Inland Empire Waterkeeper
Advocacy • Education • Restoration • Enforcement
6876 Indiana Avenue, Suite D
Riverside, CA 92506
Phone (951) 530-8823
Fax (951) 530-8824
Website www.iewaterkeeper.org

June 3, 2016

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Robertson's Ready Mix
Robertson's San Jacinto Batch Plant
1675 S. State St.
San Jacinto, CA 92383

Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd.,
a California Limited Partnership
200 S. Main Street, Suite 200
Corona, California 92882-2212

Mervyn Encarnacion, Registered Agent for
Service of Process for Robertson's Ready Mix,
Ltd., a California Limited Partnership
200 S. Main Street, Suite 200
Corona, California 92882-2212

Re: Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit Under the Clean Water Act

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper and Orange County Coastkeeper (collectively "Waterkeeper") regarding violations of the Clean Water Act[1] and California's Industrial Storm Water Permit[2] ("Storm Water Permit") occurring at the industrial facility with its main address at: 1675 S. State St., San Jacinto, California 92383 ("Facility"). The purpose of this letter is to put San Jacinto Batch Plant and Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd., a California Limited Partnership, (collectively "Robertson's"), as the owners and/or operators of the Facility, on notice of the violations of the Storm Water Permit occurring at the Facility, including, but not limited to, discharges of polluted storm water from the Facility into local surface waters. Violations of the Storm Water Permit are violations of the Clean Water Act. As explained below, Robertson's is liable for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act.

Section 505(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b), requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a), a citizen must give notice of his/her intention to file suit. The Clean Water Act requires that notice must be given to the alleged violator, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), the Regional Administrator of the EPA, the chief administrative officer of the water pollution control agency for the State in which the violations occur, and, if the alleged violator is a corporation, the registered agent of the corporation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 135.2(a)(1).

---

[1] Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 *et seq.*
[2] National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") General Permit No. CAS000001, Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, Order No. 97-03-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.

This letter is being sent to you as the responsible owner and operator of the Facility, or as the registered agent for this entity. This notice letter ("Notice Letter") is issued pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a) and (b) of the Clean Water Act to inform Robertson's that Waterkeeper intends to file a federal enforcement action against Robertson's for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice Letter.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Inland Empire Waterkeeper and Orange County Coastkeeper

Inland Empire Waterkeeper's office is located at 6876 Indiana Avenue, Suite D, Riverside, California 92506. Inland Empire Waterkeeper is a program of Orange County Coastkeeper. Orange County Coastkeeper is a non-profit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California with its office at 3151 Airway Avenue, Suite F-110, Costa Mesa, California 92626. Together, Inland Empire Waterkeeper and Orange County Coastkeeper have over 2,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Santa Ana River watershed. Waterkeeper is dedicated to the preservation, protection, and defense of the environment, wildlife, and natural resources of the Inland Empire watershed. To further these goals, Waterkeeper actively seeks federal and state agency implementation of the Clean Water Act and other environmental regulations, and, where necessary, directly initiates enforcement actions on behalf of itself and its members.

Members of Waterkeeper use and enjoy the waters that Robertson's discharges into, including the Santa Ana River and its tributaries. Members of Waterkeeper use and enjoy the Santa Ana River and its tributaries to swim, wade, picnic, hike, view wildlife, and engage in scientific study including monitoring activities. The discharge of pollutants and emissions of fugitive dust from the Facility impairs each of these uses. Further, discharges of polluted storm water and fugitive dust emissions from the Facility are ongoing and continuous. Thus, the interests of Waterkeeper's members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by Robertson's failure to comply with the Clean Water Act and the Storm Water Permit.

B. The Owners and/or Operators of the Facility

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd., is an owner and/or operator of the Facility. Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd. is an active California limited partnership and its registered agent is: Mervyn Encarnacion, 200 S. Main Street, Suite 200, Corona, California 92882. Pursuant to California Corporations Code section 15904.04, Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd.'s general partners are jointly and severally liable for the Clean Water Act violations described herein. Further, to the extent Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd.'s limited partners own and/or operate the Facility together with Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd.

Waterkeeper refers to Robertson's San Jacinto Batch Plant and Robertson's Ready Mix, Ltd. together as the "Facility Owners and/or Operators." The Facility Owners and/or Operators have violated and continue to violate the procedural and substantive terms of the Storm Water Permit including, but not limited to, the illegal discharge of pollutants from the Facility into local surface waters. As explained herein, the Facility Owners and/or Operators are liable for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act.

C. The Facility's Storm Water Permit Coverage

Facilities that discharge storm water associated with specified industrial activities are required to apply for coverage under the Storm Water Permit by submitting a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to the State Water Resources Control Board ("State Board") to obtain Storm Water Permit coverage. *See* Storm Water Permit, Finding ¶¶ 12, 17.

Robertson's submitted an NOI to obtain Storm Water Permit coverage for the Facility on March 30, 1992. The NOI submitted in March 1992 ("1992 NOI") identifies the owner/operator of the Facility as "Robertson's Ready Mix" and the Facility name and location as "San Jacinto Batch Plant, 1675 S. State St., San Jacinto, CA 92343." The 1992 NOI lists the Facility as 4 acres in size and the 57% impervious.[3] The 1992 NOI states the Facility is "Regulated by Storm water Effluent Guidelines (40 CFR Subchapter N)". Additionally, it states the Facility's storm water discharges directly to a storm drain system and the closes receiving water as the San Jacinto River. It lists the materials handled and/or stored outdoors as petroleum products-diesel; sand and gravel; and Portland cement.

