| | | See a see promo pr |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Tim O'Laughlin (SBN 116807) | Superior Court Of California, |
| | Tim O'Laughlin (SBN 116807) Valerie C. Kincaid (SBN 231815) | Sacramento |
| 2 | Timothy J. Wasiewski (SBN 302306) O'LAUGHLIN & PARIS LLP | 05/01/2019 |
| 3 | 2617 K Street, Suite 100 | hportalanza |
| 4 | Sacramento, California 95816 | By, Deputy |
| • | Telephone: (916) 993-3962 Facsimile: (916) 264-2040 | Case Number: |
| 5 | Email: towater@olaughlinparis.com vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com | 34-2019-80003133 |
| 6 | tw@olaughlinparis.com | > |
| | | |
| 7 | Attorneys for Petitioner/Plaintiff | |
| 8 | SAN JÓAQUIN TRIBUTARIES AUTHORITY, a Joint Powers Authority | Exempt from filing fee per Gov. Code §6103 Public Agency Exception |
| 9 | AUTHORITI, a solit Towers Authority | Fublic Agency Exception |
| | | |
| 10 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 11 | FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO | |
| 12 | | |
| 12 | SAN JOAQUIN TRIBUTARIES |) CASE NO.: |
| 13 | AUTHORITY, a Joint Powers Authority, |) SAN JOAQUIN TRIBUTARIES |
| 14 | Petitioner/Plaintiff, | AUTHORITY'S VERIFIED PETITION FOR |
| 15 | r etitionei/1 iaintii1, |) WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT) FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF |
| | v. | į (|
| 16 | | } |
| 17 | CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD, and | BY FAX |
| 18 | DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, | SI IAA |
| 10 | 2 0 20 1 uneugu ree, menure, | |
| 19 | Respondents/Defendants. | } |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | 1. Petitioner, San Joaquin Tributaries Authority ("SJTA"), files this verified Petition | |
| 23 | for a Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory Relief seeking: (1) a writ of mandate under | |
| 24 | Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 directing the Respondent State Water Resources Control | |
| 25 | Board ("Board" or "State Water Board") to vacate and set aside its adoption of amendments to the | |
| 26 | Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and the Water Quality Control Plan for | |
| 27 | Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California to establish a state wetland | |
| 28 | definition and procedures for discharges of dredge or fill material to waters of the state | |
| 20 | 1 | |
| | | |

SJTA's VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE and COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

("Procedures"); (2) a writ of mandate under Code of Civil Procedure ¹ section 1085 directing the State Water Board to comply with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, the Clean Water Act, and the California Administrative Procedure Act; and (3) a judicial declaration under Code of Civil Procedure section 1060 declaring that the Procedures, as adopted by the State Water Board, are void, invalid, and unenforceable.

I. INTRODUCTION

- 2. In California, the discharge of dredge or fill material to waters of the state is regulated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (33 U.S.C., § 1251 et seq.) (widely known as the "Clean Water Act") and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. (Wat. Code, Division 7, § 13000 et seq.)² ("Porter-Cologne Act").)
- 3. The Clean Water Act's provisions are limited to regulating "navigable waters," which are defined as "waters of the United States, including the territorial seas." (33 U.S.C., § 1362 (7).) Under section 404 of the Clean Water Act, discharges of dredge or fill material into "navigable waters" are regulated through a permitting process administered by the Army Corps of Engineers. (33 U.S.C., §§ 1311(a), 1344.)
- 4. When applying for a federal permit under the section 404 program, applicants must also obtain a state water quality certification from the State Water Board or one of its nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. (See, e.g., 33 U.S.C., § 1341.) Section 401 certifications authorize states to review and approve, condition, or deny proposed federal permits or licenses that will result in a discharge of dredge or fill material to waters of the United States within the state's borders. (See *id*.)
- 5. Accordingly, to lawfully discharge dredge or fill material into waters of the United States, an applicant must obtain a section 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers and a state water quality section 401 certification from the State Water Board (or one of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards).

///

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all references to the "Code of Civil Procedure" or "Code of Civ. Proc." shall refer to the California Code of Civil Procedure.

