LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID J. WEINSOFF
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, California 94930
tel. 415•460•9760 fax. 415•460•9762
weinsoff@ix.netcom.com

Via Certified Mailing - Return Receipt

February 25, 2014

Douglas Allard, President and General Manager
KriStar Enterprises
An Oldcastle Precast Company
360 Sutton Place
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Douglas Allard, President and General Manager
KriStar Enterprises
An Oldcastle Precast Company
5900 Pruitt Avenue, # 230
Windsor, CA 95472

David Steevens, President
Oldcastle Precast, Inc.
Corporate Offices
1002 15th Street SW, Suite 110
Auburn, WA 98001

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

Dear Owners, Operators and/or Facility Managers:

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 the two KriStar Enterprises facilities located at 360

Sutton Place in Santa Rosa, California and 5900 Pruitt Avenue in Windsor, California[1]. Notice is being sent to you as the as the responsible owners, officers, operators or managers of these properties and facilities. This Notice addresses the violations of the CWA, including violation of the terms of the General California Industrial Storm Water Permit and unlawful discharge of pollutants from the KriStar Enterprises facility in Santa Rosa into Colgan Creek, a tributary of the Laguna de Santa Rosa (which is CWA § 303(d) listed as impaired for sediment, temperature, bacteria, nutrients, and mercury), and the KriStar Enterprises facility in Windsor into Pool Creek, a tributary of the Russian River (which is CWA § 303(d) listed as impaired for sediment, temperature, and bacteria).

CWA § 505(b) requires that 60 days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA § 505(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a), a citizen must give notice of the intent to sue to the alleged violator, the 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 two KriStar facilities. Consequently, KriStar Enterprises (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, § 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 North Coast 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.

Based on information thus far received, River Watch believes pollutants are discharged from the concrete manufacturing activities at both sites including, but not limited to, total suspended solids, pH, chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand,

---

[1] Note that the assets of KriStar Enterprises, Inc. were acquired by Oldcastle Precast, Inc. on or about January 7, 2014. *See* http://www.kristar.com/; (February 17, 2014). This Notice identifies the sites as KriStar facilities.

potassium, sulfate, oil and grease, lead, iron, and zinc. River Watch contends the Discharger has no individual facility NPDES permit for these discharges, and has failed and is failing to apply for coverage and comply with the General Industrial Storm Water Permit, NPDES Permit No. CA S000001, State Water Resources Control Board, Order No. 92-12-DWQ as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ ("General Permit"). These discharges are in violation of the CWA's prohibition with regard to discharging a pollutant from a point source to a water of the United States, in this instance the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River, pursuant to CWA § 301(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a) and 33 U.S.C. § 1365(f).

Without obtaining coverage under, and complying with the terms of, the General Permit, the Discharger has failed to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP",) failed to develop and implement a Monitoring and Reporting Program, and failed to implement Best Available Technology Economically Achievable ("BAT") and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water at the KriStar Enterprises facilities. These violations will continue until the Discharger submits a Notice of Intent to obtain coverage under the General Permit, implements a SWPPP and Monitoring and Reporting Program, and demonstrates (following sampling and testing following storm events) that its implementation of Best Management Practices ("BMPs") is effectively controlling storm and non-storm water discharges from the two sites.

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

Operations at both KriStar Enterprises sites include a broad range of concrete manufacturing activities advertised on the Discharger's website including, ironically, "Stormwater Retention/Detention" products (http://www.kristar.com/index.php/products-showcase; February 17, 2014). The work, covered under Standard Industrial Code ("SIC") 3272 (Concrete Products, Except Block and Brick) is conducted both indoors and outdoors. The outdoor work takes place on sites that slope toward one or more storm drains and the waters of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River. Both the storm drains and the navigable waters of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River are in close proximity to the respective sites. Because the properties on which the two sites are located are subject to rain events, the range of pollutants identified above can discharge to the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River.

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 an individual NPDES permit or seek coverage under the General Permit (or obtain exemption under the terms of the General Permit from its requirements). Review of the public record by River Watch does not reveal the Discharger as having obtained any required permit

coverage under the CWA for either facility.

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

The entities responsible for the alleged violations is KriStar Enterprises, referred to herein as the Discharger, including those of its parent companies, owners, operators and employees responsible for compliance with the CWA which may include Oldcastle Precast, Inc.

4. *The location of the alleged violation.*

The locations of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA are the permanent addresses of the KriStar Enterprises facilities at 360 Sutton Place in Santa Rosa, California and 5900 Pruitt Avenue in Windsor, California, and include the adjoining navigable waters of the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River, respectively – both waters of the United States. (See attached maps.)

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 February 24, 2009 to February 24, 2014. River Watch will from time to time 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 notice is California River Watch, 290 S. Main Street, #817, Sebastopol, CA 95472 – a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, dedicated to protect, enhance and help restore the groundwater and surface water environs of California including, but not limited to, its rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries. 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 J. Weinsoff
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA 94930
Tel. 415 460-9760
Fax. 415 460-9762
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 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 February 24, 2009 and February 24, 2014, the Discharger violated the CWA, the RWQCB's Basin Plan and the Code of Federal Regulations by reason of discharging pollutants to waters of the United States without an individual NPDES permit, without compliance with the General Permit, or in violation of the General Permit.

The violations discussed herein, impacting the Laguna de Santa Rosa and the Russian River, are derived from eye witness reports and records publicly available, or from records in the possession and control of the Discharger. Furthermore, River Watch contends these violations are continuing. Halting the discharge of pollutants to these important regional waterways is critical if they are to sustain both maritime and natural habitats for bird, animal, and plant life.

Finally, River Watch also believes that the KriStar Enterprises sites in Santa Rosa and Windsor are neither properly bermed nor operated to ensure that storm and non-storm water discharges are properly contained, controlled, and/or monitored

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 of its non-compliance upon public health and the environment surrounding both KriStar Enterprises facilities:

1. Prohibition of the discharges of pollutants including, but not limited to total suspended solids, pH, chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand, potassium, sulfate, oil and grease, lead, iron, and zinc from the concrete manufacturing operations at the 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 E: Glass, Clay, Cement, Concrete, and Gypsum Product Facilities" (EPA Office of Water, EPA-833-F-06-020, December 2006; (http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sector_e_glass.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 both KriStar Enterprises sites and facilities must be discharged through discrete conveyances.

6. Any discharge from either of the KriStar Enterprises sites and facilities to waters 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 two KriStar Enterprises sites and their operations.

8. Preparation of an updated SWPPP for each of the two sites, including a monitoring program, with a copy provided to River Watch.

CONCLUSION

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 unpermitted 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.

The violations set forth in this Notice effect the health and enjoyment of members of River Watch who reside and recreate in the affected communities. Members of River Watch use the affected watersheds for recreation, sports, fishing, swimming, hiking, photography, nature walks and the like. Their health, use and enjoyment of this natural resource are specifically impaired by the Discharger's violations of the CWA as set forth in this Notice.

River Watch believes this Notice sufficiently states grounds for filing suit. At the close of the 60-day notice period or shortly thereafter River Watch has cause to file a citizen's suit under CWA § 505(a) against the Discharger for the violations of the CWA identified and described in this Notice. During the 60-day notice period, River Watch is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations identified in this Notice. However, if the Discharger wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-

day notice period. River Watch does not intend to delay the filing of a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,

David Weinsoff

David Weinsoff

DW:lhm
Attachment A - Maps

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, California 95812

Executive Officer
Regional Water Quality Control Board
North Coast Region
5550 Skylane Blvd / Suite A
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Oldcastle Precast, Inc.
c/o CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833