspectors, and others will understand certain specified topics.
- At least annually, train staff responsible for conducting stormwater compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities on specified topics.
- Implement an education program so that municipal personnel and contractors performing activities that generate pollutants understand the activity specific BMPs for each activity to be performed.
- Implement a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and others relating to specified topics.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments on the test claim, states that federal regulations authorize the inclusion of an education component, in that the proposed management program must “include a description of appropriate educational and training measures for construction site operations” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(D)(4)) and a “description of a program to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewers associated with the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer which will include, as appropriate, controls such as educational activities, permits, certifications, and other measures for commercial applicators and distributors...” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(A)(6)). The federal regulations also require a “description of a program to promote, publicize, and facilitate public reporting of the presence of illicit discharges or water quality impacts associated with discharges from municipal separate storm sewers” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(5)) and a “description of educational activities, public information activities, and other appropriate activities to facilitate the proper management and disposal of used oil and toxic materials.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(iv)(B)(6)). The State Board also says that according to the U.S. EPA’s Phase II stormwater regulations, the MEP standard requires the copermittees to implement public education programs. According to the State Board, the regulations apply to copermittees with less developed storm water programs, and require the programs to include a public education and outreach program (40 C.F.R. § 122.34(b)(1)) and a public involvement/participation program (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(2)). To the extent the permit requirements are more specific than federal law, the State Board calls them an appropriate use of the Regional Board’s discretion “to require more specificity in establishing the MEP standard.”

Claimants, in their February 2009 comments, characterize the federal regulations as only requiring them “to describe educational, public information, and other appropriate activities associated with their jurisdictional, watershed or stormwater management programs.” By contrast, under the permit claimants argue that they are required to “implement specific educational and training programs that achieve measurable increases in specific target community knowledge and to ensure a measurable change in the behavior of such target communities rather than simply report on the ... educational programs on an annual basis.” Claimants state that they are required to perform testing and surveys and “new program elements to secure the measureable changes in knowledge and behavior.”

The Commission agrees with claimants. As quoted in the State Board’s comments, the federal regulations require nonspecific descriptions of educational programs, for example, requiring the permit application to “include appropriate educational and training measures for construction site operations” and “controls such as educational activities.” The permit, on the other hand, requires implementation of an educational program with target communities and specified topics. These requirements “exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>132</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>133</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>134</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part D.5 of the permit is not federally mandated.

Based on the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that part D.5 of the permit constitutes a state mandate on the copermittees to do all of the following:

Each Copermittee shall implement an education program using all media as appropriate to (1) measurably increase the knowledge of the target communities regarding MS4s, impacts of urban 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 pollutant releases to MS4s and the environment. At a minimum, the education program shall meet the requirements of this section and address the following target communities:

- Municipal Departments and Personnel
- Construction Site Owners and Developers
- Industrial Owners and Operators
- Commercial Owners and Operators
- Residential Community, General Public, and School Children

a. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

(1) Each Copermittee shall educate each target community on the following topics where appropriate:

---

<sup>132</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>133</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>134</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

Table 3. Education

<b>Laws, Regulations, Permits, &amp; Requirements</b>	<b>Best Management Practices</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (Except Construction).</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities</li> <li>• Regional Board’s General NPDES Permit for Ground Water Dewatering</li> <li>• Regional Board’s 401 Water Quality Certification Program</li> <li>• Statewide General NPDES Utility Vault Permit</li> <li>• Requirements of local municipal permits and ordinances (e.g., storm water and grading ordinances and permits)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution prevention and safe alternatives</li> <li>• Good housekeeping (e.g., sweeping impervious surfaces instead of hosing)</li> <li>• Proper waste disposal (e.g., garbage, pet/animal waste, green waste, household hazardous materials, appliances, tires, furniture, vehicles, boat/recreational vehicle waste, catch basin/ MS4 cleanout waste)</li> <li>• Non-storm water disposal alternatives (e.g., all wash waters)</li> <li>• Methods to minimized the impact of land development and construction</li> <li>• Erosion prevention</li> <li>• Methods to reduce the impact of residential and charity car-washing</li> <li>• Preventive Maintenance</li> <li>• Equipment/vehicle maintenance and repair</li> <li>• Spill response, containment, and recovery</li> <li>• Recycling</li> <li>• BMP maintenance</li> </ul>
<b>General Urban Runoff Concepts</b>	<b>Other Topics</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters</li> <li>• Distinction between MS4s and sanitary sewers</li> <li>• BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID, source control, and treatment control</li> <li>• Short-and long-term water quality impacts associated with urbanization (e.g., land-use decisions, development, construction)</li> <li>• Non-storm water discharge prohibitions</li> <li>• How to conduct a storm water inspections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public reporting mechanisms</li> <li>• Water quality awareness for Emergency/ First Responders</li> <li>• Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination observations and follow-up during daily work activities</li> <li>• Potable water discharges to the MS4</li> <li>• Dechlorination techniques</li> <li>• Hydrostatic testing</li> <li>• Integrated pest management</li> <li>• Benefits of native vegetation</li> <li>• Water conservation</li> <li>• Alternative materials and designs to maintain peak runoff values</li> <li>• Traffic reduction, alternative fuel use</li> </ul>

(2) Copermittee educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and “allowable” behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources.



## b. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

### (1) Municipal Departments and Personnel Education

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

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects;
- ii. The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization);
- iii. How to integrate LID BMP requirements into the local regulatory program(s) and requirements; and
- iv. Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including:
  - [1] Storm water management plan development and review;
  - [2] Methods to control downstream erosion impacts;
  - [3] Identification of pollutants of concern;
  - [4] LID BMP techniques;
  - [5] Source control BMPs; and
  - [6] Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern.

(b) Municipal Construction Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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:

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to construction and grading<sup>135</sup> activities.
- ii. 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).
- iii. Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities.
- iv. The Copermittee’s inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application.
- v. Current advancements in BMP technologies.
- vi. SUSMP Requirements including treatment options, LID BMPs, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms.

---

<sup>135</sup> Attachment C of the permit defines grading as “the cutting and/or filling of the land surface to a desired slope or elevation.”

(c) Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities - Each Copermittee shall train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at least once a year. Training shall cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and reviewing monitoring data.

(d) Municipal Other Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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.

## (2) New Development and Construction Education

As early in the planning and development process as possible and all through the permitting and construction process, each Copermittee shall implement a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties. The education program shall provide an understanding of the topics listed in Sections D.5.b.(1)(a) and D.5.b.(1)(b) above, as appropriate for the audience being educated. The education program shall also educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, and other responsible parties on the importance of educating all construction workers in the field about stormwater issues and BMPs through formal or informal training.

## (3) Residential, General Public, and School Children Education

Each Copermittee shall collaboratively conduct or participate in development and implementation of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities. The plan shall evaluate use of mass media, mailers, door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states that the education requirement in part D.5. does not amount to a new program or higher level of service because the 2007 permit “includes education topics from the 2001 permit with minor wording and formatting changes. Additionally, the requirements were adopted to implement the same federal MEP standard as established in the CWA and in the 2001 Permit.”

In their February 2009 comments, the claimants state that the 2001 permit did not require:

- Implementation of an education program so that the copermittee’s planning and development review staff (and Planning Boards and Elected Officials, if applicable) understand certain specified laws and regulations related to water quality. (D.5.b.(1)(a).)
- Implementation of an education program that includes annual training prior to the rainy season so that the copermittee’s construction, building, code enforcement, and grading review staffs, inspectors, and other responsible construction staff have, at a minimum, an understanding of certain specified topics. (D.5.b.(1)(b).)
- Training of staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at least once a year relating to certain specified topics (D.5.b.(1)(c).)

- Implementation of 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. (D.5.b.(1)(d).)
- Implementation of a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties relating to certain specified topics. (D.5.b.(2).)

This analysis of whether the permit is a new program or higher level of service is in the order presented in the permit. The Commission finds that nearly all of the educational topics in part D.5.a. are the same as those in the 2001 permit (part F.4). Both the 2001 and 2007 permits require the claimants to “educate” each specified target community on the following topics (Table 3 in the 2007 permit):

**Laws, Regulations, Permits, & Requirements:** Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations; Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (Except Construction); Statewide General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities; Regional Board’s General NPDES Permit for Ground Water Dewatering; Regional Board’s 401 Water Quality Certification Program; Statewide General NPDES Utility Vault Permit; Requirements of local municipal permits and ordinances (e.g., storm water and grading ordinances and permits).

**Best Management Practices:** Pollution prevention and safe alternatives; Good housekeeping (e.g., sweeping impervious surfaces instead of hosing); Proper waste disposal (e.g., garbage, pet/animal waste, green waste, household hazardous materials, appliances, tires, furniture, vehicles, boat/recreational vehicle waste, catch basin/ MS4 cleanout waste); Non-storm water disposal alternatives (e.g., all wash waters); Methods to minimized the impact of land development and construction; Methods to reduce the impact of residential and charity car-washing; Preventive Maintenance; Equipment/vehicle maintenance and repair; Spill response, containment, and recovery; Recycling; BMP maintenance.

**General Urban Runoff Concepts:** Impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters; Distinction between MS4s and sanitary sewers; Short-and long-term water , quality impacts associated with urbanization (e.g., land-use decisions, development, construction); How to conduct a storm water inspection.

**Other Topics:** Public reporting mechanisms; Water quality awareness for Emergency/ First Responders; Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination observations and follow-up during daily work activities; Potable water discharges to the MS4; Dechlorination techniques; Hydrostatic testing; Integrated pest management; Benefits of native vegetation; Water conservation; Alternative materials and designs to maintain peak runoff values; Traffic reduction, alternative fuel use.

Because the requirement to educate the target communities on these topics was in the 2001 permit, as well as the 2007 permit, the Commission finds that doing so, as required by part D.5.a(1), table 3, is not a new program or higher level of service.

Under the 2007 permit, the copermittees are required to “educate each target community” on the following educational topics that were not in the 2001 permit: (1) Erosion prevention, (2) Non storm water discharge prohibitions, and (3) BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID [low-impact development], source control, and treatment control. Thus, the Commission finds that the part D.5.a.(1) is a new program or higher level of service to educate each target community on only the following topics: (1) Erosion prevention, (2) Non storm water discharge prohibitions, and (3) BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID, source control, and treatment control.

Part D.5.a.(2) states: “(2) Copermittee educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and ‘allowable’ behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources.” This provision was not in the 2001 permit, so the Commission finds that part D.5.a.(2) is a new program or higher level of service.

In part D.5.b.(1)(a) (Municipal Development Planning) the permit requires implementing an education program for “municipal planning and development review staffs (and Planning Board and Elected Officials, if applicable)” on specified topics. The 2001 permit required implementing an educational program for “Municipal Departments and Personnel” that would include planning and development review staffs, but not planning boards and elected officials. So the Commission finds that part D.5.b.(1)(a)(i) and (ii) is a new program or higher level of service for planning boards and elected officials.

Certain topics in part D.5.b.(1)(a) are a new program or higher level of service for both planning and development review staffs as well as planning boards and elected officials. Under both part F.4.a. of the 2001 permit, and D.5.b.(1)(a) of the 2007 permit, the copermittees are required to implement an educational program on the following topics:

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects; [The 2001 permit, in F.4.a. (p. 35) says: “Federal, state and local water quality regulations that affect development projects.”]
- ii. The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization); [The 2001 permit, in F.4.a (p. 35) calls this “Waters Quality Impacts associated with land development.”]

Thus the Commission finds that implementing an educational program on these topics is not a new program or higher level of service for municipal departments, but is for planning boards and elected officials.

The following topics were not listed in the 2001 permit, so the Commission finds that part D.5.b.(1)(a) is a new program or higher level of service to implement these in an educational program for all target communities:

- (iii) How to integrate LID BMP requirements into the local regulatory program(s) and requirements;
- (iv) Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including: [1] Storm water management plan development and review; [2] Methods to control downstream erosion impacts; [3] Identification of pollutants of concern; [4] LID BMP techniques; [5] Source control BMPs; and

[6] Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern.

Part D.5.b.(1)(b) (Municipal Construction Activities) of the permit requires implementing an educational program for municipal “construction, building, code enforcement, and grading review staffs.” Again, this is not a new program or higher level of service for those topics in which the 2001 permit also required an education program for “Municipal Departments and Personnel,” such as:

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to construction and grading activities. [The 2001 permit, in F.4.a. (p. 35) says: “Federal, state and local water quality regulations that affect development projects.”]
- ii. 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. [The 2001 permit, in F.4.a (p. 35) calls this “Water Quality Impacts associated with land development.”]

The timing of the educational program specified in D.5.b.(1)(b) requires it to be implemented “prior to the rainy season.” There is no evidence in the record, however, that this timing requirement is a new program or higher level of service compared with the 2001 permit. Thus the Commission finds that part D.5.b.(1)(b)(i) and (ii) are not a new program or higher level of service.

Municipal construction activity education topics were added to the 2007 permit, however, that were not in the 2001 permit, in paragraphs (iii) to (vi) as follows:

- (b) Municipal Construction Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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:  
[¶]... [¶] iii. Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities.  
iv. The Copermittee’s inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application.  
v. Current advancements in BMP technologies.  
vi. SUSMP Requirements including treatment options, LID BMPs, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms.

Thus, the Commission finds that part D.5.b.(1)(b)(iii) - (vi) of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service.

Part D.5.b.(1)(c) of the 2007 permit (Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities) requires the following:

- (c) Each Copermittee shall train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at

least once a year. Training shall cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and reviewing monitoring data.

The 2001 permit included (in F.4.b.) the topic “How to conduct a stormwater inspection” but did not specify that the training was to be annual, and did not require the training to cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP Implementation, or reviewing monitoring data. Thus, the Commission finds that part D.5.(b)(1)(c) is a new program or higher level of service.

Part D.5.b.(1)(d) of the 2007 permit requires the following:

(d) Municipal Other Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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.

Regarding part D.5.b.(1)(d), the 2007 Fact Sheet/Technical Report states:

A new requirement has also been added for education of activity specific BMPs for municipal personnel and contractors performing activities that generate pollutants. Education is required at all levels of municipal staff and contractors. Education is especially important for the staff in the field performing activities which might result in discharges of pollutants if proper BMPs are not used.

Because part D.5.b.(1)(d) was not in the 2001 permit, and because the Regional Board called it a “new requirement” the Commission finds that part D.5.(b)(1)(d) of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service.

Part D.5.(b)(2) of the 2007 permit requires an education program for “project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties.” Parts F.4.a and F.4.b. of the 2001 permit required a similar education program for “construction site owners and developers.” The Fact Sheet/Technical Report for the 2007 permit states:

Different levels of training will be needed for planning groups, owners, developers, contractors, and construction workers, but everyone should get a general education of stormwater requirements. Education of all construction workers can prevent unintentional discharges, such as discharges by workers who are not aware that they are not allowed to wash things down the storm drains. Training for BMP installation workers is imperative because the BMPs will not fail if not properly installed and maintained. Training for field level workers can be formal or informal tail-gate format.

Thus, the Commission finds that part D.5.(b)(2) of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service for project applicants, contractors, or community planning groups who are not developers or construction site owners.

The final part of the education programs in the 2007 permit is D.5.(b)(3) regarding “Residential, General Public, and School Children.”

Each Copermittee shall collaboratively conduct or participate in development and implementation of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities. The plan shall evaluate use of mass media, mailers,

door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.

The 2001 permit (part F.4.c.) stated the following:

In addition to the topics listed in F.4.a. above, the Residential, General Public, and School Children communities shall be educated on the following topics where applicable:

- Public reporting information resources
- Residential and charity car-washing
- Community activities (e.g., “Adopt a Storm Drain, Watershed, or Highway” Programs, citizen monitoring, creek/beach cleanups, environmental protection organization activities, etc..

The 2001 permit did not require claimants to “collaboratively conduct or participate in development ... of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities.” The 2001 permit also did not require the plan to “evaluate use of mass media, mailers, door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.” Thus, the Commission finds that part D.5.(b)(3) of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service.

In sum, as to part D.5 of the 2007 permit that requires implementing educational programs, the Commission finds that the following subparts are new programs or higher levels of service:

- D.5.a.(1): Each copermittee shall educate each target community, as specified, on the following topics: erosion prevention, nonstorm waters discharge prohibitions, and BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID, source control, and treatment control.
- D.5.a.(2): Copermittee educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and “allowable” behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources.
- D.5.b.(1)(a): Implement an education program so that planning boards and elected officials, if applicable, have an understanding of: (i) Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects; (ii) The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land developments and urbanization).
- D.5.b.(1)(a): Implement an education program so that planning and development review staffs as well as planning boards and elected officials have an understanding of: (iii) How to integrate LID BMP requirements into the local regulatory program(s) and requirements; (iv) Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including: [1] Storm water management plan development and review; [2] Methods to control downstream erosion impacts; [3] Identification of pollutants of concern; [4] LID BMP techniques; [5] Source control BMPs; and [6] Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern.”
- D.5.b.(1)(b)(iii) - (vi): Implement an education program that includes annual training prior to the rainy season for its construction, building, code enforcement, and grading review staffs, inspectors, and other responsible construction staff have, at a minimum, an

understanding of the topics in parts D.5.b.(1)(b)(iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) of the permit, as follows:

- iii. Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities.
  - iv. The Copermittee's inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application.
  - v. Current advancements in BMP technologies.
  - vi. SUSMP Requirements including treatment options, LID BMPs, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms.
- D.5.(b)(1)(c) and (d) as follows:
    - Each Copermittee shall train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at least once a year. Training shall cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and reviewing monitoring data.
  - Municipal Other Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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.
  - D.5.(b)(2), As early in the planning and development process as possible and all through the permitting and construction process, to implement a program to educate project applicants, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties. The education program shall provide an understanding of the topics listed in Sections D.5.b.(1)(a) [Municipal Development Planning] and D.5.b.(1)(b) [Municipal construction Activities] above, as appropriate for the audience being educated. The education program shall also educate project applicants, contractors, property owners, and other responsible parties on the importance of educating all construction workers in the field about stormwater issues and BMPs through formal or informal training.
  - D.5.(b)(3), Each Copermittee shall collaboratively conduct or participate in development and implementation of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities. The plan shall evaluate use of mass media, mailers, door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.