²Unless otherwise specified, all references to the "Wat. Code" or "Water Code" shall refer to the California Water Code.

- 6. The Porter-Cologne Act is California's principal water quality law. (Wat. Code, § 13000 et seq.) Under the Porter-Cologne Act, primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality belongs to the State Water Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards. (California Building Industry Assn. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2018) 4 Cal.5th 1032, 1037, citing Wat. Code, § 13001.)
- 7. The Porter-Cologne Act requires every person discharging or proposing to discharge "waste" that could affect the quality of "waters of the state" to file a waste discharge report with the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (*California Building Industry Assn. v. State Water Resources Control Bd., supra*, 4 Cal.5th at fn. 2, citing Wat. Code, § 13260 (a)(1).) Thereafter, the regional board then "prescribe[s] requirements as to the nature" of the discharge. (*Id.*, at fn. 2, citing Wat. Code, § 13263 (a).) "The regional board's prescription of requirements is, in essence, a permit to discharge waste into state waters subject to conditions set by the regional water board." (*Id.*, at fn. 2, citing *Building Industry Assn. of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 866, 875.)
- 8. The Porter-Cologne Act's waste discharge requirements and reporting provisions apply to discharges of waste to "waters of the state." (Wat. Code, §§ 13260 (a); see, e.g., Wat. Code, § 13263.) "Waters of the state" is defined as "any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state." (Wat. Code, § 13050 (e).)
- 9. Against this backdrop, on April 2, 2019, the State Water Board adopted a Resolution which, among other things, amended the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California to establish a state wetland definition and procedures for discharges of dredge or fill material to waters of the state ("Procedures"). As of April 30, 2019, the Board had not made the final version of the Resolution publicly available.
- 10. The Procedures contain four components: (1) a state wetland definition, (2) a framework for determining if a wetland that meets the wetland definition is a water of the state, (3) wetland delineation procedures, and (4) procedures for application submittal, and the review and approval of water quality certifications, waste discharge requirements, and waivers of waste discharge requirements for dredge or fill activities.

- 11. The State Water Board (and Regional Water Quality Control Boards) plan to implement the Procedures under their authority to set waste discharge requirements and issue Clean Water Act section 401 certifications. How a discharger must comply with the Procedures depends on whether the discharge occurs in water that qualifies as a water of the United States, a water of the state, or both.
- 12. By virtue of its expansive definition, waters of the state is more inclusive (i.e., regulates/covers more water features) than waters of the United States. Waters of the state consist of: (1) all waters of the United States and (2) non-federal waters that qualify as "waters of the state" but do not meet the definition of "waters of the United States." (See Wat. Code, § 13050 (e).)
- 13. For discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the state that are also waters of the United States, an applicant must complete the Clean Water Act section 404 permitting process with the Army Corps of Engineers and obtain a section 401 water quality certification from the State Water Board (or one of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards). For discharges of dredge or fill material into these waters, the Board will implement the Procedures by conditioning section 401 water quality certifications on compliance with the Procedures.
- 14. Alternatively, for discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the state that are not also waters of the United States, the State Water Board will implement the Procedures through its authority to set waste discharge requirements.
- 15. For the following reasons, the Board's adoption of the Procedures was unlawful and must be set aside:
 - a. The Procedures exceed the State Water Board's authority under Water Code section 13170 because the Board's authority to adopt statewide water quality control plans extends only to waters for which water quality standards are required under the Clean Water Act, not all waters of the state.
 - b. The Porter-Cologne Act grants the State Water Board the authority to regulate the discharge of "waste" that may affect the quality of waters of the state. (Wat. Code, §§ 13260-13263.) Because Porter-Cologne's definition of "waste" does not include discharges of dredge or fill material, the State Water Board lacks the authority to