Robertson's submitted an NOI to obtain Storm Water Permit coverage for the Facility on June 6, 1997. The NOI submitted in June 1997 ("1997 NOI") identifies the owner/operator of the Facility as "Robertson's Ready Mix" and the Facility name and location as "San Jacinto Batch Plant, 1675 S. State St., San Jacinto, CA 92343." The 1997 NOI lists the Waste Discharge Identification ("WDID") number for the Facility as 8 33S005071.

On September 29, 2015, Robertson's submitted an NOI to continue the Facility's coverage under the Permit ("2015 NOI"). The 2015 NOI identifies the owner/operator of the Facility as "Robertsons Ready Mix" and the Facility name and location as "Robertsons San Jacinto Plant, 1675 State St., San Jacinto, CA 92383." The 2015 NOI lists the Facility site size as "4 Acres." The industrial area exposed to storm water is listed as "19600 Sq.Feet", and the percentage of imperviousness is not listed.[4] The 2015 NOI lists the WDID number for the Facility as 8 33I005071.

The 1992 and 2015 NOIs list the Standard Industrial Classification ("SIC") code for the Facility as 3273 (Ready-Mixed Concrete). SIC code 3273 facilities must obtain Storm Water Permit coverage for the entire facility. *See* Storm Water Permit, Attachment A, ¶ 2. Information available to Waterkeeper, including the Facility's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP")[5] identifying

---

[3] The 2014/2015 Building Materials Industry Group Monitoring Plan confirmed the Facility was 57% impervious.

[4] To the extent the Facility Owners and/or Operators have or intend to limit the Storm Water Permit coverage at the Facility based on the asserted acreage "exposed to storm water," Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that they have not complied, and cannot comply, with Section XVII.E.1. of the Storm Water Permit and the required "no exposure" certification. Further, to the extent the Facility Owners and/or Operators failed to obtain Permit coverage for all areas of industrial activity at the Facility, storm water discharges associated with industrial activities from unpermitted portions of the Facility violate section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act.

[5] The Facility SWPPP publicly available via the SMARTS database is labeled "March 2015" and is signed by the Facility's "legally responsible person" on September 30, 2015. Waterkeeper also

vehicle and equipment maintenance and storage as industrial activities at the Facility, indicates SIC code 4212 (local trucking without storage) also applies to the Facility.

The Facility SWPPP also states that the Facility is approximately 4.1 acres. To the extent the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed to obtain Permit coverage for the entire Facility by describing the Facility as 4 acres in the 1992 NOI and the 2015 NOI, Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that discharges from the Facility not in compliance with the Storm Water Permit violate section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act.

D. Storm Water Pollution and the Waters Receiving Robertson's Discharges

With every significant rainfall event, millions of gallons of polluted storm water originating from industrial operations such as the Facility pour into storm drains and local waterways. The consensus among agencies and water quality specialists is that storm water pollution accounts for more than half of the total pollution entering surface waters each year. Such discharges of pollutants from industrial facilities contribute to the impairment of downstream waters and aquatic dependent wildlife. These contaminated discharges can and must be controlled for the ecosystem to regain its health.

Based on EPA's Industrial Stormwater Fact Sheet for Glass, Clay, Cement, Concrete, and Gypsum Product Manufacturing Facilities, polluted discharges from concrete mixing facilities such as the Facility contain pH-affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, and arsenic; chemical oxygen demand ("COD"); biochemical oxygen demand ("BOD"); total suspended solids ("TSS"); benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; and oil and grease ("O&G"). Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

The Facility SWPPP indicates the Facility discharges into a storm drain system on State Street, "which directs runoff to Warm Springs Creek and downstream bodies" and to Murrieta Creek, Santa Margarita River (Upper). However, information available to Waterkeeper indicates the Facility discharges into the municipal storm drain system ultimately discharge to the San Jacinto River, Canyon Lake, Lake Elsinore, Temescal Creek Reach 6, Reach 5, Reach 4, Reach 3, Reach 2, Reach 1B, Reach 1A, Santa Ana River Reach 3, Reach 2, Reach 1, Tidal Prism of Santa Ana River, and finally into the Pacific Ocean ("Receiving Waters"). Although pollution and habitat destruction have drastically diminished once-abundant and varied fisheries, these waters are still essential habitat for dozens of fish and bird species as well as macro-invertebrate and invertebrate species. Storm water and non-storm water contaminated with sediment, heavy metals, and other pollutants harm the special aesthetic and recreational significance that the Receiving Waters have for people in the surrounding communities. The public's use of local waterways exposes many people to toxic metals and other contaminants in storm water discharges. Non-contact recreational and aesthetic opportunities, such as wildlife observation, are also impaired by polluted discharges to the Receiving Waters.

---

obtained the March 2015 SWPPP via a Public Records Act request. Waterkeeper understands that the March 2015 SWPPP is the current SWPPP for the Facility.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region Regional Board ("Regional Board") issued the *Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Plan* ("Basin Plan"). The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include Water Contact Recreation; Non-contact Water Recreation; Agricultural Supply; Groundwater Recharge; Warm Freshwater Habitat; Wildlife Habitat; Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species; and Spawning, Reproduction and Development. *See* Basin Plan at Table 3-1.

According to the 2012 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies, Canyon Lake is impaired for nutrients and pathogens; Temescal Creek Reach 1 is impaired for pH; Temescal Creek Reach 6 is impaired for Indicator Bacteria; Santa Ana River Reach 3 is impaired for pathogens, Copper, and Lead, and Santa Ana River Reach 2 is impaired for Indicator Bacteria.