## **II. Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (Part E)**

Part E of the permit is the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP). The permit (Table 4) divides the copermittees into nine watershed management areas (WMAs) by “major receiving water bodies.” The 2001 permit also had a WURMP component (in part J).

**A. Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program copermittee collaboration (parts E.2.f & E.2.g):** These provisions require the copermittees to do the activities on pages 28-29 above, including the following:



- Collaborating with other copermittees within their watershed management areas (WMAs) to develop and implement an updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program for each watershed that prevents urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards which at a minimum includes:
  - Identifying and implementing watershed activities that address the high priority water quality problems in the watershed management areas that include both watershed water quality activities<sup>136</sup> and watershed education activities.<sup>137</sup>
  - Creating a watershed activities list that includes certain specified information to be submitted with each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan (WURMP) and updated annually thereafter.
  - Implementing identified watershed activities within established schedules.
  - Collaborating to develop and implement the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, including frequent regularly scheduled meetings.<sup>138</sup>

In its October 2008 comments, the State Board asserts that the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program activities are necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard. The State Board quotes the following federal regulations: “The Director may ... issue distinct permits for appropriate categories of discharges ... including, but not limited to ... all discharges within a system that discharge to the same watershed...” (40 C.F.R. 122.26(a)(3)(ii).) The State Board also quotes more specific federal regulations:

Permits for all or a portion of all discharges from large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems that are issued on a system-wide, jurisdiction-wide, watershed, or other basis may specify different conditions relating to different discharges covered by the permit, including different management programs for different drainage areas [watersheds] which contribute storm water to the system. (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (a)(3)(v).)

The Director may issue permits for municipal separate storm sewers that are designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section on a system-wide basis, a

---

<sup>136</sup> Watershed Water Quality Activities are activities other than education that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. A Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented on a jurisdictional basis must be organized and implemented to target a watershed’s high priority water quality problems or must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements of section D of the permit (Part E.2.f).

<sup>137</sup> Watershed Education Activities are outreach and training activities that address high priority water quality problems in the WMA (Part E.2.f).

<sup>138</sup> In their February 2009 comments, the claimants also list the following activities: (1) Annual review of WURMPs to identify needed modifications and improvements (part E.2.i); (2) Develop and periodically update watershed maps (part E.2.b); (3) Develop and implement a program for encouraging collaborative watershed-based land-use planning (part E.2.d); (4) Develop and implement a collective watershed strategy (part E.2.e). These parts of the permit, however, were not pled in the test claim so the Commission makes no findings on them.

jurisdiction-wide basis, watershed basis, or other appropriate basis;” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (a)(5).)

Proposed programs may impose controls on a systemwide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls. (40 C.F.R. § 122.26 (d)(2)(iv).)

The State Board argues that the regional board “determined that the inclusion of the requirement to formalize the Watershed Water Qualities Activities List was appropriate to further the goal of the WURMPS in achieving compliance with federal law.” Based on some reports it received, the Regional Board determined that “many of the watershed water quality activities had no clear connection to the high priority water quality problems in the area of implementation.” The Board determined it was therefore necessary and appropriate to require development of an implementation strategy to maximize WURMP effectiveness.

Claimants, in their February 2009 comments, point out that while cooperative agreements may be required by 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(d)(2)(i)(D), “each copermittee is only responsible for their own systems.” Claimants quote another federal regulation: “Copermittees need only comply with permit conditions relating to discharges from the municipal separate storm sewers for which they operate.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.26(a)(3)(vi).) Claimants argue that the 2007 permit:

[R]equires the copermittees to engage in specific programmatic activities that are duplicative of the activities that were not required under the 2001 Permit and that are already required of them on a jurisdictional basis within the boundaries of the same watershed. These new requirements include no less than two watershed water quality activities and two watershed education activities per year.

Claimants also state that the permit “mandates that watershed quality activities implemented on a jurisdictional basis must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements under Section D of the Order.” (part E.2.f.(1)(a).) According to what the claimants call these “dual baseline standards, jurisdictional and watershed, the copermittees are required to perform more and duplicative work.”

The Commission finds that the permit requirements in sections E.2.f and E.2.g. are not federal mandates. As with the other requirements in the permit, the federal regulations authorize but do not require the specificity regarding whether collaboration occurs on a jurisdictional, watershed or other basis. These requirements “exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>139</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>140</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>141</sup> to impose these requirements.

Based on the mandatory language in the permit, the Commission finds that the following in part E are a state mandate on the copermittees:

---

<sup>139</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>140</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>141</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

2. Each Copermittee shall collaborate with other Copermittees within its WMA(s) as in Table 4 [of the permit] to develop and implement an updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program for each watershed. Each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall meet the requirements of section E of this Order, reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. At a minimum, each Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall include the elements described below:

☐...☐

f. Watershed Activities<sup>142</sup>

(1) The Watershed Copermittees shall identify and implement Watershed Activities that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. Watershed Activities shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities. These activities may be implemented individually or collectively, and may be implemented at the regional, watershed, or jurisdictional level.

(a) Watershed Water Quality Activities are activities other than education that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. A Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented on a jurisdictional basis must be organized and implemented to target a watershed's high priority water quality problems or must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements of section D of this Order.

(b) Watershed Education Activities are outreach and training activities that address high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(2) A Watershed Activities List shall be submitted with each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan (WURMP) and updated annually thereafter. The Watershed Activities List shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities, along with a description of how each activity was selected, and how all of the activities on the list will collectively abate sources and reduce pollutant discharges causing the identified high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(3) Each activity on the Watershed Activities List shall include the following information:

(a) A description of the activity;

(b) A time schedule for implementation of the activity, including key milestones;

(c) An identification of the specific responsibilities of Watershed Copermittees in completing the activity;

(d) A description of how the activity will address the identified high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed;

---

<sup>142</sup> In their rebuttal comments submitted in February 2009, claimants mention part E.(3) of the permit that requires a detailed description of each activity on the Watershed Activities List. Part E.(3), however, was not in the test claim so staff makes no findings on it.

(e) A description of how the activity is consistent with the collective watershed strategy;

(f) A description of the expected benefits of implementing the activity; and

(g) A description of how implementation effectiveness will be measured.

(4) Each Watershed Copermittee shall implement identified Watershed Activities pursuant to established schedules. For each Permit year, no less than two Watershed Water Quality Activities and two Watershed Education Activities shall be in an active implementation phase. A Watershed Water Quality Activity is in an active implementation phase when significant pollutant load reductions, source abatement, or other quantifiable benefits to discharge or receiving water quality can reasonably be established in relation to the watershed's high priority water quality problem(s). Watershed Water Quality Activities that are capital projects are in active implementation for the first year of implementation only. A Watershed Education Activity is in an active implementation phase when changes in attitudes, knowledge, awareness, or behavior can reasonably be established in target audiences.

g. Copermittee Collaboration

Watershed Copermittees shall collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs. Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings.

As to the issue of new program or higher level of service, the State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states:

Although Section E.2.f. requires development and implementation of a list of Watershed Water Qualities Activities for potential implementation that was not specifically required in the 2001 Permit, the Copermittees were previously required to identify priority water quality issues and identify recommended activities to address the priority water quality problems (See 2001 Permit, section J.1 and J.2.d.)

The State Board asserts that Copermittees were already required to collaborate with other Copermittees, and that "Section E.2.g. merely adds effectiveness strategies to the collaboration requirements." ... Other requirements challenged by the Claimants exist in the 2001 Permit, but with minor wording changes (e.g., the requirement to update watershed maps, which exists in both permits).

Claimants, in their February 2009 comments, assert that parts E.2.f. and E.2.g do impose a new program or higher level of service. According to the claimants:

Under the 2001 Permit the watershed requirements were essentially limited to mapping, assessment and identification of short and long term issues. Collaboration included mapping (J.2.a.), assessment of receiving waters (J.2.b); identification and prioritization of water quality problems (J.2.c); implementation of time schedules (J.2.d) and identification of copermittee responsibilities for each recommended activity including a time schedule.

[¶]...[¶]

The 2007 Permit imposes standards far beyond those listed in ... the 2001 Permit .... The 2007 Permit now requires the copermittees to engage in specific programmatic activities that are duplicative of the activities that were not required under the 2001 Permit and that are already required of them on a jurisdictional basis within the boundaries of the same watershed. These new requirements include no less than two watershed water quality activities and two watershed education activities per year. The two-activity watershed requirement is a condition of all copermittees regardless of whether the activity is within their jurisdictional authority or not.

In addition, while the 2007 Permit states that activities can be implemented at a regional, watershed or jurisdictional level, it mandates that watershed quality activities implemented on a jurisdictional basis must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements under Section D of the Order. By reason of the dual baseline standards, jurisdictional and watershed, the copermittees are required to perform more and duplicative work.

The Commission finds that E.2.f. and E.2.g of the permit are a new program or higher level of service.

As to watershed education in part E.2.f, the 2001 permit (in part J.2.g.) stated that the WURMP shall contain “A watershed based education program.” The 2007 permit states that the WURMP shall include “watershed education activities” defined as “outreach and training activities that address high priority water quality problems in the WMA [Watershed Management Area(s)].” Moreover, in part E.f.(4), the 2007 permit states: “A Watershed Education Activity is in an active implementation phase when changes in attitudes, knowledge, awareness, or behavior can reasonably be established in target audiences.” Because of this increased requirement for implementation of watershed education, the Commission finds that watershed education activities, as defined in part E.2.f, is a new program or higher level of service.

Additionally, the Commission finds that the rest of part E.2.f. is a new program or higher level of service because it includes elements not in the 2001 permit, such as:

- A definition of watershed water quality activities (part E.2.f.(1)(a)).
- Submission of a watershed activities list, with specified contents (part E.2.f.(2)).
- A detailed description of each activity on the watershed activities list, with seven specific components (part E.2.f.(3)).
- Implementation of watershed activities pursuant to established schedules, including definitions of when activities are in an active implementation phase (part E.2.f.(4)).

As to part E.2.g., although the 2001 (in parts J.1. & J.2.) and 2007 permits both require copermittee collaboration in developing and implementing the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan, copermittee collaboration is a new program or higher level of service because the WURMP is greatly expanded over the 2001 permit in part E.2.f as discussed above. This means that new collaboration is required to develop and implement the watershed activities in part E.2.f.

The 2007 permit (in part E.2.g) also states that “Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings.” This requirement for meetings was not in the 2001 permit. The Fact Sheet/Technical Report states:

The requirement for regularly scheduled meetings has been added based on Regional Board findings that watershed groups which hold regularly scheduled meetings (such as for San Diego Bay) typically produced better programs and work products than watershed groups that went for extended periods of time without scheduled meetings.<sup>143</sup>

Therefore, the Commission finds that part E.2.g. of the 2007 permit is a new program or higher level of service.

Regarding watershed water quality activities in part E.2.f, the Fact Sheet/Technical Report the Regional Board stated:

This requirement developed over time while working with the Copermittees on their WURMP implementation under Order No. 2001-01. In October 2004 letters, the Regional Board recommended the Copermittees develop a list of Watershed Water Quality Activities for potential implementation. Following receipt of the Regional Board letters, the Copermittees created the Watershed Water Quality Activity lists. Although the Copermittees' lists needed improvement, the Regional Board found the lists to be useful planning tools that can be evaluated to identify effective and efficient Watershed Water Quality Activities. Because the lists are useful and have become a part of the WURMP implementation process, a requirement for their development has been written into the Order.

Thus, the Commission finds that part E.2.f. of the permit is a new program or higher level of service, in that it requires the following not required in the 2001 permit:

- Identification and implementation of watershed activities that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA (Watershed Management Area), as specified (part E.2.f.(1)).
- Submission of a watershed activities list with each updated WURMP and updated annually thereafter, as specified (part E.2.f.(2)-(3)).
- Implementation of watershed activities pursuant to established schedules: no less than two watershed water quality activities and two watershed education activities in active implementation phase, as defined, per permit year (part E.2.f.(4)).

### **III. Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (Part F)**

Part F of the permit describes the Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (RURMP). It was included because “some aspects of urban runoff management can be effectively addressed at a regional level. ... However, significant flexibility has been provided to the Copermittees for new regional requirements.”<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> For an inexplicable reason, the Fact Sheet/Technical Report lists this collaboration activity under Section E.2.m of the permit rather than E.2.g.. The permit at issue has no section E.2.m.

<sup>144</sup> San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, “Fact Sheet/Technical Report for Order No. R9-2007-0001.”

**A. Copermittee collaboration – Regional Residential Education Program Development and Implementation (part F.1):** Part F.1 requires the copermittees to develop and implement a Regional Residential Education Program, with specified contents (see p. 12 above). In the test claim the claimants discuss hiring a consultant to develop the educational program that “will generally educate residents on: 1) the difference between stormwater conveyance systems and sanitary sewer systems; 2) the connection of storm drains to local waterways; and 3) common residential sources of urban run-off.” Claimants allege activities to comply with section F.1 of the permit that include, but are not limited to: “development of materials/branding, a regional website, regional outreach events, regional advertising and mass media, partnership development, and the development of marketing and research tools, including regional surveys to be conducted in FY 2008-09 and again in FY 2011-12.”

In comments submitted in October 2008, the State Board asserts that the permit condition in section F.1. is necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard and that the requirement is supported by the Clean Water Act statutes and regulations. The State Board cites the following federal regulations:

(v) Permits for all or a portion of all discharges from large or medium municipal separate storm sewer systems that are issued on a system-wide, jurisdiction-wide, watershed or other basis may specify different conditions relating to different discharges covered by the permit, including different management programs for different drainage areas which contribute storm water to the system.<sup>145</sup> [¶]...[¶]

(5) The Director may issue permits for municipal separate storm sewers that are designated under paragraph (a)(1)(v) of this section on a system-wide basis, jurisdiction-wide basis, watershed basis or other appropriate basis, or may issue permits for individual discharges.<sup>146</sup> [¶]...[¶]

(2) *Part 2.* Part 2 of the application shall consist of:

(i) *Adequate legal authority.* A demonstration that the applicant can operate pursuant to legal authority established by statute, ordinance or series of contracts which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to: [¶]...[¶]

(D) Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system;<sup>147</sup>

(iv) Proposed programs may impose controls on a systemwide basis, a watershed basis, a jurisdiction basis, or on individual outfalls. ...<sup>148</sup>

In response, the claimants’ February 2009 comments state that the Regional Residential Education Program is not necessary to meet the minimum federal MEP standard. The regional nature of the education program, according to the claimants, is duplicative because it imposes the

---

<sup>145</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (a)(3)(v).

<sup>146</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (a)(5).

<sup>147</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(2)(i)(D).

<sup>148</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(iv).

education requirements at the regional and jurisdictional levels concurrently, and it exceeds federal law.

The Commission finds that the requirements in part F.1 of the permit do not constitute a federal mandate. There is no federal requirement to provide a regional educational program, so the education program, “exceed[s] the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>149</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, the permit “requires specific actions ... [that are] required acts.”<sup>150</sup> In adopting part F.1, the state has freely chosen<sup>151</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part F.1. of the permit does not constitute a federal mandate.

Based on the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that the permit constitutes a state mandate on the claimants to do all the following in part F.1 of the permit:

The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum:

1. Develop and implement a Regional Residential Education Program. The program shall include:
  - a. Pollutant specific education which focuses educational efforts on bacteria, nutrients, sediment, pesticides, and trash. If a different pollutant is determined to be more critical for the education program, the pollutant can be substituted for one of these pollutants.
  - b. Education efforts focused on the specific residential sources of the pollutants listed in section F.1.a (p. 50.)

As to whether this is a new program or higher level of service, the State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states that it is not because the claimants were already implementing a residential education program at a regional level before the permit was adopted.

In claimants’ February 2009 rebuttal comments, they assert that it is irrelevant whether or not the copermittees voluntarily met or exceeded the now mandatory requirements imposed by the 2007 permit because Government Code section 17565 states: “If a local agency ... at its option, has been incurring costs which are subsequently mandated by the state, the state shall reimburse the local agency ... for those costs incurred after the operative date of the mandate.”

The Commission finds that part F.1 of the permit is a new program or higher level of service. The 2001 permit required an educational component as part of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (part F.4) that contained a residential component, but not a Regional Residential Education Program, so the activities in this program are new. Also, the Commission agrees that whether or not claimants were engaged in an educational program is not relevant due to Government Code section 17565. The Regional Board, in requiring the regional educational program, leaves the local agencies with no choice but to comply.

---

<sup>149</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>150</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California, supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 173.

<sup>151</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates, supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.



**B. Copermittee collaboration (parts F.2 & F.3):** Parts F.2 and F.3 (quoted on p. 11 above) require the copermittees to collaborate to develop, implement, and update as necessary a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program, to include developing the standardized fiscal analysis method required in permit part G (part F.2) and facilitating the assessment of the effectiveness of jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs (part F.3).

In comments submitted in October 2008, the State Board asserts that the permit conditions in sections F.2 and F.3 are necessary to meet the minimum MEP standard, quoting the following federal regulation regarding municipal stormwater permits:

(2) *Part 2.* Part 2 of the application shall consist of:

(i) *Adequate legal authority.* A demonstration that the applicant can operate pursuant to legal authority established by statute, ordinance or series of contracts which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to: [¶]...[¶]

(D) Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system;<sup>152</sup>

The State Board also quotes section 122.26 (a)(3)(v) of the federal regulations as follows:

(v) Permits for all or a portion of all discharges from large<sup>153</sup> or medium<sup>154</sup> municipal separate storm sewer systems that are issued on a system-wide, jurisdiction-wide, watershed or other basis may specify different conditions relating to different discharges covered by the permit, including different

---

<sup>152</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(2)(i)(D).

<sup>153</sup> “(4) Large municipal separate storm sewer system means all municipal separate storm sewers that are either: (i) Located in an incorporated place with a population of 250,000 or more as determined by the 1990 Decennial Census by the Bureau of the Census (Appendix F of this part); or (ii) Located in the counties listed in appendix H, except municipal separate storm sewers that are located in the incorporated places, townships or towns within such counties; or (iii) Owned or operated by a municipality other than those described in paragraph (b)(4)(i) or (ii) of this section and that are designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described under paragraph (b)(4)(i) or (ii) of this section. ...” [40 CFR § 122.26 (b)(4).]

