240435

PHYSICAL DOCUMENT

LPS-n240435-v1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT ON EPA AND DOJ

Author: Woolner, Rhodora

Document Type: PLEADING

LSA(s):

Co-Counsel:

Counsel LSA(s):

Distribution List: Woolner, Rhodora (ENRD); Lattin, Sue (ENRD); Rose, Robert (ENRD); Berman, Lisa (ENRD); Norwood, Richard (ENRD); Hebb, Kevin M. (ENRD)

Fileroom: LPS - Main Justice

DJ#:

Case Name:

Court: CA C.D. Cal.; 9th Cir.

Notes: SCANNED/UNASSIGNED: CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH V. GEORGE ADAMIAN; AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL SERVICES; SOUTH STREET PROPERTY, LLC

Double-Sided:

Received Date: 3/20/2015

Urgent:

Oversize:

Bound Document:

Jack Silver, Esq. SB# 160575
Email: lhm28843@sbcglobal.net
LAW OFFICE OF JACK SILVER
Post Office Box 5469
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-5469
Tel. 707-528-8175
Fax. 707-528-8675

David J. Weinsoff, Esq. SB# 141372
Email: david@weinsofflaw.com
Law Office of David J. Weinsoff
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA 94930
Tel. (415) 460-9760
Fax. (415) 460-9762

Attorneys for Plaintiff
CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH

15 MAR 20 P4:44
DEPT. OF JUSTICE - ENRD
ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH, an IRC Section 501(c)(3) non-profit, public benefit corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEORGE ADAMIAN;AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL SERVICES; SOUTH STREET PROPERTY, LLC,

Defendants.

_____/

CASE NO: 2:15-cv-01913

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT ON UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ED_001083_00000496-00002

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Sonoma, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 100 E Street, Suite 318, Santa Rosa, CA 95404. On the date set forth below, I served the following described document(s):

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DECLARATORY RELIEF, CIVIL PENALTIES, RESTITUTION AND REMEDIATION (Environmental - Federal Pollution Control Act - 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251-1387)

on the following parties by placing a true copy in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

Citizen Suit Coordinator
U.S. Dept. of Justice
Environmental & Natural Resource Division
Law and Policy Section
P.O. Box 7415
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044-7415

Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

[X] (BY MAIL) I placed each such envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid for first-class mail, for collection and mailing at Santa Rosa, California, following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the practices of Law Office of Jack Silver for processing of correspondence; said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for processing.

[ ] (BY FACSIMILE) I caused the above referenced document(s) to be transmitted by Facsimile machine (FAX) 707-528-8675 to the number indicated after the address(es) noted above.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on March 17, 2015 at Santa Rosa, California.

Kayla Brown

ED_001083_00000496-00003

Jack Silver, Esq. SB #160575
E-mail:lhm28843@sbcglobal.net
Law Office of Jack Silver
Post Office Box 5469
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-5469
Tel.(707) 528-8175
Fax.(707) 528-8675

David J. Weinsoff, Esq. SB # 141372
Email: david@weinsofflaw.com
Law Office of David J. Weinsoff
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA 94930
Tel. (415) 460-9760
Fax. (415) 460-9762

Attorneys for Plaintiff
CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH, an IRC Section 501(c)(3), non-profit, public benefit corporation, Plaintiff, v. GEORGE ADAMIAN; AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL SERVICES; SOUTH STREET PROPERTY, LLC, Defendants. _____/	Case No.: 02:15-cv-01913 **COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES** (Environmental - Federal Pollution Control Act - 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 to 1387)

CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH ("RIVER WATCH"), an Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) non-profit, public benefit corporation, by and through its counsel, hereby alleges:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a civil suit brought under the citizen suit enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251, *et seq.* ("Clean Water Act" or "Act"). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action pursuant to Section 505(a)(1)(A) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a)(1)(A), and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (an action arising under the laws of the United States). The relief

requested is authorized pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02 (power to issue declaratory relief in case of actual controversy and further necessary relief based on such a declaration); 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(b), 1365(a) (injunctive relief); and 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(d), 1365(a) (civil penalties).

2. On or about December 29, 2014, RIVER WATCH provided notice of Defendants' violations of the Act, and of its intention to file suit against Defendants, to the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"); the Administrator of EPA Region IX; the Executive Director of the State Water Resources Control Board ("State Board"); the Executive Officer of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region ("Regional Board"); and to Defendants, as required by the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b)(1)(A). A true and correct copy of RIVER WATCH's notice letter is attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.