Polluted discharges from industrial sites, such as the Facility, contribute to the degradation of these already impaired surface waters and aquatic-dependent wildlife that depends on these waters.

II. THE FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED DISCHARGES OF POLLUTANTS

A. The Facility Site Description and Industrial Activities

The Facility is an active concrete batch plant consisting of one section of approximately 4.1 acres. Raw materials, including aggregate (rock, sand, and gravel), cement,[6] fly ash, and admixtures are delivered to the Facility, and are mixed with water to create concrete. These materials, water, and (if applicable) admixtures are added to concrete haul trucks that mix the ingredients together to produce concrete and haul the concrete off site. As part of the concrete production process, unused concrete is returned to the Facility, stored onsite, and recycled. The concrete production process also includes onsite vehicle and mobile equipment operation, parking, fueling, and maintenance.

The Facility's industrial activities include, but are not limited to: concrete mixing; transport of raw materials; unloading of raw materials; outdoor storage of raw materials, including sand, gravel, rock, chemical admixtures, fly ash, cement, and recycled concrete; fueling, repairing, cleaning, and maintaining vehicles and equipment; storage of fuels and hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, lubricating fluids, new vehicle fluids, and hazardous waste vehicle fluids; washing concrete mixer trucks; and vehicle and equipment parking, fueling, and maintenance.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that up to 5000 tons of aggregate, up to 80 tons of cement, up to 80 tons of fly ash, and up to 6800 gallons of admixtures, may be in process or storage at the Facility at any one time. Additionally, up to 10,300 gallons of fuels, oils, and greases may be stored at the Facility at any one time.

---

[6] Based on Waterkeeper's review of the Facility SWPPP, cement is stored in "cement storage silos" in the concrete batch plant area of the Facility, and that cement is received in this area. To the extent cement is stored outdoors, storm water discharges from the Facility may be subject to additional effluent limitations set out at 40 C.F.R. § 411.30. Waterkeeper will add additional information and/or violations relevant to the Facility Owners and/or Operators' storage and handling of cement as that information becomes available to Waterkeeper.

B. Pollutants Associated with Robertson's Industrial Activities

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that pollutants associated with operations at the Facility include, but are not limited to: pH-affecting substances[7]; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, and arsenic; COD; BOD; TSS[8]; benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; trash; and O&G.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates Robertson's has not properly developed and/or implemented the required best management practices ("BMPs") to address pollutant sources and contaminated discharges. BMPs are necessary at the Facility to prevent the exposure of pollutants to precipitation and the subsequent discharge of polluted storm water from the Facility during rain events. Consequently, during rain events, storm water carries pollutants from the Facility's stockpile or material storage area(s), truck parking area(s), fueling and maintenance area(s), add-mix area(s), batch plant area(s), washing area(s), and other areas into the storm sewer system, which flows into the Receiving Waters, in violation of the Storm Water Permit.

Information available to Waterkeeper also indicates that concrete, particulates, and fugitive dust of sand, gravel, and cement have been and continue to be tracked throughout the Facility. These pollutants accumulate at the sand and gravel storage areas and near the silos, the loading and unloading areas, and the driveways leading onto State Street. As a result, trucks and vehicles leaving the Facility via the driveways are pollutant sources tracking sediment, dirt, O&G, metal particles, and other pollutants off-site.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that raw materials are stored outside and weighing and mixing activities occur outside without adequate cover or containment resulting in discharges of polluted storm water and fugitive dust emissions. Additionally, metal parts and hazardous materials associated with maintenance, fueling, and washing of the concrete trucks are located outside without secondary containment or other measures to prevent polluted storm water and prohibited non-storm water discharges from discharging from the Facility. These activities are all pollutant sources at the Facility.

---

[7] Storm water discharged with high pH can damage the gills and skin of aquatic organisms and cause death at levels above 10 standard units. The pH scale is logarithmic and the solubility of a substance varies as a function of the pH of a solution. A one whole unit change in SU represents a tenfold increase or decrease in ion concentration. If the pH of water is too high or too low, the aquatic organisms living within it will become stressed or die.

[8] High concentrations of TSS degrade optical water quality by reducing water clarity and decreasing light available to support photosynthesis. TSS has been shown to alter predator prey relationships (for example, turbid water may make it difficult for fish to hunt prey). Deposited solids alter fish habitat, aquatic plants, and benthic organisms. TSS can also be harmful to aquatic life because numerous pollutants, including metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, are absorbed onto TSS. Thus, higher concentrations of TSS results in higher concentrations of toxins associated with those sediments. Inorganic sediments, including settleable matter and suspended solids, have been shown to negatively impact species richness, diversity, and total biomass of filter feeding aquatic organisms on bottom surfaces.

Robertson's failure to develop and/or implement required BMPs also results in prohibited discharges of non-storm water in violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Robertson's discharges process waters from equipment washing and other activities as part of its industrial operations.

C. Facility Storm Water Flows and Discharge Location

The Facility SWPPP states the site is approximately 35% pervious and is considered three (3) drainage areas labeled Drainage Area 1 (DA1), Drainage Area 2 (DA2), and Drainage Area 3 (DA3). The Facility Owners and/or Operators identify two (2) discharge points, Outfall 1 ("OF1") and Outfall 2 ("OF2"). Outfall #1 is located at the northern driveway, or Facility exit. Outfall #2 is located at the southern driveway, or Facility entrance.