<sup>154</sup> “(7) Medium municipal separate storm sewer system means all municipal separate storm sewers that are either: (i) Located in an incorporated place with a population of 100,000 or more but less than 250,000, as determined by the 1990 Decennial Census by the Bureau of the Census (Appendix G of this part); or (ii) Located in the counties listed in appendix I, except municipal separate storm sewers that are located in the incorporated places, townships or towns within such counties; or (iii) Owned or operated by a municipality other than those described in paragraph (b)(7)(i) or (ii) of this section and that are designated by the Director as part of the large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system due to the interrelationship between the discharges of the designated storm sewer and the discharges from municipal separate storm sewers described under paragraph (b)(7)(i) or (ii) of this section. ...” [40 CFR § 122.26 (b)(7).]

management programs for different drainage areas which contribute storm water to the system.

The State Board also asserts:

To the extent the Clean Water Act and federal regulations do not identify all of the specificity required in Sections F.2, F.3 . . . , the San Diego Water Board properly exercised its discretion under federal law to include specificity so that the federal MEP standard can be achieved. The San Diego Water Board exercised this duty under federal law and therefore the provisions of the 2007 Permit were adopted as federal requirements.

In the claimants' rebuttal comments submitted in February 2009, they state that "all of the authorities cited by the State merely acknowledge the State's authority to go beyond the federal regulations."

The Commission finds that the requirements in parts F.2 and F.3. of the permit do not constitute a federal mandate. There is no federal requirement to collaborate on, develop, or implement a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (RURMP). The Commission finds that these RURMP activities "exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation."<sup>155</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>156</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>157</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that parts F.2 and F.3 of the permit do not constitute federal mandates.

Based on the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that parts F.2 and F.3 of the permit constitutes a state mandate on the claimants to do all the following:

Collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop, implement, and update as necessary a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program that meets the requirements of section F of the permit, reduces the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum: [¶]...[¶]

(2) Develop the standardized fiscal analysis method required in section G of the permit, and,

(3) Facilitate the assessment of the effectiveness of jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs.

As to whether these activities are a new program or higher level of service, the claimants state in the test claim:

"[W]hile the 2001 Permit required the copermittees to collaborate to address common issues and promote consistency among JURMPs and WURMPs and to

---

<sup>155</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>156</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>157</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

establish a management structure for this purpose, it lacked the detail, specificity and level of effort now mandated by the 2007 Permit.”

In their February 2009 rebuttal comments, claimants assert that the 2001 and 2007 permits contain major substantive differences in their requirements for fiscal analyses of their jurisdictional programs.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states that the 2001 permit required that “the Copermittees enter into a formal agreement to provide, at a minimum, a management structure for designating joint responsibilities, decision making, watershed management, information management of data and reports” and other collaborative arrangements to comply with the permit.

According to the State Board, parts F.2 and F.3 are not a new program or higher level of service because the copermittees “were already conducting multiple efforts on a regional level under the 2001 permit. The inclusion of the RURMP is designed to organize these efforts into one framework to improve Copermittee and Regional Board tracking of regional efforts.” The State Board also asserts that the requirements were intended to reduce redundant reporting and improve efficiency and streamline regional program implementation. The State Board describes the 2007 permit as merely elaborating on and refining the 2001 requirements.

The permit itself states: “This Order contains new or modified requirements that are necessary to improve Copermittees’ efforts to reduce the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff to the MEP and achieve water quality standards.” [Emphasis added.] The permit also describes the Regional Urban Runoff Management Plan as new.

While the 2001 permit contained requirements for a fiscal analysis (part F.8) and an assessment of effectiveness (part F.7), it did so only as components of a Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program. The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program, required in part F.2 of the 2007 permit, is new. The fiscal analysis in part G is incorporated by reference into part F.2, and the effectiveness assessment is incorporated into part F.3. Thus, the Commission finds that the requirements in parts F.2 and F.3 are a new program or higher level of service.

#### **IV. Program Effectiveness Assessment (Part I)**

Part I of the permit is called “Program Effectiveness Assessment” and includes subparts for Jurisdictional (I.1), Watershed (I.2) and Regional (I.3) assessment, in addition to a Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (I.5). Of these, claimants pled subparts I.1, I.2 and I.5.

**A. Jurisdictional and Watershed Program effectiveness assessment (parts I.1 & I.2):** As more specifically stated on pages 22-24 above, the permit requires the copermittees to do the following:

- Annually assess the effectiveness of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) that includes specifically assessing the effectiveness of specified components of the JURMP and the effectiveness of the JURMP as a whole.
- Identify measureable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each jurisdictional activity/BMP implemented, each major JURMP component, and the JURMP as a whole.

- Development and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements.
- Annually report on the effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the specified requirements.
- As a watershed group of copermittees, annually assess the effectiveness of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) implementation, including each water quality activity and watershed education activity, and the program as a whole.
- Determine source load reductions resulting from WURMP implementation and utilize water quality monitoring results and data to determine whether implementation is resulting in changes to water quality.
- As with the JURMP, annually review WURMP jurisdictional activities or BMPs to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize the program's effectiveness, develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements to the programs, and annually report on the program's effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements.

Regarding parts I.1.a. and I.2.a. of the permit, the Fact Sheet/Technical Report states: "The section requires both specific activities and broader programs to be assessed since the effectiveness of jurisdictional [or watershed] efforts may be evident only when considered at different scales."<sup>158</sup>

The State Board, in its comments submitted in October 2008, cites section 402(p)(3(B)(ii)-(iii) of the Clean Water Act, as well as 40 C.F.R. sections 122.26(d)(2)(i)(B)-(C), (E) and (F) and subdivision (d)(2)(iv) of the same section to show the "broad federal authorities relied upon by the San Diego Water Board to support Section I ... [that] ... support inclusion of the JURMP and WURMP effectiveness assessments under federal law." The State Board also quotes section 122.26(d)(2)(v) that the copermittees must include in part 2 of their application for a permit:

*Assessment of controls.* Estimated reductions in loadings of pollutants from discharges of municipal storm sewer constituents from municipal storm sewer systems expected as the result of the municipal storm water quality management program. The assessment shall also identify known impacts of storm water controls on ground water.

The State Board also says that "under 40 C.F.R. section 122.42(c), applicants must provide annual reports on the progress of their storm water management programs. The federal law behind the JURMP and WURMP effectiveness assessment requirements were discussed at great length in the 2001 Permit Fact Sheet."<sup>159</sup> The State Board quotes a lengthy portion of the 2001

---

<sup>158</sup> Fact Sheet/Technical Report for Order No. R9-2007-0001, Parts I.1.a. and I.2.a.. Two identical paragraphs describe the JURMP on page 319 and the WURMP on page 320.

<sup>159</sup> 40 C.F.R. section 122.42(c) states:

*Municipal separate storm sewer systems.* The operator of a large or medium municipal separate storm sewer system or a municipal separate storm sewer that has been designated by the Director under §122.26(a)(1)(v) of this part must

Fact Sheet, which states that the U.S. EPA requires applicants to submit estimated reductions in pollutant loads expected to result from implemented controls and describe known impacts of storm water controls on groundwater. The 2001 Fact Sheet also includes “Throughout the permit term, the municipality must submit refinements to its assessment or additional direct measurements of program effectiveness in its annual report.” It also lists a number of U.S. EPA suggestions, recommendations, and encouraged actions.

The State Board also quotes at length from the 2007 Permit Fact Sheet/Technical Report regarding why the effectiveness assessments are required under the permit, including the need for them and the benefits of including them. According to the State Board, the federal authorities support including the effectiveness assessments, and the Regional Board appropriately exercised discretion under federal law to include them, finding them necessary to implement the MEP standard. Thus, the State Board asserts that sections I.1 and I.2 do not exceed federal law.

The claimants, in their February 2009 comments, state that neither the broad nor the specific legal authority cited in the permit Fact Sheet “contains the above-referenced mandates required under the 2007 Permit.” Claimants characterize the federal regulations as only requiring “program descriptions, estimated reductions, known impacts, and an annual report on progress. Federal law does not mandate the specific activities mandated by the 2007 Permit.” Claimants also argue that the permit requirements are not necessary to meet the federal MEP standard, and point out that the 2001 Permit Fact Sheet cited by the State Board describes actions recommended or encouraged by the U.S. EPA, but not required. As claimant says: “they simply authorize applicants to go beyond minimum federal requirements.” Claimants also quote the State Board’s comment on “the need for and benefits of assessment requirements,” noting that needs and benefits “constitute an insufficient basis for the imposition of a mandated requirement without subvention.”

Although the federal regulations require assessment of controls and annual reports, they do not require the detailed assessment in the 2007 permit. The regulations do not require, for example, assessments of the effectiveness of each significant jurisdictional activity/BMP or watershed

---

submit an annual report by the anniversary of the date of the issuance of the permit for such system. The report shall include:

- (1) The status of implementing the components of the storm water management program that are established as permit conditions;
- (2) Proposed changes to the storm water management programs that are established as permit condition. Such proposed changes shall be consistent with §122.26(d)(2)(iii) of this part; and
- (3) Revisions, if necessary, to the assessment of controls and the fiscal analysis reported in the permit application under §122.26(d)(2)(iv) and (d)(2)(v) of this part;
- (4) A summary of data, including monitoring data, that is accumulated throughout the reporting year;
- (5) Annual expenditures and budget for year following each annual report;
- (6) A summary describing the number and nature of enforcement actions, inspections, and public education programs;
- (7) Identification of water quality improvements or degradation.

quality activity, or of the implementation of each major component of the JURMP or WURMP, or identification of modifications and improvements to maximize the JURMP or WURMP effectiveness. These requirements, “exceed the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>160</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>161</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>162</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that parts I.1 and I.2 of the permit are not federal mandates.

Based on the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that parts I.1 and I.2 of the permit are a state mandate on the copermittes to do all of the following:

1. Jurisdictional

a. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, each Copermittes shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

(1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:

(a) Each significant jurisdictional activity/BMP or type of jurisdictional activity/BMP implemented;

(b) Implementation of each major component of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (Development Planning, Construction, Municipal, Industrial/Commercial, Residential, Illicit Discharge<sup>163</sup> Detection and Elimination, and Education); and

(c) Implementation of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.

(2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above.

(3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6<sup>164</sup> to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

(4) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

(5) Utilize Implementation Assessment,<sup>165</sup> Water Quality Assessment,<sup>166</sup> and Integrated Assessment,<sup>167</sup> where applicable and feasible.

---

<sup>160</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>161</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>162</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

<sup>163</sup> Illicit discharge, as defined in Attachment C of the permit, is “any discharge to the MS4 that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit and discharges resulting from firefighting activities [40 C.F.R. 122.26 (b)(2)].”

<sup>164</sup> See footnote 50, page 21.

b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, each Copermittee shall annually review its jurisdictional activities or BMPs to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order. The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Jurisdictional activities/BMPs that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable jurisdictional activities/BMPs shall 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 contributed to by MS4 discharges, jurisdictional activities or BMPs applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

c. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each Copermittee shall report on its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of sections I.1.a and I.1.b above.

## 2. Watershed

a. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4)<sup>168</sup> shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

(1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:

- (a) Each Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented;
- (b) Each Watershed Education Activity implemented; and
- (c) Implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.

---

<sup>165</sup> Implementation Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to determine the effectiveness of copermittee programs and activities in achieving measureable targeted outcomes, and in determining whether priority sources of water quality problems are being effectively addressed.”

<sup>166</sup> Water Quality Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to evaluate the condition of non-storm water discharges, and the water bodies which receive these discharges.”

<sup>167</sup> Integrated Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment to be conducted to evaluate whether program implementation is properly targeted to and resulting in the protection and improvement of water quality.”

<sup>168</sup> Table 4 of the permit divides the copermittees into nine watershed management areas. For example, the San Luis Rey River watershed management area lists the city of Oceanside, Vista and the County of San Diego as the responsible watershed copermittees. Table 4 also lists where the hydrologic units are and major receiving water bodies.

- (2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above.
- (3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6 to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in sections I.2.a.(1)(a) and I.2.a.(1)(b) above, where applicable and feasible.
- (4) Utilize outcome levels 1-4 to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, where applicable and feasible.
- (5) Utilize outcome levels 5 and 6 to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, focusing on the high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed. These assessments shall attempt to exhibit the impact of Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation on the high priority water quality problem(s) within the watershed.
- (6) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.
- (7) Utilize Implementation Assessment, Water Quality Assessment, and Integrated Assessment, where applicable and feasible.

b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, the watershed Copermittees shall annually review their Watershed Water Quality Activities, Watershed Education Activities, and other aspects of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order.<sup>169</sup> The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities shall be replaced or improved upon by implementation of more effective Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities. Where monitoring data exhibits persistent water quality problems that are caused or contributed to by MS4 discharges, Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

c. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4) shall report on its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of section I.2.a and I.2.b above.

---

<sup>169</sup> Section A is “Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations.”



The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, states that the program effectiveness assessment is not a new program or higher level of service because the 2001 permit included a JURMP (in part F.7) and WURMP (in part J) effectiveness assessment requirements.

The claimants, in their February 2009 comments, state as follows:

The 2001 Permit only required the copermittees to develop a long term strategy for assessing the effectiveness of their individual JURMP using specific and indirect measurements to track the long term progress of their individual JURMPs towards achieving water quality. [part F.7.a. of the 2001 permit.] The 2001 Permit also only mandated that the long term strategy developed by the copermittees include an assessment of the effectiveness of their JURMP in an annual report using the direct and indirect assessment measurements and methods developed in the long-term strategy. [part F.7. of the 2001 permit.]

Part F.7 of the 2001 permit required developing the following on the topic of “Assessment of Jurisdictional URMP Effectiveness Component.”

a. As part of its individual Jurisdictional URMP, each Copermittee shall develop a long-term strategy for assessing the effectiveness of its individual Jurisdictional URMP. The long-term assessment strategy shall identify specific direct and indirect measurements that each Copermittee will use to track the long-term progress of its individual Jurisdictional URMP towards achieving improvements in receiving water quality. Methods used for assessing effectiveness shall include the following or their equivalent: surveys, pollutant loading estimations, and receiving water quality monitoring. The long-term strategy shall also discuss the role of monitoring data in substantiating or refining the assessment.

b. As part of its individual Jurisdictional URMP Annual Report, each Copermittee shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of its Jurisdictional URMP using the direct and indirect assessment measurements and methods developed in its long-term assessment strategy.

The 2007 permit requires more detail in its assessments than the 2001 permit. The 2007 permit requires annual assessments and using outcome levels, among other things, to assess the effectiveness of (a) each significant jurisdictional activity/BMP, (b) implementation of each major component of the JURMP, and (c) implementation of the JURMP as a whole. The 2001 permit did not require assessments at these three levels. And for example, outcome level 4 in the 2007 permit is required for measuring load reductions.<sup>170</sup> This is a higher level of service than “pollutant loading estimations” to be used as an effectiveness strategy in the 2001 permit.<sup>171</sup> Therefore, the Commission finds that section I.1 of the permit (Jurisdictional URMP effectiveness assessment) is a new program or higher level of service.

---

<sup>170</sup> There are six Effectiveness Assessments incorporated into part I.1.a.(3) of the permit and are defined in Attachment C. One of them is “Effectiveness Assessment Level 4 – Load Reductions – Level 4 outcomes measure load reductions which quantify changes in the amounts of pollutants associated with specific sources before and after a BMP or other control measure is employed.”

<sup>171</sup> See Fact Sheet/Technical Report for Order No. R9-2007-0001.

The assessment provisions of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program are in part J.2 of the 2001 permit, which requires each copermittee to develop and implement a Watershed URMP that contains, among other things:

b. An assessment of the water quality of all receiving waters in the watershed based upon (1) existing water quality data; and (2) annual watershed water quality monitoring that satisfies the watershed monitoring requirements of Attachment B.

[¶]...[¶]

i. Long-term strategy for assessing the effectiveness of the Watershed URMP. The long-term assessment strategy shall identify specific direct and indirect measurements that will track the long-term progress of the Watershed URMP towards achieving improvements in receiving water quality. Methods used for assessing effectiveness shall include the following or their equivalent: surveys, pollutant loading estimations, and receiving water quality monitoring. The long-term strategy shall also discuss the role of monitoring data in substantiating or refining the assessment.

As with the JURMP, the 2001 permit required a “long-term strategy for assessing the effectiveness of the Watershed URMP” whereas the 2007 permit requires the annual assessment of more specific criteria: (a) each Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented; (b) Each Watershed Education Activity implemented; and (c) Implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management program as a whole. And the 2007 permit requires assessing these activities using the same six effectiveness outcome levels as for the JURMP (defined in Attachment C), that were not in the 2001 permit.<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Effectiveness assessment outcome levels are defined in Attachment C of the permit as follows: Effectiveness assessment outcome level 1 – Compliance with Activity-based Permit Requirements – Level 1 outcomes are those directly related to the implementation of specific activities prescribed by this Order or established pursuant to it. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 2 – Changes in Attitudes, Knowledge, and Awareness – Level 2 outcomes are measured as increases in knowledge and awareness among target audiences such as residents, business, and municipal employees. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 3 – Behavioral Changes and BMP Implementation – Level 3 outcomes measure the effectiveness of activities in affecting behavioral change and BMP implementation. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 4 – Load Reductions – Level 4 outcomes measure load reductions which quantify changes in the amounts of pollutants associated with specific sources before and after a BMP or other control measure is employed. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 5 – Changes in Urban Runoff and Discharge Quality – Level 5 outcomes are measured as changes in one or more specific constituents or stressors in discharges into or from MS4s. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 6 – Changes in Receiving Water Quality – Level 6 outcomes measure changes to receiving water quality resulting from discharges into and from MS4s, and may be expressed through a variety of means such as compliance with water quality objectives or other regulatory benchmarks, protection of biological integrity [i.e., ecosystem health], or beneficial use attainment.

Therefore, the Commission finds that section I.2. of the permit (the Watershed URMP effectiveness assessment) is a new program or higher level of service.