- regulate the discharge of dredge and fill material under its authority to set waste discharge requirements.
- c. Government Code³ section 11353 mandates that when adopting water quality control plan amendments, the State Water Board must also comply with applicable requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. One such requirement is that final rules and regulations adopted by the State Water Board be distributed to the public thirty (30) days prior to adoption. The Board failed to meet this requirement because it published the final version of the Procedures four (4) days prior to adopting the Procedures.
- d. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, a water quality control plan must include: (1) the identification of beneficial uses to be protected by the plan; (2) a set of objectives that ensure the reasonable protection of those beneficial uses; and (3) a program of implementation for achieving those objectives. (Wat. Code, § 13050(j).) Despite labeling the Procedures as water quality control plan amendments, the Procedures are actually policy guidance for which the Board is attempting to provide regulatory authority. The Procedures do not include any of the mandatory components of a water quality control plan (i.e., designation of beneficial uses, setting of water quality objectives or establishment of a program of implementation). Because the Procedures do not contain the necessary components of a water quality control plan and the Board has not explained how the Procedures will otherwise serve as proper amendments to a water quality control plan, the Procedures constitute unlawful water quality control plan amendments.

II. PARTIES

A. Petitioner/Plaintiff San Joaquin Tributaries Authority

16. Petitioner/Plaintiff SJTA is a California Joint Powers Authority, duly organized and existing in accordance with the provisions of section 6500 *et seq*. of the California Government Code. The SJTA is a separate legal entity from its member agencies, and is authorized by its

³ Unless otherwise specified, all references to the "Government Code" or "Gov. Code" herein shall refer to the California Government Code.

member agencies to sue and be sued in its own name. (Gov. Code, § 6508.)

17. The SJTA member agencies are political subdivisions of the State of California which include: (a) the Modesto Irrigation District, Oakdale Irrigation District, and South San Joaquin Irrigation District, each of which is a California Irrigation District formed and existing pursuant to the provisions of the Irrigation District Law (Wat. Code, § 20500 et seq.); and (b) the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation and charter city under the Constitution of the State of California, acting by and through its San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

B. Respondent/Defendant State Water Resources Control Board

- 18. Respondent State Water Board is a public agency of the State of California, duly created by the California Legislature pursuant to the provisions of Article 3, Chapter 2, Division 1 (Sections 74 *et seq.*) of the Water Code and consists of five members appointed by the Governor of the State of California.
- 19. Petitioner is not aware of the true names and capacities of the respondents sued as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sue these respondents by such fictitious names. Each of these fictitiously named respondents is responsible in some manner for the activities alleged in this Petition/Complaint. Petitioner will amend this Petition/Complaint to add the true names of the fictitiously named respondents once they are discovered.

III. STANDING

- 20. Petitioner/Plaintiff has standing to assert the actions and claims raised in this Petition/Complaint.
- 21. The SJTA is a joint powers authority whose members have a common interest in protecting their landowners' and/or customers' ability to economically engage in agricultural activities.
- 22. The SJTA members have a common interest in the State Water Board's full compliance with the Porter-Cologne Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and applicable Clean Water Act provisions.
- 23. The Procedures create a new statewide mandatory permitting program applicable to all waters of the state. Additionally, by adopting a state wetland definition that designates specified

wetland features as waters of the state, the State Water Board will regulate lands under the Procedures that are not currently regulated by the federal government (i.e., under the Clean Water Act) as wetlands.

- 24. By regulating previously unregulated wetland features as waters of the state—and thus subject to the Procedures' permitting requirements—the Procedures set new regulatory requirements that stand to impact farmers' and ranchers' agricultural activities by mandating compliance with new and costly water quality regulations.
- 25. Although the Procedures contain exclusions for certain agricultural operations and features (e.g., activities exempt from federal regulation under Clean Water Act section 404(f) and prior converted cropland), the applicability of the Procedures' exclusions is commonly a discretionary decision by State Water Board and/or regional board staff. In this context, discretionary decisions will lead to inconsistent application and uncertainty within the regulated community over whether an exclusion will apply.
- 26. The SJTA member agencies' landowners and/or customers who engage in farming and ranching activities will be directly and substantially affected by the adverse economic impacts associated with complying with the Procedures' new and costly water quality regulations.
- 27. Petitioner/Plaintiff has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the course of ordinary law unless this Court grants the requested relief.
- Accordingly, Petitioner/Plaintiff has standing to assert the actions and claims raised in this Petition/Complaint.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 1060 and 1085.
- 30. Venue for this action is proper in Sacramento County because Code of Civil Procedure section 401, subdivision 1 provides that actions against the State of California or any agency thereof may be commenced and tried in the County of Sacramento.

V. EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 31. Respondent/Defendant State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures as amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California is a final action and not subject to further administrative appellate procedures.
- 32. Petitioner actively participated in the administrative process that culminated in the State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures by submitting written comments in September 2017 and March 2019 objecting to the Board's adoption of the Procedures.

VI. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

- 33. The State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures on April 2nd, 2019 is a final action for purposes of Water Code section 1126 because the Board's action is not subject to further administrative appellate procedures and no outstanding issues remain pending or otherwise unresolved following the Board's adoption. (See, e.g., *Millview County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2019) 32 Cal.App.5th 585, 594-595.)
- 34. This Complaint/Petition is timely under Water Code section 1126 because it was filed within thirty (30) days of the Board's adoption of the Procedures.

VII. PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL DOCTRINE

- 35. Petitioner brings this action as a private attorney general pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and any other applicable legal theory, to enforce important rights affecting the public interest.
- 36. Issuance of the relief requested in this Petition/Complaint will confer a significant benefit on a large class of persons within the service areas of the SJTA member agencies by virtue of the Procedures' regulation of previously unregulated areas/activities and associated permitting costs and delays.
- 37. Issuance of the relief requested in this Petition/Complaint will confer a significant benefit on the general public by requiring the State Water Board, and its appointed officials, to comply with the applicable provisions of the Porter-Cologne Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and Clean Water Act.

38. The necessity and financial burden of enforcement are such as to make an award of attorneys' fees appropriate in this proceeding. The financial burden was great: Petitioner/Plaintiff submitted numerous written comments, attended numerous State Water Board meetings and workshops, met with other interested parties, and spent considerable time preparing and executing litigation. Enforcement was necessary to ensure that various public agencies and citizens are not required to comply with invalid and unlawful regulations and attorneys' fees are therefore warranted.

VIII. STANDARD OF REVIEW

39. A trial court "reviews an administrative action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 to determine whether the agency's action was [1] arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support, [2] contrary to established public policy, [3] unlawful, [4] procedurally unfair, or [5] whether the agency failed to follow the procedure and give the notices the law requires." (*Vallejo Police Officers Assn. v. City of Vallejo* (2017) 15 Cal.App.5th 601, 611; see *California Water Impact Network v. Newhall County Water Dist.* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1464, 1483; *Am. Canyon Fire Prot. Dist. v. County of Napa* (1983) 141 Cal.App.3d 100, 106; *Lewin v. St. Joseph Hospital* (1978) 82 Cal.App.3d 368, 386.) A court "exercises independent judgment in determining whether the agency action was consistent with applicable law." (*Neighbors in Support of Appropriate Land Use v. County of Tuolumne* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 997, 1004 [internal quotations and citations omitted].)

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Writ of Mandate – Adoption of the Procedures was Unlawful (Code of Civil Procedure § 1085)

Violation of California Water Code Section 13170

- 40. The SJTA realleges and reincorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 39 of this Petition/Complaint.
- 41. The State Water Board cites to Water Code section 13170 as the basis of its authority to adopt the Procedures as amendments to statewide water quality control plans.