The Facility's SWPPP states that DA1 includes the entire site. The SWPPP states that, "Storm water flows into the sump at the center of the plant, where it is contained and pumped back to the plant for re-use. The storm water from [DA2] and [DA3] is potentially impacted by industrial activity" and thus, Outfalls 1 and 2 are to be sampled. Additionally, the SWPPP provides no sizing information for the sump.

III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE STORM WATER PERMIT

In California, any person who discharges storm water associated with industrial activity must comply with the terms of the Storm Water Permit in order to lawfully discharge pollutants. *See* 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a), 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(c)(1); *see also* Storm Water Permit, Fact Sheet at VII.

Between 1997 and June 30, 2015, the Storm Water Permit in effect was Order No. 97-03-DWQ, which Waterkeeper refers to as the "1997 Permit." On July 1, 2015, pursuant to Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ the Storm Water Permit was reissued. For purposes of this Notice Letter, Waterkeeper refers to the reissued permit as the "2015 Permit." The 2015 Permit superseded the 1997 Permit, except for enforcement purposes, and its terms are as stringent, or more stringent, than the terms of the 1997 Permit. *See* 2015 Permit, Findings, ¶ 6. Accordingly, Robertson's is liable for violations of the 1997 Permit and ongoing violations of the 2015 Permit, and civil penalties and injunctive relief are available remedies. *See Illinois v. Outboard Marine, Inc.*, 680 F.2d 473, 480-81 (7th Cir. 1982) (relief granted for violations of an expired permit); *Sierra Club v. Aluminum Co. of Am.*, 585 F. Supp. 842, 853-54 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) (holding that the Clean Water Act's legislative intent and public policy favor allowing penalties for violations of an expired permit); *Pub. Interest Research Group of N.J. v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.*, 684 F. Supp. 115, 121-22 (D.N.J. 1988) ("Limitations of an expired permit, when those limitations have been transferred unchanged to the newly issued permit, may be viewed as currently in effect").

The Clean Water Act requires that any person discharging pollutants to a water of the United States from a point source[9] obtain coverage under an NPDES permit. *See* 33 U.S.C.

---

[9] A point source is defined as 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

§§ 1311(a), 1342; 40 CFR § 122.26(c)(1). The Storm Water Permit is an NPDES permit which regulates storm water discharges associated with certain industrial activities. The Robertson's Owners and/or Operators discharge pollutants from point sources at the Facility to waters of the United States without NPDES permit coverage in violation of Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act.

In California, industrial dischargers not covered under an individual NPDES permit must comply with the terms of the Storm Water Permit to lawfully discharge storm water associated with industrial activity. *See id.*; *see also* 1997 Permit, Fact Sheet p. VII; 2015 Permit, Fact Sheet, p. 9. Industrial activities conducted at the Facility fall under SIC codes 3273, which require Robertson's obtain Storm Water Permit coverage for the entire Facility.

A. Unauthorized Non-Storm Water Discharges from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Discharge Prohibitions

Except as authorized by Special Conditions D(1) of the 1997 Permit, Discharge Prohibition A(1) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. The 2015 Permit includes the same discharge prohibition. *See* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B. Prohibited non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit. *See* Storm Water Permit, Discharge Prohibition A(1); *see also* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges. For example, unauthorized non-storm water discharges from the Facility during concrete and water truck filling, road watering, and/or when truck washing and cleaning activities occur. The Facility Owners and/or Operators conduct these activities without BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the Storm Water Permit and thus are always prohibited.

Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that the Storm Water Permit Discharge Prohibitions are violated each time unauthorized non-storm water is discharged from the Facility. *See* 1997 Permit, Discharge Prohibition A(1); *see also* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B. These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue until the Facility Owners and/or Operators develop and implement BMPs that prevent prohibited non-storm water discharges or obtain separate NPDES permit coverage. Each time the Facility Owners and/or Operators discharge prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the 1997 Permit and Discharge Prohibition III.B. of the 2015 Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Waterkeeper will update the number and dates of violations when additional information becomes available. Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

---

may be discharged. 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14); *see* 40 C.F.R. § 122.2

B. Discharges of Polluted Storm Water from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Effluent Limitations

Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit requires dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activity in storm water discharges through implementation of BMPs that achieve Best Available Technology Economically Achievable ("BAT") for toxic[10] and non-conventional pollutants and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") for conventional pollutants.[11] The 2015 Permit includes the same effluent limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Effluent Limitation V.A.

Information available to Waterkeeper, including its review of publicly available information and observations, indicates that the Facility Owners and/or Operators have not implemented BMPs at the Facility that achieve BAT/BCT. While the Facility Owners and/or Operators have not collected any storm water samples, storm water associated with industrial activities regulated by the permit does discharge from the Facility, and given the inadequate BMPs at the Facility, those discharges violate the permit effluent limitations.

Waterkeeper will provide additional information regarding this violation as it becomes available, including evaluation of storm water data (once available) as compared to storm water benchmark levels set by the Environmental Protection Agency. Such EPA Benchmarks are relevant and objective standards for evaluating whether a permittee's BMPs achieve compliance with BAT/BCT standards as required by Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit.[12]

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed and continue to fail to develop and/or implement BMPs at the Facility as required to achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards. Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that because of the lack of BMPs that meet BAT/BCT standards, the Storm Water Permit Effluent Limitations are violated each time storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 1 (setting forth dates of rain events resulting in a discharge at the Facility).[13] These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time Robertson's discharges polluted storm water without developing and/or implementing BMPs that achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards. Each time Robertson's discharges polluted storm water in violation of Effluent

---

[10] Toxic pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.15 and include copper, arsenic, lead, benzene, and zinc, among others.