**B. Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (part I.5):** As stated on pages 19-20 above, part I.5 requires the copermitees to collaborate to develop a Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA) that evaluates the copermitee programs on a jurisdictional, watershed, and regional level, and that emphasizes watershed assessment. The LTEA must build on the results of the August 2005 Baseline LTEA, and must be submitted to the Regional Board no later than 210 days before the permit expires. The LTEA must address the Regional objectives listed in part I.3 of the permit, as well as assess the effectiveness of the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program, and address outcome levels 1-6 as specified in attachment C of the permit.

In its October 2008 comments on the test claim, the State Board says that the LTEA requirement was imposed “so that the San Diego Water Board could properly evaluate the Copermitees’ storm water program during the reapplication process.” The State Board asserts that the LTEA provision is a federal mandate, citing 40 C.F.R. section 122.26, subdivisions (d)(2)(iv) and (v), in which (v) states that a permit application must include:

*Assessment of controls.* Estimated reductions in loadings of pollutants from discharges of municipal storm sewer constituents from municipal storm sewer systems expected as the result of the municipal storm water quality management program. The assessment shall also identify known impacts of storm water controls on ground water.

According to the State Board, “Even if the requirements to develop an LTEA are not specifically required by the federal regulations, the general discussion of the federal MEP standard is applicable here and supports the San Diego Water Board’s determination that the region-wide LTEAs are necessary to meet the federal MEP standard.”

In their February 2009 rebuttal comments, the claimants state:

The program effectiveness component of the 2007 Permit mandates Jurisdictional (I.1), Watershed (I.2), Regional (I.3), Total Maximum Daily Loads (“TMDL”) and BMP Implementation (I.4) and Long-term Effectiveness Assessment (I.5) requirements. This Section mandates multiple layers of program assessment, review and reporting. Such duplicative and collaborative efforts were not required under the 2001 Permit and are not required by federal law.

Claimants assert that there is no federal authority that states that the regional, jurisdictional and watershed program effectiveness training requirements are required to meet the minimum federal MEP standards. Claimants also state that permits in other jurisdictions do not have LTEA requirements. According to the claimants, “while portions of the federal regulations cited by the State permit region-wide or watershed-wide cooperation, there is no mandatory requirement for multiple layers of program effectiveness assessment.”

Although the federal regulations require assessment of controls, they do not require the detailed assessment in the 2007 permit. They do not require, for example, collaboration with other copermitees, addressing specified objectives or outcome levels, or addressing jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs. These requirements “exceed the mandate in that federal law

or regulation.”<sup>173</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>174</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>175</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part I.5 of the permit is not a federal mandate.

Because of the mandatory language on the face of the permit, the Commission finds that part I.5 of the permit is a state mandate for the claimants to do all of the following:

5. Long-term Effectiveness Assessment

- a. Each Copermitttee shall collaborate with the other Copermitttees to develop a Longterm Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA), which shall build on the results of the Copermitttees’ August 2005 Baseline LTEA. The LTEA shall be submitted by the Principal Permitttee to the Regional Board no later than 210 days in advance of the expiration of this Order.
- b. The LTEA shall be designed to address each of the objectives listed in section I.3.a.(6)<sup>176</sup> of this Order, and to serve as a basis for the Copermitttees’ Report of Waste Discharge for the next permit cycle.
- c. The LTEA shall address outcome levels 1-6, and shall specifically include an evaluation of program implementation to changes in water quality (outcome levels 5 and 6).
- d. The LTEA shall assess the effectiveness of the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program in meeting its objectives and its ability to answer the five core management questions. This shall include assessment of the frequency of monitoring conducted through the use of power analysis and other pertinent statistical methods. The power analysis shall identify the frequency and intensity of sampling needed to identify a 10% reduction in the concentration of

---

<sup>173</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>174</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>175</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

<sup>176</sup> Part I.3.a.(6) of the permit states: At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall: (6) Include evaluation of whether the Copermitttees’ jurisdictional, watershed, and regional effectiveness assessments are meeting the following objectives: (a) Assessment of watershed health and identification of water quality issues and concerns. (b) Evaluation of the degree to which existing source management priorities are properly targeted to, and effective in addressing, water quality issues and concerns. (c) Evaluation of the need to address additional pollutant sources not already included in Copermitttee programs. (d) Assessment of progress in implementing Copermitttee programs and activities. (e) Assessment of the effectiveness of Copermitttee activities in addressing priority constituents and sources. (f) Assessment of changes in discharge and receiving water quality. (g) Assessment of the relationship of program implementation to changes in pollutant loading, discharge quality, and receiving water quality. (h) Identification of changes necessary to improve Copermitttee programs, activities, and effectiveness assessment methods and strategies.

constituents causing the high priority water quality problems within each watershed over the next permit term with 80% confidence.

e. The LTEA shall address the jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs, with an emphasis on watershed assessment.

The next issue is whether the LTEA (part I.5) is a new program or higher level of service. The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, state as follows:

The LTEA does not impose a new program or higher level of service. Rather, it requires the Copermittees to conduct a long term effectiveness assessment prior to submitting an application for reissuance of the Order in the next permit term and is necessary to support proposed changes to the Copermittees' programs."

The claimants, in their February 2009 comments, argue that the LTEA requirement in part I.5 does impose a new program or higher level of service. According to the claimants:

Section F.7 of the 2001 Permit only required individual copermittees to develop long term effectiveness assessments for their Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan ("JURMP"). ... The 2001 Permit did not require the copermittees to collaborate to develop an overarching LTEA for regional, jurisdictional and watershed programs, and did not require the submission of a LTEA by a date certain in advance of the Permit expiration.

The Commission finds that the LTEA is a new program or higher level of service. The 2001 permit required JURMP assessment (in part F.7) and WURMP (in part J.2) as quoted above in the discussion on parts I.1 and I.2., but not an LTEA. The Fact Sheet/Technical Report for the 2007 permit states:

Section I.5 (Long-Term Effectiveness Assessment) requires the Copermittees to conduct a Long-Term Effectiveness Assessment prior to their submittal of an application for reissuance of the Order. The Long-Term Effectiveness Assessment is necessary to provide support for the Copermittees' proposed changes to their programs in their ROWD. It can also serve as the basis for changes to the Order's requirements.

The Commission finds that the LTEA (part I.5) is a new program or higher level of service for three reasons. First, the scope of the assessment in the 2001 permit addresses only the JURMP and WURMP rather than "jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs, with an emphasis on watershed assessment" as in the 2007 permit (see the analysis of I.1 and I.2 above). Second, the 2001 permit did not require collaborating with all other copermittees on assessment. Third, the 2001 permit contains much less detail on what to include in the assessment, such as, for example, the eight regional objectives listed in I.3.a.(6), incorporated by reference in part I.5. Also, the LTEA must assess the "effectiveness of the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program ... [and] shall include assessment of the frequency of monitoring conducted through the use of power analysis and other pertinent statistical methods." These methods were not required under the 2001 permit.

#### **V. All Copermittee Collaboration (Part L)**

Part L, labeled "All Permittee Collaboration," requires the copermittees to collaborate to address common issues and plan and coordinate activities, including developing a Memorandum of

Understanding (MOU), as specified. The Copermittees entered into an MOU effective in January 2008, which is attached to the test claim. The Copermittees allege activities involved with working body support and working body participation.

In comments submitted in October 2008, the State Board asserts that the permit condition in part L is necessary to meet the minimum MEP standard, quoting the following federal regulation regarding municipal stormwater permits:

(2) *Part 2.* Part 2 of the application shall consist of:

(i) *Adequate legal authority.* A demonstration that the applicant can operate pursuant to legal authority established by statute, ordinance or series of contracts which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to: [¶]...[¶]

(D) Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system;<sup>177</sup>

The Commission finds that there is no federal mandate to develop a management structure (memorandum of understanding, or MOU) as required in part L of the 2007 permit. The federal regulation most on point requires an applicant (claimant) to demonstrate adequate legal authority “which authorizes or enables the applicant at a minimum to: [¶]...[¶] (D) Control through interagency agreements among coapplicants the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system;”<sup>178</sup> All the federal regulations address is authority to establish an interagency agreement or memorandum of understanding, but do not require it to be implemented or specify its contents beyond “controlling ... the contribution of pollutants from one portion of the municipal system to another portion of the municipal system.”

By contrast, part L of the permit requires the copermittees to collaborate, promote consistency among JURMP and WURMP and plan and coordinate activities required under the permit. It also requires joint execution and submission to the Regional Board an MOU with a minimum of seven specified requirements.

Thus, this permit activity “exceed[s] the mandate in that federal law or regulation.”<sup>179</sup> As in *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*,<sup>180</sup> the permit requires specific actions, i.e., required acts that go beyond the requirements of federal law. In adopting these permit provisions, the state has freely chosen<sup>181</sup> to impose these requirements. Thus, the Commission finds that part L of the permit does not impose a federal mandate.

Based on the mandatory language in the permit, the Commission finds that part L of the permit is a state mandate on the claimants to do the following:

---

<sup>177</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(2)(i)(D).

<sup>178</sup> 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.26 (d)(2)(i)(D).

<sup>179</sup> Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

<sup>180</sup> *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>181</sup> *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1593-1594.

1. Collaborate with all other Copermittees regulated under this Order to address common issues, promote consistency among Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Programs and Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs, and to plan and coordinate activities required under this Order.

(a) Jointly execute and submit to the Regional Board no later than 180 days after adoption of the permit, a Memorandum of Understanding, Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement that at a minimum:

- (1) Identifies and defines the responsibilities of the Principal Permittee<sup>182</sup> and Lead Watershed Permittees;<sup>183</sup>
- (2) Identifies Copermittees and defines their individual and joint responsibilities, including watershed responsibilities;
- (3) Establishes a management structure to promote consistency and develop and implement regional activities;
- (4) Establishes standards for conducting meetings, decisions-making, and cost-sharing;
- (5) Provides guidelines for committee and workgroup structure and responsibilities;
- (6) Lays out a process for addressing Copermittee non-compliance with the formal agreement;
- (7) Includes any and all other collaborative arrangements for compliance with this order.

The State Board, in its October 2008 comments, asserts that the management structure framework in part L of the 2007 permit is not a new program or higher level of service because:

The 2001 permit required significant collaboration to address common issues and promote consistency across management programs [and] development of a management structure through execution of a formal agreement, meeting minimum specifications. It also required standardized reporting, including fiscal analysis.

The State Board also argues there is “minimal substantive difference” between the 2001 and 2007 permits in their requirements to establish “a formal cooperative arrangement and to implement regional urban runoff management activities. The 2007 Permit merely elaborates on and refines the 2001 requirements.”

In its February 2009 rebuttal comments, the claimants assert that the 2001 and 2007 permits contain major substantive differences in their requirements for fiscal analyses of their jurisdictional programs.

---

<sup>182</sup> The Principal Permittee is the County of San Diego.

<sup>183</sup> According to the permit: “Watershed Copermittees shall identify the Lead Watershed Permittee for their WMA [Watershed Management Area].”

Part L.1 of the 2007 permit, the first paragraph in L requiring collaboration, is identical to part N of the 2001 permit. The Commission finds, however, that the collaboration is a new program or higher level of service because it now applies to all the activities that are found to be a new program or higher level of service in the analysis above (i.e, not in the 2001 permit) including the Regional Urban Runoff Management Program.

Part L.1.a, regarding the MOU or formal agreement, is similar but not identical to part N of the 2001 permit. Both permits require adoption of a “Memorandum of Understanding [MOU], Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement.” The 2001 permit, in part N.1.a, required the MOU to provide a management structure with the following contents: “designation of joint responsibilities, decision making, watershed activities, information management of data and reports, including the requirements under this Order; and any and all other collaborative arrangements for compliance with this Order.”

By contrast, the 2007 permit, requires the MOU to be submitted to the Regional Board within 180 days after adoption of the permit and requires that the MOU, at a minimum:

- (1) Identifies and defines the responsibilities of the principal Permittee and Lead Watershed Permittees;
- (2) Identifies Copermittees and defines their individual and joint responsibilities;
- (3) Establishes a management structure to promote consistency and develop and implement regional activities;
- (4) Establishes standards for conducting meetings, decision-making, and cost-sharing;
- (5) Provides guidelines for committee and workgroup structure and responsibilities;
- (6) Lays out a process for addressing Copermittee non-compliance with the formal agreement; and
- (7) Includes any and all other collaborative arrangements for compliance with this order.

The contents of the MOU specified in the 2001 permit, although stated with less specificity, are the same as those in the 2007 permit for numbers (1)-(2) and (7) above. Both permits require the MOU to contain “designation of joint responsibilities” and “collaborative arrangements for compliance with this order.” Thus, the Commission finds that jointly executing and submitting those parts of the MOU to the Regional Board is not a new program or higher level of service.

The Commission finds that part L.1.a of the permit is a new program or higher level of service for all copermittees to do the following:

- Collaborate with all other Copermittees to address common issues, promote consistency among Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Programs and Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs, and to plan and coordinate activities required under the permit.
- Jointly execute and submit to the Regional Board, no later than 180 days after adoption of the permit, a Memorandum of Understanding, Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement which at a minimum: (3) Establishes a management structure to promote consistency and develop and implement regional activities; (4) Establishes standards for conducting meetings, decision-making, and cost-sharing; (5) Provides guidelines for



committee and workgroup structure and responsibilities; and (6) Lays out a process for addressing copermittee non-compliance with the formal agreement.

**Summary of Issue 1:** The Commission finds that the following parts of the 2007 permit are a state-mandated, new program or higher level of service.

#### I. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program and Reporting (Parts D & J)

- Collaborate with other copermittees to develop and implement a hydromodification management plan, as specified (D.1.g.), for private priority development projects. Reimbursement is not required for this activity for municipal priority development projects.
- Develop and submit an updated Model SUSMP that defines minimum Low-impact Development and other BMPs as specified (D.1.d.(7)-(8)), for private priority development projects. Reimbursement is not required for this activity for municipal priority development projects.
- Street sweeping (D.3.a.(5)) and reporting on street sweeping (J.3.a(3)x-xv);
- Conveyance system cleaning (D.3.a.(3)(b)(iii)) and reporting on conveyance system cleaning (J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii));
- Educational component (D.5).
  - Educate each specified target community on the following topics: (1) Erosion prevention, (2) Non storm water discharge prohibitions, and (3) BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID, source control, and treatment control (D.5.a.(1));
  - Educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and ‘allowable’ behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources (D.5.a.(2));
  - Implement an education program that includes annual training only for planning boards and elected officials, if applicable, to have an understanding of the topics in (i) and (ii) (D.5.b.(1)(a)(i) & (ii));
  - Implement an education program so that its planning and development review staffs (and Planning Boards and Election Officials, if applicable) have an understanding of the topics in (iii) and (iv) as specified (D.5.b.(1)(a)(iii) & (iv));
  - Implement an education program that includes annual training prior to the rainy season so that [the Copermittee’s] 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: the topics in (iii) to (vi), as specified (D.5.b.(1)(b)(iii) & (iv));
    - Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities (D.5.b.(1)(c));
    - Municipal Other Activities (D.5.b.(1)(d));
    - New Development and Construction Education (D.5.(b)(2));
    - Residential, General Public, and School Children Education (D.5.(b)(3)).

## II. Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (Parts E.2.f & E.2.g.)

- Identify and implement the Watershed activities as specified (E.2.f.).
- Collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs. Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings. (E.2.g.)

## III. Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (Parts F.1, F.2 & F.3)

- Include developing and implementing a Regional Residential Education Program development and implementation in the RURMP, as specified (F.1.).
- Include developing the standardized fiscal analysis method required in permit part G in the RURMP (F.2.).
- Facilitate the assessment of the effectiveness of jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs in the RURMP (F.3.).

## IV. Program Effectiveness Assessment (Parts I.1, I.2 & I.5)

- Annually assess the effectiveness of each copermittee's JURMP, as specified (I.1.).
- Annually assess the effectiveness of each watershed group's WURMP (I.2.).
- Collaborate with the other copermittees to develop a Long-term Effectiveness Assessment, as specified, and submit it to the Regional Board as specified (I.5.).

## V. All Permittee Collaboration (Part L)

- Collaborate with all other copermittees to address common issues, promote consistency among the JURMP and WURMP, and to plan and coordinate activities required under the permit.
- Jointly execute and submit to the Regional Board, no later than 180 days after adoption of the permit, a Memorandum of Understanding, Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement as specified (L.1.a. (3)-(5)).

Any further reference to the test claim activities is limited to these parts of the permit found to be a new program or higher level of service.

### **Issue 2: Do the test claim activities impose costs mandated by the state within the meaning of Government Code sections 17514 and 17556?**

The final issue is whether the permit provisions impose costs mandated by the state,<sup>184</sup> and whether any statutory exceptions listed in Government Code section 17556 apply to the test claim. Government Code section 17514 defines "cost mandated by the state" as follows:

[A]ny increased costs which a local agency or school district is required to incur after July 1, 1980, as a result of any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, or any executive order implementing any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, which mandates a new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

---

<sup>184</sup> *Lucia Mar, supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; Government Code section 17514.

Government Code section 17564 requires reimbursement claims to exceed \$1000 to be eligible for reimbursement. In the test claim, the County of San Diego itemized the costs of complying with the permit conditions as follows:

Activity	Cost FY 2007-08
Regional Urban Runoff Management Program -Copermittee collaboration (F.2, F.3, L)	\$260,031.09
Copermittee collaboration, Regional Residential Education, Program Development and Implementation (F.1)	\$131,250.00
Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) -hydromodification ( D.1.g)	\$630,000.00
JURMP Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans -low impact development ( D.1.d)	\$52,200.00
Long Term Effectiveness Assessment ( I.5)	\$210,000.00
Street Sweeping (D.3.a.(5) Equipment, Staffing, Contract	\$3,477,190.00
Conveyance System Cleaning ( D.3.a.(3)) and Reporting (J.2.a.(3)(c) iv – vii.	\$3,456,087.00
Program Effectiveness Assessment (I.1 & I.2)	\$392,363.00
Educational Surveys and Tests (D.5)	\$62,617.00
Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program -Copermittee collaboration (E.2.f., E.2.g)	\$1,632,893.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,304,631.09</b>

Claimants submitted documentation in February 2010 that show the 2008-2009 cost for the permit activities is \$18,014,213. These figures, along with those in the test-claim narrative and declarations submitted by the San Diego County and 18 cities,<sup>185</sup> illustrate that the costs to comply with the permit activities exceed \$1,000. The Commission, however, cannot find “costs mandated by the state” within the meaning of Government Code section 17514 if any exceptions in Government Code section 17556 apply, which is discussed below.