///

///

- 42. The State Water Board developed and adopted the Procedures in part as a response to the reduction (through federal rulemaking and United States Supreme Court decisions) of waters that qualify as waters of the United States, and thus fall outside Clean Water Act jurisdiction.
- 43. For example, as of April 23, 2019, the State Water Board's Procedures webpage states, "[t]he State Water Board has developed the Procedures to address several important issues. There is [a] need to strengthen protection of waters of the state that are no longer protected under the Clean Water Act (CWA) due to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, since the Water Boards have historically relied on CWA protections in dredged or fill discharge permitting practices."
- 44. Similarly, the Procedures' official Fact Sheet states that the Procedures are "needed" to protect waters of the State, "...at a time when the current federal administration is proposing to dramatically reduce the scope of the federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction."
- 45. Water Code section 13170 authorizes the State Water Board to adopt water quality control plans "...for waters for which water quality standards are required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto." (Wat. Code, § 13170.) Another name for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is the Clean Water Act. (*Pud No. 1 v. Wash. Dep't of Ecology* (1994) 511 U.S. 700, 704.)
- 46. Although Water Code section 13170 authorizes the State Water Board to adopt statewide water quality control plans, it limits the Board's authority to adopt water quality control plans to "...waters for which water quality standards <u>are required</u> by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto [i.e., the Clean Water Act]." (Wat. Code, § 13170 (emphasis added).)
- 47. Clean Water Act section 303 addresses the establishment of water quality standards under the Clean Water Act. (33 U.S.C., § 1313.) By its own terms, section 303 applies only to "navigable waters." (*Id.*, at (c)(2)(A) ["Whenever the State revises or adopts a new standard, such revised or new standard shall be submitted to the Administrator. Such revised or new water quality standard shall consist of the designated uses of the *navigable waters* involved and the water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses" (emphasis added)]; see also (c)(4) ["The Administrator shall promptly prepare and publish proposed regulations setting forth a revised or new water quality standard for the *navigable waters* involved" (emphasis added)].)

- 48. The Clean Water Act defines "navigable waters" as waters of the United States, including the territorial seas. (33 U.S.C., § 1362 (7).) Which waters qualify and do not qualify as "waters of the United States" is determined by federal regulations and federal court decisions. (See, e.g., *Rapanos v. United States* (2006) 547 U.S. 715, 723-729.)
- 49. Therefore, Water Code section 13170 inherently limits State Water Board regulatory authority through statewide water quality control plans to waters that qualify as waters of the United States.
- 50. Despite Water Code section 13170's limitation, the Procedures adopted by the State Water Board apply to discharges of dredge and fill material to <u>all</u> waters of the state, which include (1) all waters of the United States and (2) non-federal waters that qualify as "waters of the state" but do not qualify as "waters of the United States."
- 51. Water Code section 13170's express terms limit the Board's authority to adopt statewide water quality control plans, the mechanism by which the Board adopted the Procedures, to waters for which water quality standards are required by the Clean Water Act—waters of the United States.
- 52. The Board's primary reason for adopting the Procedures is to regulate waters of the state that are no longer covered by the Clean Water Act (i.e., no longer waters of the United States).
- 53. If a water feature is not covered by the Clean Water Act—in other words, it is not a water of the United States—that water feature is not a water for which water quality standards are required under the Clean Water Act.
- 54. The Clean Water Act only requires water quality standards for waters covered by the Clean Water Act.
- 55. If a water falls outside the scope of the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction (i.e., it is no longer a water of the United States), it is not a water for which water quality standards are required by the Clean Water Act.
- 56. To the extent the Procedures regulate waters of the state not covered by the Clean Water Act (i.e., waters of the state that are <u>not</u> waters of the United States) through a statewide water quality control plan, the Board has exceeded its authority under Water Code section 13170

because these waters are not waters for which water quality standards are required under the Clean Water Act.

57. Because the State Water Board's action was unlawful, this Court should issue a writ of mandate directing the State Water Board to set aside its adoption of the Procedures.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Writ of Mandate – Adoption of the Procedures was Unlawful (Code of Civil Procedure § 1085)

Exceedance of the Board's Authority to Regulate "Waste" under the Porter-Cologne Act

- 58. The SJTA realleges and reincorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 57 of this Petition/Complaint.
- 59. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the State Water Board may regulate discharges of "waste" that may affect the quality of waters of the state. (Wat. Code, §§ 13260, 13263.)
- 60. "Waste" under Porter-Cologne, "...includes sewage and any and all other waste substances, liquid, solid, gaseous, or radioactive, associated with human habitation, or of human or animal origin, or from any producing, manufacturing, or processing operation, including waste placed within containers of whatever nature prior to, and for purposes of, disposal." (Wat. Code, § 13050 (j).)
- 61. The Porter-Cologne Act's definition of waste does not include the discharge of dredge or fill material.
- 62. To the extent that the State Water Board implements the Procedures under its waste discharge requirement authority, the Board has exceeded its authority under Porter-Cologne because dredge and fill material are not included in the Act's definition of waste.
- 63. Because the State Water Board's action was unlawful, this Court should issue a writ of mandate directing the State Water Board to set aside its adoption of the Procedures.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Writ of Mandate – Adoption of the Procedures was Unlawful (Code of Civil Procedure § 1085)