[11] Conventional pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.16 and include biochemical oxygen demand, TSS, oil and grease, pH, and fecal coliform.

[12] *See United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (MSGP) Authorization to Discharge Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System*, as modified effective February 26, 2009 ("Multi-Sector Permit"), Fact Sheet at 106; *see also*, 65 Federal Register 64839 (2000).

[13] Dates of significant rain events are measured at Rain Station KRAL, located at the Riverside Municipal Airport in Riverside, California, and at Rain Station KRIV, located at March Air Reserve Base. A significant rain event is defined by EPA as a rainfall event generating 0.1 inches or more of rainfall, which generally results in discharges at a typical industrial facility.

Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). The Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

Further, Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that 2015 Permit Effluent Limitation V.A. is a separate, independent requirement with which Robertson's must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the Numeric Action Levels ("NALs") listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with Effluent Limitation V.A. The NALs do not represent technology based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has implemented BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT.[14] And even if the Facility Owners and/or Operators submit any Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to Section XII. of the 2015 Permit, the violations of Effluent Limitation V.A. described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

C. Discharges of Polluted Storm Water from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations

Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable Water Quality Standard ("WQS").[15] The 2015 Permit includes the same receiving water limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. Discharges that contain pollutants in excess of an applicable WQS violate the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(2); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A.

Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface water that adversely impact human health or the environment. The 2015 Permit includes the same receiving water limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B. Discharges that contain pollutants in concentrations that exceed levels known to adversely impact aquatic species and the environment constitute violations of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B.

---

[14] "The NALs are not intended to serve as technology-based or water quality-based numeric effluent limitations. The NALs are not derived directly from either BAT/BCT requirements or receiving water objectives. NAL exceedances defined in [the 2015] Permit are not, in and of themselves, violations of [the 2015] Permit." 2015 Permit, Finding 63, p. 11. The NALs do, however, trigger reporting requirements. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XII.

[15] The Basin Plan designates Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters. Water quality standards are pollutant concentration levels determined by the state or federal agencies to be protective of designated Beneficial Uses. Discharges above water quality standards contribute to impairment of Receiving Waters' Beneficial Uses. Applicable water quality standards include, among others, the Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants in the State of California, 40 C.F.R. § 131.38 ("CTR"), and water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. Industrial storm water discharges must strictly comply with water quality standards, including those criteria listed in the applicable basin plan. *See Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1166-67 (9th Cir. 1999).

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that while the Facility Owners and/or Operators have not collected any storm water samples, storm water associated with industrial activities regulated by the Storm Water Permit does discharge from the Facility, and given the inadequate BMPs at the Facility, those discharges violate the receiving water limitations.

As explained herein, the Receiving Waters are impaired for some of the same pollutants discharging from the Facility and thus unable to support the designated beneficial uses. The 2012 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies lists the Receiving Waters as impaired for pH, pathogens, and Indicator Bacteria. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that facilities of this type often discharge storm water which contains elevated concentrations of pollutants, such as aluminum, iron, copper, lead, and pH, which can be acutely toxic and/or have sub-lethal impacts on the avian and aquatic wildlife in the Receiving Waters. Discharges of elevated concentrations of pollutants in the storm water from this type of facility also adversely impact human health. Waterkeeper will provide additional information regarding this violation as it becomes available, including an evaluation of storm water data (once available) as compared to CTR criteria and Basin Plan objectives. These types of harmful discharges are violations of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1) and C(2); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A and VI.B.

Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations are violated each time polluted storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 1 (setting forth dates of rain events resulting in a discharge at the Facility). These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time contaminated storm water is discharged in violation of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. Each time discharges of storm water from the Facility cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable WQS is a separate and distinct violation of Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. of the 2015 Permit VI.A, and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Each time discharges from the Facility adversely impact human health or the environment is a separate and distinct violation of Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B. of the 2015 Permit, and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Waterkeeper will update the dates of violation when additional information and data becomes available. The Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

Further, Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owners and/or Operators on notice that 2015 Permit Receiving Water Limitations are separate, independent requirements with which Robertson's must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. The NALs do not represent water quality based criteria relevant to determine whether an industrial facility has caused or contributed to an exceedance of a water quality standard.[16] And even if the Facility Owners and/or Operators submit any Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to

---

[16] "The NALs are not intended to serve as technology-based or water quality-based numeric effluent limitations. The NALs are not derived directly from either BAT/BCT requirements or receiving water objectives. NAL exceedances defined in [the 2015] Permit are not, in and of themselves, violations of [the 2015] Permit." 2015 Permit, Finding 63, p. 11. The NALs do, however, trigger reporting requirements. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XII.

Section XII. of the 2015 Permit, the violations of the Receiving Water Limitations described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

D. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

The Storm Water Permit requires permittees to develop and implement Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit are set out below.

1. 1997 SWPPP Requirements

Section A(1) and Provision E(2) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP by October 1, 1992, or prior to beginning industrial activities, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the 1997 Permit SWPPP requirement are to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges from the Facility, and to implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Section A(2). These BMPs must achieve compliance with the Storm Water Permit's Effluent Limitations and Receiving Water Limitations.

To ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit, the SWPPP must be evaluated on an annual basis pursuant to the requirements of Section A(9) of the 1997 Permit, and must be revised as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 1997 Permit, Sections A(9) and (10). Sections A(3) – A(10) of the 1997 Permit set forth the requirements for a SWPPP. Among other requirements, the SWPPP must include: a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow patterns, nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, areas of industrial activity, and other features of the facility and its industrial activities (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(4)); a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(5)); a description of potential pollutant sources, including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, significant spills and leaks, non-storm water discharges and their sources, and locations where soil erosion may occur (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(6)).