**A. Claimants did not request the test claim activities within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (a).**

The first issue is whether the claimants requested or proposed the activities in the permit. The Department of Finance and the State Board both assert that claimants did so in their Report of

<sup>185</sup> The County and city declarations are attached to the test claim.

Waste Discharge. As discussed above, the claimants were required to submit a ROWD and Stormwater Quality Management Plan before the permit was issued.<sup>186</sup>

Government Code section 17556, subdivision (a), provides that the Commission shall not find costs mandated by the state if:

(a) The claim is submitted by a local agency ... that requested legislative authority for that local agency ... to implement the program specified in the statute, and that statute imposes costs upon that local agency or school district requesting the legislative authority. A resolution from the governing body or a letter from a delegated representative of the governing body of a local agency ... that requests authorization for that local agency ... to implement a given program shall constitute a request within the meaning of this subdivision.

Based on the language of the statute, section 17556, subdivision (a), does not apply because the permit is not a statute, the claimants did not request “legislative authority” to implement the permit, and the record lacks any resolutions adopted by the claimants. Therefore, the Commission finds that the claimants did not request the activities in the permit within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (a).

**B. Claimants have fee authority under Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), for the test claim activities that do not require voter approval under Proposition 218**

Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), states:

The commission shall not find costs mandated by the state, as defined in Section 17514, in any claim submitted by a local agency ... if, after a hearing, the commission finds any one of the following: [¶]...[¶] (d) The local agency ... has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service.

The California Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), in *County of Fresno v. State of California*.<sup>187</sup> The court, in holding that the term “costs” in article XIII B, section 6, excludes expenses recoverable from sources other than taxes, stated:

Section 6 was included in article XIII B in recognition that article XIII A of the Constitution severely restricted the taxing powers of local governments. (See *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d at p. 61.) The provision was intended to preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions onto local entities that were ill equipped to handle the task. (*Ibid.*; see *Lucia Mar Unified School Dist. v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 836, fn. 6 [244 Cal.Rptr. 677, 750 P.2d 318].) Specifically, it was designed to protect the tax revenues of local governments from state mandates that would require expenditure of such revenues. Thus, although its language broadly

<sup>186</sup> Water Code section 13376; 40 Code of Federal Regulations, section 122.21 (a). The Federal regulation applies to U.S. EPA-issued permits, but is incorporated into section 123.25 (the state-program provision) by reference. Also see the 2007 permit, page 2, part A.

<sup>187</sup> *County of Fresno v. State of California, supra*, 53 Cal.3d 482.

declares that the “state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse ... local government for the costs [of a state-mandated new] program or higher level of service,” read in its textual and historical context section 6 of article XIII B requires subvention only when the costs in question can be recovered *solely from tax revenues*.

In view of the foregoing analysis, the question of the facial constitutionality of section 17556(d) under article XIII B, section 6, can be readily resolved. As noted, the statute provides that “The commission shall not find costs mandated by the state ... if, after a hearing, the commission finds that” the local government “has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service.” Considered within its context, the section effectively construes the term “costs” in the constitutional provision as excluding expenses that are recoverable from sources other than taxes. Such a construction is altogether sound. As the discussion makes clear, the Constitution requires reimbursement only for those expenses that are recoverable solely from taxes. It follows that section 17556(d) is facially constitutional under article XIII B, section 6.<sup>188</sup>

In another case about subdivision (d) of section 17556, *Connell v. Superior Court*,<sup>189</sup> the dispute was whether local agencies had sufficient fee authority for a mandate involving increased purity of reclaimed wastewater used for certain types of irrigation. The court cited statutory fee authority for the reclaimed wastewater, and noted that the water districts did not dispute their fee authority. Rather, the water districts argued that they lacked “sufficient” fee authority in that it was not economically feasible to levy fees sufficient to pay the mandated costs. In finding the fee authority issue is a question of law, the court stated that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), is clear and unambiguous, in that its plain language precludes reimbursement where the local agency has the authority, i.e., the right or the power, to levy fees sufficient to cover the costs of the state-mandated program.” The court rejected the districts’ argument that “authority” as used in the statute should be construed as a “practical ability in light of surrounding economic circumstances” because that construction cannot be reconciled with the plain language of section 17556, and would create a vague standard not capable of reasonable adjudication. The court also said that nothing in the fee authority statute (Wat. Code, § 35470) limited the authority of the districts to levy fees “sufficient” to cover their costs. Thus, the court concluded that the plain language of section 17556 made the fee authority issue solely a question of law, and that the water districts could not be reimbursed due to that fee authority.<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> *County of Fresno v. State of California*, *supra*, 53 Cal.3d 482, 487. Emphasis in original.

<sup>189</sup> *Connell v. Superior Court* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 382.

<sup>190</sup> *Connell v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 59 Cal.App.4th 382, 398-402.

**1. Claimants’ have regulatory fee authority (within the meaning of Gov. Code, § 17556, subd. (d)) under the police power sufficient to pay for the mandated activities that do not require voter approval under Proposition 218: the hydromodification plan and low-impact development.**

In its October 2008 comments, the State Board asserted that the claimants have fee authority to pay for the permit activities. Although the Board recognizes “limitations on assessing fees and surcharges under California law ... [concerning] the percentage of voters who must approve the assessment” the Board points to examples of local agencies (Cities of Los Angeles, San Clemente, and Palo Alto) that have successfully adopted an assessment. The State Board also argues that the cities’ trash collection responsibilities may also include street sweeping and conveyance system cleaning for which the city could charge fees, and that developer fees could be charged for hydromodification and low impact development.

Claimants, in comments submitted in February 2009, state that they cannot unilaterally impose a fee to recover the cost to comply with the 2007 permit on water or sewer bills sent to residents because of *Howard Jarvis Taxpayer Assoc. v. City of Salinas*,<sup>191</sup> in which the court invalidated a stormwater management utility fee imposed by the city on all owners of developed parcels in the city. The court held that article XIII D (Proposition 218) of the California Constitution “required the city to subject the proposed storm drainage fee to a vote of the property owners or the voting residents of the affected area.”<sup>192</sup> As to the argument that claimants can put the fee to a vote in their jurisdictions, claimants state as follows:

Articles XIII C and XIII D, which were added to the Constitution by Proposition 218, regulate the imposition of general and special taxes as well as the imposition of special assessments and property related fees. In each of these cases the question of whether to impose a tax, special assessment or a property related fee must be submitted to and approved by the voters. And, in the case of a special tax, and in certain instances the imposition of a fee or charge, the tax or fee must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the resident voters. The State fails to cite any authority that requires the copermittees to first submit the question of whether to impose a tax or fee to the voters and have them reject the proposition. Such a requirement would render all mandate claims moot, without first submitting the question of whether to impose a tax or assessment to a vote of the electorate.

The issue of local fee authority for municipal stormwater permit activities in this permit cannot be answered without discussing regulatory fee authority under the police power and the limitations on that authority via the voter-approval requirement in article XIII D of the California Constitution (Proposition 218).

Case law has recognized three general categories of local agency fees or assessments: (1) special assessments, based on the value of benefits conferred on property; (2) development fees, exacted in return for permits or other government privileges; and (3) regulatory fees, imposed under the police power.<sup>193</sup> The regulatory and development fees are discussed below in the context of

---

<sup>191</sup> *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assoc. v. City of Salinas* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1351, 1358-1359.

<sup>192</sup> *Id.* at page 1358-1359.

<sup>193</sup> *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 866, 874.

XIII D (Proposition 218) that would allow the claimants to impose fees for the activities in the test claim related to development.

Regulatory fee authority under the police power: The law on local government fee authority begins with article XI, section 7, of the California Constitution, which states: “A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” Article XI, section 7, includes the authority to impose fees, and courts have held that “the power to impose valid regulatory fees does not depend on legislatively authorized taxing power but exists pursuant to the direct grant of police power under article XI, section 7, of the California Constitution.”<sup>194</sup>

Water pollution prevention is also a valid exercise of government police power.<sup>195</sup>

In *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization*,<sup>196</sup> the California Supreme Court upheld a fee on manufacturers of paint that funded a child lead-poisoning program that provided evaluation, screening, and medically necessary follow-up services for children who were deemed potential victims of lead poisoning. The program was entirely supported by fees assessed on manufacturers or other persons contributing to environmental lead contamination. In upholding the fee, the court ruled that it was a regulatory fee imposed under the police power and not a special tax requiring a two-thirds vote under article XIII A, section 4, of the California Constitution. The court stated:

From the viewpoint of general police power authority, we see no reason why statutes or ordinances calling on polluters or producers of contaminating products to help in mitigation or cleanup efforts should be deemed less “regulatory” in nature than the initial permit or licensing programs that allowed them to operate.

Viewed as a mitigating effects measure, [the fee] is comparable in character to several police power measures imposing fees to defray the actual or anticipated adverse effects of various business operations.<sup>197</sup> [Emphasis added.]

Regulatory fees also help to prevent or mitigate pollution, as the Court said: “imposition of 'mitigating effects' fees in a substantial amount ... also 'regulates' future conduct by deterring further manufacture, distribution, or sale of dangerous products, and by stimulating research and development efforts to produce safer or alternative products.”<sup>198</sup> The court also recognized that regulatory fees do not depend on government-conferred benefits or privileges.<sup>199</sup>

---

<sup>194</sup> *Mills v. County of Trinity* (1980) 108 Cal.App.3d 656, 662, in which a taxpayer challenged a county ordinance that imposed new and increased fees for county services in processing subdivision, zoning, and other land-use applications that had been adopted without a two-thirds affirmative vote of the county electors.

<sup>195</sup> *Freeman v. Contra Costa County Water Dist.* (1971) 18 Cal.App.3d 404, 408.

<sup>196</sup> *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 866.

<sup>197</sup> *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization, supra*, 15 Cal.4th 866, 877.

<sup>198</sup> *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization, supra*, 15 Cal.4th 866, 875-877.

<sup>199</sup> *Id.* at page 875.

Although the holding in *Sinclair Paint* applied to a state-wide fee, the court’s language (treating “ordinances” the same as “statutes”) recognizes that local agencies also have police power to impose regulatory fees, and it relied on local government police power cases in its analysis.<sup>200</sup>

Other cases have defined a regulatory fee as an imposition that funds a regulatory program<sup>201</sup> or that distributes the collective cost of a regulation<sup>202</sup> and is “enacted for purposes broader than the privilege to use a service or to obtain a permit. . . .the regulatory program is for the protection of the health and safety of the public.”<sup>203</sup> Courts will uphold regulatory fees if they do not exceed the reasonable cost of providing services necessary to the activity on which the fee is based and are not levied for an unrelated revenue purpose.

In upholding regulatory fees for environmental review by the California Department of Fish and Game, the court of appeal summarized the following rules on regulatory fees:

A regulatory fee may be imposed under the police power when the fee constitutes an amount necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of the regulation. [Citations omitted.] Such costs . . . include all those incident to the issuance of the license or permit, investigation, inspection, administration, maintenance of a system of supervision and enforcement. [Citations omitted.] Regulatory fees are valid despite the absence of any perceived “benefit” accruing to the fee payers. [Citations omitted.] Legislators “need only apply sound judgment and consider ‘probabilities according to the best honest viewpoint of informed officials’ in determining the amount of the regulatory fee.”<sup>204</sup> [Emphasis added.]

In *Tahoe Keys Property Owner’s Assoc. v. State Water Resources Control Board*,<sup>205</sup> the court refused to issue a preliminary injunction against collecting a pollution mitigation fee of \$4000 for each lot developed in the Tahoe Keys subdivision of Lake Tahoe. The fees were to be used for mitigation projects designed to achieve a net reduction in nutrients generated by the Tahoe Keys development. The court said: “on the face of the regulation, there appears to be a sufficient

---

<sup>200</sup> *Sinclair Paint v. State Board of Equalization*, *supra*, 15 Cal.4th 866, 873. The Court stated: “Because of the close, ‘interlocking’ relationship between the various sections of article XIII A (Citation omitted) we believe these “special tax” cases [under article XIII A, § 3, state taxes] may be helpful, though not conclusive, in deciding the case before us. The reasons why particular fees are, or are not, “special taxes” under article XIII A, section 4, [local government taxes] may apply equally to section 3 cases.”

<sup>201</sup> *California Assn. of Prof. Scientists v. Dept. of Fish and Game* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 935, 950.

<sup>202</sup> *Id.* at 952.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>204</sup> *California Assn. of Prof. Scientists v. Dept. of Fish and Game*, *supra*, 79 Cal.App.4th 935, 945.

<sup>205</sup> *Tahoe Keys Property Owner’s Assn. v. State Water Resources Control Board* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1459.



nexus between the effect of the regulation and the objectives it was supposed to advance to support the regulatory scheme [mitigation of pollution in Lake Tahoe].”<sup>206</sup>

A variety of local agency regulatory fees have been upheld for various programs, including: processing subdivision, zoning, and other land-use applications,<sup>207</sup> art in public places,<sup>208</sup> remedying substandard housing,<sup>209</sup> recycling,<sup>210</sup> administrative hearings under a rent-control ordinance,<sup>211</sup> signage,<sup>212</sup> air pollution mitigation,<sup>213</sup> and replacing converted residential hotel units.<sup>214</sup> Fees on developers for environmental mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act have also been upheld.<sup>215</sup>

Given the variety of examples where regulatory fees have been upheld, and the broad range of costs to which they may be applied (including those for ‘administration’), the claimants have fee authority under the police power to impose fees for the permit activities that are a state-mandated new program or higher level of service. But a determination as to whether the claimants’ fee authority is sufficient, within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), to pay for the mandated activities and deny the test claim, cannot be made without analysis of the limitations on the fee authority imposed by Proposition 218.

Regulatory fee authority is limited by voter approval under Proposition 218: With some exceptions, local government fees or assessments that are incident to property ownership are subject to voter approval under article XIII D of the California Constitution, as added by Proposition 218 in 1996. Article XIII D defines a fee as “any levy other than an ad valorem tax, a special tax, or an assessment, imposed by an agency on a parcel or a person as an incident of property ownership, including a user fee or charge for a property-related service.” It defines an assessment as “any levy or charge upon real property by an agency for a special benefit conferred upon the real property [and] includes, but is not limited to, ‘special assessment,’ ‘benefit assessment,’ ‘maintenance assessment,’ and ‘special assessment tax.’”

Among other procedures, new or increased property-related fees require a majority-vote of the affected property owners, or two-thirds registered voter approval, or weighted ballot approval by the affected property owners (art. XIII D, § 6, subd. (c)). Assessments must also be approved by owners of the affected parcels (art. XIII D, § 4, subd.(d)). Expressly exempt from voter

---

<sup>206</sup> *Id.* at page 1480.

<sup>207</sup> *Mills v. County of Trinity, supra*, 108 Cal.App.3d 656, 662.

<sup>208</sup> *Ehrlich v. City of Culver City* (1996) 12 Cal.4th 854, 886.

<sup>209</sup> *Apartment Assoc. of Los Angeles County v. City of Los Angeles* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 830.

<sup>210</sup> *City of Dublin v. County of Alameda* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 264.

<sup>211</sup> *Pennell v. City of San Jose* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 365.

<sup>212</sup> *United Business Communications v. City of San Diego* (1979) 91 Cal.App.3d 156.

<sup>213</sup> *California Building Industry Ass’n v. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Dist.* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 120.

<sup>214</sup> *Terminal Plaza Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco* (1986) 177 Cal.App.3d 892.

<sup>215</sup> *Environmental Council of Sacramento v. City of Sacramento* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 1018.

approval, however, are property-related fees for sewer, water, or refuse collection services (art. XIII D, § 6, subd. (c)).

In 2002, an appellate court in *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association v. City of Salinas*, *supra*, 98 Cal.App.4th 1351, found that a city's charges on developed parcels to fund stormwater management were property-related fees, and were not covered by Proposition 218's exemption for "sewer" or "water" services. This means that an election would be required to charge stormwater fees if they are imposed "as an incident of property ownership."

The issue of whether a local agency has sufficient fee authority for the mandated activities under Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), in light of the voter approval requirement for fees under article XIII D (Proposition 218) is one of first impression for the Commission.

The Commission finds that a local agency does not have sufficient fee authority within the meaning of Government Code section 17556 if the fee or assessment is contingent on the outcome of an election by voters or property owners. The plain language of subdivision (d) of this section prohibits the Commission from finding that the permit imposes "costs mandated by the state" if "The local agency ... has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service." [Emphasis added.] Under Proposition 218, the local agency has no authority to impose the fee without the consent of the voters or property owners.

Additionally, it is possible that the local agency's voters or property owners may never adopt the proposed fee or assessment, but the local agency would still be required to comply with the state mandate. Denying reimbursement under these circumstances would violate the purpose of article XIII B, section 6, which is to "to preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are 'ill equipped' to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose."<sup>216</sup>

In its January 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, the State Board disagrees that "the requirement to subject new or increased fees to these voting or protest requirements strips the claimants of 'fee authority' within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d)." The State Board cites *Connell v. Superior Court*,<sup>217</sup> in which the water districts argued that they lacked "sufficient" fee authority because it was not economically feasible for them to levy fees that were sufficient to pay the mandated costs. The *Connell* court determined that "the plain language of the statute [Gov. Code, § 17556, subd. (d)] precludes reimbursement where the local agency has the authority, i.e., the right or the power, to levy fees sufficient to cover the costs of the state-mandated program."<sup>218</sup> The State Board equates the Proposition 218 voting requirement with the economic impracticability faced by the water districts in *Connell*.

The claimants disagree, citing a lack of authority that requires them to first submit the question of whether to impose a tax or fee to the voters and have them reject the proposition. According

---

<sup>216</sup> *County of San Diego*, *supra*, 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

<sup>217</sup> *Connell v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 59 Cal.App.4th 382.