Violation of Code of California Government Code Section 11353

- 64. The SJTA realleges and reincorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 63 of this Petition/Complaint.
- 65. California's Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") establishes rulemaking procedures and standards for state agencies in California. (Gov. Code, § 11340 et seq.)
- 66. Under the APA, a "regulation" includes rules or standards of general application that implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the agency adopting the regulation. (Gov. Code, § 11342.600.)
 - 67. Significant portions of the Procedures meet the definition of a "regulation."
- 68. Government Code section 11353 outlines specific APA requirements to which the State Water Board must adhere to when adopting water quality control plans or policies that constitute regulations. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 11353.)
- 69. Amongst these requirements, Government Code section 11353 mandates that when adopting water quality control plan amendments, the State Water Board must also comply with applicable requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (i.e., the Clean Water Act). (Gov. Code, § 11353 (b)(7).)
- 70. Amongst the applicable requirements of the Clean Water Act are requirements governing the minimum public participation and notice procedures to which the State Water Board must adhere to when adopting water quality control plan amendments. (40 C.F.R., § 25.1 (a); see also 40 C.F.R., § 25.2(a)(1) [activities covered under the public participation and notice regulations include state rulemaking under the Clean Water Act].)
- 71. Applicable here, the Clean Water Act regulations provide that any final rules and regulations adopted by the State Water Board be distributed to the public in accordance with Code of Federal Regulations ("C.F.R.") title 40, subsection 25.4 (c). (40 C.F.R., § 25.10 (a).)
- 72. In relevant part, 40 C.F.R. subsection 25.4 (c) provides that the public should be notified of agency action within not less than thirty (30) days in advance of agency action.

- 73. The final version of the Procedures was not distributed to the public thirty (30) days in advance of the State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures.
 - 74. The State Water Board adopted the Procedures on April 2, 2019.
- 75. On March 22, 2019, the State Water Board released the purportedly "final" version of the Procedures—eleven (11) days before the Board was scheduled to adopt the Procedures.
- 76. Thereafter, on March 29, 2019, the Board released a "Change Sheet" containing new sections and amendments to the Procedures. This Change Sheet was distributed <u>four (4) days</u> before the Board adopted the Procedures on April 2, 2019.
- 77. The Clean Water Act's public notification and participation requirements exist so the public has the opportunity to understand official programs and proposed actions. (40 C.F.R., § 25.3 (c)(1).) The requirements also exist to ensure that government agencies are responsive to the public's concerns and do not make any significant decisions without consulting the public. (*Id.*, at (c)(2)-(3).)
- 78. The State Water Board failed to comply with the Clean Water Act's public notification requirements by releasing the final version of the Procedures four (4) days before it adopted the Procedures, instead of the required thirty (30) day minimum. (40 C.F.R., §§ 25.10 (a), 25.4 (c).)
- 79. Additionally, by releasing the Procedures four (4) days before adopting the Procedures, the Board engaged in significant decision making without consulting the public due to the public's lack of a meaningful opportunity to digest and comprehend the truly final version of the Procedures.
- 80. By failing to adhere to applicable requirements of the Clean Water Act, the State Water Board's April 2, 2019 adoption of the Procedures violated Government Code section 11353 (b)(7). Because the State Water Board's action was unlawful, this Court should issue a writ of mandate directing the State Water Board to set aside its adoption of the Procedures.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Writ of Mandate – Adoption of the Procedures was Unlawful (Code of Civil Procedure § 1085)