Sections A(7) and A(8) of the 1997 Permit require an assessment of potential pollutant sources at the facility and a description of the BMPs to be implemented at the facility that will reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges, including structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective.

2. 2015 SWPPP Requirements

As with the SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit, Sections X(A) - (H) of the 2015 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. *See also* 2015 Permit, Appendix 1. The objective of the SWPPP requirements are still to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges, and to implement site-specific BMPs

to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 2015 Permit, Section X(C).

The SWPPP must include, among other things and consistent with the 1997 Permit, a narrative description and summary of all industrial activity, potential sources of pollutants, and potential pollutants; a site map indicating the storm water conveyance system, associated points of discharge, direction of flow, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, including the extent of pollution-generating activities, nearby water bodies, and pollutants control measures; a description of the BMPs developed and implemented to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges necessary to comply with the Storm Water Permit; the identification and elimination of non-storm water discharges; the location where significant materials are being shipped, stored, received, and handled, as well as the typical quantities of such materials and the frequency with which they are handled; a description of dust and particulate-generating activities, and; the identification of individuals and their current responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP. 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(H).

Further, the 2015 Permit requires the discharger to evaluate the SWPPP on an annual basis and revise it as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(B). Like the 1997 Permit, the 2015 Permit also requires that the discharger conduct an annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation that includes a review of all visual observation records, inspection reports and sampling and analysis results, a visual inspection of all potential pollutant sources for evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system, a review and evaluation of all BMPs to determine whether the BMPs are adequate, properly implemented and maintained, or whether additional BMPs are needed, and a visual inspection of equipment needed to implement the SWPPP. 2015 Permit, Section X(B) and Section XV.

3. <u>The Facility Owners and/or Operators Have Violated and Continue to Violate the Storm Water Permit SWPPP Requirements</u>

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility Owners and/or Operators have been and continue to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed and/or implemented SWPPP. For example, in violation of Section A(4) of the 1997 Permit and Section X(E)(3) of the 2015 Permit, there is no site map attached to the SWPPP. To the extent the site map uploaded on SMARTS could be the SWPPP site map it fails to identify all areas of industrial activity, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, including the extent of pollution-generating activities, and nearby water bodies.

Further, the narrative portions of the SWPPP fail to include all sources of unauthorized non-storm water discharges in violation of Section A(6) of the 1997 Permit and Section X(G)(1)(e) of the 2015 Permit. The SWPPP also fails to include an adequate assessment of potential pollutant sources or BMPs that achieve the BAT/BCT standards, as required by Section A(6) of the 1997 Permit and Sections X(G) and X(H) of the 2015 Permit.

To the extent there are areas of the Facility where industrial activities, in fact, do not occur, the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed to comply with the certification requirements set out at Section XVII(E)(1) of the 2015 Permit that would allow Robertson's to exclude certain areas from its storm water management program. Nor have the Facility Owners and/or Operators revised

the Facility SWPPP, as required by Section A(7) of the 1997 Permit and Section X(D)(2)(a) of the 2015 Permit.

The Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed and continue to fail to adequately develop, implement, and/or revise the SWPPP, in violation of SWPPP requirements of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility operates with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or properly revised SWPPP is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. The Facility Owners and/or Operators have been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's SWPPP requirements since at least June 3, 2011. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. The Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

E. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Storm Water Permit requires permittees to develop and implement storm water monitoring and reporting programs ("M&RPs") prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific M&RP requirements of the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit are set out below.

1. 1997 Permit Requirements

Section B(1) and Provision E(3) of the 1997 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP by October 1, 1992, or prior to the commencement of industrial activities at a facility, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The primary objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Section B(2).

The M&RP must therefore ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *Id.* Sections B(3) – B(16) of the 1997 Permit set forth the M&RP requirements. Specifically, Section B(3) requires dischargers to conduct quarterly visual observations of all drainage areas within their facility for the presence of authorized and unauthorized non-storm water discharges. Section B(4) requires dischargers to conduct visual observations of storm water discharges from one storm event per month during the Wet Season. Sections B(3) and B(4) further require dischargers to document the presence of any floating or suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor, and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to eliminate unauthorized non-storm water discharges and to reduce or prevent pollutants from contacting non-storm water and storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(3) and B(4). Dischargers must revise the SWPPP in response to these observations to ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility. *Id.*, Section B(4). Sections B(5) and B(7) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to visually observe and collect samples of storm water from all locations where storm water is discharged.

The Facility was and/or is a member of the Building Materials Industry Group Monitoring Program, and thus the Facility Owners and/or Operators must comply with the group monitoring provisions set forth in Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit. Under Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit, the Facility Owners and/or Operators must collect at least two (2) samples from each discharge point at the Facility over a five (5) year period. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(5), B(7), and B(15). Storm water samples must be analyzed for TSS, pH, specific conductance ("SC"), total organic carbon or O&G, and other pollutants that are likely to be present in the facility's discharges in significant quantities, such as aluminum and nitrate plus nitrite. *See* Storm Water Permit, Section B(5)(c). The 1997 Permit requires facilities classified as SIC code 3273, such as the Facility, to also analyze storm water samples for iron. *Id.*; *see also* 1997 Permit, Table D, Sector E.