<sup>218</sup> *Id.* at page 401.

to the claimants, such a requirement would render all mandate claims moot, without first submitting the question of whether to impose a tax or assessment to a vote of the electorate.

The Commission disagrees with the State Board. The Proposition 218 election requirement is not like the economic hurdle to fees in *Connell*. Absent compliance with the Proposition 218 election and other procedures, there is no legal authority to impose or raise fees within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d). The voting requirement of Proposition 218 does not impose a mere practical or economic hurdle, as in *Connell*, but a legal and constitutional one. Without voter or property owner approval, the local agency lacks the “authority, i.e., the right or power, to levy fees sufficient to cover the costs of the state-mandated program.”<sup>219</sup>

In fact, the fee at issue in the *Connell* case (Wat. Code, § 35470) was amended by the Legislature in 2007 to conform to Proposition 218. Specifically, the Water Code statute now requires compliance with “the “notice, protest, and hearing procedures in Section 53753 of the Government Code.”<sup>220</sup> This Government Code statute implements Proposition 218.

For these reasons, the Commission finds that local agencies do not have fee authority that is sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d) to deny the test claim for those activities that would condition the fee or assessment on voter or property-owner approval under Proposition 218 (article XIII D). The Commission finds that Proposition 218 applies to all the activities in this test claim (except for the hydromodification and LID activities that are related to priority development projects discussed below) so that they impose “costs mandated by the state” (within the meaning of Gov. Code, § 17556, subd. (d)). To the extent that property-owner or voter-approved fees or assessments are imposed to pay for any of the permit activities found above to be a state-mandated new program or higher level of service, the fee or assessment would be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines to offset the claimant’s costs in performing those activities.

Fees imposed for two of the test-claim activities, however, i.e., for the hydromodification management plan and low-impact development, would not be subject to voter approval under Proposition 218, as discussed below.

Fees as a condition of property development are not subject to Proposition 218: Proposition 218 does not apply to development fees, including those imposed on activities in part D of the permit. Article XIII D expressly states that it shall not be construed to “affect existing laws relating to the imposition of fees or charges as a condition of property development.”<sup>221</sup>

Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that fees imposed “as an incident to property ownership” are subject to Proposition 218, but fees that result from the owner’s voluntary

---

<sup>219</sup> *Connell v. Superior Court, supra*, 59 Cal.App.4th 382, 401.

<sup>220</sup> Water Code section 35470, as amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 27. Section 53753 of the Government Code requires compliance with “the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution” for assessments.

<sup>221</sup> California Constitution, article XIII D, section 1, subdivision (b).

decision to seek a government benefit are not.<sup>222</sup> Thus, fees imposed as a result of the owner's voluntary decision to undertake a development project are not subject to Proposition 218, because they are not merely incident to property ownership.<sup>223</sup>

The final issue, therefore, is whether claimants may impose fees that are sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), to pay for the activities in the permit related to development: the hydromodification management plan (part D.1.g), and low-impact development (part D.1.d.(7)&(8)). The Commission finds claimants have fee authority that is sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), and that these activities do not impose costs mandated by the state and are not reimbursable.

Hydromodification management plan: Part D.1 of the permit describes the development planning component of the JURMP. Part D.1.g. requires each copermitttee to collaborate with other copermitttees to develop and implement and report on developing a hydromodification management plan (HMP) to manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all priority development projects, as specified. As discussed above, the HMP is a state-mandated new program or higher level of service for only private priority development projects. The purpose of the HMP is:

[T]o manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects, where such rates and durations are likely to cause increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

According to the permit, priority development projects are:

- a) all new Development Projects that fall under the project categories or locations listed in section D.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 that falls under the project categories or locations listed in section D.1.d.(2).

---

<sup>222</sup> In *Richmond v. Shasta Community Services Dist.* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 409, the court held that water service fees were subject to Proposition 218, but that water connection fees were not. In *Apartment Assoc. of Los Angeles County v. City of Los Angeles*, *supra*, 24 Cal.4th 830, 839-840, the court held that apartment inspection fees were not subject to Proposition 218 because they were not imposed on property owners as such, but in their capacity as landlords.

<sup>223</sup> A recent report by the Office of the Legislative Analyst concurs with this conclusion: "Local governments finance stormwater clean-up services from revenues raised from a variety of fees and, less frequently, through taxes. Property owner fees for stormwater services typically require approval by two-thirds of the voters, or a majority of property owners. Developer fees and fees imposed on businesses that contribute to urban runoff, in contrast, are not restricted by Proposition 218 and may be approved by a vote of the governing body. Taxes for stormwater services require approval by two-thirds of the electorate." Office of the Legislative Analyst. *California's Water: An LAO Primer* (October 22, 2008) page 56. [Emphasis added.] See: <[http://www.lao.ca.gov/2008/rsrc/water\\_primer/water\\_primer\\_102208.pdf](http://www.lao.ca.gov/2008/rsrc/water_primer/water_primer_102208.pdf)> as of October 22, 2008.

The priority development project categories listed in part D.1.d.(2) are:

- (a) Housing subdivisions of 10 or more dwelling units. This category includes single-family homes, multi-family homes, condominiums, and apartments.
- (b) Commercial developments greater than one acre. [as specified]
- (c) Developments of heavy industry greater than one acre. This category includes, but is not limited to, manufacturing plants, food processing plants, metal working facilities, printing plants, and fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.).
- (d) 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.
- (e) 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 shall meet all SUSMP requirements except ... hydromodification requirement D.1.g.
- (f) 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.
- (g) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). All development located within or directly adjacent to or discharging directly to an ESA (where discharges 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% 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.
- (h) Parking lots 5,000 square feet or more or with 15 or more parking spaces and potentially exposed to urban 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.
- (i) 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.
- (j) 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.

The Commission finds that claimants have authority to impose fees for complying with the HMP activities in permit part D.1.g. for priority development projects, and their authority is sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), in that the fee would not be subject to Proposition 218 voter approval. These activities involve collaborating with other copermittees to develop and implement a hydromodification management plan, and reporting on it. Because regulatory fees, pursuant to article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution, could be imposed on these priority development projects to pay for the costs of HMP, the Commission finds that permit part D.1.g. does not impose costs mandated by the state.

Low impact development: Low impact development is defined in Attachment C of the permit as a “storm water management and land development strategy that emphasizes conservation and the use of on-site natural features integrated with engineered, small-scale hydrologic controls to more closely reflect pre-development hydrologic functions.” The purpose of LID is to “collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects.” LID best management practices include draining a portion of impervious areas into pervious areas prior to discharge into the storm drain, and constructing portions of priority development projects with permeable surfaces.

Part D.1.d.(7) requires updating the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMP) to include low impact development requirements, as specified, including BMP requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of sections D.1.d.(4)<sup>224</sup> and D.1.d.(5).<sup>225</sup> Both D.1.d.(4) and D.1.d.(5) are the LID requirement implemented at priority development projects.

Part D.1.d.(8) requires permittees to develop and submit an updated model SUSMP that defines minimum low impact development and other BMP requirements to incorporate into the permittees local SUSMPs for application to priority development projects.

The Commission finds that claimants have authority to impose fees for complying with the LID activities in parts D.1.d.(7) and D.1.d.(8) of the permit, and their authority is sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), in that they are not subject to Proposition 218 voter approval. Because regulatory fees, pursuant to article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution, could be imposed on the priority development projects to pay for the costs associated with LID, the Commission finds that permit parts D.1.d.(7) and D.1.d.(8) do not impose costs mandated by the state.

---

<sup>224</sup> Part D.1.d.(4) of the permit includes LID BMP requirements: “Each Copermittee shall require each Priority Development Project to implement LID BMPs which will collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects.” The Permit lists various LID site design BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects, and other LID BMPs that must be implemented at all Priority Development Projects “where applicable and feasible.”

<sup>225</sup> Part D.1.d.(5), regarding “Source control BMP Requirements” requires permittees to require each Priority Development Project to implement source control BMPs that must “Minimize storm water pollutants of concern in urban runoff” and include five other specific criteria.

**2. Claimants also have fee authority regulated by the Mitigation Fee Act that is sufficient (within the meaning of Gov. Code, § 17556, subd. (d)) to pay for the hydromodification and low-impact development permit activities.**

Development fees are also an exercise of the local police power under article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution.<sup>226</sup> A fee is considered a development fee if it is exacted in return for building permits or other governmental privileges so long as the amount of the fee bears a reasonable relation to the development's probable costs to the community and benefits to the developer.<sup>227</sup> Development fees are not restricted by Proposition 218 as discussed above.

Fees on developers as conditions of permit approval are governed by the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, §§ 66000-66025) which defines a "fee" as:

[A] monetary exaction other than a tax or special assessment, whether established for a broad class of projects by legislation of general applicability or imposed on a specific project on an ad hoc basis, that is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project, but does not include ... fees for processing applications for governmental regulatory actions or approvals ....<sup>228</sup> [Emphasis added.]

Public facilities are defined in the Act as "public improvements, public services, and community amenities."<sup>229</sup>

When a local agency imposes or increases a fee as a condition of development approval, it must do all of the following: (1) Identify the purpose of the fee; (2) Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. (3) Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed; and, (4) Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project upon which the fee is imposed. (Gov. Code, § 66001, subd. (a),)

The city or county must also determine whether there is a reasonable relationship between the specific amount of the fee and the costs of building, expanding, or upgrading public facilities. These determinations, known as nexus studies, are in writing and must be updated whenever new fees are imposed or existing fees are increased.<sup>230</sup> A fee imposed "as a condition of approval of

---

<sup>226</sup> *California Building Industry Assoc. v. Governing Board* (1988) 206 Cal.App.3d 212, 234.

<sup>227</sup> *Sinclair Paint, supra*, 15 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> at page 875.

<sup>228</sup> Government Code section 66000, subdivision (b).

<sup>229</sup> Government Code section 66000, subdivision (d).

<sup>230</sup> Government Code section 66001, subdivision (b). The Act also requires cities to segregate fee revenues from other municipal funds and to refund them if they are not spent within five years. Any person may request an audit to determine whether any fee or charge levied by the city or county exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of the service provided (Gov. Code, §66006, subd. (d)). Under Government Code section 66014, fees charged for zoning changes, use permits, building permits, and similar processing fees are subject to the same nexus requirements as development fees. Lastly, under California Government Code

a proposed development or development project” is limited to the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service or facility.<sup>231</sup> This is in contrast to regulatory fees, which do not depend on government-conferred benefits or privileges.<sup>232</sup>

The Mitigation Fee Act defines a “development project” as “any project undertaken for the purpose of development ... includ[ing] a project involving the issuance of a permit for construction or reconstruction, but not a permit to operate.” (Gov. Code, § 66000, subd. (a).)

A fee does not become a development fee simply because it is made in connection with a development project. Approval of the development must be conditioned on the payment of the fee. The Mitigation Fee Act is limited to situations where the fee or exaction is imposed as a condition of approval of a development project.<sup>233</sup>

Because local agencies may make development of priority development projects conditional on the payment of a fee, the Commission finds that the claimants have fee authority, governed by the Mitigation Fee Act, that is sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), to pay for the hydromodification management plan and low-impact development activities. As discussed below, HMP and LID are “public facilities,” which the Mitigation Fee Act defines as “public improvements, public services, and community amenities.”<sup>234</sup>

The County of San Diego, in its January 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis, disagrees that it can impose a fee for the hydromodification plan (HMP) activities in the permit, stating that development and implementation of the HMP does not constitute a “public facility.”

The Commission disagrees. The purpose of the permit is to prevent or abate pollution in waterways and beaches in San Diego County. More specifically, the purpose of the HMP is:

[T]o manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects, where such increased rates and durations are likely to cause increased erosion of channel beds and banks, sediment pollutant generation, or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.

All these stated purposes of the HMP provide public services or improvements, or community amenities within the meaning of the Act.<sup>235</sup> Moreover, the California Supreme Court stated that the Act “concerns itself with development fees; that is, fees imposed on development projects in

---

section 66020, agencies collecting fees must provide project applicants with a statement of the amounts and purposes of all fees at the time of fee imposition or project approval.

<sup>231</sup> Government Code section 66005, subdivision (a).

<sup>232</sup> *Sinclair Paint, supra*, 15 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> at page 875.

<sup>233</sup> *California Building Industry Ass’n v. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Dist.* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup>, 130, 131.

<sup>234</sup> Government Code section 66000, subdivision (d).

<sup>235</sup> Government Code section 66000, subdivision (d).



order to finance public improvements or programs that bear a ‘reasonable relationship’ to the development at issue.”<sup>236</sup> The HMP is such a program.

Similarly, the purposes of LID are to “collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects” and to reduce stormwater runoff from priority development projects. These activities are public services or improvements that fall within the Act’s definition of public facility.

The County also argues that under the Mitigation Fee Act, the local agency must determine that there is “a reasonable relationship between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.” The County argues that there is no reasonable relationship between the costs incurred by claimants to develop and implement the HMP and a particular development project on which the fee might be imposed.

Again, the Commission disagrees. Every time a developer proposes a project that falls within one of the “priority development project” categories listed above, and the developer has “not yet begun grading or construction activities at the time any updated SUSMP or hydromodification requirement commences,” the local agency may impose a fee subject to the Mitigation Fee Act. The fee would be for the costs of developing and implementing the HMP to “manage increases in runoff discharge rates and durations from all Priority Development Projects [that] cause ... impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.” The local agency may also impose a fee on priority development projects to comply with LID, the purpose of which is to “collectively minimize directly connected impervious areas and promote infiltration at Priority Development Projects” and to reduce stormwater runoff.

Finally, the County argues that assessing fees on a private developer who submits a project for approval to recover the costs of reviewing and approving a particular project is “specifically excluded from the definition of ‘fee’ under the Act.” The definition of fee in the Act states that it “does not include ... fees for processing applications for governmental regulatory actions or approvals ....” (Gov. Code, § 66000, subd. (b).)

The Commission disagrees that an HMP fee would be for “processing applications for governmental regulatory actions or approvals.” Rather, it would be for permit approval of priority development projects, and used to implement the HMP and LID requirements. In *Barratt American Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga* (2005) 37 Cal.4th 685, 698, the California Supreme Court distinguished between regulatory fees that implement state and local building safety standards under the Health and Safety Code and developer fees subject to the Mitigation Fee Act by stating: “These regulatory fees fund a program that supervises how, not whether, a developer may build.” Thus, the Commission finds that the developer fees may be imposed for permit approval for priority development projects if the permit is conditional on payment of the fee, and the fee is used for HMP and LID compliance.

In sum, the Commission finds that the claimants have fee authority governed by the Mitigation Fee Act that is sufficient (within the meaning of Gov. Code, § 17556, subd. (d), to pay for the following parts of the permit that are related to development: the hydromodification management plan (part D.1.g) and updating the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans to include Low Impact Development requirements (part D.1.d.(7)&(8)).

---

<sup>236</sup> *Utility Cost Management v. Indian Wells Valley Water Dist.* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1185, 1191.

**3. Claimants' fee authority under Public Resources Code section 40059, or via benefit assessments, is not sufficient to pay for street sweeping, and Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), does not apply to reporting on street sweeping.**

Street sweeping is one test claim activity that is typically funded by local agency fees or assessments. Fees and assessments are both governed by Proposition 218.

The permit (in part D.3.a.5) requires a program to sweep “improved (possessing a curb and gutter) municipal roads, streets, highways, and paring facilities” at intervals depending on whether they are identified as consistently generating the highest volumes, moderate volumes, or low volumes of trash and/or debris. Reporting on street sweeping, such as curb-miles swept and tons of material collected, is also required (part J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv).

Some local agencies collect fees for street sweeping for their refuse fund, such as the City of Pasadena.<sup>237</sup> Other local agencies, e.g., the County of Fresno<sup>238</sup> and the City of La Quinta,<sup>239</sup> collect an assessment for street sweeping as a street maintenance activity. Both approaches are discussed below in light of the procedural requirements under Proposition 218.

Fees for street sweeping as refuse collection/solid waste handling: Article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution states: “A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary or other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” Local agency fees for refuse collection are authorized by Public Resources Code section 40059, which states:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each county, city, district, or other local governmental agency may determine all of the following:

(1) Aspects of solid waste handling which are of local concern, including, but not limited to, frequency of collection, means of collection and transportation, level of services, charges and fees, and nature, location, and extent of providing solid waste handling services. [Emphasis added.]

“Solid waste” is defined in Public Resources Code section 40191 as:

[A]ll putrescible and nonputrescible solid, semisolid, and liquid wastes, including garbage, trash, refuse, paper, rubbish, ashes, industrial wastes, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, dewatered, treated, or chemically fixed sewage sludge

---

<sup>237</sup> City of Pasadena, Agenda Report, Resolution Nos. 8942 and 8943, April 27, 2009, “Public Hearing: Amendment to the General Fee Schedule to Increase the Residential Refuse Collection Fees and Solid Waste Franchise Fees.” One of the findings in the resolution is: “Whereas, street sweeping is a refuse collection service involving solely the collection, removal and disposal of solid waste from public rights of way, and is, therefore, properly allocated to the Refuse Fund.”

<sup>238</sup> County of Fresno, Resolution Nos. 8942 and 8943, adopted January 15, 2008.

<sup>239</sup> City of La Quinta, Resolution No. 2009-035, adopted May 5, 2009.

which is not hazardous waste, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semisolid wastes and other discarded solid and semisolid wastes.<sup>240</sup>

“Solid waste handling” is defined in Public Resources Code section 40195 as “the collection, transportation, storage, transfer, or processing of solid wastes.” Given the nature of material swept from city streets, street sweeping falls under the rubric of ‘solid waste handling.’

Under Proposition 218, “refuse collection” is expressly exempted from the voter-approval requirement (article XIII D, § 6, subd. (c)). Although “refuse collection” has no definition in article XIII D, the plain meaning of refuse<sup>241</sup> collection is the same as solid waste handling, as the dictionary definition of “refuse” and the statutory definition of “solid waste” both refer to rubbish and trash as synonyms. Refuse is collected via solid waste handling.

To impose or increase refuse collection fees, the local agency must provide mailed written notice to each parcel owner on which the fee will be imposed, and conduct a public hearing not less than 45 days after mailing the notice. If written protests against the proposed fee are presented by a majority of the parcel owners, the local agency may not impose or increase the fee (article XIII D, § 6, subd. (a)(2)). In addition, revenues are: (1) not to exceed the funds required to provide the service, (2) shall not be used for any other purpose than to provide the property-related service, and the amount of the fee on a parcel shall not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel. And the service must be actually used by or immediately available to the property owner (article XIII D, § 6, subd. (b)).

Government Code, section 17556, subdivision (d), does not apply to street sweeping because the fee is contingent on the outcome of a written protest by a majority of the parcel owners. The plain language of subdivision (d) of this section prohibits the Commission from finding that the permit imposes “costs mandated by the state” if “The local agency ... has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service.” [Emphasis added.] Under Proposition 218, the local agency has no authority to impose the fee if it is protested by a majority of parcel owners.

Additionally, it is possible that a majority of land owners in the local agency may never allow the proposed fee, but the local agency would still be required to comply with the state mandate. This would violate the purpose of article XIII B, section 6, which is to “to preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are ‘ill equipped’ to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose.”<sup>242</sup>

Thus, the Commission finds that fee authority under Public Resources Code section 40059 is not sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service in permit parts D.3.a.5 (street sweeping). Therefore, the Commission finds that street sweeping imposes costs mandated by the state and is reimbursable.

---

<sup>240</sup> This definition also excludes hazardous waste, radioactive waste and medical waste, as defined.

<sup>241</sup> “Refuse” is defined as “ Items or material discarded or rejected as useless or worthless; trash or rubbish.” <<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/refuse>> as of November 23, 2009.

<sup>242</sup> *County of San Diego, supra*, 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

Any proposed fees that are not blocked by a majority of parcel owners for street sweeping must be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines.

Fees for street sweeping reports: Proposition 218 does not contain an express exemption on voter approval for reporting on street sweeping, only for “refuse collection.” Moreover, Proposition 218 (art. XIII D, § 6, subd. (b)(4)) states: “No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question.” The permit does not require the street sweeping reports be available to property owners, only that the reports be submitted to the Regional Board. For these reasons, the Commission finds that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), does not apply to reporting on street sweeping, so that part J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv of the permit imposes costs mandated by the state and is reimbursable.

Assessments for street operation and maintenance: As mentioned above, some local agencies collect an assessment for street sweeping, e.g., the County of Fresno<sup>243</sup> and the City of La Quinta.<sup>244</sup> Assessments are defined as “any levy or charge upon real property by an agency for a special benefit conferred upon the real property. ‘Assessment’ includes, but is not limited to, ‘special assessment,’ ‘benefit assessment,’ ‘maintenance assessment’ and ‘special assessment tax.’” (article XIII D, § 2, subd. (b).) The terms “maintenance and operation” of “streets” and “drainage systems,” although used in article XIII D, are not defined in it. The plain meaning of maintenance of streets and drainage systems, however, would include street sweeping because “maintenance” means “the work of keeping something in proper condition; upkeep.”<sup>245</sup> Clean streets are used not only for transportation, but for conveying storm water to storm drains.

The Supreme Court defined special assessments as follows:

A special assessment is a “compulsory charge placed by the state upon real property within a pre-determined district, made under express legislative authority for defraying in whole or in part the expense of a permanent public improvement therein....” [Citation.] [Citation.] In this regard, a special assessment is ‘levied against real property particularly and directly benefited by a local improvement in order to pay the cost of that improvement.’ [Citation.] ‘The rationale of special assessment[s] is that the assessed property has received a special benefit over and above that received by the general public. The general public should not be required to pay for special benefits for the few, and the few specially benefited should not be subsidized by the general public.’<sup>246</sup>

The Supreme Court summarized the constitutional procedures for creating an assessment district.

Under Proposition 218's procedures, local agencies must give the record owners of all assessed parcels written notice of the proposed assessment, a voting ballot, and a statement disclosing that a majority protest will prevent the assessment's

---

<sup>243</sup> County of Fresno, Resolution Nos. 8942 and 8943, adopted January 15, 2008.

<sup>244</sup> City of La Quinta, Resolution No. 2009-035, adopted May 5, 2009.

<sup>245</sup> <<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/maintenance>> as of December 7, 2009.

<sup>246</sup> *Silicon Valley Taxpayers Ass’n. v. Santa Clara Open Space Authority* (2008) 44 Cal.4th 431, 442.

passage. (Art. XIII D, § 4, subds. (c), (d).) The proposed assessment must be “supported by a detailed engineer's report.” (Art. XIII D, § 4, subd. (b).) At a noticed public hearing, the agencies must consider all protests, and they “shall not impose an assessment if there is a majority protest.” (Art. XIII D, § 4, subd. (e).) Voting must be weighted “according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property.” (*Ibid.*)<sup>247</sup>

Proposition 218 dictated that as of July 1, 1997, existing assessments were to comply with its procedural requirements, but an exception was created for “any assessment imposed exclusively to finance the capital costs or maintenance and operation expenses for sidewalks, streets, sewers, water, flood control, drainage systems or vector control.” (art. XIII D, § 5, subd. (a), emphasis added.) This means that the procedural requirements of Proposition 218 apply only to increases in assessments for street sweeping that were imposed after Proposition 218 was enacted.<sup>248</sup>

Absent any evidence in the record that assessments imposed before July 1, 1997 for street sweeping are sufficient to pay for the street sweeping specified in part D.3.a. of the permit, the Commission cannot find that assessments imposed before that date would pay for the costs mandated by the state for street sweeping within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d).

Should a local agency determine that its existing assessments are not sufficient to pay for the mandated street sweeping, it can raise assessments by following the article XIII D (Proposition 218) procedures detailed above. Those procedures, however, include an election and a protest, both of which were found above to extinguish local fee authority sufficient to pay for the mandate and to block the application of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d).

Thus, to the extent that the claimants impose or increase assessments to pay for the street sweeping, they would be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines.

**4. Claimants’ fee or assessment authority under Health and Safety Code section 5471 is not sufficient to pay for conveyance-system cleaning, and Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), does not apply to reporting on conveyance-system cleaning**

Conveyance-system cleaning for operation and maintenance of the MS4 and MS4 facilities (catch basins, storm drain inlets, open channels, etc.) is required in the permit (part D.3.a.(3)). Specifically, claimants are required to clean in a timely manner “Any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of design capacity.... Any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning shall be cleaned of any accumulated trash and debris immediately. Open channels shall be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner.” Claimants are also required to report on the number of catch basins and inlets inspected and cleaned (J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii).

---

<sup>247</sup> *Silicon Valley Taxpayers Ass’n v. Santa Clara Open Space Authority*, *supra*, 44 Cal.4th 431, 438.

<sup>248</sup> See also *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Ass’n. v. City of Riverside* (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th, 679, holding that a preexisting streetlighting assessment is ‘exempt under Proposition 218.’

Local agencies have fee authority under Health and Safety Code section 5471 to charge fees for storm drainage maintenance and operation as follows:

[A]ny entity<sup>249</sup> shall have power, by an ordinance approved by a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislative body thereof, to prescribe, revise and collect, fees, tolls, rates, rentals, or other charges for services and facilities furnished by it, either within or without its territorial limits, in connection with its water, sanitation, storm drainage, or sewerage system. ... Revenues derived under the provisions in this section, shall be used only for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of water systems and sanitation, storm drainage, or sewerage facilities .... [Emphasis added.]

This plain meaning of this statutory fee for storm drain operation and maintenance would include conveyance-system cleaning as required in the permit (part D.3.a.(3)(iii)), which the permit specifies as cleaning “catch basins or storm drain inlets.” This cleaning is within the operation and maintenance of the storm drains.

The statutory fee, adopted in 1953, is now subject to the procedural requirements of Proposition 218. As it states in subdivision (d) of Health and Safety Code section 5471:

If the procedures set forth in this section as it read at the time a standby charge was established were followed, the entity may, by ordinance adopted by a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislative body thereof, continue the charge pursuant to this section in successive years at the same rate. If new, increased, or extended assessments are proposed, the entity shall comply with the notice, protest, and hearing procedures in Section 53753 of the Government Code [the codification of the Proposition 218 procedural requirements].

Proposition 218 does not exempt from voting requirements fees for storm drain maintenance like it does for “water, sewer, and refuse collection” in section 6 (c) of article XIII D. In fact, in *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Ass’n. v. City of Salinas* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1351, the court invalidated a local storm drain fee and held that the exemption from an election for sewer fees does not include storm drainage fees. As to new or increased assessments imposed for storm drainage operation and maintenance, they would be subject to the same election requirement of Proposition 218 (art. XIII D, § 4, subd. (e)) as for other assessments.

Therefore, the Commission finds that local agencies do not have sufficient authority under section 5471 of the Health and Safety Code to impose fees or assessments (under Gov. Code § 17556, subd. (d)) for conveyance system cleaning as required by part D.3.a.(3)(iii) of the permit or reporting as required by part J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii of the permit.

Fees or assessments for conveyance-system reports: The Commission also finds that local agencies do not have fee or assessment authority for reporting on conveyance-system (in part J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii) on the number of catch basins and inlets inspected and cleaned. Fees or

---

<sup>249</sup> Entity is defined to include “counties, cities and counties, cities, sanitary districts, county sanitation districts, sewer maintenance districts, and other public corporations and districts authorized to acquire, construct, maintain and operate sanitary sewers and sewerage systems.” Health and Safety Code section 5470, subdivision (e).

assessments imposed for this reporting would be subject to a vote of parcel owners. Moreover, Proposition 218 (art. XIII D, § 6, subd. (b)(4)) states: “No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question.” The permit does not require the reports on conveyance- system cleaning be available to property owners, only that the reports be submitted to the Regional Board. For these reasons, the Commission finds that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), does not apply to reporting on conveyance-system cleaning, and that part J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii of the permit imposes costs mandated by the state within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), and is reimbursable.

Any revenue from existing assessments, or assessments obtained after voter approval, for conveyance system cleaning would be included in the parameters and guidelines as offsets to reimbursement.

**C. Claimants have potential fee authority and offsetting revenue if they comply with the requirements of Senate Bill 310 (Stats. 2009, ch. 577)**

Effective January 2010, Senate Bill 310 (Stats. 2009, ch. 577) was enacted to add Water Code provisions authorizing local agencies to adopt watershed improvement plans.

SB 310 is intended to establish multiple watershed-based pilot programs.<sup>250</sup> The bill creates the California Watershed Improvement Act of 2009 (commencing with Wat. Code, § 16000). Pursuant to Water Code section 16101, each county, city, or special district that is a copermitttee under a NPDES permit *may* develop either individually or jointly a watershed improvement plan. The process for developing a watershed improvement plan is to be conducted consistent with all applicable open meeting laws. Each county, city, or special district, or combination thereof, is to notify the appropriate Regional Board of its intention to develop a watershed improvement plan.

The watershed improvement plan is voluntary – it is not necessarily the same watershed activities required by the permit in the test claim.

SB 310 includes the following local agency fee authority:

16103. (a) In addition to making use of other financing mechanisms that are available to local agencies to fund watershed improvement plans and plan measures and facilities, a county, city, special district, or combination thereof may impose fees on activities that generate or contribute to runoff, stormwater, or surface runoff pollution, to pay the costs of the preparation of a watershed improvement plan, and the implementation of a watershed improvement plan if all of the following requirements are met:

- (1) The Regional Board has approved the watershed improvement plan.
- (2) The entity or entities that develop the watershed improvement plan make a finding, supported by substantial evidence, that the fee is reasonably related to the cost of mitigating the actual or anticipated past, present, or future adverse effects of the activities of the feepayer. "Activities," for the purposes of this paragraph,

---

<sup>250</sup> Senate Rules Committee, Office of Senate Floor Analyses, Analysis of Senate Bill 310 (2009-2010 Reg. Sess.) as amended August 31, 2009, page 4.

means the operations and existing structures and improvements subject to regulation under an NPDES permit for municipal separate storm sewer systems.

(3) The fee is not imposed solely as an incident of property ownership.

(b) A county, city, special district, or combination thereof may plan, design, implement, construct, operate, and maintain controls and facilities to improve water quality, including controls and facilities related to the infiltration, retention and reuse, diversion, interception, filtration, or collection of surface runoff, including urban runoff, stormwater, and other forms of runoff, the treatment of pollutants in runoff or other waters subject to water quality regulatory requirements, the return of diverted and treated waters to receiving water bodies, the enhancement of beneficial uses of waters of the state, or the beneficial use or reuse of diverted waters.

(c) The fees authorized under subdivision (a) may be imposed as user-based or regulatory fees consistent with this chapter.

However, Water Code section 16102, subdivision (d), states: “A regional board may, if it deems appropriate, utilize provisions of the approved watershed improvement plan (approved under this new act) to promote compliance with one of more of the regional board’s regulatory plans or programs.” Subdivision (e) states “Unless a regional board incorporates the provisions of the watershed improvement plan into waste discharge requirements issued to a permittee, the implementation of a watershed improvement plan by a permittee shall not be deemed to be in compliance with those waste discharge requirements.”

Therefore, the Commission finds that Water Code section 16103 may only provide offsetting revenue for this test claim to the extent that a local agency voluntarily complies with Water Code section 16101, the Regional Board approves the plan and incorporates it into the test claim permit to satisfy the requirements of the permit.

**D. The holding in *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* does not apply to the test claim activities.**

The State Board’s January 2010 comments on the draft staff analysis cite *San Diego Unified v. Commission on States Mandates*,<sup>251</sup> arguing that the permit in this test claim, like the pupil expulsion hearings, are intended to implement a federal law, and has costs that are, in context, de minimis. In *San Diego Unified School District*, the California Supreme Court held costs for hearing procedures and notice are not reimbursable for pupil expulsions that are discretionary under state law. The court found that these hearing procedures are incidental to federal due process requirements and the costs are de minimis, and thus not reimbursable.

The Commission disagrees. The permit in this case does not meet the criteria in the *San Diego Unified School District* case. Unlike the discretionary expulsions in *San Diego Unified School District*, the permit imposes state-mandated activities. And although the permit is intended to implement the federal Clean Water Act, there is no evidence or indication that its costs are de minimis. Claimants submitted declarations of costs totaling over \$10 million for fiscal year

---

<sup>251</sup> *San Diego Unified School Dist., supra*, 33 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 859.



2007-2008 alone.<sup>252</sup> Claimants further submitted documentation of 2008-2009 costs of over \$18 million. The State Board offers no evidence or argument to refute these cost declarations, so the Commission finds that permit activities (except for LID and HMP discussed above) impose costs mandated by the state that are not de minimis.

Summary: To recap fee authority under issue 2, the Commission finds that, due to the fee authority under the police power generally, and as governed by the Mitigation Fee Act, there are no “costs mandated by the state” within the meaning of Government Code sections 17514 and 17556 for the following parts of the permit that have a reasonable relationship to property development:

- Hydromodification Management Plan (part D.1.g);
- Updating the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans to include Low Impact Development requirements (parts D.1.d.(7) & D.1.d.(8));

The Commission also finds that the claimants’ fee or assessment authority is not sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), and that there are costs mandated by the state within the meaning of Government Code section 17514 for all the activities in the permit, including:

- The fee authority in Public Resources Code section 40059 for the permit activities in parts D.3.a.5 (street sweeping) and J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv (reporting on street sweeping);
- The fee authority in Health and Safety Code section 5471, for the permit activities in part D.3.a.(3)(iii) (conveyance system cleaning) or part J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii (reporting on conveyance system cleaning) of the permit.

Further, the Commission finds the following would be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines for this test claim:

- Any fees or assessments approved by the voters or property owners for any activities in the permit, including those authorized by Public Resources Code section 40059 for street sweeping or reporting on street sweeping, and those authorize by Health and Safety Code section 5471, for conveyance-system cleaning, or reporting on conveyance-system cleaning;
- Any proposed fees that are not subject to a written protest by a majority of parcel owners and that are imposed for street sweeping.
- Effective January 1, 2010, fees imposed pursuant to Water Code section 16103 only to the extent that a local agency voluntarily complies with Water Code section 16101 by developing a watershed improvement plan pursuant to Statutes 2009, chapter 577, and the Regional Board approves the plan and incorporates it into the test claim permit to satisfy the requirements of the permit.

---

<sup>252</sup> The County and city declarations are attached to the test claim.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that parts of 2007 permit issued by the California Regional Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Order No. R9-2007-001, NPDES No. CAS0108758), are a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution for the claimants to perform the following activities.

The term of the permit is from January 24, 2007 – January 23, 2012.<sup>253</sup> The permit terms and conditions are automatically continued, however, pending issuance of a new permit if all requirements of the federal NPDES regulations on the continuation of expired permits are complied with.<sup>254</sup>

### **I. Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program and Reporting (parts D & J)**

#### **Street sweeping (part D.3.a.(5)): Sweeping of Municipal Areas**

Each Copermitttee shall implement a program to sweep improved (possessing a curb and gutter) municipal roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities. The program shall include the following measures:

- (a) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least two times per month.
- (b) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept at least monthly.
- (c) Roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities identified as generating low volumes of trash and/or debris shall be swept as necessary, but no less than once per year.

#### **Street sweeping reporting (J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv): Report annually on the following:**

---

<sup>253</sup> According to attachment B of the permit: “*Effective Date*. This Order shall become effective on the date of its adoption provided the USEPA has no objection....” “(q) *Expiration*. This Order expires five years after adoption.”

<sup>254</sup> According to attachment B of the permit: “(r) *Continuation of Expired Order* [23 CCR 2235.4]. After this Order expires, the terms and conditions of this Order are automatically continued pending issuance of a new permit if all requirements of the federal NPDES regulations on the continuation of expired permits (40 CFR 122.6) are complied with.”

- x. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating the highest volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xi. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating moderate volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles of improved roads, streets, and highways identified as consistently generating low volumes of trash and/or debris, as well as the frequency of sweeping conducted for such roads, streets, and highways.
- xiii. Identification of the total distance of curb-miles swept.
- xiv. Identification of the number of municipal parking lots, the number of municipal parking lots swept, and the frequency of sweeping.
- xv. Amount of material (tons) collected from street and parking lot sweeping.