3. More than sixty days have passed since notice was served on Defendants and the state and federal agencies. RIVER WATCH received no communication from Defendants during the 60-Day Notice Period or at any time prior to the filing of this Complaint, other than an acknowledgment through the return of the certified mail Return Receipt that Defendants received the 60-Day Notice. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that neither the EPA nor the State of California has commenced or is diligently prosecuting a court action to redress the violations alleged in this Complaint. This action's claim for civil penalties is not barred by any prior administrative penalty under Section 309(g) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g).

4. Venue is proper in the Central District of California pursuant to Section 505(c)(1) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(c)(1), because the source of the violations is located within this judicial district.

II. INTRODUCTION

5. This complaint seeks relief for Defendants' discharges of polluted non-storm water and polluted storm water from Defendant AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL SERVICES, a recycling facility located at 5626 Cherry Avenue in Long Beach, California ("Facility")

in violation of the Act and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Permit No. CAS000001, State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 91-13DWQ, as amended by Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ and Water Quality Order No. 97-03DWQ ("General Permit"). Defendants' violations of the discharge prohibitions, receiving water limitations, and treatment technology requirements of the General Permit and the Act are ongoing and continuous.

6. The failure on the part of persons and facilities such as Defendants and the Facility to comply with storm water requirements is recognized as a significant cause of water pollution in the Pacific Ocean and other area receiving waters. The general consensus among regulatory agencies and water quality specialists is that storm pollution amounts to more than half of the total pollution entering the aquatic environment each year. In this area of the City of Long Beach, storm water flows completely untreated through storm drain systems (principally the Long Beach Separate Storm Sewer System or "MS4") or other channels directly to the waters of the United States.

III. PARTIES

7. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH is, and at all times relevant to this Complaint was, an Internal Revenue Code § 501(c)(3) non-profit, public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, with headquarters located in Sebastopol, California and offices in Los Angeles, California. RIVER WATCH's southern California mailing address is 7401 Crenshaw Boulevard, #422, Los Angeles, California 90043. The specific purpose of RIVER WATCH is to protect, enhance and help restore surface and ground waters of California including rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, aquifers and associated environs, biota, flora and fauna; and to educate the public concerns environmental issues associated with these environs. Members of RIVER WATCH reside in southern California where the Facility is located. Said members have interests in the waters and watersheds which are or may be adversely affected by Defendants' discharges and violations as alleged herein. Said members use the affected waters and watershed areas for recreation, sports, fishing,

swimming, hiking, photography, nature walks and/or the like. Furthermore, the relief sought will redress the injury in fact, likelihood of future injury and interference with the interests of said members. Continuing commission by Defendants of the acts and omissions alleged herein will irreparably harm RIVER WATCH and its members, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

8. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that Defendant American Industrial Services is now, and at all times relevant to this Complaint was, an entity doing business as a privately owned and operated scrap recycling operation under Standard Industrial Code numbers 4212, 4953 and/or 5093, located and operating at 5626 Cherry Avenue in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California, and referred to in this Complaint as the Facility.

9. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that Defendant South Street Property, LLC is now, and at all times relevant to this Complaint was, a limited liability corporation located in Los Angeles County, California, registered to do business in the State of California, and having an ownership interested in the Facility.

10. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that Defendant George Adamian is now, and at all times relevant to this Complaint was, an individual residing in Los Angeles County, California, the owner and operator of the Facility, and the owner of Defendant South Street Property, LLC.

IV. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

11. Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of any pollutant into waters of the United States, unless such discharge is in compliance with various enumerated sections of the Act. Among other things, Section 301(a) prohibits discharges not authorized by, or in violation of, the terms of a NPDES permit issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342.

12. Section 402(p) of the Act establishes a framework for regulating municipal and industrial storm water discharges under the NPDES program. 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p). States

with approved NPDES permit programs are authorized by Section 402(p) to regulate industrial storm water discharges through individual permits issued to dischargers or through the issuance of a single, statewide general permit applicable to all industrial storm water dischargers. 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p).

13. Pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342, the Administrator of the U.S. EPA has authorized California's State Water Resources Control Board to issue NPDES permits including general NPDES permits in California.

14. The State Water Resources Control Board elected to issue a statewide general permit for industrial storm water discharges. The State Water Resources Control Board issued the General Permit on or about November 19, 1991, modified the General Permit on or about September 17, 1992, and reissued the General Permit on or about April 17, 1997, pursuant to Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p).

15. In order to discharge storm water lawfully in California, industrial dischargers must comply with the terms of the General Permit or have obtained and complied with an individual NPDES permit. 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

16. The General Permit contains several prohibitions. Effluent Limitation B(3) of the General Permit requires dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants in their storm water discharges through implementation of the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable ("BAT") for toxic and non-conventional pollutants, and the Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") for conventional pollutants. BAT and BCT include both non-structural and structural measures. General Permit, Section A(8). Conventional pollutants are total suspended solids, oil and grease, pH, biochemical oxygen demand, and fecal coliform. 40 C.F.R. § 401.16. All other pollutants are either toxic or nonconventional. *Id.*; 40 C.F.R. § 401.15.

17. Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the General Permit requires that "materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) that discharge either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States are prohibited. Prohibited non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit." Special Condition

D(1)(a) of the General Permit authorizes the following types of non-storm water discharges: "fire hydrant flushing; potable water sources, including potable water related to the operation, maintenance, or testing of potable water systems; drinking fountain water; atmospheric condensates including refrigeration, air conditioning, and compressor condensate; irrigation drainage; landscape watering; springs; ground water; foundation or footing drainage; and sea water infiltration where the sea waters are discharged back into the sea water source." Such authorized non-storm water discharges must also meet a number of conditions including, among others, that such discharges "do not contain significant quantities of pollutants" and that "the non-storm water discharges are reported and described annually as part of the annual report." Special Conditions D(1)(b)(iv), (vi). Water discharged from the Facility is not an authorized non-storm water discharge.

18. Discharge Prohibition A(2) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or threaten to cause pollution, contamination, or nuisance.

19. Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges to any surface water or groundwater that adversely impact human health or the environment.

20. Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality standards contained in a Statewide Water Quality Control Plan or the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan.

21. The General Permit does not provide for any mixing zones by dischargers. The General Permit does not provide for any dilution credits to be applied by dischargers. As a result, compliance with Receiving Water Limitation C(2) is measured at a discharger's storm water monitoring location.

22. The General Permit requires that facility operators "investigate the facility to identify all non-storm water discharges and their sources. As part of this investigation,

all drains (inlets and outlets) shall be evaluated to identify whether they connect to the storm drain system. All non-storm water discharges shall be described. This shall include the source, quantity, frequency, and characteristics of the non-storm water discharges and associated drainage area." Section A(6)(a)(v). The General Permit authorizes certain non-storm water discharges providing that the non-storm water discharges are in compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements; that the non-storm water discharges are in compliance with local agency ordinances and/or requirements; that best management practices ("BMPs") are included in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") to (1) prevent or reduce the contact of non-storm water discharges with significant materials or equipment and (2) minimize, to the extent practicable, the flow or volume of non-storm water discharges; that the non-storm water discharges do not contain significant quantities of pollutants; and that the monitoring program includes quarterly visual observations of each non-storm water discharge and its sources to ensure that BMPs are being implemented and are effective. Special Conditions D(1)(b)(i)-(v). Section B(3) of the General Permit requires dischargers to conduct visual observations of all drainage areas for the presence of non-storm water discharges, to observe the non-storm water discharges, and maintain records of such observations.

23. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board has established beneficial uses of the Santa Ana Region's water in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana Region, generally referred to as the Basin Plan, that are being impaired by Defendants' activities as detailed and alleged in this Complaint. See http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/chapter3.pdf.

24. Section 505(a)(1) and Section 505(f) of the Clean Water Act provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements. 33 U.S.C. §§1365(a)(1) and (f), § 1362(5). An action for injunctive relief under the Act is authorized by 33 U.S.C.

§ 1365(a). Violators of the Act are also subject to an assessment of civil penalties of up to $37,500 per day per day pursuant to Sections 309(d) and 505 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(d), 1365. *See also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 19.1 -19.4.

V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

25. Defendants George Adamian and South Coast Property, LLC own and operate the Facility. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that hazardous and non-hazardous construction and debris waste are disposed of at the Facility, that the Facility's operations fall within SIC Codes 5093, 1429, and 4953, and that the operations at the Facility are conducted in areas of the Facility that are both outdoors and indoors.

26. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that unpermitted non-storm water from the Facility flows off the site into the Long Beach MS4 which is ultimately discharged to the Pacific Ocean, a water of the United States.

27. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that the industrial activities at the Facility include the importing, sorting, processing, and storage of recyclable materials. Materials handled at the Facility include, but are not limited to, hazardous and non-hazardous construction and debris waste.

28. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that storm water flows easily over the surface of the Facility, collecting zinc, copper, aluminum, lead, iron, and other pollutants as it flows off the Facility site and into the Long Beach MS4.

29. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that BAT/BCT for any storm water discharges from the Facility would be the elimination of those discharges.

30. On information and belief, RIVER WATCH alleges that since at least April 15, 2014, Defendants have failed to implement BAT and BCT at the Facility for their discharges from the Facility. Section B(3) of the General Permit requires that Defendants implement BAT for toxic and non-conventional pollutants and BCT for conventional pollutants by no later than October 1, 1992. Recycling operations began at the Facility in 2014. As of the date of this Complaint, Defendants have failed to implement BAT and BCT.

31. Information available to RIVER WATCH indicates that Defendants have not fulfilled the requirements set forth in the General Permit for discharges from the Facility due to the continued discharge of non-storm water and contaminated storm water. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that all of the violations alleged in this Complaint are ongoing and continuing.

VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Discharges of Non-storm Water in Violation of Permit Conditions and the Act (Violations of 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311, 1342)

32. RIVER WATCH re-alleges and incorporates all of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

33. Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the General Permit prohibits non-storm water discharges that discharge either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. It requires either the elimination of those non-storm water discharges or requires that a discharger obtain a separate NPDES permit for the discharges.

34. Discharges from the Facility are not a type of authorized non-storm water discharge authorized by Special Condition D(1) of the General Permit.

35. RIVER WATCH is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that since at least April 15, 2014, when Defendants were assigned Waste Dischargers Identification ("WDID") number 4 19I024802 by the State Water Resources Control Board, Defendants have been discharging non-storm water from the Facility in violation of the Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the General Permit. Said non-storm water discharges enter the Long beach MS4 and are discharged to the Pacific Ocean.

36. Every day since at least April 15, 2014, that Defendants have discharged and continue to discharge non-storm water from the Facility in violation of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). These violations are ongoing and continuous.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Implement the Best Available and Best Conventional Treatment Technologies

(Violations of 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311, 1342)

37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

38. Effluent Limitation B(3) of the General Permit require dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants in their storm water discharges through implementation of BAT for toxic and non-conventional pollutants and BCT for conventional pollutants. Defendants have failed in their SWPPP to implement BAT and BCT at the Facility for the storm water discharges from the Facility to the Long Beach MS4.

39. Each day since April 15, 2014, that Defendants have failed to develop and implement BAT and BCT in violation of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

40. Defendants have been in violation of the BAT/BCT and the General Permit's SWPPP requirements every day since April 15, 2014. Defendants continue to be in violation of the BAT/BCT and the General Permit's SWPPP requirements each day that they fails to develop and fully implement BAT/BCT for discharges from the Facility.

VII. RELIEF REQUESTED

Wherefore, RIVER WATCH respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief:

a. Declare Defendants to have violated and to be in violation of the Act as alleged herein;

b. Enjoin Defendants from discharging non-storm water and polluted storm water from the Facility unless authorized by the General Permit, including but not limited to ceasing deliveries to the Facility and removing all pollution sources pending compliance with the General Permit;

c. Enjoin Defendants from further violating the substantive and procedural requirements of the Permit;

d. Order Defendants to provide RIVER WATCH with reports documenting the elimination of non-storm water discharges from the Facility;

e. Order Defendants to pay civil penalties of $37,500 per day for each violation of the Act pursuant to Sections 309(d) and 505(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(d), 1365(a) and 40 C.F.R. §§ 19.1 -19.4;

f. Order Defendants to take appropriate actions to restore the quality of waters impaired or adversely affected by their activities;

g. Award RIVER WATCH's costs (including reasonable investigative, attorney, witness, compliance oversight, and consultant fees) as authorized by the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d); and,

h. Award any such other and further relief as this Court may deem appropriate.

DATED: March 16, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICE OF JACK SILVER

JACK SILVER

LAW OFFICE OF DAVID J. WEINSOFF

DAVID J. WEINSOFF

Attorneys for Plaintiff
CALIFORNIA RIVER WATCH

EXHIBIT A

LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID J. WEINSOFF
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, California 94930
tel. 415•460•9760/fax. 415•460•9762
david@weinsofflaw.com

Via Certified Mailing – Return Receipt

December 29, 2014

Mr. George Adamian, Owner
American Industrial Services
5626 Cherry Avenue
Long Beach, California 90805

Mr. George Adamian, Registered Agent
South Street Property, LLC
10524 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Re: Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act)

Dear Owner, Operator and Site Manager:

NOTICE

This Notice is provided on behalf of California River Watch ("River Watch") in regard to violations of the Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that River Watch believes are occurring at American Industrial Services ("AIS") located at 5626 Cherry Avenue, in Long Beach, California. Notice is being sent to you as the responsible owner, operator, and manager of the AIS facility and real property. This Notice addresses the violations of the CWA, including violation of the terms of the General California Industrial Storm Water Permit, and the unlawful discharge of pollutants from the AIS facility into the Long Beach Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4"), which discharges to the Pacific Ocean.

CWA § 505(b) requires a citizen to give notice of the intent to file suit sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Act. Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the state in which the violations occur.

As required by the CWA, this Notice provides notice of the violations that have occurred, and continue to occur at the AIS facility. Consequently, George Adamian, American Industrial Services, and South Street Property, LLC (collectively, the "Discharger") is placed on formal notice by River Watch that after the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice, River Watch will be entitled to bring suit in the United States District Court against the Discharger for continuing violations of an effluent standard or limitation, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit condition or requirement, or Federal or State Order issued under the CWA (in particular, but not limited to, CWA § 301(a), § 402(p), and § 505(a)(1), as well as the failure to comply with requirements set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB") Water Quality Control Plan or "Basin Plan."

The CWA requires that any Notice regarding an alleged violation of an effluent standard or limitation or of an order with respect thereto shall include sufficient information to permit the recipient to identify the following:

1. The specific standard, limitation, or order alleged to have been violated.

To comply with this requirement, River Watch notices the Discharger of ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of CWA § 402(p) and violations of NPDES Permit No. CAS000001, State Water Resources Control Board, Order No. 92-12-DWQ as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ (the "General Permit") relating to the recycling services at the AIS facility.

The Discharger filed a Notice of Intent ("NOI") agreeing to comply with the terms and conditions of the General Permit, and has been assigned Waste Dischargers Identification ("WDID") number 4 191024802. River Watch contends that in the operation of the AIS facility, the Discharger has failed and is failing to comply with the terms and conditions of the General Permit requiring the preparation, implementation, review and update of an adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP"), the elimination of all non-authorized storm water discharges, and the development and implementation of an adequate monitoring and reporting program as follows:

a. <u>Failure to Submit Required Annual Report</u>

Under Section B.14 of the General Permit, "[a]ll facility operators shall submit an Annual Report by July 1 of each year to the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board responsible for the area in which the facility is located and to the local agency (if requested)." On November 18, 2014, the RWQCB issued the Discharger a "Notice of Non-Compliance: Failure to Submit Annual Reports as Required by the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities, Order No. 97-03-

DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000001, WDID No. 4 191024802." The RWQCB Notice, incorporated herein by reference, asserts that the RWQCB's "records indicate that [AIS has] not submitted [its] 2013-2014 annual report that was due on July 1, 2014." River Watch's independent review of the California State Water Resources Control Board's "SMARTS" database did not reveal this Annual Report prior to the filing of this Notice.

b. Failure to Comply with SWPPP Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation Requirements

Under Section A.9 of the General Permit governing implementation of effective SWPPPs, "[t]he facility operator shall conduct one comprehensive site compliance evaluation (evaluation) in each reporting period (July 1 – June 30)." The evaluation, among other mandates, requires:

- Under A.9.c. "[a] review and evaluation of all BMPs (both structural and non-structural) to determine whether the BMPs are adequate, properly implemented and maintained, or whether additional BMPs are needed ..." Eyewitness investigation by River Watch reveals unpermitted, off-site, non-storm water discharges and failure to properly berm or contain storm water discharges from the AIS facility. Additionally, the AIS webpage reveals a photograph of uncovered "construction and debris waste" (http://aisdisposal.com/; December 11, 2014), threatening further unpermitted discharges from the AIS facility in violation of the General Permit.