Section B(7)(d) of the 1997 Permit allows for the reduction of sampling locations in very limited circumstances when "industrial activities and BMPs within two or more drainage areas are substantially identical." If a discharger seeks to reduce sampling locations, the "[f]acility operators must document such a determination in the annual report." *Id.*

2. <u>2015 Permit Requirements</u>

As with the 1997 M&RP requirements, Sections X(I) and XI(A)-XI(D) of the 2015 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. The objective of the M&RP is still to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the 2015 Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XI. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and is evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *See id.*

As an *increase* in observation frequency to the 1997 Permit, Section XI(A) of the 2015 Permit requires all visual observations at least once each month, and at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location. Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, O&G, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(2). Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(3).

Section XI(B)(1-5) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to collect storm water discharge samples from a qualifying storm event[17] as follows: 1) from each discharge location, 2) from two storm events within the first half of each reporting year[18] (July 1 to December 31), 3) from two storm events within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30), and 4) within four hours of the start of a discharge, or the start of facility operations if the qualifying storm event occurs within the previous 12-hour period. Section XI(B)(11) of the 2015 Permit, among other

---

[17] The 2015 Permit defines a qualifying storm event as one that produces a discharge for at least one drainage area, and is preceded by 48-hours with no discharge from any drainage areas. 2015 Permit, Section XI(B)(1).

[18] A reporting year is defined as July 1 through June 30, 2015 Permit, Findings, ¶ 62(b).

requirements, provides that permittees must submit all sampling and analytical results for all samples via SMARTS within 30 days of obtaining all results for each sampling event.

The parameters to be analyzed are also consistent with the 1997 Permit, except the 2015 Permit no longer requires SC be sampled. Specifically, Section XI(B)(6)(a)-(b) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to analyze samples for TSS, oil & grease, and pH. Section XI(B)(6)(c) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to analyze samples for pollutants associated with industrial operations. Section XI(B)(6) of the 2015 Permit also requires dischargers to analyze storm water samples for additional applicable industrial parameters related to receiving waters with 303(d) listed impairments, or approved Total Maximum Daily Loads.

3. <u>The Facility Owners and/or Operators Have Violated and Continue to Violate the Storm Water Permit M&RP Requirements</u>

The Facility Owners and/or Operators have been and continue to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or revised M&RP. For example, the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed and continue to fail to develop an M&RP that requires the Facility Owners and/or Operators to analyze storm water discharges from the Facility for all required parameters by failing to specify that storm water discharges will be analyzed for, at a minimum, aluminum, lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, arsenic, COD, and BOD, in violation of Section B(5)(c) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI(B)(6)(c) of the 2015 Permit. Nor have the Facility Owners and/or Operators developed an M&RP that requires analysis for pollutants listed on the 2012 303(d) list that are associated with the industrial activities at the Facility, including pH, in violation of Section XI(B)(6) of the 2015 Permit. In addition, the Facility Owners and/or Operators failed and continue to fail to develop an M&RP that requires that the applicable test methods be used when analyzing storm water samples from the Facility.

The Facility Owners and/or Operators also failed to collect and analyze storm water samples as required by the Storm Water Permit. For example, for the past five (5) years the Facility Owners and/or Operators have not collected storm water samples as was required in violation of Sections B(5), B(7), and B(15) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI of the 2015 Permit. Specifically, pursuant to the applicable group monitoring plan, the Facility Owners and/or Operators were required to collect samples in the 2014/2015 wet season.

Further, at Sections 10.4.7 and 10.4.8 the Facility SWPPP states that the Facility Owners and/or Operators will both combine storm water samples and reduce the number of locations to be sampled in each drainage area if the industrial activities and BMPs in the area are similar. The Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed and continue to fail to meet the requirements of Sections XI(C)(4) and XI(C)(5) related to representative sampling reduction and qualified combined samples.

The Facility Owners' and/or Operators' failure to conduct sampling and monitoring as required by the Storm Water Permit demonstrates that it has failed to develop, implement, and/or revise an M&RP that complies with the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. Every day that the Facility Owners and/or Operators conduct operations in violation of the specific monitoring requirements of the Storm Water Permit, or with an inadequately developed and/or implemented M&RP, is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. The

Facility Owners and/or Operators have been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's M&RP requirements every day since at least June 3, 2011. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. The Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

F. Failure to Comply with the Storm Water Permit's Reporting Requirements

Section B(14) of the 1997 Permit requires a permittee to submit an Annual Report to the Regional Board by July 1 of each year. Section B(14) requires that the Annual Report include a summary of visual observations and sampling results, an evaluation of the visual observation and sampling results, the laboratory reports of sample analysis, the annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation report, an explanation of why a permittee did not implement any activities required, and other information specified in Section B(13). The 2015 Permit includes the same annual reporting requirement. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XVI.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed to submit and/or upload the Facility 2014/2015 Annual Report. Further, the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed and continue to fail to submit Annual Reports that comply with these reporting requirements. For example, in its 2010/2011, 2011/2012, 2012/2013, 2013/2014 Annual Reports, the Facility Owners and/or Operators certified that: (1) a complete Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation was done pursuant to Section A(9) of the Storm Water Permit; (2) the SWPPP's BMPs address existing potential pollutant sources; and (3) the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit, or will otherwise be revised to achieve compliance. However, information available to Waterkeeper indicates that these certifications are erroneous. For example, as discussed above, no storm water samples were collected from the Facility. Further, the Facility's SWPPP does not include many elements required by the Storm Water Permit, and thus it is erroneous to certify that the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit.