**Conveyance system cleaning (D.3.a.(3)):**

- (a) Implement a schedule of inspection and maintenance activities to verify proper operation of all municipal structural treatment controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges to or from its MS4s and related drainage structures.
- (b) Implement a schedule of maintenance activities for the MS4 and MS4 facilities (catch basins, storm drain inlets, open channels, etc). The maintenance activities shall, at a minimum, include: [¶]...[¶]
- iii. Any catch basin or storm drain inlet that has accumulated trash and debris greater than 33% of design capacity shall be cleaned in a timely manner. Any MS4 facility that is designed to be self cleaning shall be cleaned of any accumulated trash and debris immediately. Open channels shall be cleaned of observed anthropogenic litter in a timely manner.

**Conveyance system cleaning reporting (J.3.a.(3)(c)(iv)-(viii)):** Update and revise the permittees' JURMPs to contain:

- iv. Identification of the total number of catch basins and inlets, the number of catch basins and inlets inspected, the number of catch basins and inlets found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the number of catch basins and inlets cleaned.
- v. Identification of the total distance (miles) of the MS4, the distance of the MS4 inspected, the distance of the MS4 found with accumulated waste exceeding cleaning criteria, and the distance of the MS4 cleaned.
- vi. Identification of the total distance (miles) of open channels, the distance of the open channels inspected, the distance of the open channels found with anthropogenic litter, and the distance of open channels cleaned.
- vii. Amount of waste and litter (tons) removed from catch basins, inlets, the MS4, and open channels, by category.

viii. Identification of any MS4 facility found to require inspection less than annually following two years of inspection, including justification for the finding.

**Educational component (part D.5):** To implement an education program using all media as appropriate to (1) measurably increase the knowledge of the target communities regarding MS4s, impacts of urban 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 pollutant releases to MS4s and the environment. At a minimum, the education program shall meet the requirements of this section and address the following target communities:

- Municipal Departments and Personnel
- Construction Site Owners and Developers
- Industrial Owners and Operators
- Commercial Owners and Operators
- Residential Community, General Public, and School Children

a.(1) Each Copermittee shall educate each target community on the following topics where appropriate: (i) Erosion prevention, (ii) Non storm water discharge prohibitions, and (iii) BMP types: facility or activity specific, LID,-source control, and treatment control.

a.(2) Copermittee educational programs shall emphasize underserved target audiences, high-risk behaviors, and “allowable” behaviors and discharges, including various ethnic and socioeconomic groups and mobile sources.

#### b. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

##### (1) Municipal Departments and Personnel Education

(a) Municipal Development Planning – Each Copermittee shall implement an education program so that its Planning Boards and Elected Officials, if applicable, have an understanding of:

- i. Federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations applicable to Development Projects;
- ii. The connection between land use decisions and short and long-term water quality impacts (i.e., impacts from land development and urbanization);
- iii. How to integrate LID BMP requirements into the local regulatory program(s) and requirements; and
- iv. Methods of minimizing impacts to receiving water quality resulting from development, including:

[1] Storm water management plan development and review;

[2] Methods to control downstream erosion impacts;

[3] Identification of pollutants of concern;

[4] LID BMP techniques;

[5] Source control BMPs; and

[6] Selection of the most effective treatment control BMPs for the pollutants of concern.

(b) Municipal Construction Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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:

iii. Proper implementation of erosion and sediment control and other BMPs to minimize the impacts to receiving water quality resulting from construction activities.

iv. The Copermittee’s inspection, plan review, and enforcement policies and procedures to verify consistent application.

v. Current advancements in BMP technologies.

vi. SUSMP Requirements including treatment options, LID BMPs, source control, and applicable tracking mechanisms.

(c) Municipal Industrial/Commercial Activities - Each Copermittee shall train staff responsible for conducting storm water compliance inspections and enforcement of industrial and commercial facilities at least once a year [except for staff who solely inspect new development]. Training shall cover inspection and enforcement procedures, BMP implementation, and reviewing monitoring data.

(d) Municipal Other Activities – Each Copermittee shall 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.

## (2) New Development and Construction Education

As early in the planning and development process as possible and all through the permitting and construction process, each Copermittee shall implement a program to educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, community planning groups, and other responsible parties. The education program shall provide an understanding of the topics listed in Sections D.5.b.(1)(a) and D.5.b.(1)(b) above, as appropriate for the audience being educated. The education program shall also educate project applicants, developers, contractors, property owners, and other responsible parties on the importance of educating all construction workers in the field about stormwater issues and BMPs through formal or informal training.

## (3) Residential, General Public, and School Children Education

Each Copermittee shall collaboratively conduct or participate in development and implementation of a plan to educate residential, general public, and school children target communities. The plan shall evaluate use of mass media, mailers, door hangers, booths at public events, classroom education, field trips, hands-on experiences, or other educational methods.

## **II. Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (parts E.2.f & E.2.g.)**

Each Copermittee shall collaborate with other Copermittees within its WMA(s) [Watershed Management Area] as in Table 4 [of the permit] to develop and

implement an updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program for each watershed. Each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall meet the requirements of section E of this Order, reduce the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevent urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. At a minimum, each Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program shall include the elements described below: [¶]...[¶]

[Paragraphs (a) through (e) were not part of the test claim.]

f. Watershed Activities

(1) The Watershed Copermittees shall identify and implement Watershed Activities that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. Watershed Activities shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities. These activities may be implemented individually or collectively, and may be implemented at the regional, watershed, or jurisdictional level.

(a) Watershed Water Quality Activities are activities other than education that address the high priority water quality problems in the WMA. A Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented on a jurisdictional basis must be organized and implemented to target a watershed's high priority water quality problems or must exceed the baseline jurisdictional requirements of section D of this Order.

(b) Watershed Education Activities are outreach and training activities that address high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(2) A Watershed Activities List shall be submitted with each updated Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plan (WURMP) and updated annually thereafter. The Watershed Activities List shall include both Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities, along with a description of how each activity was selected, and how all of the activities on the list will collectively abate sources and reduce pollutant discharges causing the identified high priority water quality problems in the WMA.

(3) Each activity on the Watershed Activities List shall include the following information:

- (a) A description of the activity;
- (b) A time schedule for implementation of the activity, including key milestones;
- (c) An identification of the specific responsibilities of Watershed Copermittees in completing the activity;
- (d) A description of how the activity will address the identified high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed;
- (e) A description of how the activity is consistent with the collective watershed strategy;
- (f) A description of the expected benefits of implementing the activity; and

(g) A description of how implementation effectiveness will be measured.

(4) Each Watershed Copermittee shall implement identified Watershed Activities pursuant to established schedules. For each Permit year, no less than two Watershed Water Quality Activities and two Watershed Education Activities shall be in an active implementation phase. A Watershed Water Quality Activity is in an active implementation phase when significant pollutant load reductions, source abatement, or other quantifiable benefits to discharge or receiving water quality can reasonably be established in relation to the watershed's high priority water quality problem(s). Watershed Water Quality Activities that are capital projects are in active implementation for the first year of implementation only. A Watershed Education Activity is in an active implementation phase when changes in attitudes, knowledge, awareness, or behavior can reasonably be established in target audiences.

g. Watershed Copermittees shall collaborate to develop and implement the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs. Watershed Copermittee collaboration shall include frequent regularly scheduled meetings.

### **III. Regional Urban Runoff Management Program (parts F.1, F.2 & F.3)**

The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum:

Each copermittee shall collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop, implement, and update as necessary a Regional Urban Runoff Management Program that meets the requirements of section F of the permit, reduces the discharge of pollutants from the MS4 to the MEP, and prevents urban runoff discharges from the MS4 from causing or contributing to a violation of water quality standards. The Regional Urban Runoff Management Program shall, at a minimum: [¶]...[¶]

1. Develop and implement a Regional Residential Education Program. The program shall include:

a. Pollutant specific education which focuses educational efforts on bacteria, nutrients, sediment, pesticides, and trash. If a different pollutant is determined to be more critical for the education program, the pollutant can be substituted for one of these pollutants.

b. Education efforts focused on the specific residential sources of the pollutants listed in section F.1.a.

2. Develop the standardized fiscal analysis method required in section G of the permit, and,

3. Facilitate the assessment of the effectiveness of jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs.

### **IV. Program Effectiveness Assessment (parts I.1 & I.2)**

1. Jurisdictional

a. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, each Copermittee shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

(1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:

(a) Each significant jurisdictional activity/BMP or type of jurisdictional activity/BMP implemented;

(b) Implementation of each major component of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (Development Planning, Construction, Municipal, Industrial/Commercial, Residential, Illicit Discharge<sup>255</sup> Detection and Elimination, and Education); and

(c) Implementation of the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.

(2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above.

(3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6<sup>256</sup> to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

---

<sup>255</sup> Illicit discharge, as defined in Attachment C of the permit, is “any discharge to the MS4 that is not composed entirely of storm water except discharges pursuant to a NPDES permit and discharges resulting from firefighting activities [40 C.F.R. 122.26 (b)(2)].”

<sup>256</sup> Effectiveness assessment outcome levels are defined in Attachment C of the permit as follows: Effectiveness assessment outcome level 1 – Compliance with Activity-based Permit Requirements – Level 1 outcomes are those directly related to the implementation of specific activities prescribed by this Order or established pursuant to it. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 2 – Changes in Attitudes, Knowledge, and Awareness – Level 2 outcomes are measured as increases in knowledge and awareness among target audiences such as residents, business, and municipal employees. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 3 – Behavioral Changes and BMP Implementation – Level 3 outcomes measure the effectiveness of activities in affecting behavioral change and BMP implementation. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 4 – Load Reductions – Level 4 outcomes measure load reductions which quantify changes in the amounts of pollutants associated with specific sources before and after a BMP or other control measure is employed. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 5 – Changes in Urban Runoff and Discharge Quality – Level 5 outcomes are measured as changes in one or more specific constituents or stressors in discharges into or from MS4s. Effectiveness assessment outcome level 6 – Changes in Receiving Water Quality – Level 6 outcomes measure changes to receiving water quality resulting from discharges into and from MS4s, and may be expressed through a variety of means such as compliance with water quality objectives or other regulatory benchmarks, protection of biological integrity [i.e., ecosystem health], or beneficial use attainment.



(4) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.1.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.

(5) Utilize Implementation Assessment,<sup>257</sup> Water Quality Assessment,<sup>258</sup> and Integrated Assessment,<sup>259</sup> where applicable and feasible.

b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, each Copermittee shall annually review its jurisdictional activities or BMPs to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order. The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Jurisdictional activities/BMPs that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable jurisdictional activities/BMPs shall 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 contributed to by MS4 discharges, jurisdictional activities or BMPs applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

c. As part of its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each Copermittee shall report on its Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of sections I.1.a and I.1.b above.

## 2. Watershed

a. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4)<sup>260</sup> shall annually assess the effectiveness of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation. At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall:

---

<sup>257</sup> Implementation Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to determine the effectiveness of copermittee programs and activities in achieving measureable targeted outcomes, and in determining whether priority sources of water quality problems are being effectively addressed.”

<sup>258</sup> Water Quality Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment conducted to evaluate the condition of non-storm water discharges, and the water bodies which receive these discharges.”

<sup>259</sup> Integrated Assessment is defined in Attachment C of the permit as an “Assessment to be conducted to evaluate whether program implementation is properly targeted to and resulting in the protection and improvement of water quality.”

<sup>260</sup> Table 4 of the permit divides the copermittees into nine watershed management areas. For example, the San Luis Rey River watershed management area lists the city of Oceanside, Vista and the County of San Diego as the responsible watershed copermittees. Table 4 also lists where the hydrologic units are and major receiving water bodies.

- (1) Specifically assess the effectiveness of each of the following:
    - (a) Each Watershed Water Quality Activity implemented;
    - (b) Each Watershed Education Activity implemented; and
    - (c) Implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole.
  - 2) Identify and utilize measurable targeted outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment methods for each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above.
  - 3) Utilize outcome levels 1-6 to assess the effectiveness of each of the items listed in sections I.2.a.(1)(a) and I.2.a.(1)(b) above, where applicable and feasible.
  - 4) Utilize outcome levels 1-4 to assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, where applicable and feasible.
  - 5) Utilize outcome levels 5 and 6 to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of implementation of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program as a whole, focusing on the high priority water quality problem(s) of the watershed. These assessments shall attempt to exhibit the impact of Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program implementation on the high priority water quality problem(s) within the watershed.
  - 6) Utilize monitoring data and analysis from the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program to assess the effectiveness each of the items listed in section I.2.a.(1) above, where applicable and feasible.
  - 7) Utilize Implementation Assessment, Water Quality Assessment, and Integrated Assessment, where applicable and feasible.
- b. Based on the results of the effectiveness assessment, the watershed Copermittees shall annually review their Watershed Water Quality Activities, Watershed Education Activities, and other aspects of the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program to identify modifications and improvements needed to maximize Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness, as necessary to achieve compliance with section A of this Order.<sup>261</sup> The Copermittees shall develop and implement a plan and schedule to address the identified modifications and improvements. Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities that are ineffective or less effective than other comparable Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities shall be replaced or improved upon by implementation of more effective Watershed Water Quality Activities/Watershed Education Activities. Where monitoring data exhibits persistent water quality problems that are caused or contributed to by MS4 discharges, Watershed Water Quality Activities and Watershed Education Activities applicable to the water quality problems shall be modified and improved to correct the water quality problems.

---

<sup>261</sup> Section A is “Prohibitions and Receiving Water Limitations.”

c. As part of its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program Annual Reports, each watershed group of Copermittees (as identified in Table 4) shall report on its Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program effectiveness assessment as implemented under each of the requirements of section I.2.a and I.2.b above.

**Long Term Effectiveness Assessment (I.5):**

a. Collaborate with the other Copermittees to develop a Longterm Effectiveness Assessment (LTEA), which shall build on the results of the Copermittees' August 2005 Baseline LTEA. The LTEA shall be submitted by the Principal Permittee to the Regional Board no later than 210 days in advance of the expiration of this Order.

b. The LTEA shall be designed to address each of the objectives listed in section I.3.a.(6)<sup>262</sup> of this Order, and to serve as a basis for the Copermittees' Report of Waste Discharge for the next permit cycle.

c. The LTEA shall address outcome levels 1-6, and shall specifically include an evaluation of program implementation to changes in water quality (outcome levels 5 and 6).

d. The LTEA shall assess the effectiveness of the Receiving Waters Monitoring Program in meeting its objectives and its ability to answer the five core management questions. This shall include assessment of the frequency of monitoring conducted through the use of power analysis and other pertinent statistical methods. The power analysis shall identify the frequency and intensity of sampling needed to identify a 10% reduction in the concentration of constituents causing the high priority water quality problems within each watershed over the next permit term with 80% confidence.

e. The LTEA shall address the jurisdictional, watershed, and regional programs, with an emphasis on watershed assessment.

1. Collaborate with all other Copermittees regulated under the permit to address common issues, promote consistency among Jurisdictional Urban Runoff

---

<sup>262</sup> Part I.3.a.(6) of the permit states: At a minimum, the annual effectiveness assessment shall: (6) Include evaluation of whether the Copermittees' jurisdictional, watershed, and regional effectiveness assessments are meeting the following objectives: (a) Assessment of watershed health and identification of water quality issues and concerns. (b) Evaluation of the degree to which existing source management priorities are properly targeted to, and effective in addressing, water quality issues and concerns. (c) Evaluation of the need to address additional pollutant sources not already included in Copermittee programs. (d) Assessment of progress in implementing Copermittee programs and activities. (e) Assessment of the effectiveness of Copermittee activities in addressing priority constituents and sources. (f) Assessment of changes in discharge and receiving water quality. (g) Assessment of the relationship of program implementation to changes in pollutant loading, discharge quality, and receiving water quality. (h) Identification of changes necessary to improve Copermittee programs, activities, and effectiveness assessment methods and strategies.

Management Programs and Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs, and to plan and coordinate activities required under this Order.

**V. All Copermittee Collaboration (part L)**

(a) Collaborate with all other Copermittees to address common issues, promote consistency among Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Programs and Watershed Urban Runoff Management Programs, and to plan and coordinate activities required under the permit.

Jointly execute and submit to the Regional Board no later than 180 days after adoption of the permit, a Memorandum of Understanding, Joint Powers Authority, or other instrument of formal agreement that at a minimum: [¶]...[¶]

3. Establishes a management structure to promote consistency and develop and implement regional activities;
4. Establishes standards for conducting meetings, decisions-making, and cost-sharing.
5. Provides guidelines for committee and workgroup structure and responsibilities;
6. Lays out a process for addressing Copermittee non-compliance with the formal agreement.

The Commission finds that due to the fee authority under the police power (Cal. Const. art. XI, § 7) and as governed by the Mitigation Fee Act, there are no “costs mandated by the state” within the meaning of Government Code sections 17514 and 17556 for the following parts of the permit that have a reasonable relationship to property development:

- Hydromodification Management Plan (part D.1.g);
- Updating the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans to include Low Impact Development requirements (parts D.1.d.(7) & D.1.d.(8));

The Commission also finds that the claimants’ fee or assessment authority is not sufficient within the meaning of Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), and that there are costs mandated by the state within the meaning of Government Code section 17514 for all the activities in the permit, including:

- The fee authority in Public Resources Code section 40059 for the permit activities in parts D.3.a.5 (street sweeping) and J.3.a.(3)(c)x-xv (reporting on street sweeping);
- The fee authority in Health and Safety Code section 5471, for the permit activities in part D.3.a.(3)(iii) (conveyance system cleaning) or part J.3.a.(3)(c)iv-viii (reporting on conveyance system cleaning) of the permit.

Further, the Commission finds the following would be identified as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines for this test claim:

- Any fees or assessments approved by the voters or property owners for any activities in the permit, including those authorized by Public Resources Code section 40059 for street sweeping or reporting on street sweeping, and those authorize by Health and Safety Code

section 5471, for conveyance-system cleaning, or reporting on conveyance-system cleaning;

- Any proposed fees that are not subject to a written protest by a majority of parcel owners and that are imposed for street sweeping.
- Fees imposed pursuant to Water Code section 16103 only to the extent that a local agency voluntarily complies with Water Code section 16101, the Regional Board approves the plan and incorporates it into the test claim permit to satisfy the requirements of the permit.