- Under Section A.9.d.vi. "a certification that the facility operator is in compliance with this General Permit. If the above certification cannot be provided, explain in the evaluation report why the facility operator is not in compliance with this General Permit. The evaluation report shall be submitted as part of the annual report, retained for at least five years, and signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions 9. And 10. of Section C. of [the] General Permit." The alleged failures to fully and accurately ensure compliance with the annual report and SWPPP/BMP requirements of the General Permit as detailed above contradicts the evaluation.

2. *The activity alleged to constitute a violation.*

The Discharger's recycling operations (which it classifies under SIC Code 4953, but may properly be included under 5093 and/or 4212) at the AIS facility "allows clients to dispose of their construction and debris waste;" this waste includes hazardous and non-hazardous waste (http://aisdisposal.com/; December 11, 2014). The work at the AIS facility is conducted both indoors and outdoors. Because the real property on which the AIS facility is located is subject to rain events, and because there is no RWQCB

exemption from the collecting and analyzing of the range of pollutants identified above, there can be a discharge of these pollutants, measured at the point the discharge enters into the Long Beach MS4, which discharges to the Pacific Ocean.

To properly regulate these activities and control the discharge of these types of pollutants, the State Water Resources Control Board requires industrial facilities to obtain and comply with the terms and conditions of an individual NPDES permit or seek coverage under the General Permit (or obtain a proper exemption under the terms of the General Permit from its requirements). Review of the public record by River Watch reveals that the Discharger obtained coverage under the General Permit for the AIS facility, but fails to comply with its environmentally protective requirements, in particular the implementation of effective BMPs.

3. *The person or persons responsible for the alleged violation.*

The persons and entities responsible for the alleged violations are George Adamian, American Industrial Services and South Street Property, LLC referred to collectively herein as the Discharger.

4. *The location of the alleged violation.*

The location or locations of the various violations is the permanent address of the AIS facility at 5626 Cherry Avenue in Long Beach, California, including the waters of the Pacific Ocean – a water of the United States.

5. *The date or dates of violation or a reasonable range of dates during which the alleged activity occurred.*

The range of dates covered by this Notice is from December 29, 2009 to December 29, 2014. River Watch will from time to time further update this Notice to include all violations which occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature, therefore each day constitutes a violation.

6. *The full name, address, and telephone number of the person giving notice.*

The entity giving this Notice is California River Watch, referred to herein as "River Watch." River Watch is a 501(c)(3) non-profit, public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, with headquarters located in Sebastopol, California and offices in Los Angeles, California. The mailing address of River Watch's northern California office is 290 S. Main Street, #817, Sebastopol, CA 95472. The mailing address of River Watch's southern California office is 7401 Crenshaw Blvd. #422, Los Angeles, CA 90043.

River Watch is dedicated to protect, enhance, and help restore surface and ground waters of California including rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, aquifers and associated environs, biota, flora and fauna. And to educate the public concerning environmental issues associated with these environs.

River Watch may be contacted via email: US@ncriverwatch.org, or through its attorneys. River Watch has retained legal counsel with respect to the issues set forth in this Notice. All communications should be addressed to:

David Weinsoff, Esq.
Law Office of David Weinsoff
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA 94930
Tel. 415-460-9760
Email: lhm28843@sbcglobal.net

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

CWA § 301(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of any pollutant into waters of the United States unless such discharge is in compliance with various enumerated sections of the Act. Among other things, Section 301(a) prohibits discharges not authorized by, or in violation of, the terms of an individual NPDES permit or a general NPDES permit issued pursuant to CWA § 402(p), 33 U.S.C. § 1342. CWA § 402(p), 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), establishes a framework for regulating storm water discharges under the NPDES program. States with approved NPDES permitting programs are authorized under this section to regulate storm water discharges through permits issued to dischargers and/or through the issuance of a single, statewide general permit applicable to all storm water dischargers. Pursuant to CWA § 402, the Administrator of the U.S. EPA has authorized California's State Water Resources Control Board to issue NPDES permits including general NPDES permits in California.

The State Water Resources Control Board elected to issue a statewide general permit for industrial discharges, and issued the General Permit on or about November 19, 1991, modified the General Permit on or about September 17, 1992, and reissued the General Permit on or about April 17, 1997, pursuant to CWA § 402(p).

In order to discharge storm water lawfully in California, industrial dischargers must comply with the terms of the General Permit or have obtained an individual NPDES permit and complied with its terms.

The General Permit contains certain absolute prohibitions. Discharge Prohibition Order Section A(1) of the General Permit prohibits the direct or indirect discharge of materials other than storm water ("non-storm water discharges"), which are not otherwise regulated by a NPDES permit, to waters of the United States. Discharge Prohibition Order Section A(2) prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or threaten to cause pollution, contamination, or nuisance. Receiving Water Limitation Order Section C(1) prohibits storm water discharges to any surface or groundwater that adversely impact human health or the environment. Receiving Water Limitation Order Section C(2) prohibits storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality standards contained in a Statewide Water Quality Control Plan or the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan.

In addition to absolute prohibitions, the General Permit contains a variety of substantive and procedural requirements that dischargers must meet. Facilities discharging, or having the potential to discharge, storm water associated with industrial activity that have not obtained an individual NPDES permit must apply for coverage under the General Permit by filing a NOI. The General Permit requires existing dischargers to file NOIs before March 30, 1992.

Dischargers must also develop and implement a SWPPP which must comply with the standards of BAT and BCT. The SWPPP must, among other requirements:

- Identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm and non-storm water discharges from the facility, and identify and implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges [Permit Section A(2)]. BMPs must implement BAT and BCT [Permit Section B(3)].

- Include a description of individuals and their responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP [Permit Section A(3)]; a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow pattern and nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, impervious areas, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, and areas of industrial activity [Permit Section A(4)]; a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site [Permit Section A(5)]; and, a description of potential pollutant sources including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, and a description of significant spills and leaks, a list of all non-storm water discharges and their sources, and a description of locations where soil erosion may occur [Permit Section A(6)].

- Include a narrative assessment of all industrial activities and potential pollutant sources at the facility [Permit Section A(7)]. Include a narrative description of the BMPs to be implemented at the facility for each potential pollutant and its source, and consider both non-structural BMPs (including "Good Housekeeping") and structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective [Permit Section A(8)].

- Conduct one comprehensive site compliance evaluation by the facility operator in each reporting period (July 1 - June 30), with SWPPP revisions made, as appropriate, and implemented within 90 days of the evaluation [Permit Section A(9)].

The General Permit requires dischargers to eliminate all non-storm water discharges to storm water conveyance systems other than those specifically set forth in Special Condition D(1)(a) of the General Permit and meeting each of the conditions set forth in Special Condition D(1)(b).

As part of their monitoring program, dischargers must identify all storm water discharge locations that produce a significant storm water discharge, evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs in reducing pollutant loading, and evaluate whether pollution control measures set out in the SWPPP are adequate and properly implemented. Dischargers must conduct visual observations of these discharge locations for at least one storm per month during the wet season (October through May) and record their findings in their Annual Report [Permit Section B(14)]. Dischargers must also collect and analyze storm water samples from at least two storms per year in compliance with the criteria set forth in Permit Section B(5). Dischargers must also conduct dry season visual observations to identify sources of non-storm water pollution in compliance with Permit Section B(7).

Permit Section B(14) of the General Permit requires dischargers to submit an "Annual Report" by July 1 of each year to the executive officer of the relevant Regional Water Quality Control Board. Permit Section A(9)(d) of the General Permit requires the dischargers to include in the annual report an evaluation of the dischargers' storm water controls, including certifying compliance with the General Permit. *See also* Permit Sections C(9), C(10) and B(14).

The EPA has established Parameter Benchmark Values ("EPA Benchmarks") as guidelines for determining whether a facility discharging storm water has implemented the requisite BAT and BCT. (65 Fed. Reg. 64746, 64767 (Oct. 30, 2000)). California Toxics Rule ("CTR") limitations are also applicable to all non-storm water and storm water discharges. (40 C.F.R. part 131).

The RWQCB has established applicable water quality standards. This Basin Plan includes a narrative toxicity standard and a narrative oil and grease standard. The Basin Plan provides that "[w]aters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." The Basin Plan establishes limits on metals, solvents, pesticides and other hydrocarbons.

VIOLATIONS

River Watch contends that between December 29, 2009 and December 29, 2014 the Discharger violated the CWA, the Basin Plan and the Code of Federal Regulations by discharging pollutants from the AIS facility to waters of the United States without an individual NPDES permit, or in violation of the General Permit.

The violations discussed herein are derived from eye witness reports and records publicly available, or records in the possession and control of the Discharger. Furthermore, River Watch contends these violations are continuing.

Finally, River Watch also believes that the AIS facility is not operated to ensure that storm and non-storm water discharges are properly contained, controlled, and/or monitored. As a result, the Discharger fails to follow the requirements of the General Permit in its sampling protocols for the AIS facility by failing to accurately capture "first flush" samples and failing to properly sample from all the outfalls of the AIS facility.

REMEDIAL MEASURES REQUESTED

River Watch believes that implementation of the following remedial measures are necessary in order to bring the Discharger into compliance with the CWA and reduce the biological impacts from its non-compliance upon public health and the environment surrounding the AIS facility:

1. Prohibition of the discharges of pollutants including, but not limited to:

    - pH, Total Suspended Solids, Specific Conductance, Total Organic Carbon or Oil & Grease (standard parameters);

    - Total Suspended Solids, COD, heavy metals (including aluminum, iron, lead, copper and zinc) (Table D parameters for Sector N SIC 5093 facilities);

    - NH3, Mg; COD, heavy metals (including arsenic, cadmium, copernicium, lead, mercury, selenium, and silver (Table D parameters for Sector K SIC 4953 facilities).

2. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the General Permit, and BMPs detailed in the EPA's Industrial Stormwater Fact Sheet Series:

   - "Sector K: Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities" (EPA Office of Water, EPA-833-F-06-026, December 2006 (http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/npdes/stormwater/upload/sector_k_hazwaste.pdf).

   - "Sector N: Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities" (EPA Office of Water, EPA-833-F-06-029, December 2006 (www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sector_n_scraprecycling.pdf).

3. Compliance with the storm water sampling, monitoring and reporting requirements of the General Permit.

4. Sampling of storm water at least four (4) times per year over each of the next five (5) years: at "first flush"; the first significant rain after "first flush"; the first significant rain after April 1; and the second significant rain after April 1.

5. 100% of the discharge from the AIS facility must be discharged through discrete conveyances.

6. Any discharge from the AIS facility to a water of the United States must be sampled during the four (4) sampling events identified in paragraph #4 above.

7. Preparation and submittal to the RWQCB of a "Reasonable Potential Analysis" for the AIS facility and its operations.

8. Preparation of an updated SWPPP including a monitoring program, with a copy provided to River Watch.

CONCLUSION

The violations set forth in this Notice effect the health and enjoyment of members of River Watch who reside and recreate in the affected community. Members of River Watch use the affected watershed for recreation, sports, fishing, swimming, hiking, photography, nature walks and the like. Their health, use, and enjoyment of this natural resource is specifically impaired by the Discharger's alleged violations of the CWA as set forth in this Notice. CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), § 1362(5). An action for injunctive relief under the CWA is authorized by 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a).

Violators of the Act are also subject to an assessment of civil penalties of up to $37,500 per day/per violation for all violations pursuant to Sections 309(d) and 505 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(d), 1365. *See also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 19.1-19.4. River Watch believes this Notice sufficiently states grounds for filing suit in federal court under the "citizen suit" provisions of CWA to obtain the relief provided for under the law.

The CWA specifically provides a **60-day** "notice period" to promote resolution of disputes. River Watch strongly encourages the Discharger to contact River Watch within **20 days** after receipt of this Notice Letter to: (1) initiate a discussion regarding the allegations detailed in this Notice, and (2) schedule a date for a site visit of the AIS facility. In the absence of productive discussions to resolve this dispute, or receipt of additional information demonstrating that the Discharger is in compliance with the strict terms and conditions of the General Permit, River Watch intends to file a citizen's suit under CWA § 505(a) when the 60-day notice period ends.

Very truly yours,

David Weinsoff

DW:lhm

cc: Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812

Executive Officer
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region
3737 Main Street / Suite 500
Riverside, CA 92501-3348

Law Office of Jack Silver
P.O. Box 5469
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-5469

X-RAYED
MAR 20 2015
DOJ MAILROOM

Citizen Suit Coordinator
U.S. Dept. of Justice
Environmental & Natural Resource Division
Law and Policy Section
P.O. Box 7415
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044-7415