The Facility Owners and/or Operators have also submitted incomplete Annual Reports. For example, in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 Annual Reports, as the reason no samples were collected the Facility Owners and/or Operators state that the Facility "is a construction based business and during inclement weather our facility is closed." Not only does information available to Waterkeeper demonstrate that the Facility does operate during storm events, the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit do not excuse failures to collect required samples on this basis.

In addition, the facility operator must report any noncompliance with the Storm Water Permit at the time that the Annual Report is submitted, including 1) a description of the noncompliance and its cause, 2) the period of noncompliance, 3) if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue, and 4) steps taken or planned to reduce and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance. Storm Water Permit, Section C(11)(d). The Owners and/or Operators have not reported non-compliance as required.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility Owners and/or Operators have failed to submit the 2014/2015 Annual Report, and have submitted incomplete and/or incorrect Annual Reports that fail to comply with the Storm Water Permit. As such, the Facility Owners and/or Operators are in daily violation of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility

Owners and/or Operators conduct operations at the Facility without reporting as required by the Storm Water Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1311(a). The Facility Owners and/or Operators have been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's reporting requirements every day since at least June 3, 2011. These violations are ongoing, the 2015 Permit's annual reporting requirements are as stringent as the 1997 Permit requirements, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available, including specifically violations of the 2015 Permit reporting requirements (*see* 2015 Permit, Sections XII. and XVI.). The Facility Owners and/or Operators are subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since June 3, 2011.

IV. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of up to $37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009.

In addition to civil penalties, Waterkeeper will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d), Waterkeeper will seek to recover its costs, including attorneys' and experts' fees, associated with this enforcement action.

V. CONCLUSION

Waterkeeper is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations described in this Notice Letter. However, upon expiration of the 60-day notice period, Waterkeeper will file a citizen suit under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act for Robertson's violations of the Storm Water Permit.

If you wish to pursue settlement discussions please contact Waterkeeper's legal counsel:

Caroline Koch
Lawyers for Clean Water, Inc.
1004A O'Reilly Avenue
San Francisco, California 94129

Orange County Coastkeeper
ATTN: Colin A. Kelly
3151 Airway Ave., Suite F-110
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Tel: (714) 850-1965 ext. 307

Sincerely,

Colin Kelly
Senior Staff Attorney
Inland Empire Waterkeeper
Orange County Coastkeeper

SERVICE LIST

Via U.S. Mail

Loretta Lynch, Attorney General
U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Jared Blumenfeld
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Kurt Berchtold
Executive Officer
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
3737 Main Street, Suite 500
Riverside, California 92501

Gina McCarthy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Thomas Howard
Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, California 95812

Exhibit 1

Robertson's San Jacinto
Exhibit 1

Riverside Municipal Airport Riverside, CA Rain Station KRAL		
Date	**Day of Week**	**Daily Precipitation (Inches)**
6/31/2011	Sunday	.34
10/5/2011	Wednesday	.46
11/4/2011	Friday	.33
11/12/2011	Saturday	.15
12/12/2011	Monday	.43
1/21/2012	Saturday	.20
1/23/2012	Monday	.21
2/15/2012	Wednesday	.36
3/17/2012	Saturday	.52
4/11/2012	Wednesday	.21
4/13/2012	Friday	.18
12/13/2012	Thursday	.49
12/24/2012	Monday	.22
12/29/2012	Saturday	.13
1/24/2013	Thursday	.19
1/25/2013	Friday	.37
1/26/2013	Saturday	.19
2/8/2013	Thursday	.49
3/8/2013	Friday	.46
Total Rain Days		**19**

March Air Reserve Base Riverside, CA Rain Station KRIV		
Date	**Day of Week**	**Daily Precipitation (Inches)**
7/30/2013	Friday	.38
10/9/2013	Wednesday	.42
11/21/2013	Thursday	.20
11/22/2013	Friday	.15
12/7/2013	Saturday	.18
12/19/2013	Thursday	.18
2/28/2014	Friday	1.08
3/1/2014	Saturday	.43
3/2/2014	Sunday	.25
4/2/2014	Wednesday	.13
4/25/2014	Friday	.16
4/26/2014	Saturday	.18
8/3/2014	Sunday	.20
8/20/2014	Wednesday	.27
11/1/2014	Saturday	.17
12/2/2014	Tuesday	.77
12/3/2014	Wednesday	.51
12/4/2014	Thursday	.28
12/12/2014	Friday	.73
12/13/2014	Saturday	.20
12/17/2014	Wednesday	.13
1/11/2015	Sunday	.12
1/26/2015	Monday	.29
1/30/2015	Friday	.11
2/22/2015	Sunday	.12

2/23/2015	Monday	.19
3/1/2015	Sunday	.12
5/8/2015	Friday	.28
5/14/2015	Thursday	.15
5/15/2015	Friday	.12
7/18/2015	Saturday	.40
7/19/2015	Sunday	.97
9/15/2015	Tuesday	.43
10/5/2015	Monday	.27
10/14/2015	Wednesday	.12
10/15/2015	Thursday	.21
10/22/2015	Tuesday	.14
1/5/2016	Tuesday	.78
1/6/2016	Wednesday	.68
1/7/2016	Thursday	.64
1/31/2016	Sunday	.12
1/17/2016	Wednesday	.10
3/7/2016	Monday	.14
3/11/2016	Friday	.27
4/8/2016	Friday	.22
4/10/2016	Sunday	.49
4/25/2016	Monday	.19
5/6/2016	Friday	.27
	Total Rain Days	**48**