Unlawful Water Quality Control Plan Amendments

- 81. The SJTA realleges and reincorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 80 of this Petition/Complaint.
- 82. The Porter-Cologne Act requires the State Water Board to adopt water quality control plans to protect the waters of the state for the many beneficial uses to which those waters are put, including domestic use, municipal supply, agricultural production, and the preservation of fish and wildlife resources. (Wat. Code, § 13000 et seq.)
- 83. Each water quality control plan must: (1) identify "beneficial uses" that will be protected by the plan, (2) establish "objectives" that provide a reasonable level of protection for those beneficial uses, and (3) create a "program of implementation" needed to achieve those objectives. (Wat. Code, §§ 13050(j), 13241, 13242.)
- 84. The Board adopted the Procedures as amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and forthcoming Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California.
- 85. The Procedures consist of four components: (1) a state wetland definition, (2) a framework for determining if a wetland that meets the state wetland definition is a water of the state, (3) wetland delineation procedures, and (4) procedures for application submittal, and the review and approval of water quality certifications, waste discharge requirements, and waivers of waste discharge requirements for dredge or fill activities.
- 86. Despite adopting the Procedures as water quality control plan amendments, the Procedures do not designate beneficial uses, do not set water quality objectives, nor do they mention a program of implementation.
- 87. By not including any of the mandatory components of a water quality control plan, and not explaining how the Procedures will work as amendments to a water quality control plan, the Procedures constitute unlawful water quality control plan amendments.

- 88. The Procedures are actually State Water Board guidance and policy. The State Water Board's improper adoption of the Procedures as regulations is an unlawful attempt to give policy regulatory authority, which violates Water Code section 13000 et seq.
- 89. Because the State Water Board's action was unlawful, this Court should issue a writ of mandate directing the State Water Board to set aside its adoption of the Procedures.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Declaratory Relief under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1060

- 90. The SJTA realleges and reincorporates, as though fully set forth herein, each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 89 of this Petition/Complaint.
- 91. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1060, "[a]ny person...may ask for a declaration of rights or duties, either alone or with other relief; and the court may make a binding declaration of these rights or duties, whether or not further relief is or could be claimed at this time." (Code of Civ. Proc., § 1060.)
- 92. Pursuant to Government Code section 11350, "[a]ny interested person may obtain a judicial declaration as to the validity of any regulation or order by bringing an action for declaratory relief in the superior court in accordance with the Code of Civil Procedure." (Gov. Code, § 11350.)
- 93. Petitioner contends that the State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures as amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California violate, among other things, the Porter-Cologne Act, the APA, and the Clean Water Act.
- 94. The State Water Board contends that it complied with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations in adopting the Procedures.
- 95. An actual controversy exists surrounding the legality of the State Water Board's adoption of the Procedures.
- 96. A judicial determination of this controversy is necessary and appropriate at this time.

7

8

10

11

2324

2526

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner/Plaintiff prays for judgment against Respondents as follows:

- 1. For a writ of mandate directing Respondent to vacate and set aside its adoption of amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California and the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California to establish a state wetland definition and procedures for discharges of dredge or fill material to waters of the state:
- For a writ of mandate directing Respondent to comply with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and applicable Clean Water Act sections and regulations;
- 3. For a judgment declaring: (a) that the Respondent's adoption of the Procedures is void and invalid; (b) that the adoption of the Procedures violated Water Code section 13170; (c) that the adoption of the Procedures exceeded the State Water Board's authority to regulation "waste" under the Porter-Cologne Act; (d) that the adoption of the Procedures violated the APA; (e) that the adoption of the Procedures was an unlawful attempt to implement policies through the water quality control planning process; and (f) that the Procedures as adopted are unenforceable;
 - 4. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
 - 5. For such other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 1, 2019

O'LAUGHLIN & PARIS LLP

By:

TIM O'LAUGHLIN (SBN 116807) VALERIE C. KINCAID (SBN 231815) TIMOTHY J. WASIEWSKI (SBN 302306) Attorneys for Petitioner/Plaintiff,

SAN JOAQUIN TRIBUTARIES AUTHORITY

VERIFICATION

I, STEVE KNELL, state that I am the General Manager for Oakdale Irrigation District, a member agency of Plaintiff/Petitioner San Joaquin Tributaries Authority. I have read the foregoing Petition/Complaint and have personal knowledge that the matters set forth therein are true and correct, and on that basis allege them to be true and correct. I make this verification in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure § 446, subdivision (a).

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct and that this verification was executed on May 1, 2019, in Oakdale, California.

By:
STEVE KNELL, GENERAL MANAGER,
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT