# CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD 

 SAN DIEGO REGION
## IN THE MATTER OF:

Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R9-2015-0110
Aganst San Altos - Lemon Grove, LLC

## DECLARATION OF DEE DEE

 EVERETT IN SUPPORT OF SAN ALTOS-LEMON GROVE, LLC'S LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ARGUMENTS AND ANALYSIS IN OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT NO. R9-2015-0110I, Dee Dee Everett, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a paralegal with the law firm of Opper \& Varco LLP, counsel for San Altos - Lemon Grove, LLC. I know the following of my own personal knowledge and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters discussed herein.
2. Attached as Exhibit A are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Wayne Chiu dated January 14, 2016.
3. Attached as Exhibit B are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Chiara Clemente dated January 22, 2016.
4. Attached as Exhibit C are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Leon Peter Firsht dated December 28, 2015.
5. Attached as Exhibit D are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Gary Harper dated December 28, 2015.
6. Attached as Exhibit E are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Frank Melbourne, Volume I dated January 13, 2016.
7. Attached as Exhibit F are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Frank Melbourn, Volume II dated January 14, 2016.
8. Attached as Exhibit $G$ are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Tad Nakatani dated December 29, 2015.
9. Attached as Exhibit H are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Brian Alan Nemerow dated December 29, 2015.
10. Attached as Exhibit I are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of John Robert Quenzer dated December 29, 2015.
11. Attached as Exhibit J are true and correct copies of excerpts of the Deposition of Malik Tammi dated December 28, 2015.

I declare, subject to penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this $3^{\text {ra }}$ day of February, 2016, at San Diego, California.
Lluhlu Everett
Dee Dee Everett

## EXHIBIT A

## CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD <br> SAN DIEGO REGION

IN THE MATTER OF: ।
Administrative Civil Liability
Complaint No. R9-2015-0110
Against San Altos-Lemon Grove, LLC

DEPOSITION OF WAYNE CHIU, a witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, taken at 225 Broadway, San Diego, California, at 8:34 a.m., on Thursday, January 14, 2016, before Diane M. Lytle, CSR 8606.

Hutchings Number 600593

## WAYNE CHUI - 1/14/2016

$09: 27$
$09: 27$ them after I left.
Q. They told you -- They told you after you left or --
A. No. I mean, they told me, when I pointed this out to them, that they would contain and cover them after I left.

09:27 Q. But they didn't state what they were doing with those stockpiles?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't ask?
A. I didn't ask.

09:27
Q. Okay.

When you are evaluating whether or not a stockpile -- You know what, please strike that.

Let's look at -- Can you please state for me the difference between an active versus inactive part of a

09:28 construction site as defined by the permit.
A. Well, my understanding is, any area of a site that has been disturbed can be considered active.

However, if no activity to disturb an active area is
scheduled for 14 days or longer, then it becomes
09:28
Q. Did you ask anyone what they were doing with those stockpiles?
A. They told me that they would contain -- cover
inactive on day 15.

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210
Q. How about stockpiles? Are stockpiles active if
moving anything or adding to it, then I would expect it
to be covered and contained.
Q. Is that defined anywhere in the permit?
A. The "actively"?
Q. Yes.
A. Not that I know.
Q. Do you know if that is defined anywhere in the

CASQA handbook?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know, or you're answering "no"?

09:30
A. Oh, I'm sorry. I don't know.
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WAYNE CHUI - 1/14/2016
```
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```
09:32 made active again.
    So given the site was under a stop work notice for
    at least two weeks and not been worked on for probably
    longer than that, I determined that there were several
    areas that were inactive or were scheduled to be
    inactive. And I saw most of those areas with little to
    no evidence of erosion control BMP.
    Q. Did you talk to the site rep about what their
construction schedule was on that day?
    A. They just said that they were working on
        implementing BMPs.
    Q. So you did not discuss the specific
        construction schedule of where they had scheduled to be
        doing work for the month of December?
    A. No, because my understanding was they were
    under a stop work notice.
    Q. Sure.
    But they had a schedule before they were under the
    stop work notice; isn't that right?
    MR. BOYERS: Objection. Leading.
    MS. BERESEORD:
    Q. Do you think they would have had a construction
    schedule for the month of December if they hadn't had a
    stop work notice?
    A. I'm sure they would have.
```

09:44 conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I would say it's considered a
pollutant at any level.
MS. BERESFORD:
09:44 Q. Are you familiar with Table 1 in section
$5(a)(2)$ of the permit.
I'm sorry, that I don't have.
A. $5(a)(2)$, I have seen that table, yes.
Q. What do you think the purpose of that table is?
A. The table is there to provide guidance to a
site as to when they need to begin implementing more
rigorous BMPs.
Q. So if you have turbidity at less than 250 NTU,
is that an indication that the BMPs are likely
09:45 appropriate?
MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: I would not say that.
I would say that at 250 NTU , there is a significant
concern at that point. But under 250 NTU, we still have
09:45 a pollutant being discharged from the site. And if
there are not BMPs being implemented per the
requirements of the permit, any discharge of sediment
that is not being controlled to the best available
control technology, BCT or BAT standard, is discharging
09:46
in violation of the permit.
hutchings Litigation services - GLobal legal services 800.697 .3210

10:16 would address them should there be a rain event.
And so at the inspection on March 27 th, we had informed them that, you know, because it was dry, that, you know, what they had on site appeared adequate. But if there's a rain event, they need to know what BMPs they will implement should there be a rain event, and they did not have an answer for that.
Q. Why did you not issue a report for March 27?
A. We felt that they had, again, largely met the

## $10: 17$

requirements. And with the additional feedback we
provided to them, we expected them to understand that
they would implement those BMPs should there be a rain event.
Q. So as of March 27, did you feel that they had shown that they had made significant efforts to come back into compliance with the permit?
A. It appeared at the time that they had implemented several BMPs that were addressing the issues that I had identified, but there were still several

10:18 areas that they could have improved.
Q. But had they made significant effort to come back into compliance with the permit based on what you saw in December?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague as to "significant."
10:18
THE WITNESS: I think "significant" is the key word

```
10:18 here. But I'd say they did significant improvements.
            MS. BERESFORD:
            Q. How did you convey your comments to San Altos?
            A. Verbally.
            Q. Was there anything in writing to follow up?
            A. No.
            Q. When did you go to the site next?
            How about I show you this exhibit?
            MS. BERESFORD: Can you please --
            THE WITNESS: That will help.
            MS. BERESFORD: Can you please mark this.
            (EXHIBIT 7)
            THE WITNESS: If you give me a date and time, that
        shows me when I was there last.
10:19 MS. BERESFORD:
            Q. Exhibit }7\mathrm{ to the deposition is Exhibit
        Number 19 to the ACL.
            A. Looks like I was out there in May.
            Q. Can you please state for the record what
                    10:19 Exhibit 7 is.
            A. It is an inspection report that was prepared by
            Frank. Maybe it was prepared by me. I'm not sure. I
            don't remember.
```

But it was an inspection report for an inspection
10:19 that was conducted at the site on May 13th, 2015.
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```
WAYNE CHUI - 1/14/2016
```

10:19

10:20

0:20

May 13 ?
A. I think it was sunny. I don't remember.

Photos look like it was partly cloudy.
Q. Was it raining on -- during your site visit?
A. No.
Q. Okay.

And do you know if rain was forecast for the next 48 hours?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Let's look at finding number 1 on page 3 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- which talks about "Several stockpiles
observed without adequate containment."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And you refer to photos 1 and 2.

```
WAYNE CHUI - 1/14/2016
```

Page 72

10:27 that most projects refer to.
Q. And do you think it's a good handbook to follow?
A. I think it does provide good guidance as to how

10:27 to implement BMPs.
Q. Okay.

Going back to the May 13 report, finding number 3 talks about "Several areas were observed to be inactive, or scheduled to be inactive or could be scheduled to be

10:27 inactive."
Can you identify for me the specific areas that you thought were inactive.
A. There were several lots that appeared to be completed lots that did not need to have additional

10:27 activity on them. So as I said, you know, they -- they may have been storing things there or driving there, but that doesn't necessarily make them active. And they probably shouldn't have been areas where they were storing things and actively driving on them. There were
$10: 28$
plenty of other areas where they could have done that.
So photo 4 shows an example of that. Photo 5
showed a slope that I saw that I -- it appeared at that
time to look to be inactive. And given the guidance I
had provided to that site, I expected them to be
10:28
stabilizing any and all slopes as soon as they possibly
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$10: 28$
could.
Similarly, with photo 6, there was a slope there that appeared like it could have been inactive or
scheduled to be inactive and stabilized with some sort
of effective soil covering.
Q. Did you talk to anyone about what they were
doing in these areas?
A. NO.
Q. Do you know where on the site these areas are?
A. Let's see. I think photo 4 was a lot that is kind of on the -- I would say the southern side of the site. Photo 6 is kind of in the -- I think the -- I'm sorry. Photo 4 was on the northern end on the site. Photo 6 is on the southeastern side of the site, maybe more in the middle-ish area. The slope in photo 5, I think, was in the south or northeastern corner of the site.
Q. I'm sorry, say that again.
A. The northeastern corner of the site.

But we walked the entire site too, and these were just examples of areas that we saw without the erosion control BMPs. There were several areas throughout the site where we expected to see erosion control BMPs.
Q. And did you note those anywhere?
A. No. I thought we had plenty of examples that

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210

## Productionc8



Hope you got my voice mails on Friday and Monday. I will talk to the rest of the team but let's set June 3rd @ 10:00 AM as the tentative time to meet.

Call me when you get a chance @ 949-233-6700. Thanks.
Ben-

From: bencanderson@bcadievelopment.com
To: benanderso@aol.com
Sent: 5/8/2015 11:21:58 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: FW: Administrative Civil Liability Complaint for Valencia (WDID 937C369143: SM-828060)

| EXHIBIT 8 |
| :---: |
| REPORTER D. Lytle |
| WITNESS dhior-Ex (800) |
| DATE $1-14-16$ |

From: Chiu, Wayne@Waterboards [mailto:Wayne.Chiu@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 9:01 AM
To: Ben Anderson (bencanderson@bcadevelopment.com)
Cc: Becker, Eric@Waterboards; Melbourn, Frank@Waterboards; Clemente, Chiara@Waterboards; Ellison, Kailyn@Waterboards
Subject: Administrative Civil Liability Complaint for Valencia (WDID 937C369143; SM-828060)

Ben,

The San Diego Water Board is prepared to issuc an Administrative Civil Liability ( ACL ) Complaint (i.e. monetary penalties) for violations at the Valencia housing development construction site in Lemon Grove. I think it would make sense for us to meet and discuss this matter prior to issuing the ACL. Complaint. An hour should be sufficient. I am available to meet at my office on the following dates and times:

May 28 at 1:30 p.m.
June I at 10 a.m. or 1:30 p.m.
June 3 at $10 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. or 1:30 p.m.

Please let me know which date and time works best for you.
Thanks,
Wayne Chiu, PE
Water Resource Control Engineer
Storm Water Wlanagement Unit
Califormia Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92108
Direct Line: (619) 521-3354
Main Line: (619) 516-1990

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www avg.com
Version: $2015.0 .5863 /$ Virus Database: $4342 / 9725$ - Release Date: 05/08/15
WAYNE CHUI - 1/14/2016

09:29

## 09:29

09:29

09:30

09: 30

09:30
Q. How about stockpiles? Are stockpiles active if
they're going to be used within the next 14 days?
A. I don't consider stockpiles part of the
active/inactive categoric -- categorization of the terms
of the permit. Say that for -- I think it's
construction material stockpiles, they require cover and
berm at all times unless actively being used. Eor waste
stockpiles, it's protect from wind and rain at all times
and contain unless actively being used.
Q. And how -- define "actively being used."
A. Well, if I see a -- if I see that, you know,
there is evidence that they are adding to a stockpile or
removing from that stockpile during the day, then I
would call that actively being used. But if they're not
moving anything or adding to it, then I would expect it
to be covered and contained.
Q. Is that defined anywhere in the permit?
A. The "actively"?
Q. Yes.
A. Not that I know.
Q. Do you know if that is defined anywhere in the

CASQA handbook?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know, or you're answering "no"?
A. Oh, I'm sorry. I don't know.

09:29

09:29

09:29

09:30

## 

to be covered and contained.
Q. Is that defined anywhere in the permit?
A. The "actively"?
Q. Yes.
A. Not that I know.
Q. Do you know if that is defined anywhere in the CASQA handbook?

```
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know, or you're answering "no"?
A. Oh, I'm sorry. I don't know.
```

EXHIBIT B

# CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROI BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION 

IN THE MATTER OF:
Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R9-2015-0110 Against San Altos-Lemon Grove, LLC

DEPOSITION OF CHIARA CLEMENTE, witness
herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, taken at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego,

California, on Friday, January 22, 2016, at 9:07 a.m., before Marc Volz, CSR 2863, RPR, CRR
Q. Are you able to tell me why there's no violation asserted for December 14?
A. I don't know.

MS. DRABANDT: Objection.
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Can you please again go back to page 6 of the Technical Analysis for the Encinitas ACL. I'm at the very bottom paragraph of that page where it says "San Diego Water Board staff inspected the site on December 17, 2012. The inspection revealed that temporary erosion control BMPs identified in the city's SWPPP (soil binders and velocity dissipation devices) were not implemented. The inspection also revealed that most of the sediment control BMPs identified in the SWPPP (sediment traps, fiber rolls, street sweeping, storm drain inlet protection and construction entrance and exit stabilization) were not implemented or were totally ineffective as shown in following paragraphs." Do you see that paragraph?
A. Yes.
Q. Are things like failure to use fiber rolls and soil binders evidence of failure to apply linear sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. Does the Encinitas ACL allege a specific
violation for failure to apply linear sediment controls?
A. No.
Q. Why not?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Attorney-client
privilege.
MS. BERESEORD:
Q. Was the failure to apply linear sediment controls, as described by failure to use soil binders, fiber rolls, et cetera, considered one of the basis for the violation of failure to implement adequate controls?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you incorporate it into failure to implement adequate controls and not have a separate violation?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Attorney-client privileged.

MS. BERESEORD:
Q. Does the San Altos complaint allege both failure to have adequate controls in an active or inactive area and a separate violation for failure to have linear sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was a separate approach taken there?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Attorney-client
privileged.
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MS. BERESFORD: Let the record reflect we're trying
to determine how the fair and consistent policy is
applied into very different complaints and the Water Board will not answer that question.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Let's look at page 8 of the Technical Analysis for the Encinitas ACL.

MS. DRABANDT: Is now a good time for a break or do you want to wait a little?

MS. BERESFORD: If you would like to take a break, you can. I leave it up to the witness.

THE WITNESS: Sure. Let's take a break.
MS. BERESFORD: Okay. Great.
(Recess.)
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. I'm going to go back to something. We talked earlier -- and please state it differently if I'm mischaracterizing it -- that the Encinitas ACL alleged violations for failure to implement adequate controls, structures and management practice at the project; that it did not distinguish between inactive and active areas.
A. Correct.
Q. The San Altos complaint alleges violations specific to active failure to have BMPs on active areas
and failure to have sufficient BMPs on inactive areas; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you describe for me the unique facts of the

San Altos case that caused this different approach?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection to the point where any
attorney-client privileged information regarding
strategies.
If you can answer, generally speaking, go ahead.
THE WITNESS: The unique facts of the San
Altos-Lemon Grove case that did what?
MS. BERESEORD:
Q. That resulted in having separate violations for
inactive and active areas versus one allegation overall for lack of BMPs.
A. No, I cannot describe them.
Q. Did you discuss that issue with Mr. Melbourn?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. No.
Q. We were also talking about that the Encinitas ACL did not allege specific violations for failure to have linear sediment controls, and the San Altos complaint does allege specific violations for linear sediment controls. Can you describe the unique facts

Page
areas that I considered either unsubstantiated or that raised questions and $I$ would discuss those, but I don't specifically recall what areas we discussed.

MS. BERESFORD: Let's mark this, please, as Exhibit number 4.
Q. Can you please identify this document.
A. This is Exhibit Number 8 to the site's
complaint -- or to the site's technical report, which is the December 15, 2014 Facility Inspection Report written by Wayne Chiu.
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. If you could please turn to page 7 and look at photo 4. Then down in the right-hand corner there's text that says "Photos 4 through 7 show completed building pads and adjacent slopes without any erosion controls." Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then about six lines up from the bottom,
part of the sentence reads "Photos 4 through 7 --" I'll start at the beginning. "Sediment from completed lots and slopes in photos 4 through 7 transported to road in photo 8 lacking any erosion control measures during storm events, and inadequate runoff controls to reduce and prevent transport of sediment through site." Do you

$$
\text { CHIARA CLEMENTE - } 1 / 22 / 2016
$$

```
see that?
    A. Uh-huh.
    Q. I'd like to then go to the findings on page 3.
    A. Uh-huh.
    Q. The findings say "Several areas were observed
to be inactive without effective soil control. See
photos 4 through 7." Do you see that?
    A. I see "Several areas were observed to be
inactive, or could be scheduled to be inactive, without
effective soil cover to control potential erosion," dot,
dot, dot.
    Q. So is photo 4 the basis for violation number 4:
    "Failure to have, implement erosion control BMPs in
    inactive areas"?
    A. I'm sure it was part of the evidence that was
    put into the allegations of violation for failure to
    have adequate erosion control.
            Q. Is photo 4 also used -- and I'm looking at the
        language now at the bottom of page 7, to have inadequate
        run-off controls?
            A. So that's interesting. I'm not quite sure I
        understand that sentence very well because -- let me
        read the sentence. "Sediment from completed lots and
        slopes in photos 4 through }7\mathrm{ transported to road in
        photo 8 lacking any erosion control measures during
```
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storm events, and inadequate runoff controls to reduce
look and see whether photo 8 refers to inadequate run-off controls.
Q. Photo 8 is right there on page 7 . Would you look at that?
A. I would defer to the technical staff on this.
Q. Let's go back to page 3 .
A. Of the inspection report?
Q. Yes, please. Going to finding number 3, in reading that text would you agree that photo 4 was one of the basis to allege a violation of failure to have sufficient BMPs in an inactive area?
A. What I read from this is that -- let me finish reading it first, sorry. So the only thing I can say with certainty is that photo 4 is evidence of effective -- of lacking effective soil cover for erosion control.
Q. Does the first sentence of finding 3 specify that it was for areas observed to be inactive?
A. Yes. It says several areas were observed to be inactive. And then the next sentence says "Several completed building pads and several inactive slopes lacked any effective soil cover."
Q. Then going to finding number 5, can you please
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read that first sentence?
A. "Several slopes throughout the site were observed to lack linear sediment controls along the toe and grade breaks of exposed slopes. See photos 4 through 7."
Q. So were photos 4 through 7 used as evidence to allege violations of failure to have linear sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. Were photos 4 through 7 used to support the alleged violation of failure to have effective soil cover for inactive areas? Going back up to number 3 .
A. Possibly.
Q. If you could please turn to page 4. Finding number 7 says "Lack of effective run-on and run-off controls observed within and around the site which contributed to sediment discharges from the site. See photos 4 and 14." Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So was photo 4 used as evidence for the allegation of failure to have effective run-on and run-off controls?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to number 6 above, please. It says "Lack of effective perimeter sediment controls observed
which resulted in unauthorized sediment discharges from the site. See photos 9 through 14."
A. I'm sorry, where are we?
Q. I'm sorry. Page 4 of the exhibit.
A. Number 6?
Q. Number 6. It says "Lack of effective perimeter
sediment controls observed which resulted in
unauthorized sediment discharges from the site. See
photos 9 through 14." You see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So was photo 14 used as evidence to allege
failure to have effective perimeter sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. And then going to number 7 , photo 14 , was that used to establish lack of effective run-on and run-off controls?
A. Yes.

MS. BERESFORD: Can we please mark this exhibit as number 5.
Q. Can you please state what Exhibit 5 is?
A. This is Exhibit Number 18 to the Valencia technical report for the administrative civil liability complaint, which is a May 8, 2015 Facility Inspection Report conducted by Frank Melbourn.
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
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> areas that I considered either unsubstantiated or that raised questions and I would discuss those, but I don't specifically recall what areas we discussed.
> MS. BERESFORD: Let's mark this, please, as Exhibit number 4 .
Q. Can you please identify this document.
A. This is Exhibit Number 8 to the site's complaint -- or to the site's technical report, which is the December 15, 2014 Facility Inspection Report written by Wayne Chiu.
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. If you could please turn to page 7 and look at photo 4. Then down in the right-hand corner there's text that says "Photos 4 through 7 show completed building pads and adjacent slopes without any erosion controls." Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then about six lines up from the bottom, part of the sentence reads "Photos 4 through 7 --" I'll start at the beginning. "Sediment from completed lots and slopes in photos 4 through 7 transported to road in photo 8 lacking any erosion control measures during storm events, and inadequate runoff controls to reduce and prevent transport of sediment through site." Do you
see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. I'd like to then go to the findings on page 3 .
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The findings say "Several areas were observed
to be inactive without effective soil control. See photos 4 through 7." Do you see that?
A. I see "Several areas were observed to be inactive, or could be scheduled to be inactive, without effective soil cover to control potential erosion," dot, dot, dot.
Q. So is photo 4 the basis for violation number 4:
"Failure to have, implement erosion control BMPs in inactive areas"?
A. I'm sure it was part of the evidence that was put into the allegations of violation for failure to have adequate erosion control.
Q. Is photo 4 also used -- and I'm looking at the language now at the bottom of page 7 , to have inadequate run-off controls?
A. So that's interesting. I'm not quite sure I
understand that sentence very well because -- let me
read the sentence. "Sediment from completed lots and
slopes in photos 4 through 7 transported to road in
photo 8 lacking any erosion control measures during
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storm events, and inadequate runoff controls to reduce and prevent transport of sediment." So I would have to
look and see whether photo 8 refers to inadequate
run-off controls.
Q. Photo 8 is right there on page 7 . Would you
look at that?
A. I would defer to the technical staff on this.
Q. Let's go back to page 3 .
A. Of the inspection report?
Q. Yes, please. Going to finding number 3, in reading that text would you agree that photo 4 was one of the basis to allege a violation of failure to have sufficient BMPs in an inactive area?
A. What I read from this is that -- let me finish reading it first, sorry. So the only thing I can say with certainty is that photo 4 is evidence of effective -- of lacking effective soil cover for erosion control.
Q. Does the first sentence of finding 3 specify that it was for areas observed to be inactive?
A. Yes. It says several areas were observed to be inactive. And then the next sentence says "Several completed building pads and several inactive slopes lacked any effective soil cover."
Q. Then going to finding number 5, can you please
read that first sentence?
A. "Several slopes throughout the site were observed to lack linear sediment controls along the toe and grade breaks of exposed slopes. See photos 4 through 7."
Q. So were photos 4 through 7 used as evidence to allege violations of failure to have linear sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. Were photos 4 through 7 used to support the
alleged violation of failure to have effective soil cover for inactive areas? Going back up to number 3.
A. Possibly.
Q. If you could please turn to page 4. Finding number 7 says "Lack of effective run-on and run-off controls observed within and around the site which contributed to sediment discharges from the site. See photos 4 and 14." Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So was photo 4 used as evidence for the allegation of failure to have effective run-on and run-off controls?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to number 6 above, please. It says
"Lack of effective perimeter sediment controls observed
which resulted in unauthorized sediment discharges from
the site. See photos 9 through 14."
A. I'm sorry, where are we?
Q. I'm sorry. Page 4 of the exhibit.
A. Number 6?
Q. Number 6. It says "Lack of effective perimeter
sediment controls observed which resulted in
unauthorized sediment discharges from the site. See
9 photos 9 through 14." You see that?
failure to have effective perimeter sediment controls?
A. Yes.
Q. And then going to number 7, photo 14, was that used to establish lack of effective run-on and run-off controls?
A. Yes.

MS. BERESFORD: Can we please mark this exhibit as

## number 5 .

Q. Can you please state what Exhibit 5 is?
A. This is Exhibit Number 18 to the Valencia
technical report for the administrative civil liability complaint, which is a May 8, 2015 Facility Inspection
Report conducted by Erank Melbourn.
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
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A. Yes.

MS. BERESFORD: I apologize. Can we go off the
record for a moment, please.
(Recess.)
MS. BERESEORD:
Q. I would like to go back to -- is Exhibit 5 to
the deposition Exhibit Number 18 to the ACL Technical
Analysis?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, please. Look at that. I would like to look at page 6 which has photograph number 1.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Was this photograph used as evidence to show the violation of failure to have sufficient linear sediment controls?
A. I don't know.
Q. Looking at the third sentence underneath photograph number 1, it says "Displayed slopes in the photograph show signs of erosion, and were lacking erosion and sediment control BMPs at their base." Is that discussing lack of linear sediment controls?
A. Yes. But the question was, was it used in the violation.
Q. Okay. So you believe it shows evidence of lack of linear sediment controls, but you don't know if that
was the basis for the violation for this day.
A. Correct.
Q. The second to the last sentence also says
(4) "There was an absence of run-on/run-off control BMPs."

5 Do you see that?
basis of alleging failure to have sufficient run-on and run-off control BMPs?
A. I do not know.
Q. Let's look at photograph number 2 . The second sentence says "The photograph also displays unprotected (absent exosion control BMPs) disturbed soil and a lack of sediment controls above street gutters." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think this photograph was used to establish lack of perimeter sediment controls at the site?
A. I do not know but I suspect so.
Q. If you can look at photograph number 3 . The second sentence says "The photograph displays a sediment discharge from disturbed construction areas into the street." Does this show a failure to have sufficient linear sediment controls?
A. I do not know.
Q. The next sentence says "Except the area with
plastic sheeting, displayed slopes in the photograph
4 show sign of erosion, and were lacking erosion and
sediment control BMPs at their base."
A. So I believe the photo provides evidence of
hear. Do you think it shows failure to have sufficient
linear sediment controls?
A. I would defer to technical staff.
Q. I have the same question for photograph
number 4. It says "The photograph displays disturbed soil without erosion control BMPs and sediment control BMPs." Does that mean linear sediment control BMPs?
A. I would defer to technical staff.
Q. What other sediment control BMPs are there?
A. I would defer to technical staff.
Q. I'm just saying in general. If you call
sediment controls, is there something different between
22 sediment control BMPs and linear sediment control BMPs?
A. I don't know.
Q. Then I would have the same question about photograph number 6 . It says "The photograph displays

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210

```
disturbed soil without erosion control BMPs and sediment
```

inactive slopes (See photos 4 through 6) lacked any effective soil cover for erosion control."
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then if you go and look at pages -- page 7,

3 photos 4 through 6. And particularly photo 5 through 6.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Were these photographs used to establish

6 failure to have sufficient BMPs in inactive areas?
A. I would presume so but I do not know for sure.
Q. And then going back to page 4 up in the
findings, paragraph number 5 says "Several slopes
throughout the site were observed to lack linear
sediment controls along the toe and grade breaks of
exposed slopes (See photos $1,5,6,8,9,11$, and 12).
So were photos 5 and 6 also used to establish failure to
have sufficient linear sediment controls?
A. Yes. Or it appears so.
Q. Paragraph 4 says "Active areas were observed to
lack appropriate control BMPs (run-off control and soil
stabilization) to prevent erosion during storm events.
See photos 7 through 12." You can look at photos 7
through 12 on page 8 . Were those photos used to
establish the violation of failure to have sufficient
BMPs in active areas?
A. Sufficient erosion control BMPs?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I would presume so.
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Q. Does finding number 4 also say that those photos were used to establish failure to have sufficient run-off control?
A. If those same photo numbers were alleged, can we just say that for all of them?
Q. Well, I'd like to but, unfortunately, I think we have to go through this process. So were photos 7 through 12 also used to establish failure to effectively manage run-off control?
A. Yes. Run-on and run-off controls.
Q. And that's discussed in finding number 7 below; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Then going to finding number 6 states that "Lack of effective perimeter sediment controls observed. (See photos 13 and 14)." So was photo 14 also used to establish lack of effective perimeter sediment control?
A. Yes.
Q. And in finding number 7 below it says photo 14 was also used to establish lack of effective run-on and run-off controls; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MS. BERESFORD: Can we please mark this as our next exhibit.

THE WITNESS: Number 7.
disturbed soil without erosion control BMPs and sediment control BMPs." Does that mean linear sediment control BMPs?
A. I would, once again, defer to technical staff. I do not know the answer.

MS. BERESFORD: Let's please mark this as Exhibit Number 6.
Q. Can you please identify exhibit number 6 for me.
A. This is Exhibit Number 19 to the technical report for the San Altos-Lemon Grove complaint. It is a Facility Inspection Report for the site on May 13, 2015, conducted by -- or written by Wayne Chiu.
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
A. I am.
Q. Can you please look at page 3?
A. Page what?
Q. 3. Looking at finding number 3, at the bottom of page 3 it says "Several areas were observed to be inactive, or could be scheduled to be inactive, without effective soil cover to control potential erosion."
A. Uh-huh.
Q. "Several completed building pads and several inactive slopes (See photos 4 through 6) lacked any effective soil cover for erosion control."

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210

> CHIARA CLEMENTE - 1/22/2016

Page
A. Uh-huh.
findings, paragraph number 5 says "Several slopes throughout the site were observed to lack linear sediment controls along the toe and grade breaks of exposed slopes (See photos $1,5,6,8,9,11$, and 12). So were photos 5 and 6 also used to establish failure to have sufficient linear sediment controls?
A. Yes. Or it appears so.
Q. Paragraph 4 says "Active areas were observed to
lack appropriate control BMPs (run-off control and soil stabilization) to prevent erosion during storm events.
See photos 7 through 12." You can look at photos 7 through 12 on page 8 . Were those photos used to establish the violation of failure to have sufficient BMPs in active areas?
A. Sufficient erosion control BMPs?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I would presume so.

```
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Q. Does finding number 4 also say that those photos were used to establish failure to have sufficient run-off control?
A. If those same photo numbers were alleged, can we just say that for all of them?
Q. Well, I'd like to but, unfortunately, I think we have to go through this process. So were photos 7 through 12 also used to establish failure to effectively manage run-off control?
A. Yes. Run-on and run-off controls.
Q. And that's discussed in finding number 7 below;
is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Then going to finding number 6 states that
"Lack of effective perimeter sediment controls observed (See photos 13 and 14)." So was photo 14 also used to establish lack of effective perimeter sediment control?
A. Yes.
Q. And in finding number 7 below it says photo 14 was also used to establish lack of effective run-on and run-off controls; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MS. BERESFORD: Can we please mark this as our next exhibit.

THE WITNESS: Number 7 .

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
A. I am.
Q. Can you please say what it is?
A. Exhibit 7 is pages 17 and 18 from the enforcement policy.
Q. I'd like to talk about the section that starts at the bottom of page 7 that says "Multiple Violations Resulting From the Same Incident." It talks about where -- can you please describe for me this policy specific to Subsection $C$ where it says the violation continues for more than one day. Can you please explain how this enforcement policy works for that fact.
A. It's the one I'm most unclear about so I'm not sure I would be good to explain it.
Q. Who would be able to explain it then?
A. So it would be my counsel. Whenever we have questions regarding the interpretation of the enforcement policy we would defer to our counsel. But basically, for the record, what the language is, is "For situations not addressed my statute, a single base liability amount can also be assessed for multiple violations at the discretion of the Water Boards, under the following circumstances." And it lists multiple circumstances going on into page 18 . And number C is
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"The violation continues for more than one day." So
that means under these circumstances, if the violations
continue for more than one day, it's implying that the
Water Board has the discretion to assign a single base
liability amount.
Q. Did San Altos have violations that continued
for more than one day?
A. They did.
Q. Do you have the discretion to assign a single
base liability amount to those violations?
MS. DRABANDT: Calls for a legal conclusion. You

## can answer.

THE WITNESS: I can answer?
MS. DRABANDT: I'm not asking you to not answer.
THE WITNESS: So what you're referring to -- and
this is why I find that "C" language confusing is
because this is for multiple violations, but what you're
really asking me to do is refer to the multiple day violations which is page 18.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. No. I'm asking you to interpret this specific
section.
A. Yeah. And I've never applied the "C" to the multiple day violations. And I would ask counsel, if they thought it was appropriate, if the Water Board
wanted to use its discretion on this situation.
Q. Did you discuss this issue put together,
subsection C, with Mr. Melbourn?
A. No.
Q. How about subsection D? It says "When violations are not independent of one another or are not substantially distinguishable." Is it your understanding that this policy that we have multiple violations that are not substantially distinguishable that you can establish a single base liability?
A. Yes.
Q. In your opinion were there violations in the San Altos case that were not substantially distinguishable?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal conclusion. Attorney-client privileged.

MS. BERESFORD: Are you directing her not to answer?

MS. DRABANDT: Yeah.
MS. BERESFORD: Just to be clear for the record, you've stated a lot of attorney-client privileged objections. I have interpreted those to mean that you're directing her not to answer. Is that a correct interpretation of your objection?

MS. DRABANDT: Correct.
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MS . BERESEORD:
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
A. I am.
Q. Can you please say what it is?
A. Exhibit 7 is pages 17 and 18 from the enforcement policy.
Q. I'd like to talk about the section that starts at the bottom of page 7 that says "Multiple Violations Resulting From the Same Incident." It talks about where -- can you please describe for me this policy specific to Subsection $C$ where it says the violation continues for more than one day. Can you please explain how this enforcement policy works for that fact.
A. It's the one I'm most unclear about so I'm not sure I would be good to explain it.
Q. Who would be able to explain it then?
A. So it would be my counsel. Whenever we have questions regarding the interpretation of the enforcement policy we would defer to our counsel. But basically, for the record, what the language is, is "For situations not addressed my statute, a single base liability amount can also be assessed for multiple violations at the discretion of the Water Boards, under the following circumstances." And it lists multiple circumstances going on into page 18 . And number $C$ is
"The violation continues for more than one day." So that means under these circumstances, if the violations continue for more than one day, it's implying that the Water Board has the discretion to assign a single base liability amount.
Q. Did San Altos have violations that continued for more than one day?
A. They did.
Q. Do you have the discretion to assign a single base liability amount to those violations?

MS. DRABANDT: Calls for a legal conclusion. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I can answer?
MS. DRABANDT: I'm not asking you to not answer.
THE WITNESS: So what you're referring to -- and this is why I find that "C" language confusing is because this is for multiple violations, but what you're really asking me to do is refer to the multiple day violations which is page 18.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. No. I'm asking you to interpret this specific section.
A. Yeah. And I've never applied the "C" to the multiple day violations. And I would ask counsel, if they thought it was appropriate, if the Water Board

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. So you can't tell me any facts as to why you did not consolidate those.
A. Correct.
Q. Did you consolidate multiple violations in the Encinitas ACL into one ongoing violation?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you state the unique facts of San Altos where that did not occur in the San Altos case?
A. No. Sorry. I cannot state it without disclosing attorney-client privileged information.

MS. DRABANDT: Thank you for clarifying.
MS. BERESFORD: I think we are nearing the end. I apologize, but if you give me another five minutes we will talk and hopefully wrap up shortly.
(Recess.)
MS. BERESFORD: Back on the record. Just a couple of final questions.
Q. You mentioned earlier that the supervisors of the compliance assurance unit participated in round tables to discuss various issues, including the enforcement policy?
A. So the enforcement coordinators participate in round tables and have done like an enforcement conference or trainings to discuss implementation of the
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| NAME OF <br> COMPANY | California Regional Water Quality Control <br> Board |
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REMARKS
Wayne,
Provided is a DVD containing documents related to the Valencia project located in Lemon Grove
If you have any questions please contact me.
I Con Corrections

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY. The information in this transmittal letter is legally privileged and confidential information and is intended only for the use of the addressee listed on this cover sheet if you have received this transmittal in errof, please immediately notify us by telephone at the number indicated below to arrange return of the document. Thank you


EXHIBIT / 3


# CITY OF LEMON GROVE 

thesf (larmote ins farels

## Fingineering Services Department

January 26.2015
Mr. Wayne Chiu, PE
Water Resource Control Engineer
Califormia Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92108
Subject: Summary of Valencia Construction Site (937C369143) Notice of Violation
Dear Wayne,
As you are aware, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) was notified on December 2, 2014 of a Notice of Violation/Stop Work Notice issued by the city to San Altos LLC (Valencia) for failure to comply with the city's minimum Best Management Practices (BMPs). Furthermore, the Regional Board was also notified that this site was also permitted under its own Statc of Califomia General Construction Permit with a WDID 937C369143.

The city welcomed the opportunity to work with the Regional Board with the same goal of bringing the Valencia site into compliance with stormwater BMPs requirements. This correspondence is intended to provide the Regional Board with a summary of actions the city has taken since the issuance of the NOV/Stop Work Notice on December 2, 2014 and the removal of the NOV/Stop Work Notice on January 22, 2015.

The table below provides a summary of actions and events:

| Date | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 / 2 / 14$ | City Issues NOV/Stop Work Notice to San Altos IL.C |
| $12 / 8 / 14$ | City Hires DMAX Fngineering to Conduct Inspections and Sampling |
| $12 / 9 / 14$ | DMAX Conducts Inspection/Confirms BMP Deficiencies |
| $12 / 11 / 14$ | DMAX Conducts Follow-Up Inspection with Rain Forecasted the Next Day <br> $12 / 11 / 14$ <br> $12 / 12 / 14$ |
| $12 / 12 / 14$ | City Issues Ist Administrative Citation Warning |
| DMAX Conducts Sampling/llegal Discharge Observed |  |
| City Issues 2nd Administrative Citation Fine S100 |  |
| $12 / 15 / 14$ | Regional Board Conducts Joint Inspection/Observes Violations |
| $12 / 16 / 14$ | DMAX Conducts Inspection/BMP Deficiencies Observed |

[^0]

In addition, supporting documentation has been provided for the Regional Board review and use. The following documents are provided on a DVD:

- Copy of Transmittal Letter
- Copy of this Letter
- Copies of Inpcctions/Pictures/Enforcement Actions/Administrative Citations issued by the City
- Memorandums, Inspection forms, Sampling Results, Pictures from City's Stormwater Consultant
- Copies of San Altos LLC Daily Reports and Related Forms/Letters

Once again the City of Lemon Grove appreciates the opportunity to work with the Regional Board to bring the Valencia site into compliance. Should you have any questions regarding the information and documentation provided please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (619) 825-3825.

Sincerely,


Leon P. First
City Engineer
Attachments: DVD

EXHIBIT C

# CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION 

## IN THE MATTER OF:

Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R9-2015-0110 Against San Altos-Lemon Grove, LLC

DEPOSITION OF LEON PETER FIRSHT, witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, taken at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego, California, on Monday, December 28, 2015, at 1:10 p.m., before Marc Volz, CSR 2863, RPR, CRR
A. I think so but I don't recall.
Q. Did those have any guest speakers?
A. No.
Q. So Mr. Tamimi did the presentations himself?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember generally what they covered?
A. Probably what a priority project is, frequency of inspections. Talked in general about city requirements for industrial commercial inspections. That's all I recall at the moment.
Q. Did he ever discuss whether there was a difference -- let me start over. Did he ever review the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan?
A. Yes.
Q. That's often referred to as the JURMP.
A. Yes.
Q. Did he ever discuss the relationship between
violations of the JURMP and whether those were
violations of the Construction General Permit?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say about that?
A. That the city had its own program within the
municipal code which was separate from the Regional Board's construction inspection program.
Q. Do you have an idea, was it your impression
whether or not a violation of the JURMP was also a
violation of the General Construction Stormwater Permit?
A. Possibly. We didn't necessarily look at it
from the aspect that it would be a violation. We were
only concerned with what the city's municipal code
stated.
Q. Other than the two trainings that was given by Mr. Tamimi do you have any additional stormwater training or certification?
A. No.
Q. Are you familiar with what a Qualified Stormwater Professional is?
A. USP?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I've heard the term.
Q. Are you one?
A. I am not.
Q. Have you heard the term of a Qualified SWPPP

Developer or a QSD?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you one?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever inspected construction sites for stormwater violations?
A. I have attended the inspection. I may have my
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A. No, we have not.
Q. Do you know why he requested it in this instance?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I can presume because he came out to the site on December 15th. I don't recall the exact date.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. But he never discussed with you on the phone or told you in an email any other reason why he would want this type of information?
A. Mr. Chiu submitted -- actually sent an email. It's not in here, but he sent an email to the developer and the city stating what he was asking from each of us.
Q. Were you concerned that the city might be issued a penalty if it didn't submit all of this information?
A. Yes. The email is actually attached.
Q. Would it be fair to characterize that you prepared this information to protect the city from violations?
A. Yes. No, I'm sorry, I don't see the email, the follow-up email after the meeting that Wayne sent but I know there was an email.
Q. Do you recall generally what that email is
saying?
A. I think from what I recall is he asked

Mr. Anderson to provide a response by a certain date and he asked that the city monitor the contractor through specific documents.
Q. Was the city nervous about this project and whether it was going to get its own violation?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: Let me clarify this. When you say city, I'd say for myself the answer is yes, but I don't know about others.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. What was it in particular that was making you nervous about getting a violation from the Regional Board?
A. I guess maybe that I'd heard that the Regional Board was difficult to deal with.
Q. Was that specific to stormwater issues or in general?
A. Stormwater.

MS. BERESFORD: I will mark this as Exhibit 14. And it actually says Exhibit 14 at the top. Before we go on, it's 2:40. It's been about an hour and a half. Do you need a short break?

THE WITNESS: No.

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697.3210

EXHIBIT D

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION

IN THE MATTER OF: )
ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL ) LIABILITY COMPLAINT NO. ) R9-2015-0110 ) AGAINST SAN ALTOS - LEMON ) GROVE, LLC.

THE DEPOSITION OF GARY HARPER, a witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, LLP, at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego, California, at 8:28 a.m., on Monday, December 28, 2015, before R. Jerrod Jones, CSR 11750, RPR

## GARY HARPER - 12/28/2015

Page 12
Q. And what were you doing?
A. I was working at Lien Engineering.
Q. And what is a certificate in special
inspection?
A. Special inspection started with the Northridge earthquake. It's structural inspection for steel, welding, masonry, fireproofing. And as a special inspector, you are assigned to stay on a job site the whole time that any kind of structural building was going on.
Q. Okay. What year did you get that certificate?
A. It took about two years. You get a
certificate in each field for welding, and then for steel and for concrete.
Q. Does that program include any training in storm water compliance?
A. No.
Q. Are you required to do continuing education classes for that certificate?
A. No.
Q. So after you got your certificate, you said you worked for CTE for approximately six months?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you leave there?
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A. I was -- Poway had a job as an engineering inspector, and I applied for that.
Q. So you started work with the City of Poway approximately when?
A. 2003.
Q. Okay. And how long were you with them?
A. Eive years.
Q. And why did you leave the City of Poway?
A. I was going to start a company with a
friend of mine who is an engineer in inspection, but it didn't pan out.
Q. And so then what did you do after that?
A. I went to work for the City of Lemon Grove as an engineering inspector.
Q. And what year did you start with the City of Lemon Grove?
A. 2010. 2011.
Q. And you've been with them ever since?
A. Yes.
Q. So this case I'm sure you are aware has to
do a lot with storm water issues. What training have you had to inspect a site for storm water issues?
A. Periodically at the City of Lemon Grove,
they have storm water training. Malik Tamimi heads
those meeting, trains us.
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Q. How often do you have those meetings?
A. I think I've had two in five years.
Q. Do you remember what those meetings were
about?
A. Stormwater.
Q. Can you be any more specific?
A. I can't. It's been a while.
Q. Do you know when the last one was?
A. No. I'm sorry.
Q. Mr. Tamimi heads those meetings?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever have any guest speakers?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who they were?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me?
A. Yes.
Q. Who were they?
A. Tad from D-Max, and two other individuals
from D-Max. I don't remember who they were.
Q. How long were those two trainings?
A. Maybe an hour or two.
Q. Do you recall if they focused on any specific type of storm water permit?
A. No. I'm sorry, I don't.
Q. Well, I know the answers to these, but I'm going to ask them anyway, just to be clear for the record. Are you a qualified storm water professional?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. I was going -- do you know what a qualified storm water professional is?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Do you know what a qualified
stormwater -- or a qualified SWPPP developer is?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Are you familiar with a document called
the General Construction storm water permit?
A. I'm not familiar with it.
Q. Okay. How many sites have you -- well,
let me rephrase.
Have you ever inspected any construction sites for storm water compliance?
A. Yes.
Q. How many sites?
A. I'm sorry, but I don't remember. It's many, many.
Q. More than ten?
A. Yes.
Q. More than 20?
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Q. Are you familiar with a document called the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan, often referred to as the JURMP?
A. Yes.
Q. When you go to a site to inspect a site, are you evaluating it for whether or not it complies with the JURMP?

Let me rephrase before I go on. Do you know if the City of Lemon Grove has a JURMP?
A. Yes.
Q. So when you inspect sites in the city of Lemon Grove, are you inspecting them to see if they are in compliance with the City's JURMP?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you inspect sites in the city of

Lemon Grove, are you inspecting them to see if they are in compliance with the City's ordinances?

## A. Yes.

Q. But you are not inspecting the site to see if its compliant with rules set up by the state Water Resources Control Board or the Regional Water Quality Control Board?

## A. Not specifically.

Q. I want to move specifically to talk about the San Altos, Lemon Grove site. They are
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THE WITNESS: I don't understand the question. I'm sorry.

BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. I'm trying to better understand when you are at a site and you are trying to figure out what's an inactive versus an active area. Does it matter to you if they say, "We're going to work on that area in three or four days," you would call that area an active area or an inactive area?

MR. BOYERS: The same objection.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I still don't understand what you're asking. BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. To you, is an active area something that somebody is only working on that day?
A. No.
Q. So what is an active area for you?
A. They're areas that are either actively working on or have been actively working on in the last ten days or haven't been disturbed.
Q. Okay. So going back to the pictures. You don't recall identifying these as active or inactive; is that correct?
A. I don't recall. That's correct.
Q. And so do you know how someone would know
Q. Okay. Do you know why you might not have filled one out?
A. Yes.
Q. And why would you not have filled one out that day?
A. Rain was imminent, and they had an illegal discharge.
Q. So you didn't -- for that reason, you didn't fill out an additional Inspection Form?
A. I'm sorry. I don't remember.
Q. You know, I apologize, I want to go back to Exhibit 3. That is the December 2nd form again.
A. Okay.
Q. The second page is called NPDES Storm Water Program Construction Storm Water Compliance Inspection Form. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You indicated to me before that you were not doing inspections in accordance with the Regional Board Construction Permit. Is that your correct testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. So when this form says Construction Storm Water Compliance Inspection Form, what are you looking in a compliance form? What is this form
Q. Okay. Do you know why you might not have filled one out?
A. Yes.
Q. And why would you not have filled one out that day?
A. Rain was imminent, and they had an illegal discharge.
Q. So you didn't -- for that reason, you didn't fill out an additional Inspection Form?
A. I'm sorry. I don't remember.
Q. You know, I apologize, I want to go back to Exhibit 3. That is the December 2nd form again.
A. Okay.
Q. The second page is called NPDES Storm Water Program Construction Storm Water Compliance Inspection Form. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You indicated to me before that you were not doing inspections in accordance with the Regional Board Construction Permit. Is that your correct testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. So when this form says Construction Storm

Water Compliance Inspection Form, what are you
looking in a compliance form? What is this form
specific to?
A. The grading plans and the terms.
Q. Thank you. Let's go back to Exhibit 4, which is the December 4 th Inspection Form. Do you see that the first page has yellow highlighting and red underline?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you make those marks? Did you make that highlighting?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page of photographs. And on the bottom left-hand corner, there's a red box with a comment that says, "Sediment in street." Did you make that?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Do you know who did?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page of photographs. There's a box in the upper left-hand corner and text that says, "Lack of erosion control in inactive areas." Did you make that mark?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Did you identify this photograph as an inactive area anywhere in your report?
A. I don't see anything.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Do you recall if you asked anybody during
this inspection about which areas were active and which areas were inactive?
A. I don't remember.

MS. BERESFORD: Okay. Thanks.
Would you please mark that as Exhibit 6.
(Exhibit Number 6 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. It's a Correct Work.
Q. Did you fill it out?
A. I think so.
Q. And what is the date of it?
A. December 9th.
Q. 2014?
A. 2014.
Q. Did you visit the site that day?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. There are two pages of photographs attached. Did you take those photographs?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation. BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Did you talk to anybody about this document?
A. No.
Q. And did you say that you had previously skimmed it?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did you think about it?
A. In what way?
Q. You skimmed it. Did you have any thoughts after skimming it?
A. No, I didn't.

MS. BERESFORD: I believe this is Exhibit 10.
(Exhibit Number 10 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. And what is it?
A. It is a Correct Work issued from the City to Valencia.
Q. And did you fill this out?
A. I think so, yes.
2. And what's the date of it?
GARY HARPER - 12/28/2015
A. March 24th, 2015.

## row?

A. No. I'm sorry. I don't remember why.
Q. So I have inspection reports from you from

December of 2014, and then this report from March 2015. Did you go out to the site in between that period of time?
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A. I don't remember. I'm sorry.
Q. Is there a reason that you wouldn't have gone for such a long period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would that reason have been?
A. That Tad started doing the inspections.
Q. The last page is a document called Inspector's Report. Did you prepare this document?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. Did you do it on your own, or did you do
it with some assistance from someone at the City?
A. I think I did it alone.
Q. Under the "Remarks" it says, "Eollow-up to Tad's inspection of $3 / 18 / 15$." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. If Tad was inspecting the site, do you
know why you went back out?
A. I don't remember. Sorry.
Q. Do you know if someone told you to go out
and inspect the site?
A. I don't remember that.
Q. Now, this Inspector's Report on the last page is different than the Construction Storm Water Compliance Inspection Form that you filled out in December of 2014 ; is that correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Why did you use a different form?
A. Because I needed more space to report
everything that was going on.
Q. Okay. Do you see on the first page it

6 says, "Erosion control is inadequate," and it's
highlighted?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do that highlighting?
A. I don't think so.
Q. If you go to the second -- I'm sorry, the
last page of photographs, there's a red box and red
text that says, "Lack of erosion controls in active
areas." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
2. Did you make that notation on that photograph?
A. No.
Q. Does your report anywhere indicate that photograph is of an active area?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that one.
Q. Did you note anywhere in your report that
this photograph reflected "lack of erosion controls
in active areas"?
A. Yes.
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Q. And where did you note that?
A. Number six.
Q. And how would somebody reading that know that it was this photograph?
A. They wouldn't.
Q. Did anyone call you from the Regional

Board to ask you which photographs demonstrated it?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask anyone -- it says -- I'm looking at your number six. It says, "Some other areas that seem inactive last week are now active."

How did you know that they were inactive the
week before?
A. From the report, I must have gone out there the week before.
Q. Do you think you went out the week before?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you ask anybody about which areas were
active or inactive?
A. Almost every time I went out there.
Q. And to you that meant within ten days?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'd like to direct your attention to number two on that page. It says, "Concrete waste. Crew did clean concrete waste, although another spill
Q. And where did you note that?
A. Number six.
Q. And how would somebody reading that know that it was this photograph?
A. They wouldn't.
Q. Did anyone call you from the Regional Board to ask you which photographs demonstrated it? A. No.
Q. Did you ask anyone -- it says -- I'm looking at your number six. It says, "Some other areas that seem inactive last week are now active."

How did you know that they were inactive the week before?
A. From the report, I must have gone out there the week before.
Q. Do you think you went out the week before?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you ask anybody about which areas were active or inactive?
A. Almost every time I went out there.
Q. And to you that meant within ten days?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'd like to direct your attention to
number two on that page. It says, "Concrete waste. Crew did clean concrete waste, although another spill

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { occurred at lot } 23 \text { that was not cleaned up." } \\
& \text { So in reading this, do you believe that there } \\
& \text { were two -- for lack of a better term -- spills of } \\
& \text { concrete waste at the site? } \\
& \text { A. No. } \\
& \text { Q. Can you describe to me what that sentence } \\
& \text { means, then? } \\
& \text { A. The first concrete waste crew did not } \\
& \text { clean concrete waste, although it says "another } \\
& \text { spill." } \\
& \text { Q. Although it says, correct me if I'm wrong, } \\
& \text { "Concrete crew did clean concrete waste." } \\
& \text { A. Yes. } \\
& \text { Q. "Although another spilled occurred at lot } \\
& \text { 23." It says, "There's another spill that was } \\
& \text { A. Yes, it appears there were two spills by } \\
& \text { that sentence. } \\
& \text { Q. And by that, do you think that means they } \\
& \text { cleaned up the first one? } \\
& \text { A. Yes. } \\
& \text { Qoppened? cleaned up." Do you have a date of when that might have } \\
& \text { A. No. } \\
& \text { Q. It sat } \\
& \text { Q. Y. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Did you have a date of when that spill may have occurred?
A.

No.
Q. Is it possible that the first concrete waste spill was cleaned in a day?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that. BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q. So you've indicated earlier yes, you think there were two spills. Is it possible that they could have cleaned a spill in a day's time?

MR. BOYERS: The same objection.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Going back to number six, talking about erosion control on inactive areas versus active areas. Based on your report and what you see in the photographs, what additional erosion controls on active areas would you have recommended that they use?

MR. BOYERS: I'm going to object as leading.
MS. BERESFORD: Well, then, I will rephrase. BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Based on your report and the photographs, do you think they should have implemented more
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recall, were you already intending on developing an
administrative civil liability complaint?
A When --
MS. DRABANDT: I'm going to object.
Attorney-client privilege.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q When you visited the site, had you discussed with Mr. Chiu your intent to -- that the purpose of visiting the site was for the purpose of developing an administrative civil liability complaint?

A No.
Q Okay. Have you ever discussed the site with Malik Tamimi?

A Yes.
Q Can you describe those discussions for me?
A The discussions were focused on the procedural aspects of the issuance of an administrative civil liability complaint, specifically when would be the hearing and the timing.

Q How many times did you speak with him?
A I would estimate five times.
Q Do you recall when your first conversation was?
A No.
Q Did you ever discuss any specific alleged
violations of the site with Mr. Tamimi?
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A No.
Q Did you ever speak with Gary Harper?
A No.
Q Did you ever speak with Leon Firsht?
A) No.

Q Did you ever talk to Tad Nakatani?
A No.
Q Did you ever talk to John Quenzer?
A
No.
Q Did you ever speak to Brian Nemero?
A No.
Q Have you ever spoken to John Draminski?
A No.
Q Have you ever spoken to Tamara O'Neil?
A No.
Q Okay. Do you recognize this document?
A I recognize it as an ACL complaint package.
However, I was not involved with this case.
Q Oh, then I'm giving you the wrong document. My apologies.

Have you ever recognized this document?
A Yes.
Q And what is that?
A This is the notice of hearing and issuance of Complaint No. R9-2015-0110 for administrative civil
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Page

```
13:00 failure to adequately manage run-on -- excuse me --
    runoff within the site.
    Number }3\mathrm{ on page 8 of 10 again shows sediment in
    the street which, in my opinion, is a failure to manage
    the runoff from within the site.
    And just my recollection and finding number 6 on
    page 4 of 10 stating that there was a lack of effective
    run-on and runoff controls observed.
    Q. Anything else for May 8?
    A. Not that I recall.
    Q. Okay.
    Let's talk about May 13, and I'd like to refer you
to Exhibit Number 19 of the ACL.
    A. I have Exhibit Number 19.
    Q. And can you please identify for me those --
    Well, first, let me ask, is this what you relied on for
        the allegations for violation number 8 for May 13?
            A. I relied upon this inspection report and my
        recollection from my visit of the site at the same time,
        as well as the photographs that Wayne took and I took of
        the site.
            Q. Okay.
            Can you please identify for me the basis for your
        allegation of failure to manage run-on and runoff for
        May 13, please?
```
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December 4, 2014, December 12, 2014, December 17, 2014, December 31, 2014, May 8th, 2015, and September 15, 2015."

Q Thank you. So to paraphrase -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- but the primary basis of the allegation -- of the alleged violation is for discharging sediment-laden storm water from the cite into Encanto Channel and thence Chollas Creek on those dates; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. I would like to talk -- well, first, is sediment a pollutant under the Construction General Permit? A Yes.

Q Is it a pollutant if it's discharged at any level at any concentration?

A I would say yes. It's a pollutant when it's discharged. The -- yes.

Q Is sediment subject to the best control technology standard as defined in Appendix 5 of the construction permit?

A Yes.
Q Is compliance with best control technology measured
by compliance with Section 5A2 and Table One of the permit?
A Could you repeat that?
Q Yes. Do you recognize that page?
A
Yes.
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            Q And what is that page?
            A It's a page out of the Construction Storm Water
                Permit related to E1 Standards in receiving water
                    monitoring.
            Q So my question is: Is compliance with best control
            technology measured by compliance with that table for
                    sediment?
            A Could you repeat the question one more time?
            Q Yes.
            MS. BERESEORD: Could you please read it back for
                    me, please?
            (Last question was read.)
            MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
                    conclusion.
                            THE WITNESS: My response is no.
                    BY MS. BERESFORD:
            Q So how do they measure compliance with best control
            technology for sediment?
            MS. DRABANDT: Same objection.
            THE WITNESS: Well, I understood you to say
                    compliance in general. So compliance with BCT or the best
                    conventional technology means two things to me -- two
                    different things because we have other regulations that
                    apply, and so I would just say that with this -- compliance
                    with BCT is one aspect of it, but there could be other
```
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things that occur on the construction site that could cause

BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q Okay. So when evaluating whether there has been a
violation of a permit for discharge of sediment, does compliance with that table matter in any way?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion.
THE WITNESS: The information in the table is
useful for determining how well or effective some of the
best management practices are at the site, but, in my
opinion, compliance with those numbers do not necessarily constitute compliance with the permit.

BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q So if there is a discharge of sediment and someone takes a turbidity sample, and the turbidity sample is 10

NTUs, is that a violation of the permit?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I would say that a sample with 10 NTU
is a very low amount, and so that would be what we would consider a fairly clean sample.

So that would not raise my -- my -- raise any
alarms with me if I saw something of that amount, but,
again, that is just one factor there could be other things
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and also directly into Encanto Channel.
Q Can you show me the evidence that it was deposited into the storm water conveyance channel?

A I rely on the fact that I can see that the sediment reached all the way down to -- all the way down -- flowed down Akins Avenue into the City of San Diego storm water conveyance system. There's two inlets on Akins Avenue on each side of the street. Those connect into Encanto Channel.

Also directly opposite from the discharge point that's shown, there's -- I'm looking at the first page of photos, and I'm looking at the middle row, far right column, there's some bags of -- gravel bags where you can see sediment has overtopped -- sediment-laden water has overtopped that. The photo below it also shows the entrance.

Opposite that there is a connection to Encanto Channel where $I$ observed the site several times where it would discharge there. So in my opinion based upon seeing the sediment in the street and in the gutters from these photos, that there was a discharge into the city storm water conveyance system and also into Encanto Channel directly.

Q What facts are there that copper, lead, or zinc
entered Chollas Creek?
A I would rely on studies that have been done
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nationwide and also statewide that show that construction storm water runoff is likely to contain those pollutants.

Q Do you have an estimate for this particular site what the concentrations of copper, lead, or zinc might be?
( N .
Q Do you know if any recommendations were provided to the discharger advising them of additional BMPs that they should implement on December 4?

A Basing this solely on Exhibit 3, I see that there was a box checked "Erosion control is inadequate," and a box that was checked saying "Failure to maintain erosion/sediment control device."

So from that I would take that the City notified the developer San Altos that those needed to be addressed.

Furthermore, the box at the top is checked saying "Stop Work Notice of Violation." That's a very serious effort by municipality. That's one of the strongest enforcement tools they have is to tell the developer they have to stop construction work on the site, and that the only work they can do is fixing their erosion control deficiencies.

Because for the developer time is money, and so every day that they are not constructing is another day that they are losing out on -- on profits. So this is a very serious matter when I see a city or a municipality issue a
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A At this point, no.
Q Could it have been?
A Highly unlikely.
Q And why is that?
A When there are flows through Encanto Channel or any storm water conveyance system or creek, the flows are usually strong enough to where they will push through sediment.

There will always be some sediment that will stay behind typically, unless it's a very, very strong event. But typically the sediment will be pushed down, and so it would be very difficult to recover.

Q Do you know what the flow of Encanto Channel was on December 4?

A I do not.
Q Do you know if Mr. Harper actually observed whether or not sediment was flowing into the storm water conveyance on December 4?

A I do not know for sure. However, I will point out that as the listed inspector for the City for this
inspection report/Notice of Violation Work Stop Notice, that -- and also an assumption that I would make that he took these photographs -- but on the -- on the third page of the photographs looking at the left-hand column middle photo, that there is flow of sediment-laden water going down
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Akins Avenue towards the inlet.
So I would be surprised if he didn't see it go in.
I believe the photo below it shows the inlet, but it's a
little hard for me to see it in this reproduction of the photo.

Q Okay. Thank you. Let's talk about December 12 th which is Exhibit No. 7, or I would like to refer to it as Exhibit No. 7 to the ACL.

BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q Do you recognize Exhibit 7?
A Yes.
Q Can you state what it is?
A Exhibit No. 7 contains -- the cover on Exhibit 7 is the administrative citation from the City of Lemon Grove to Tim Anderson the project manager for the San Altos Lemon Grove, LLC Development. It's dated -- the date of the violation observed is December 12, 2014. The date of the citation is December 15, 2014, and was issued by Leon Firsht.

Q Did you rely on this document for the -- for alleging that Violation No. 1 occurred on December 12 th?

A I did. I also would like to add that in addition with Exhibit No. 7 is some attachments.

There's the attachment describing the Lemon Grove Municipal Code for discharge of non-storm water prohibited.
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Q Okay. Moving to December 17, I would like to refer you to Exhibit No. 10.

A I have it.
Q Okay. Can you please state what Exhibit No. 10 is?
A Exhibit No. 10 is a D-Max Engineering, Incorporated memo dated December 17, 2014 from Brian Nemero to Malik Tamimi, and the subject line states "December 17, 2014, Field Visit at Valencia Construction Site."

Q Did you rely on this document to state that there was the alleged Violation No. 1 on December 17 ?

A Yes.
Q Did you rely on any other facts for the allegation that Violation No. 1 occurred on December 17?

A No.
Q Did you make the highlighting and red underlining on this document?

A Yes.
Q And what are the facts here that support that sediment entered into the storm drain on December 17?

A I relied upon the photographs that were attached to the report. Photograph No. 1 is the construction site entrance that is located on Akins Avenue. It's adjacent to a City of San Diego neighborhood, and the gravel bags are covered in sediment.

There is sediment in the street. The gravel bags

```
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Q So did anyone observe the sediment going into the storm drain?

A I don't know.
Q Do you know which weather station you rely on when you're taking your rainfall data?

A I know from one of my inspection reports that the NOAA Station for Lemon Grove was not active, and so I believe at one point I've cited the La Mesa Station which is close by. And also another weather reporting station that we've used for that region is the one at Gillespie Field.

Q How far is that from the site?
A Off the top of my head, I don't know. But it's when -- when one does a search for the closest weather stations, those are the two that come up.

Q Is there a station at Federal Avenue?
A I do not know.
Q Okay. I would like to talk about December 31, please, and specifically Exhibit No. 12 to the ACL.

A I have Exhibit No. 12.
Q And what is that?
A Exhibit No. 12 is a D-Max Engineering, Incorporated memo dated December 31, 2014, from John Quenzer to Leo Firsht and Malik Tamimi.

The subject states "December 31st, 2014, Field
Visit at Valencia Construction Site."

Storm Water Permit if they were to do so.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q To not cover an active stockpile?
A To not cover a stockpile that's not actively being worked on.

Q Okay. How do you define -- or how does the permit
define actively being used?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion.
THE WITNESS: That section of the permit does not
define actively.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q Do you -- when -- in your interpretations is it -is that definition different than whether it's been used in the last 14 days?

A Yes.
Q Can you please be more specific then in what your definition of it is then?

A If you read the permit language specifically, it's in a section that's in a different section from the active versus inactive definition, and it uses the word "actively," and my reading of that section of the permit is that one is actively pulling material from that stockpile.

And the reason being, is that we are not only
concerned with erosion due to rain events, but there's also

```
Storm Water Permit if they were to do so.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
    Q To not cover an active stockpile?
    A To not cover a stockpile that's not actively being
worked on.
    Q Okay. How do you define -- or how does the permit
define actively being used?
    MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
    conclusion.
    THE WITNESS: That section of the permit does not
        define actively.
        BY MS. BERESFORD:
            Q Do you -- when -- in your interpretations is it --
        is that definition different than whether it's been used in
        the last 14 days?
        A Yes.
        Q Can you please be more specific then in what your
        definition of it is then?
            A If you read the permit language specifically, it's
        in a section that's in a different section from the active
        versus inactive definition, and it uses the word "actively,"
        and my reading of that section of the permit is that one is
        actively pulling material from that stockpile.
            And the reason being, is that we are not only
        concerned with erosion due to rain events, but there's also
```
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    a component that's concerned about wind erosion. And so,
obviously, if a sediment pile or some sort of a material
pile is not covered and not being used, then it would be open to wind erosion.

So, therefore, it is our understanding of the
permit that unless one is actively removing material from
that stockpile, it needs to be covered.
Q Okay. Let's talk about December 2nd, and if I can refer you to Exhibit No. 2 of the ACL?

A I have it.
Q Did you rely on this document in alleging Violation No. 2 for December 2nd?

A Yes.
Q Did you rely on any other facts for purposes of alleging Violation No. 2 for December 2nd?

A Yes.
Q And what other facts did you rely on?
A I believe I looked at rainfall data indicating that there were imminent storms.

Q Did you rely on any other facts for alleging the Violation No. 2 for December 2nd?

A Mainly the photographs from -- from the inspection report. There might have been some other things, but right now just mainly I recall using the photographs.

Q Okay. Did you do the highlighting and red box
"Effective: Yes or no. No."
Q Is there any indication of what those stockpiles were being used for?

A No.
Q Okay. And sticking with Exhibit No. 4, there was an allegation of an uncovered stockpile for December 8.

Did you rely on Exhibit No. 4 for alleged Violation No. 2 for December 8th?

A Yes.
Q Did you rely on any other evidence for Violation No. 2 for December 8th?

A It's difficult to answer that, but I would say that not only am I looking at the inspection report but looking at the previous inspection reports to see if there's any consistent deficiencies. So I was looking at the totality of things but mainly relying upon the photograph and the text from the inspection.

Q Do you know who conducted the inspection on December 8th?

A I don't know who conducted the inspection on December 8th, but it says on the inspection report that the inspector name is Harper.

Q Did you ever talk with Mr. Harper about his

## inspection?

(A) No.
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"Effective: Yes or no. No."
Q Is there any indication of what those stockpiles were being used for?

A No.
Q Okay. And sticking with Exhibit No. 4, there was an allegation of an uncovered stockpile for December 8.

Did you rely on Exhibit No. 4 for alleged Violation No. 2 for December 8th?

A Yes.
Q Did you rely on any other evidence for Violation No. 2 for December 8th?

A It's difficult to answer that, but I would say that not only am I looking at the inspection report but looking at the previous inspection reports to see if there's any consistent deficiencies. So I was looking at the totality of things but mainly relying upon the photograph and the text from the inspection.

Q Do you know who conducted the inspection on December 8th?

A I don't know who conducted the inspection on December 8th, but it says on the inspection report that the inspector name is Harper.

Q Did you ever talk with Mr. Harper about his

## inspection?

(A) No.
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Q Did you ever talk with him about whether he thought they were improving from on December 8 th as opposed to December 4 th?
(A) No.

Q And I don't want to put words in your mouth. You noted on page 2, it says "Need to cover stockpiles," but you don't know what those stockpiles were being used for; is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q Okay. Do you know if it was raining on December 8th?

A I don't recall.
Q What facts demonstrate that the alleged violations on December 5, 6, 7, or 8 resulted in impacts to the beneficial uses of Encanto Channel?

A Could you repeat that?
Q Sure. Are there any facts that this alleged Violation No. 2 uncovered stockpiles resulted in impacts to beneficial uses of Encanto Channel?

A I would look at the weather report to see if there where any storm events in that time period.

It's -- I see on this inspection report from Exhibit No. 4 that it talked about on Friday there was a 95 percent chance of storm event, so that would color my opinion on whether there might have been impacts.
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Q Right. I'm talking about December 5, 6, 7, and 8.
A So 5, 6, 7, and 8, I would -- I would want to look at the rainfall data to see, but potentially, there could be if there was a storm event.

Q What if there was not a storm event?
A Less likely, unless there was significant winds. If there was significant winds, it could have blown sediment into the receiving waters.

Q Did you attach wind data to any of your technical reports?
(A) No.

Q Did you look at wind data for your technical
reports?
A No. I will -- I will correct that. In the weather
information it does have wind data, so I apologize. It does.

In the precipitation data it includes the full
weather report, and it does include wind. It's not my
highest priority, but it is something that we do look at.
Q Do you have a miles-per-hour criteria that you look at when evaluating potential impacts?
(A) No.

Q So how do you evaluate wind data?
A There would be two things. One is the maximum velocity, but also if there's notations for gust -- but,
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again, that's what $I$ would say is a lesser point for us typically, but it is of importance.

There have been sites that we've contacted the air pollution control board on when -- even during the dry dust control. They're lacking dust control. We have made those contacts.

Q For December 5, 6, 7, and 8, do you have facts that there was direct threat to potential receptors for this specific alleged violation?

A Based upon the inspection reports that I saw and the lack of erosion control and sediment control on the site, I would say they -- the site posed a threat to water quality.

Q Is that the same as a direct threat to potential receptors?

A Yes.
Q I would like to talk about September 15 where I will refer you to Exhibit No. 22.

What is the basis for alleged Violation No. 2 for September 15?

A Exhibit No. 2 is the Lemon Grove inspection report by TAD Nakatani on September 15, 2015, of the Valencia site. In there -- in his inspection report he noted on page 2 in regard to material stockpiles, he described some small sediment piles are not protected "Effective: Yes or no.
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No." On the following page, I believe -- that's it.
Q Do you know what the sediment piles were being used for?

A No.
( Did you talk to Mr. Nakatani about this report?
A No.
Q Is it possible that they were going to be working on those piles that afternoon?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Speculative.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q Okay. All right. Let's go to -- we're going to talk about Violation No. 4 in a second, if you want to take a look at that.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Can we go off the record for one second?

MS. DRABANDT: Go off the record.
(Brief recess.)
MS. BERESFORD: We'll go back on.
BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q I'm sorry. Before we move on to Violation No. 4, I do want to go back and talk about the definition of active a little bit more.

Can you please look at that (indicating)?
A Yes.
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"actively using stockpiles."
Q And on that basis you think the definition is different?

A Yes.
Q Have you ever heard that discussed at any training?
A No.
Q Do you know if the CASQA BMP handbook discussing that?

A I do not.
Q You know, can I ask you to find that in here for me? Please forgive my ignorance, but I would like to know.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Can we go off the record for a second?

MS. DRABANDT: Sure. Let's go off the record.
MS. BERESFORD: Go back on.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q And I was asking Mr. Melbourne to please locate for me in the permit the reference to active and actively as respects to stockpiles that he has been talking about.

So if you could please do that?
A Yes. So if you look at Attachment $D$ to the
Construction Storm Water Permit which is -- Attachment D applies to Risk Level 2 Construction Sites and this site is
a Risk Level 2 Site, so these are the requirements that apply to it.
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And on page 1, Attachment D if you look at section
B which is "Good Site Management Housekeeping No. 1(b)," it says "Cover and burn loose stockpile construction materials that are not actively being used and (i.e., soils, spoils, aggregate flash stucco, hydrated line, etc.)."

Q Okay. And then I had asked whether you had heard in any training direction that that definition or use of actively was different from the active definition in the glossary.

Have you heard any direction on that in any

## training?

A No.
Q And do you know if the CASQA handbook discusses

## that?

A I don't believe it does.
Q And did you ever talk to San Altos specifically

## about that?

A No.
Q Do you know if Mr. Chiu discussed that with San Altos?

A I do not know.
Q Okay. Let's move to alleged Violation No. 4.
If you could refer to the ACL and state what alleged Violation No. 4 is, please?

A Linda, did you want this back (indicating)?
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can see some equipment parked in that area. Also does not appear to have been sprayed, and there is two stockpiles that are uncovered that have not been sprayed.

For this alleged violation there was an imminent storm event, so these areas needed to be protected. And given that this, in my judgment, this area was inactive based upon looking at the site and the conditions around the development -- that this area was inactive.

I'm much more confident about the area near the house in that staging area and above that blue line that you see on the left side middle, but I think also a decent case can be made that the Tangelos Place, itself, should have been sprayed with some sort of erosion control material.

Because if you look in subsequent photos of the site, there was not substantial grading occurring on that road that was at the base at which it was until they paved it. And, yes, they were using it for transportation.
some trucks may have been riding on it, but as far as grading, there was no grading that occurred on that area for several months.

On the second page of photographs in the upper left, you'll see a car parked on a very flat graded area. That area does not appear, to me, to be active. They were parking vehicles on there. And so, again, in my opinion, that area should have been sprayed with some sort of erosion
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control material.
The photo in the bottom right is a continuation of that area, and, again, I would say in my opinion, that should have been sprayed.

Q Any other areas that you deem to be inactive on December 1?

A No.
Q I'd like to go to the first page of photos. We talked a lot about those -- oh, I'm sorry. Strike that.

Did you ever ask anybody if there was going to be work performed on any of these areas in the next 14 days?

A I was not at the site on this date, so no.
Q In preparing the ACL when you were looking at these photographs, did you talk to anyone to find out if they had worked on these areas that you identified as inactive in the next 14 days?

A No. I did not talk to anybody, but I did look at, like I said, subsequent inspection reports and photographs to look at areas and to see when there was activity on those areas.

Also, in my follow-up inspections or my inspections that occurred later on, I could see the same pattern. And, again, this area -- this site was under a Stop Work Notice, so --

Q I don't believe it was on December 1 .
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> construction states, "Areas of construction activity that are not active, and those that have been active and are not scheduled to be re-disturbed for at least 14 days."
> Q Okay. Let's talk about December 1 .
> Can you, please, identify for me the facts that you
relied on for this alleged violation for December 1 ?
A So I relied upon Exhibit No. 2 which is the Stop
Work Notice issued by the City of Lemon Grove on December 2 , 2014, by -- it appears to be Gary Harper from the City of Lemon Grove.

Attached to his inspection report are some photographs that were taken on December 1, 2014, and December 2, 2014. In this exhibit I highlighted the first page of photographs in the upper left-hand corner of photograph -- and I put a text box that says "Lack of erosion control BMPs on inactive areas."

In the photograph you will see a roadway. It is Tangelos Place, and there is a house in the upper left part that is being -- like, stuccoed. You can see that in the lower right-hand corner of the picture that there's some orange. The orange is indicative of sprayed-on erosion control product.

There is no looks like no soil binder on the graded street, and there is a side part of the street which is a housing pad that is also not covered. In the foreground you
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can see some equipment parked in that area. Also does not appear to have been sprayed, and there is two stockpiles that are uncovered that have not been sprayed.

For this alleged violation there was an imminent storm event, so these areas needed to be protected. And given that this, in my judgment, this area was inactive based upon looking at the site and the conditions around the development -- that this area was inactive.

I'm much more confident about the area near the house in that staging area and above that blue line that you see on the left side middle, but I think also a decent case can be made that the Tangelos Place, itself, should have been sprayed with some sort of erosion control material.

Because if you look in subsequent photos of the site, there was not substantial grading occurring on that road that was at the base at which it was until they paved it. And, yes, they were using it for transportation. So some trucks may have been riding on it, but as far as grading, there was no grading that occurred on that area for several months.

On the second page of photographs in the upper left, you'll see a car parked on a very flat graded area. That area does not appear, to me, to be active. They were parking vehicles on there. And so, again, in my opinion, that area should have been sprayed with some sort of erosion
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control material.
The photo in the bottom right is a continuation of
that area, and, again, I would say in my opinion, that should have been sprayed.

Q Any other areas that you deem to be inactive on December 1?

A No.
Q I'd like to go to the first page of photos.
We talked a lot about those -- oh, I'm sorry. Strike that.
Did you ever ask anybody if there was going to be work performed on any of these areas in the next 14 days?

A I was not at the site on this date, so no.
Q In preparing the ACL when you were looking at these photographs, did you talk to anyone to find out if they had worked on these areas that you identified as inactive in the next 14 days?

A No. I did not talk to anybody, but I did look at, like I said, subsequent inspection reports and photographs to look at areas and to see when there was activity on those areas.

Also, in my follow-up inspections or my inspections that occurred later on, I could see the same pattern. And, again, this area -- this site was under a Stop Work Notice, so --

Q I don't believe it was on December 1.
control material.
The photo in the bottom right is a continuation of that area, and, again, I would say in my opinion, that should have been sprayed.

Q Any other areas that you deem to be inactive on December 1?

A No.
Q I'd like to go to the first page of photos. We talked a lot about those -- oh, I'm sorry. Strike that.

Did you ever ask anybody if there was going to be work performed on any of these areas in the next 14 days?

A I was not at the site on this date, so no.
Q In preparing the ACL when you were looking at these photographs, did you talk to anyone to find out if they had worked on these areas that you identified as inactive in the next 14 days?

A No. I did not talk to anybody, but I did look at, like I said, subsequent inspection reports and photographs to look at areas and to see when there was activity on those areas.

Also, in my follow-up inspections or my inspections that occurred later on, I could see the same pattern. And, again, this area -- this site was under a Stop Work Notice, so --

2 I don't believe it was on December 1.
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A Correct. It was not on December 1 , but it was on December 2 nd all the way through until it was released on January 22 nd.

Q Do you know what the weather report was for December 1?

A I don't recall, but I know that there were significant storm events that occurred pretty much every week during the month of December.

Q If someone is working on an active area, and they need to prepare for a storm event, do you know the timeline that they need to be -- how long that weather forecast is that they look at?

A Well, there's -- there's different things that they will at look at. One is when they look for storm events that are greater than a 50 percent chance in the forecast, they'll often look 48 hours out.

But in this case, I believe, the storm event was predicted for the following day on December 2 nd , and typically in the permit, from what I recall, it talks about trying to address these areas as soon as possible, but typically no later than 24 hours prior to the anticipated storm event.

And I think that's -- in the photographs, you can see, there was a meeting of staff, and so, therefore, it looks like they were trying to address the deficiencies at

Q Did you talk to her about what that meeting was about?

A No.
Q Did you talk to Mr. Haxper about what the meeting was about?

A No.
Q Do you have any idea what the meeting was about?
A I believe very strongly that it was a meeting to discuss deficient BMPs.

Q But why? Why could they not have been talking about where they were going to work that afternoon?

A Because this is a fairly substantial meeting, and there was an imminent storm event, and the City was very concerned that there was going to be a sediment discharge from the site.

In fact, if you look at page 2 of the inspection report, it says "See Stop Work Notice. Discharge is imminent. If NOAA forecast is correct, 100 percent heavy rain this afternoon."

Q And what is the date of this photograph?
A That's on the 1st.
Q Is that the first time that anyone from the city had been out there in several months?

A I do not know.
Q All right. Let's talk about December 2nd.
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A Yes. I would point to you on the 7 th page of photos, if you were to look at the lower right-hand photo that has the text box "Lack of Erosion Control BMPs on Inactive Areas," again, that's Tangelos Place. And that area -- they finished grading that, and they did not do any other land disturbance to that until they paved it.

A photo looking in the opposite direction is on the next page in the upper left. Again, these were some steep slopes. Yes, there was traffic that could drive on there, but as far as land disturbance for construction activity, they could have put some sort of soil binder on there or some gravel to protect that.

Again, some energy dissipators given the steepness of the slope would have been helpful.

Q So for your interpretation of the permit driving on an area is not active use of an area?

A I have a tough problem with that because if you
look at most of the areas where you focus on driving such as the entrances, they implement BMPs. They'll put on gravel, or they'll put in shaker plates because of the driving aspect to it and the fact that they don't want to track stuff off the site.

So when I look at some of these areas where they've graded it and there's no further grading that's going to go on to those sites until they put in the street, they might
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do some digging for utilities on the side, but if they're done grading for that area, given the ease of being able to apply some sort of soil binder or gravel to some of these areas, in my mind and based on the permit requirements and my experience, that those are areas that they should protect. It makes a lot of sense.

It helps to prevent the erosion from happening in
the first place. And if you look at the site back in --
later in a few months -- later in May when I was out on the
site, again, you saw completely unprotected areas, and it
was a muddy mess, and it was a huge source of sediment for the site.

Q Do you know if you can drive on soil binder?
A You can, but it does break down.
Q How quickly?
A It depends on how much activity -- driving activity occurs on there. So more activity, then it would break down quicker. But as far as the application of it, it doesn't take much application, and it's very cost effective for sites. Also gravel, gravel is more expensive but has longer lasting impacts.

Q Can you drive on energy dissipators?
A It's best if you don't. Straw wattles hold a better for you to drive over than, say, a gravel bag, but they lose their ability on areas where you drive over them.
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those -- I would have thought that they would have sprayed those also.

Q Did you ever talk to anyone about what those sites were scheduled to be used for in the next 14 days?

A No.
Q Okay. Let's talk about December 4. And I'm referring to Exhibit No. 3 .

Can you please identify for me the areas that are subject to Violation No. 4 for December 4?

A So the one that really stood out to me from this, there's at least two or three photographs that caught my attention. But on the second page of photographs in the upper left, there is a box -- red box that I've identified "Lack of erosion control in inactive areas." So what's missing here on the front is -- this is one of the construction entrances. So what's missing there is gravel, and a shaker plate, or something like that.

But that's -- that's not the focus but -- but just that's one that thing stood out to me. But if you look up towards the center and then going towards the right of the photo. That area there was graded and is developed as a park for the residents there at the community, and so that area did not change substantially, and that was not an area where -- where they were driving up and around on.

And so that was an area that we had identified with
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upper left -- it looks like there's a box container. And there were several areas that were sprayed with the orange bonded fiber matrix material, soil binder.

And you can see there's a lot of erosion rills, and there's a lot of erosion that was lost less So where they sprayed, but still there was a lot of erosion there. Those areas needed to be touched up. They needed to be repaired.

Q Do you know if they were slated to work on those areas within the next 14 days?

A I'm not aware that they were slated to be worked on in the next 14 days.

Q Could they have been scheduled for that?
A Again, I doubt it because they were under a Stop Work Notice.

Q But could they have been scheduled for it?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Speculative.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. BERESFORD:

## Q Any other areas?

A If you go to the next page, the middle left where you see a bunch of the partially covered stockpiles. That area there, I think, could have also have been sprayed as being inactive. It does not look like to me that area was used to access the stockpiles, so, therefore, a soil binder would have been appropriate in that section.
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Q Do you know what they were doing in that area as of
December 4 , or what they were scheduled to be doing?
A That was one of the later phases scheduled, so I
don't believe there was any scheduled activity for that
section.
Q Did you ever discuss with anyone what that schedule was?

A On later visits when I was on the site, I did talk to the site superintendent when they were on the site. I did talk with them about scheduling, yes.
( And so did you discuss with a them what the schedule was with them for December?
(A) No.

Q So did you know the schedule for this area in

## December?

(A) NO.

Q Any other areas?
A I don't think so.
Q Going back to the photographs on December 1st -the first page of photographs on December 1st.

Do you know if they implemented any BMPs?
A Excuse me. Linda, which exhibit are we on?
Q I'm sorry. December 1st which I believe is part of Exhibit No. 2.

> A Okay.
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A It's in a different location, so the ones that had shown up previously are gone.

Q So does that sound like the ones that they had worked on are gone?

A That would be a reasonable inference.
Q Any other inactive areas on January 14th?
A I'm not sure if I -- if we talked about that, but No. 5 -- I'm looking at Exhibit 25 which is the January 14 , 2015, City of Lemon Grove inspection report. On page 3 for "Recommendations 5." It talks about "Stabilize area, if inactive or rain in forecast." Again, that's Section 5.

On the map on the final page it's in the upper
northwest corner of the site, and that site -- that part of the site was not active at that time for -- for work. And, again, they were under the Stop Work Notice, so I would assume that area was inactive.

And also then it talks about No. 7 on the BMP
recommendations page, it says, "Repair minor rails and protect against concentrated flows in the area." And that No. 7 correlates to some of the pads along the southern part of Avalon Way.

And those were some of the first ones built and worked on, but the parkway strips or the areas along the -the streets would not have been, in my mind, active at that time. So those would have been area that's should have had
soil cover.
Q And do you know if they were doing any work to
implement BMPs in those areas on January 14th?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Speculative.
THE WITNESS: I do not know.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q Okay. Jumping ahead to May 9, 10, 11, and 12.
Do you have any reports for those days?
A I do not have specific inspection reports for May
9,10 , or 11 , or 12 .
Q Do you know if they were working in any of those areas -- were they working on the site on those days?

A I'd have to refer to my inspection notes, but, if I can recall, during that time period there were storm events.

And so, therefore, most of their efforts most likely would have been to address the BMP deficiencies.

Q Did you produce your inspection notes?
A I produced my inspection report.
Q Do you have separate notes that you take?
A No.
Q Okay. I'd like to refer you to Exhibit 18 which is the inspection report for May 8, and that's -- I'd like you to look at page 3 at the bottom, No. 2 says, "Several areas were observed to be inactive or could be scheduled to be inactive."
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Q Were you -- were they driving in that area?
A No. It's not an area where there would be vehicles driving on it.

Q Did you ask for the construction schedule for the next two weeks?

A I did not.
Q Do you know how far this location is from Encanto Channel?

A This site is located right next to Encanto Channel.
Q What does that mean? Do you have an estimated distance?

A It's adjacent to Encanto Channel. The development site abuts Encanto Channel.

Q Is there one -- did you observe storm water flowing all through the side of where it's adjacent, or does it enter in distinct locations?

A I observed flows in Encanto Channel, and I observed the storm drain inlets on Akins Avenue that discharge directly into Encanto Channel.

Q And did you =- in preparing allegations for this ACL, did you determine there was a substantial threat to beneficial water use?

A I determined that there was a threat to beneficial uses from this site.

Q And what facts did you rely on for that
or no.
Q Were your -- was your reaction to this report substantially different from how you feel when you read other similar reports?

A It was not substantially different.
Q We're going to go back to Notice of Violation No. 4, and look at the allegations for September 15. I will ask you to look at Exhibit No. 22 to the ACL.

A Did you say 22?
Q Yes, I did.
Did you rely on this document for Notice of
Violation No. 4 for September 15?
A Yes, I did.
Q Did you rely on any other evidence for that allegation?

A Not that I recall.
Q Can you identify the inactive areas for me that form the basis of Notice of Violation No. 4 for September 15?

A In looking at Exhibit No. 22 which is Tad
Nakatani's September 15, 2015, City of Lemon Grove inspection form of the San Altos-Valencia Hills site. If you look on the first page of that under "Physical Stabilization," it states, "Significant areas lack erosion control. Evidence of erosion throughout site. Effective:
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Yes or no. No."
    And when I look at the BMP Recommendations on page
3, No. 1 states, "Utilize erosion controls on all disturbed
areas prior to rain events or when they are inactive,
whichever comes first."
    And I note that on the map on page 4, that his one
circle applies to a lot of the lots in the graded pads
throughout the site. During this time, September 15, 2015,
the areas that I would expect that were inactive would have
been those along Valencia Court that have the one circled
and those along Orlando Drive that have the one.
    The ones that are circled along Tangelos Place, I
would expect that that was an active area for that time of
the development.
    Q Do you know where they were doing construction on
from September 15 to September 30?
    A I believe it was along Tangelos Place.
    Q Could they have been doing any other work in any
other area of the site?
            MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Speculative.
            THE WITNESS: I don't know.
        BY MS. BERESFORD:
            Q Okay.
            A I would also note No. 5 on that BMP Recommendation,
            states, "Clean sediment out of roadway and gutter." Again,
```
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A Yes.
Q Are underlying soils waters of the United States?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion.
THE WITNESS: It may.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q How is that?
A Depends on the site characteristics.
Q Can you be more specific?
A If the geology is such that there's a high groundwater level, then it could be.

Q Do you know what the groundwater level at this site is?

A No.
Q Other than clean up the stucco, if stucco falls on
the ground before a rain event, weather best management practice would be the best available technology for purposes of the construction general permit?

A I have seen on various sites where stucco contractors will lay down a fabric material or a plastic. So I've seen it where it's a plastic, and then on top of that a fabric material or a fabric material that is waterproof.

And it will catch the bulk of the stucco that falls off during the stucco application process. And, thereby,
they can pick it up, and they can then dump it into the concrete bins -- or construction, after it's dried, they can then dump it into construction waste bins. If it's still wet, they can -- they can dump it into a concrete washout.

Q Is it possible that stucco can fall on the soil even if somebody is using that type of process?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Speculative.
THE WITNESS: Yes, it's possible.
BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q And do you know if using the process you're just

## described, if that complies with OSHA?

A I do not know if that complies with OSHA.
2 Let's look at Exhibit No. 13, please, to the ACL.
A I have Exhibit No. 13.
Q Did you rely on this document for the allegation of the failure to discharge -- the failure to prevent the discharge of concrete waste to the ground for March 18?

A My technical analysis does not cite Exhibit No. 13 in there. However, I believe it does cite Exhibit 14.

I will say that Exhibit No. 13 does contain photographs that to me depict violations of Section B.2.I of Attachment $D$ to the Construction Storm Water Permit.

Q And what would that be?
A In looking at the first page of photographs in the upper right-hand corner, there appears to be a discharge of

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210

FRANK MELBOURN - VOLUME I - 1/13/2016
changed its ways, then this follow-up inspection would not have discovered another discharge.

It was just a matter of days, different, in less than five days, or five days.

Q Let's go back to Exhibit No. 13.
How many pictures in that exhibit do you think show discharges of concrete waste to the ground?

A In the photographs themselves, I would say only one.

Q On March 18?
A Correct. However, I would note that on page 3 of the BMP Recommendations for No. 2 it says, "Concrete waste observed on multiple locations."

Q And how many pictures of discharges to ground are in Exhibit 16?

A One.
Q Do you know how many houses they were doing stucco work at during this period?

A I do not.
Q So on March 18 they have multiple locations. On March 23rd -- or March 24 they have one.

Is it possible that they improved, and just had one accident on March 24?

A I don't know.
Q Is it possible that they didn't have any on

March 19?
A It's possible.
(2) Possible they didn't have any on March 20?

A It's possible.
Q Possible they didn't have any on March 21?
A It's possible.
Q Possible they didn't have any on March 22?
A Possible.
Q Let's look at Exhibit No. 17 -- and before we move
on -- I'm sorry. So this one that was identified for March
24, do you know when they cleaned that up?
A I do not.
Q Okay. Let's look at Exhibit No. 17.
Did you rely on this document for the allegation
for Violation No. 13?
A Yes.
Q And what is the basis of that allegation?
A Based upon Exhibit No. 17 which is the City of
Lemon Grove's Administrative Citation for $\$ 1,000$ issued to
Tim Anderson the project manager for the San Altos-Lemon
Grove Project, Valencia Hills. It was for illegal
discharges of cementous materials. The date of the
violation is April 1, 2015, and it was issued by Tamara
O'Neil on April 1, 2015.
Attached to it are photographs of various houses
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April 1st -- are there any facts that that waste actually left the site?

A No.
Q Any evidence that that waste actually harmed waters of the United States?

A No.
2 Do you know which site where you saw the plastic being used by the stucco contractors?

A I believe it was the Garden Community site.
Q Let's look at Exhibit No. 13 again which was for March 18, and I'm going to jump to Notice of Violation No. 12.

Do you know what was stored in those drums?
I'm sorry. Let's be more specific. I'm referring to
Exhibit No. 13, and the last page has photographs, and it appears to be the same photograph on page No. 17 of the technical analysis for the ACL.

Do you know what was in those drums?
A I do not know.
Q Do you know if they were hazardous or nonhazardous?
A I do not know.
Q Do you know if the containers were watertight?
A I don't think they were.
Q And why do you say that?
A Well, looking at the photograph, it appears that

one of the lids is cracked open.

Q Can you show me where?
A I'm looking at the photograph in the technical
analysis which is labeled Eigure 12 on page 17. To me, the bucket on the front left appears to have a lid where the lip goes up, so, to me, it does not look like it was sealed.

Q I'm sorry. I don't know if it matters. I'm
looking at Exhibit No. 16 which I have one page of
photographs attached to that.
A Yes.
Q I do not see a picture of chemicals. You're saying
that's from Exhibit No. 15 from the ACL.
So that photograph comes from Exhibit No. 15?
A Yes.
Q Okay. My apologies.
Do you know if there was any rain that occurred
between March 18 and March 24?
A Not without looking at the precipitation data, no.
Q So do you have any evidence that this alleged violation caused a threat to beneficial use of Encanto Channel?

A Based on the information in front of me, no.
Q Okay.
MS. BERESFORD: Let's go off the record.
(Brief recess.)
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Q If they were the same stockpile, wouldn't he have put all the information together?

A Let me see. I agree with you. They are separate stockpiles.

Q Does the Notice of Violation allege that stockpiled waste material is exposed from January 6th through January 14?

A It does not note it. However, in looking at the two reports that -- it's reasonable to assume that they were in that position that the inspector deemed a deficiency because it shows up in both reports.
(Q) You're talking about the stockpiles near the basin?

A Correct.
Q So are those the stockpiles that you are focused on for Violation No. 11?

A Yes.
Q How do we know that they're waste stockpiles?
A I would say that I base that upon my confusion that it was the -- the scrap pile from the one above.

Q But you think they're different stockpiles at this point?

A At this point I agree with you. They are different stockpiles based upon the information in the map.

Q And do you have any evidence that waste stockpiles were not protected from wind and rain from January 6th

```
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through January $13 ?$
A I do not.
Q Let's look at Violation No. 10, please.
A I have it in front of me.
Q Can you please state what that is for the record?
A On page 16 of the "ACL Complaint Violation No. 10"
is: "The failure to protect storm drain inlets (3 days)
pursuant to Section E. 6 Attachment $D$ to the Construction Storm Water Permit.
"Dischargers shall ensure that all storm drain inlets, and perimeter controls. Control BMPs, and pollutant controls at entrances and exits (Example, tire washout locations) are maintained and protected from activities that reduce their effectiveness."

Q Let's look at Exhibit No. 4, please, to the ACL.
Did you rely on this report for the allegation of failure to protect storm drain inlets on December 8th?

A I did.
Q Did you rely on any other evidence for this for December 8?

A Not that I can recall.
Q Do you know if there was a discharge resulting from this alleged violation on December 8th?

A I do not.
Q Do you know if there was an alleged potential -- or

```
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## connected to the MS4?

```
A I don't know.
Q Let's look at May 13 and Exhibit No. 19.
A I have Exhibit No. 19 in front of me.
Q Can you please identify for me what in that document states that there was failure to protect a storm dxain on May 13th?
A I did not write this inspection report. I was at the site on May 13, 2015, and so I recall documenting through a photograph and visually seeing this figure that we have in -- the photograph in Eigure 11 on page 16 . So it was not included by Wayne in his inspection report.
MS. DRABANDT: May I, please, ask for an
explanation of what photograph you're referring to?
THE WITNESS: So in the Technical Analysis to the
ACL complaint on page 16 , there's a photograph on -- that's entitled Figure 11. And it's a photograph I took during the inspection that wayne Chiu conducted of the site. And so it documented the failure to protect a storm drain inlet at the site.
BY MS. BERESEORD:
Q So Mr. Chiu's report did not identify that as a violation on May 13th?
(A) It did not.
Q Do you know if that storm drain was -- or if
```
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that -- the picture on page 16 of a storm drain inlet, do you know if that was connected to the MS4?

A I don't know.
Q If it was not connected to the MS4, is it still a violation of the Construction General Permit?

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: In my opinion, it's a violation of the Construction Storm Water Permit. BY MS. BERESFORD:
(2) If it's not connected to the MS4?

A Right. And the reason being I have seen many sites where the developers will say a storm inlet is not connected, and there will be sediment inside -- which there was at the time that I took this photograph -- and they will not clean it out.

And so, therefore, as soon as there is a set of -a storm event and the site is connected, it will discharge the sediment.

Q So you're citing them for a violation that you think they're going to do, but have not done yet?
(A) It's --

MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Argumentative. Calls
for legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I would say --
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BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q Is it possible that they could have cleaned it out? Did you ever ask them if they did?

A Well, it wasn't protected at the time. And we were expecting storm events. So, in my mind, that is a violation of the Construction Storm Water Permit requirement.

Q Okay. Even if it's not connected to the MS4?
A Even if it's connected to the MS4.
Q Where is it going to go?
A If it's connected, it's going to go to Encanto
Channel.
Q What if it's not connected?
A Then, it's going to stay on site.
(Q And is that still a violation?
MS. DRABANDT: Objection. Calls for legal
conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I would refer to the Construction
Storm Water Permit.
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q If you didn't notify them of this being a potential violation, how are they supposed to take corrective action before a storm water event?

A I provided the inspection report to the developer.
Q Your inspection report?
A Oh, I'm sorry, Wayne's did. And it did not include
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Q Could that be down the street and not related to the perimeter?

A I don't think so because it says, "Discharge location," so that is typically an entrance or exit area.

Q Have you talked to Mr. Harper about what location he meant there?

A I did not.
Q Are there any pictures of the discharge locations from December 8th?

A Not in the attached photos to Exhibit No. 4.
Q So there's no evidence of a discharge on 5, 6, or 7; is that correct?

A That would be correct.
Q Let's talk about May 9 through 12, please.
Do you have any inspection reports from May 9
through 12?
A I do not.
Do you know what the weather was like on May 10,
11, 12?
A I don't recall.
Q How do you know that there was insufficient perimeter controls on May 9, 10, 11, and 12?

A I based that allegation upon the fact that there were inadequate perimeter sediment control BMPs on May 8 th and also on May 13th. And so far I'm inferring that they
you were saying?
A Perhaps you misunderstood.
Q Okay. So, wow, I'm sorry if I misunderstood. So when you were talking about the areas of active versus inactive, there could have been active areas going on in those days?

A If you look at the definition in the permit, it talks about an area that is no longer scheduled to be worked on, or hasn't been worked on in the last 14 days, I believe. I'd have to refer to the permit, but I would refer to that definition.

Q So as an -- even if someone is under a Stop Work Notice, and they were scheduled to work on that area within the next 14 days, would that still make that area active?

A Yes.
Q So did you ever discuss with anyone what the schedule of active areas were to be for the month of December?
(A) No.

Q Did you ever discuss with anyone what the areas of active construction was supposed to be for the month of January?
(A) No.

Q Are you aware that when Gary Harper was inspecting the site and identifying areas as inactive versus active,
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A I don't know. I hadn't thought about it.
Q Can we look, please, at Exhibit No. 2 --
A Yes. I have Exhibit No. 2.
Q -- to the ACI. And I'd like to look at the first page of photographs, which are date stamped December 1. And two of the photographs, one in the upper left-hand corner and one in the lower right-hand corner are time stamped as 10:44 a.m.

Do you see that?
A Yes, I see that.
Q Are these two locations close to each other?
A I believe they are close to each other.
Q And can you describe how where they are in relationship to each other?

A I believe that the photograph on the lower right-hand side is slightly down the hill on Tangelos Place from the photograph in the upper left.

Q Can you describe for me why the photograph in the upper left is considered inactive but the photograph in the lower right is considered active?

A So if you recall when I talked about the photo in the upper left, that the areas where -- it might be easier for me to point to you -- but the areas here (indicating) and along here, I described as being inactive, and I was making the comment that this area here which is Tangelos

Place is a roadway, and that it had been graded and was not changing significantly -- was not planned or scheduled to be regraded for many months as far as with pavement and utilities to be put in.

And so my comment was that I deemed this area (indicating) to be inactive because the only thing that was occurring on there was some traffic, and it -- very little because they ended up closing the northeast entrance/exit very shortly after this time period. So even less traffic was going on there, and so my comment was even though this is a graded roadway, and there's some traffic, it was my opinion that there should also be some soil stabilization on there. A soil binder could be sprayed on there. This area along here (indicating).

This area has some traffic (indicating), looks like they have some vehicles parked there, but again it's -- it's not scheduled to be regraded.

Q If somebody is using a location -- a graded area as a road, just as a road, and the road has some slopes on it, are the slopes on the road active or inactive?

A If the road is graded, and there's no plan to do any other land disturbance to it, it's just being used as a dirt road, then $I$ would say it's inactive.
\& Okay. And I'm sorry if you already explained this. Forgive me.
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Can you, please, describe for me what characterizes this photograph in the lower right-hand corner as active?

A Well, I characterize that area as active was because I see there were some pipes that were laid down there, and it looks like there some vehicles did some turning around. And so since there's some materials placed there, that perhaps that was an area that was going to get more traffic than what $I$ would expect in some of the other areas.

And so, therefore, they would also be -- it's a housing pad, so I know at another point they will be doing -- pouring concrete, digging utilities, that sort of thing. And that's -- that phase, that area was due to be worked fairly soon, if $I$ can recall correctly.

Q How do you know? Like, what's your recollection based on?

A Based on my discussions with the site superintendent at later times as far as the sequencing of the phases for the development.

Q And do you know when that conversation occurred?
A I believe it occurred sometime in the May of 2015 on-site. It may have also occurred on March of 2015 when I was on-site.

Q Did you inspect the site on March 27 th?
A I was -- I believe I was on the site. Wayne Chiu
was the lead on that, so I was there. I observed the
conditions at the time, but I did not produce an inspection
report.
Q Do you know if Mr. Chiu produced an inspection
report?
A I believe -- I don't believe an inspection report
was created for that.
Q Why not?
A If I can recall, that was a meeting in which wayne
was discussing -- Wayne Chiu was discussing with the
developer the potential for enforcement, and it was also a
chance to get the -- the developer, the subcontractors, and
some of the City of Lemon Grove staff together to make sure
that everybody was on the same page when it came to
protecting the site from sediment and runoff.
Q Do you recall what the general conclusion of that
inspection was?
A I remembered that I was disappointed with the site
conditions, that the developer was planning to use -- what I
would say -- some unorthodox BMPs on the site, and was also
thinking that the rainy season was over, and that there
weren't going to be any more storm events, and so that they
felt they were in the clear.
Q Do you recall Mr. Chiu's conclusions after that inspection were?
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meant by that comment?
A. NO.
Q. Do you know if the slopes identified on the map with the number 3 that you noted, do you know if they were scheduled to have had any work done on December 16 ?
A. No.
Q. So let me rephrase.

Did you know whether that -- those slopes would be active on December 16 ?
A. No.
Q. Do you know what the weather conditions were for December 16?
A. From Exhibit Number 9, I do not see anything
that indicates weather. However, I do recall from my own recollection that December of 2014 there were storms

```
12:19 every week. So I would not be surprised if there was a
    storm event that was -- that happened within a day or
two of this inspection.
    Q. Do you know if there was evidence of a
    12:19
    12:20
12:21
not have sufficient linear sediment controls on May 8
    A. The best example I can point to would be
    photograph number 1 on page 6 of 10. In the upper
    left-hand corner, you can see a slope, and that would be
    one slope that I recall that did not have the linear
    sediment control. You can see it on the section towards
    the upper center and upper right, but it did not
    continue through.
            Furthermore, reserve sediment in the street that is
        indicative of erosion and the linear sediment controls
12:22 help to reduce the amount of erosion that occurs or
```

12:24 that that sediment came off of that slope. But what I would say is that there is evidence of erosion from those slopes. There is evidence of sediment in the street, so it is not unreasonable to make the assumption that some of the sediment from the slope exited onto the street.
Q. Do you have any other evidence to support the allegation for May 8th?
A. Just my recollection that $I$ recall seeing

12:24 several slopes.
Q. Okay.

For ease of reference for future discussion, I'm going to introduce this exhibit now.

Can you please mark this as Exhibit 6. (EXHIBIT 6)
$12: 25$
We've discussed previously that you've considered weather conditions in your -- in preparing the complaint and the allegations; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this the information that you relied on when
evaluating the weather conditions for the alleged violations?
A. I relied upon this information, and there were times that I also looked at information from NOAA online; however, I found this information to be the best when it came to user-friendliness and ease of

## 12:26 understanding.

$12: 26$
$12: 27$
$12: 29$
Q. Did you make any notes from your investigation
of information from NOAA, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{A}$ ?
A. No.
Q. I want to briefly go back to the May 8,

Eshibit 19. All right.
I'm sorry. Never mind.
Let's proceed to May 13, please, and that would be
Exhibit Number 19 to the ACL.
exhibit, one can see several stockpiles covered with black plastic.

If $I$ can recollect appropriately, this looks like Seville Way to me. But there's a slope there. I know it's a street. But that's the type of place where you have a slope. And this was a fairly steep slope that the linear sediment control installation of fiber rolls can work very effectively to reduce the amount of energy. Also, they do actually hold up fairly well if they're driven over a few times.
Looking at photo 2, it's hard -- I can see several
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12:32 site during the inspection, but Wayne produced the report.
Q. Do you know if any of these slopes were active? MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague as to the definition

12:33 of "active."
Are you referring to the construction general
permit definition?
MS. BERESFORD: Yes.
Q. Do you know if any of these slopes were active

12:33 defined by the construction general permit?
A. Based on my recollection of the site inspection and walking the site, looking at the site, and based upon my previous visits at the site, I would say some of them may have been inactive and others may have been

## 12:33 <br> active.

It was unfortunate that on that date, the site
representative did not meet us by the time we had
finished our inspection.
Q. Did he know you were there?
A. Yes.
Q. How did he know?
A. When we arrived on site, we went -- Wayne and I went to the -- started walking the site. And within a few minutes of us being on site, a contractor -- I don't
know that it was a representative of the developer, but
one of the contractors for the site approached us, asked
who we were. We explained who we were.
He got on the phone and called the site
superintendent and said that the site superintendent was
off site, but that he would be there shortly. By the
time we finished our inspection, walking the entire
site, he had not shown up, so we left.
Q. How do you know it was the site superintendent that he called?
A. The person that called told us that it was the site superintendent, and I believe the name he used was Sandstrom.
Q. So you were just talking about some slopes are active and some slopes are inactive.

Can you identify for me which you're alleging -which slopes you're alleging are active and which slopes you're alleging are inactive?
A. My opinion whether the slope was active or inactive, it needed protection because there was a storm event forecasted.
Q. For May 13th?
A. Eor within the next 24 to 48 hours. That's my recollection. So I would have expected that they would be preparing the site for a storm event.
Q. But for purposes of the allegations, can you
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12:39 went along. But, again, that area could have been inactive. But it -- they could also consider it active. But, in my opinion, that was inactive.

Same with photos 9 and 10, I would call those areas inactive, those streets.

And to me, photo 7 would also be inactive. That was used for some travel. But, again, I think it was insufficient to bring in the definition of land disturbance.

MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Is there evidence of a discharge on May 13?
A. When you say sediment discharge, do you mean to the street or to the storm water conveyance system?
Q. To the storm water conveyance system.
A. No.
Q. With the exception of the road areas that you identified on page 8 , are the linear sediment controls that you identified -- the deficient linear sediment controls that you identified for May 13 different than those that you identified on May 8?
A. Some were the same, some were different.
Q. Which ones were the same?
A. The ones that occurred on Seville Way would have been the same.

## 12: 43

there were deficiencies at the site for quite a long
time, looking at the sea of Lemon Grove inspection
reports, my site visits.
Q. Anything specific?
A. NO.

12:43
Q. Okay.

And, then, let's look at September 15, please, and that would be Exhibit Number 22 to the ACL.
A. I have Exhibit Number 22.
Q. And what -- Did you rely on this document for
the allegations of insufficient linear sediment controls for September 15?
A. I did.
Q. And what is the evidence -- What did you rely on in this document to allege that violation?
A. What I recall is that attached to this Exhibit

```
13:00
13:01
        failure to adequately manage run-on -- excuse me --
        runoff within the site.
            Number 3}\mathrm{ on page 8 of 10 again shows sediment in
        the street which, in my opinion, is a failure to manage
        the runoff from within the site.
            And just my recollection and finding number 6 on
        page 4 of 10 stating that there was a lack of effective
        run-on and runoff controls observed.
            Q. Anything else for May 8?
            A. Not that I recall.
            Q. Okay.
            Let's talk about May 13, and I'd like to refer you
        to Exhibit Number 19 of the ACL.
    A. I have Exhibit Number 19.
    Q. And can you please identify for me those --
        Well, first, let me ask, is this what you relied on for
        the allegations for violation number 8 for May 13?
            A. I relied upon this inspection report and my
        recollection from my visit of the site at the same time,
        as well as the photographs that Wayne took and I took of
        the site.
            Q. Okay.
            Can you please identify for me the basis for your
        allegation of failure to manage run-on and runoff for
        May 13, please?
```
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13:05 sediment control?
A. Yes.
2. So if you have a failure to implement perimeter
sediment control, do you necessarily have a failure to
13:06 manage runoff?
MR. BOYERS: Objection. Legal conclusion.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. But in this case, that -- that's -- is that
13:06 true, failure to manage -- failure to implement
perimeter sediment control, and, therefore, you also
have failure to manage runoff?
A. Could you rephrase that?
Q. Sure.
Is the failure to manage runoff related to the
failure to implement perimeter sediment control?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
What was the basis for your allegations of failure
13:07 to implement perimeter -- I'm sorry -- failure to manage
run-on and runoff for May $9,10,11$, and 12 ?
A. The allegation was based upon the findings and evidence collected during the inspections on May 8 th and May 13 th by the regional board, and the fact that there were consistent violations for those violations;
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13:07

13:08

13:08

13:09
$\square$

open, the type of construction that's occurring.
So there's a lot of factors that play into it. So I would say on a case by case, time by time that those requirements change. Not that the requirements change, but the implementation of BMPs that would say those
therefore, it was reasonable for us to infer that those violations continued in the meanwhile.
Q. Did you have any independent evidence of what occurred on the site on those days?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Okay.

Do you -- Does the level of the BMPs require the failure -- Let me start over.

Did the BMPs required to manage run-on and runoff, do those change at -- depending on whether or not it's dry weather or whether there's a storm in the 48-hour forecast?
A. Yes.
Q. So in dry weather, are the BMPs associated with managing run-on and runoff not as stringent if you are in an active area?
A. Based upon my understanding of the construction storm water permit, there are a lot of factors that are dynamic for sites and so a factor will be weather. But another factor will be the amount of acreage that's
$13: 14$

13:14
$13: 15$

13:15

13:15

13:15
Q. How do you know that means there's sediment in the street? Could it be just a notation that they should sweep the street after they finish rebuilding?
A. I don't know.
Q. Who did this inspection?
A. I don't know, but the Exhibit Number 4 states the inspector name that appears to be Harper.
Q. Did you ask him if that's what he meant by that notation that there was sediment in the street?
A. No.
Q. Is it possible that they -- Let me continue.

Do any of the photographs show sediment in the street on December 8?
A. None of the attached photographs to Exhibit

Number 4 demonstrate sediment in the street.
Q. Is it possible they cleaned up the sediment on

December 4 or December 5?
MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MS. BERESEORD:
Q. Do you have any other evidence that there was sediment in the street on December $5,6,7$, or 8 ?

MR. BOYERS: I believe you have referenced 5, 6, or
7 before. Are we adding 8?
MS. BERESFORD: He was talking about Exhibit Number
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$13: 34$
$13: 35$
residential area would be insignificant compared to what would have come off of the construction site.
Q. Is there anything in the report for December 9 that indicates how much sediment he's talking about?
A. It states on page 2 of the December 9th, 2014 City of Lemon Grove inspection report that there was a large amount of sediment on roadway southeast of site.
Q. Is Akins Avenue southeast or southwest?
A. In my opinion -- and I don't see on this map, I don't see a north arrow indicated on there, but I would say that the Akins Avenue area is southwest of this site, not southeast.

BY MR. BOYERS: Okay.
MS. BERESEORD: Let's go off the record.
(A recess is taken.)
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. I want to revisit your inspection on May 13. You indicated that you and Mr. Chiu went to the site, that you had spoken to somebody out there that attempted to call someone that you thought was the site superintendent, he didn't make it to the site before you were done; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

Did you follow up after the fact with anyone at the

13:35 site to discuss your findings?
A. I believe I transmitted -- Let's see datewise.

I don't recall specific date, but I visited the site on
May 15 th and met with Tim Anderson and Tyler Sandstrom.
And so to coordinate that inspection meeting, I know at
some point I had to communicate with them. Whether it
was by telephone or by email, I don't recall.
Q. When you --
A. And at that point, I recall that I -- I believe

13:36 I -- Let me think. If I recall correctly, I believe I talked with Tim Anderson by phone after I got back from the inspection with Wayne Chiu on the 13th, and I expressed that there were many deficiencies that were noted at the site; and that there was a storm event expected, I believe, sometime on the 14 th or 15 th; and that the site really needed to get taken care of.

And if I can recall correctly, there was a storm drain inlet that we see on figure 11 on page 16 of the technical analysis that shows the unprotected storm drain inlet. And I believe in the inspection that I conducted on the 15 th, that that was taken care of.

So referring to Exhibit Number 20, which is my May 15 th, 2015 inspection report for the site, the page 8 of 8 , photograph number 5 shows the same storm 13:37 drain inlet that now has been protected with gravel
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```
13:43 Q. Okay.
    So who ultimately decides which BMPs are
        appropriate for any given day?
            A. For the Regional Water Quality Control Board,
            13:44 we are not in the business of specifying specific best
        management practices that must be applied.
            So, therefore, I would say from our point of view,
        we will assess whether they were effective and whether
        they complied with the requirements of the permit, but
        that it would be ultimately up to the QSP for the site
        to decide and the developer in conjunction with the QSP
        to decide what is best for that site and that developer.
            Q. Okay. Thank you.
            I want to talk about some of the weather
            13:44 information that you collected. And if I could refer
        You back to Exhibit -- I believe it's Exhibit 6.
            A. I have it in front of me.
            Q. And I believe I asked if this is what you
        relied on for weather information, and I think you
        indicated yes, and that in some instances, you relied on
        NOAA for certain things; is that correct?
            A. Yes.
            Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at this,
        please. Let's mark this as Exhibit 7. (EXHIBIT 7)
    Do you know what Exhibit 7 is?
```
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## 13:46

 13: 47 (13:47)be page 7, 8 --
Q. Oops. Did I give you --

MR. BOYERS: 31 and 32.
THE WITNESS: Did you want those also?
MS. BERESFORD: NO, no.
THE WITNESS: Appears to be pages 7 and 8 of
Attachment $D$ to the construction storm water permit.
MS. BERESFORD:
13:46 Q. Does this identify where a QSP is supposed to
look for weather information?
A. Yes.
Q. Where are they supposed to obtain that

## information?

A. States that they can obtain precipitation
forecast information from the National Weather Service
Forecast Office, example, by entering the ZIP code of
the project's location at http://srh.noaa.gov/forecast.
Q. Does it say the discharger can get that

13:47 information from NOAA or that the discharger shall get

## that information from NOAA?

A. It states "shall."
Q. So would you say the majority of the weather
information that you relied on came from this Weather
A. Exhibit 7 is a -- of the deposition appears to

Underground site?
13:47

## 13:49

A. Yes.
Q. What is Weather Underground?
A. It is a web site that collects weather
information from various weather stations throughout the

## 13:48 nation.

Q. Why did you not use NOAA data?
A. The NOAA data does not present itself in a
format that is easily read and understood by a
layperson.

## Q. So does that mean it's okay to use data from <br> somewhere other than NOAA under the permit? <br> A. Eor this case, I felt that using this weather

station was a good approximation of the weather that was
occurring at the site sufficient for me to know whether
13:48 there was a storm event or not during the time period.
Q. Do you know if there are any other locations
that collect weather data that's closer to the site than
the site that you relied on from the Weather
Underground?
A. I don't know.
Q. For about how many times did you look at the NOAA data?
A. I would say two times or less.
Q. Do you know which site you referred to -- and

13:49 correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding is that NOAA
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13:50
data is identified by latitude and longitude, do you
know which NOAA station you collected that information

## from?

A. I do not.
Q. I would like to talk about December 16. I am currently searching for which exhibit that might be.

MR. BOYERS: 9 .
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. My colleague indicates Exhibit 9 to the ACL, information about December 16 .
A. I have Exhibit Number 9 in front of me.
Q. Unfortunately, I'm thinking of the wrong date.

I would like to talk about December 17.
MR. BOYERS: 10 .
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. December 17 is the memo from Brian Nemerow, or does it contain the memo from Brian Nemerow?
A. Exhibit Number 10 is a D-Max, Incorporated, memo dated December 17th, 2014, from Brian Nemerow to Malik Tamimi.
Q. When we were discussing some alleged violations involving activity on December 16 yesterday, I recall you indicating that you thought there had been rainfall earlier in the day.

And my question to you is, did you track rainfall

```
14:18 areas that may contain additional pollutants so there is
    no discharge into the underlying soil and onto the
surrounding areas."
    There's an "into the underlying soil" and "onto the
14:18 surrounding areas." I take that as a discharge to the
ground.
    Q. Okay.
    How many times did you visit the site?
    A. I don't recall a specific number, but I would
14:18 say anywhere between five to ten times.
    Q. We've had a lot of discussion over the past
two days about active versus inactive areas.
    Did you discuss the construction schedule every
time you went to the site?
A. No.
Q. When did you discuss the construction schedule?
Let me rephrase.
Did you ever discuss the construction schedule with
anyone from -- a representative of San Altos?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you do that?
A. March 27th, 2015, the first time I was on the
site, we discussed the construction schedule.
On May 15th, 2015, we discussed the construction
14:19 schedule.
```
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## 14:20




```
14:19
```

14:19
14:20
14:20
(1):
(1):
stop work notice and the impact on some of the
stop work notice and the impact on some of the
activities, but the bulk of the scheduling conversation
activities, but the bulk of the scheduling conversation
that we had was on what was to come.
that we had was on what was to come.
Q. Have you undergone any construction training?
Q. Have you undergone any construction training?
MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague as to what is
MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague as to what is
14:20 "construction training."
14:20 "construction training."
MS. BERESFORD:
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Have you taken any classes on construction
Q. Have you taken any classes on construction
management?
management?
A. I have not taken any classes on construction
A. I have not taken any classes on construction
14:21 management. I have had in my civil engineering studies
14:21 management. I have had in my civil engineering studies
classes in -- in timber design, structural design,
classes in -- in timber design, structural design,
foundations, soils, concrete design.
foundations, soils, concrete design.
I don't believe I had any sort of construction
I don't believe I had any sort of construction
management classes or construction contracts training in
management classes or construction contracts training in
14:21 law school.

```
    14:21 law school.
```
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Weather History for KSEE - January. 2015

| Sunday |  | Monday |  | Tuesday |  | Wednesday |  | Thurscday |  | Friday |  | Saturday |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 |  |
| Actuat | $78^{\circ} 144^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $80^{\circ} 142^{\circ}$ | Actual | $82^{\circ} 142^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $82^{\circ} 144^{\circ}$ | Actual | $86^{\circ}$ : $42^{\circ}$ | Actual | $8.4{ }^{\circ} 144^{\prime \prime}$ | Actuas | $78^{\circ} 139^{\circ}$ 0.00 |
|  | 0.00 m |  | 0.00 in | Average | 0.00 in | Average: | 0.00 in | Average | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 | Average: | 0.00 in |
| Average | $69^{\circ}$ : $40^{\circ}$ | Average: | $68^{\circ} 140^{\circ}$ |  | $68^{\circ} 140^{\circ}$ |  | $68^{\circ} 140^{\circ}$ |  | $67^{\circ} 140^{\circ}$ | Average. | $67^{\circ} 140^{\prime \prime}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 67^{\circ}: 40^{\circ} \\ & 0.11 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 0.08 in |  | 0.09 n |  | 0.09 in |  | 0.09 m |  | 0.09 in |  | 0.10 m |  |  |
| 8 |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  |
| Actuat | $80^{* \prime} 150^{\circ}$ | Actual | $78^{\circ} 148^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $80^{\circ} 142^{\circ}$ | Actuat: | $89^{\circ} 144^{\circ}$ | Actuat | $87^{\circ} / 44^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $89^{\circ}{ }^{\text {4 }} 44^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $\begin{aligned} & 89^{\circ}: 48^{\circ} \\ & 0.00 \mathrm{in} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 0.00 m |  | 0.00 m |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  |  |
| Average | $67^{\circ}$ : $40^{\circ}$ | Average: | $67^{\circ} 141^{\circ}$ | Average: | $67^{\circ} \mid 41^{\circ}$ | Average: | $67^{\circ} / 41^{\circ}$ | Average: | $67^{\circ} / 47^{*}$ | Average | $67^{\circ}+42^{\circ}$ | Average | $67^{\circ}$ (42" |
|  | 0.11 m |  | 0.12 in |  | 0.13 m |  | 0.14 in |  | 0.14 in |  | 0.14 m |  | 0.14 in |
| 15 |  | 16 |  | 17 |  | 18 |  | 19 |  | 20 | 8 | 21 |  |
| Actual | $84^{\circ} 146^{*}$ | Actual | $75^{\circ} 144^{\circ}$ | Actual. | $75^{\circ} 150^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $78^{\circ} \\| 48^{\circ}$ | Actuat | $75^{\circ} / 50^{\circ}$ | Actuas | $73^{\circ} 155^{\circ}$ | Actuat | $69^{\circ} 157^{\circ}$0.00 mm |
|  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 m |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 m |  |  |
| Average | $66^{\circ} 142^{\circ}$ | Average: | $66^{\circ} 142^{\circ}$ | Average: | $66^{\circ} / 42^{\circ}$ | Average: | $66^{\circ} 143^{\circ}$ | Average: | $66^{\circ} 143^{\circ}$ | Average | $65^{\circ} 143^{\circ}$ | Average | $65^{\circ} / 43^{\circ}$ |
|  | 0.13 m |  | 0.13 irl |  | 0.13 m |  | 0.13 in |  | 0.13 in |  | 0.13 m |  |  |
| 22 |  | 23 |  | 24 |  | 25 |  | 26 | $\xrightarrow{\circ}$ | 27 |  | 28 |  |
| Actual | $62^{\circ} 153^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $66^{\circ} / 46^{\circ}$ | Actuat | $69^{\circ} / 41^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $75^{\circ}$ \| $39^{\circ}$ | Actual: | $73^{\circ} / 42^{\circ}$ | Actual. | $66^{\circ}$ / $48^{\circ}$ | Actual | $64^{\circ}+53^{\circ}$ |
|  | 0.21 nl |  | 0.41 m |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 in |  | 0.00 my |  | 0.03 in |
| Average: | $65^{\circ} / 43^{\circ}$ | Average: | $65^{\circ} / 43^{\circ}$ | Average | $65^{\circ} 143^{\circ}$ | Average | $65^{\circ} / 43^{\circ}$ | Average | $65^{\circ} 143^{\circ}$ | Average: | $65^{\circ} / 43^{\circ}$ | Average: | $66^{\circ}$ - $43^{\circ}$ |
|  | 0.12 (n) |  | 0.13 m |  | 0.12 in |  | 0.12 in |  | 0.12 in |  | 0.12 m |  | 0.11 m |
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3. Upon identifying failures or other shortcomings, as directed by the QSP, Risk Level 2 dischargers shall begin implementing repairs or design changes to BMPs within 72 hours of identification and complete the changes as soon as possible.
4. For each inspection required, Risk Level 2 dischargers shall complete an inspection checklist, using a form provided by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board or in an alternative format.
5. Risk Level 2 dischargers shall ensure that checklists shall remain onsite with the SWPPP and at a minimum, shall include:
a. Inspection date and date the inspection report was written.
b. Weather information, including presence or absence of precipitation, estimate of beginning of qualifying storm event, duration of event, time elapsed since last storm, and approximate amount of rainfall in inches.
c. Site information, including stage of construction, activities completed, and approximate area of the site exposed.
d. A description of any BMPs evaluated and any deficiencies noted.
e. If the construction site is safely accessible during inclement weather, list the observations of all BMPs: erosion controls, sediment controls, chemical and waste controls, and non-storm water controls. Otherwise, list the results of visual inspections at all relevant outfalls, discharge points, downstream locations and any projected maintenance activities.
f. Report the presence of noticeable odors or any visible sheen on the surface of any discharges.
g. Any corrective actions required, including any necessary changes to the SWPPP and the associated implementation dates.
h. Photographs taken during the inspection, if any.
i. Inspector's name, title, and signature.

## H. Rain Event Action Plan

1. Additional Risk Level 2 Requirement: The discharger shall ensure a QSP develop a Rain Event Action Plan (REAP) 48 hours prior to any
$\qquad$
likely precipitation event. A likely precipitation event is any weather pattern that is forecast to have a $50 \%$ or greater probability of producing precipitation in the project area. The discharger shall ensure a QSP obtain a printed copy of precipitation forecast information from the National Weather Service Forecast Office (e.g., by entering the zip code of the project's location at http://www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast).
2. Additional Risk Level 2 Requirement: The discharger shall ensure a QSP develop the REAPs for all phases of construction (i.e., Grading and Land Development, Streets and Utilities, Vertical Construction, Final Landscaping and Site Stabilization).
3. Additional Risk Level 2 Requirement: The discharger shall ensure a QSP ensure that the REAP include, at a minimum, the following site information:
a. Site Address
b. Calculated Risk Level (2 or 3)
c. Site Storm Water Manager Information including the name, company, and 24-hour emergency telephone number
d. Erosion and Sediment Control Provider information including the name, company, and 24-hour emergency telephone number
e. Storm Water Sampling Agent information including the name, company, and 24-hour emergency telephone number
4. Additional Risk Level 2 Requirement: The discharger shall ensure a QSP include in the REAP, at a minimum, the following project phase information:
a. Activities associated with each construction phase
b. Trades active on the construction site during each construction phase
c. Trade contractor information
d. Suggested actions for each project phase
5. Additional Risk Level 2 Requirement: The discharger shall ensure a QSP develop additional REAPs for project sites where construction activities are indefinitely halted or postponed (Inactive Construction). At a minimum, Inactive Construction REAPs must include:
a. Site Address
b. Calculated Risk Level (2 or 3)
c. Site Storm Water Manager Information including the name, company, and 24-hour emergency telephone number

EXHIBIT G

# CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION 

IN THE MATTER OF:

ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT NO. R9-2015-0110
AGAINST SAN ALTOS - LEMON GROVE, LLC.

> THE DEPOSITION OF TAD NAKATANI, a witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, LLP, at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 , San Diego, California, at $8: 42$ a.m., on Tuesday, December 29,2015 , before $R$. Jerrod Jones, CSR 11750, RPR

Job Number 598613
you were referring to there?
A. I believe that is referring to the General Construction Permit. Although, I pretty much was just using that option as a -- I would say it's not really, you know, something that we're -- excuse me. That wouldn't be the General Construction Permit. I believe that one is referring to the Municipal Permit.

But I don't know that this is necessarily meaning that we're doing this inspection to meet the inspection frequency requirement of the Municipal Permit. My understanding of this box was just sort of that that's a, hey, this is our sort of a routine inspection that we're doing for the City.
Q. Okay. When you were asked or when you went to go inspect the site, what was the standard that you were comparing it against? Were you doing an inspection per the Construction General Storm
Water Permit; or were you inspecting the site in accordance with the City's Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan?
A. So this would be in accordance with the City's standards.
Q. So you were inspecting it in accordance with the city's JURMP?

TAD NAKATANI - 12/29/2015
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A. Yeah. Or actually, they have a lot in their Municipal Code as well.
Q. But when you were inspecting, you were not
inspecting for purposes of the Construction General Storm Water Permit, correct?
A. Correct. My intention was to be doing it
for the City in accordance with the City standards.
Q. Okay. And then the next line says,
"Construction Project Priority."
A. Uh-huh.
Q. It looks like originally you checked "High." Did you scratch that out and then check "Medium"?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe what happened there a little bit for me.
A. Well, I don't honestly remember exactly why I initially checked "High." But that priority is something that the City assigns to it. So I -- I just may have found out initially I believed it was high; and then found out from the City that they had assigned a medium priority to it, maybe. I don't know the exact thought process at that point.
Q. Okay. Sure. On the second page of the document, you indicated that there were no
TAD NAKATANI - 12/29/2015
violations; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's what's indicated there.
Q. And is this your handwriting at the bottom of the Recommended Corrective Action?
A. Yes. Yes, it is.
Q. Does this inspection document discuss
whether or not there were concerns with BMPs with respect to active versus inactive areas?
A. Yes, there is a mention of inactive areas.
Q. Can you point out to me where that
reference is?
A. I noticed one under one comment on the

Recommended Corrective Actions on page two, the first
one there mentions inactive areas.
Q. Can you read that sentence to me.
A. "Add erosion control to all disturbed
areas inactive for ten days, including roadways not currently in use."
Q. So when you were evaluating an active
versus inactive area, your evaluation was whether it was active or inactive for a ten-day period; is that correct?
A. In this instance, that appears to be
correct.
Q. And how would you have known whether an
TAD NAKATANI - 12/29/2015
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violations; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's what's indicated there.
Q. And is this your handwriting at the bottom of the Recommended Corrective Action?
A. Yes. Yes, it is.
Q. Does this inspection document discuss
whether or not there were concerns with BMPs with respect to active versus inactive areas?
A. Yes, there is a mention of inactive areas.
Q. Can you point out to me where that reference is?
A. I noticed one under one comment on the Recommended Corrective Actions on page two, the first one there mentions inactive areas.
Q. Can you read that sentence to me.
A. "Add erosion control to all disturbed
areas inactive for ten days, including roadways not currently in use."
Q. So when you were evaluating an active
versus inactive area, your evaluation was whether it was active or inactive for a ten-day period; is that correct?
A. In this instance, that appears to be correct.
Q. And how would you have known whether an
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area was active or inactive for ten days?
A. At this point I would not have.
Q. You didn't ask anybody?
A. I don't recall. Let me see. Yeah, I don't recall.
Q. Towards the top of the page, there's a column. I think it's the third one down on page two. It says, "Are material stockpiles protected, covered, contained, and located away from non-storm water discharges?" Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then you checked "yes"?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then it says, "Several unprotected stockpiles." Do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did you talk to anyone about how long the stockpiles have been there, or when they were going to go away, or anything like that?
A. I couldn't tell you for a particular inspection whether or not I spoke to someone about that, you know, unless I have a specific note about it.
Q. So if you saw a stockpile, is it possible it could have been moved later that day?
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A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Is it possible that the same stockpile could have been moved the day before?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation. BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. I will rephrase. If you went out and did an inspection and you saw a stockpile, did you have any knowledge of when that stockpile was placed. there?
A. I may or may not have spoken to someone on site during the inspection. But I can't tell just from my notes at this point whether or not that's the case.
Q. So for these stockpiles, you can't tell me whether or not you knew when those stockpiles were created?
A. Let's see. Someone may have told me when it was created or last active, but they may not have. I don't know at this point.
Q. Okay. Did you discuss this inspection with anybody?
A. I don't know. I would say there was -I'm not sure. Gary Harper may have been there during that inspection, as he was there for many of them. But just from looking at these forms, I can't tell
Q. So did you visit the site on that day?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you go back out to the site on that day?
A. Most likely it was because the City asked me to go on that day.
Q. Do you recall if they said why?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Do you see that there's some yellow highlighting on that document?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you make that highlighting?
A. No.
Q. Do you know who did?
A. No.
Q. Does this report discuss failure to have
erosion control BMPs in inactive and active areas?
A. I don't see specific mention of active versus inactive.
Q. Do you recall if you discussed with anyone at the site on that day --
A. I don't recall.
Q. Let me finish my question.
A. Sorry.
Q. I guess you didn't recall talking about it
Q. Do you know if you talked to anyone about whether the stockpiles had been moved?
A. I don't recall for sure. But from the January 6th inspection, again, I would say it's
likely I talked to the contractor or their
representative, based on the note I had about a stockpile being reported as active.
Q. Do you --
A. And that was on the 6th.
Q. Do you normally note in your Inspection Reports anywhere if you've talked to anyone about anything?
A. No. There's no field for that. Yeah, so I will sometimes make a note, such as the one on the 6th, that suggested that there was a conversation, but there's no --
Q. -- specific documentation?
A. Yeah, place. Whatever time you indicate whether or not you spoke to someone.
Q. Does anything in your January 14 th Inspection Report identify whether a specific area is inactive?
A. Let's see. I don't see any specific indication that a particular area is inactive in my notes here.
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Q. As of January 14, your inspection January 14, did you think that the storm water controls at the site were in better condition than when you inspected the site in December?
A. I don't recall at this point.
Q. Based on your reports, can you say whether or not you thought it was in better condition?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Vague as to "better condition."

THE WITNESS: Yeah, can you clarify?
MS. BERESFORD: Sure. Let's go to the next exhibit and we can go from there. So this will be Exhibit 12. Exhibit 12 to the deposition is indicated as Exhibit 23 at the top.
(Exhibit Number 12 was marked for
identification.)
BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you please describe what it is.
A. This is a Memo that I sent to the City on

January 16th, 2015, summarizing inspections and
sampling from December and January.
Q. Based on this Memo, can you say whether
you thought the storm water, the BMPs, and other
protections at the site were better at the site in January than they were in December?
A. I would say that compared to early

December, like the December 9th time, that they did
implement a significant number of BMPs that they
had -- that had been deficient before. So yes, they did improve several of the deficiencies they had, specifically with erosion control in December -- or December 9th.
Q. And your last inspection of the site was January 14; is that correct?
A. Prior to this letter, I believe so.
Q. I'd like to go to the third page of the Memo. The second row up discusses stockpiles. Do you see that?
A. "The stockpiles were placed close to a drain inlet." That one?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. If you move to the next column over, the second sentence says, "On January 14, the stockpiles had been covered." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know the date when the stockpiles had been covered?
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protections at the site were better at the site in January than they were in December?
A. I would say that compared to early December, like the December 9th time, that they did implement a significant number of BMPs that they had -- that had been deficient before. So yes, they did improve several of the deficiencies they had, specifically with erosion control in December -- or December 9th.
Q. And your last inspection of the site was January 14; is that correct?
A. Prior to this letter, I believe so.
Q. I'd like to go to the third page of the

Memo. The second row up discusses stockpiles. Do you see that?
A. "The stockpiles were placed close to a drain inlet." That one?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. If you move to the next column over, the second sentence says, "On January 14 , the stockpiles had been covered." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know the date when the stockpiles had been covered?
A. I don't know the exact date they were placed on there.
Q. Is it possible that they had been covered on January 13th?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: Let me see on my January. Yeah, I guess from these materials, all I can tell is that they were -- it sounds like they were not covered on the 6th, and they were covered when I returned on the 14th. I don't know the timing of anything in between.

BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Let's go back to your January 14 th inspection.
A. Okay.
Q. And your January 6th inspection. Let's go to the second page there.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. On January 6th, which is Exhibit 10, in the third row down it says, "Uncovered stockpiles reported as active." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on January 14th, on Exhibit 11, on the third row down, can you say again what that says to me.
A. I don't know the exact date they were placed on there.
Q. Is it possible that they had been covered on January 13th?

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
THE WITNESS: Let me see on my January. Yeah, I guess from these materials, all I can tell is that they were -- it sounds like they were not covered on the 6th, and they were covered when I returned on the 14th. I don't know the timing of anything in between.

BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Let's go back to your January 14th inspection.
A. Okay.
Q. And your January 6th inspection. Let's go to the second page there.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. On January 6th, which is Exhibit 10, in the third row down it says, "Uncovered stockpiles reported as active." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on January 14th, on Exhibit 11,
on the third row down, can you say again what that says to me.

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210
A. "Wood/scrap piles should be removed or protected."
Q. Do you think that's the same stockpile that you were talking about on January 6th?
A. Probably not, I would wager.
Q. Okay.
A. I would --
Q. At some point
A. Can you hold on a second, so I can see if

I can find the corresponding part on the map?
Q. Sure.
A. So the one on January 14th of 2015?
Q. Yes.
A. That was wood/scrap pile. As it's shown on the map, that is not in the same location as the one that -- that's not the same stockpile that is referred to on the January 16 th report about being placed too close to the drain. Those are two separate stockpiles.
Q. Okay. And is there any note about the stockpiles near the drain, about whether those were covered or not?
A. Not specifically. It is possible on the January 6th report that the uncovered stockpiles reported as active may be referring to that, or may
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## EXHIBIT H

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION

IN THE MATTER OF:
Administrative Civil Liability
Complaint No. R9-2015-0110
Against San Altos-Lemon Grove, LLC $\qquad$ )

DEPOSITION OF BRIAN ALAN NEMEROW, witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, taken at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego, California, on Tuesday, December 29, 2015, at 3:37 p.m., before Marc Volz, CSR 2863, RPR, CRR
A. That's correct.
Q. The next -- or the first sentence of the second sentence says, "Evidence of sediment discharge was observed at the Akins entrance/exit location and along the curb farther downstream." Do you see that sentence? A. Yes.
Q. I particularly want to look at photo 3 .
A. Okay.
Q. There is a car in photo 3, do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. Is that the same car that's in photo 4?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. If you look at photo 4, there's some areas that appear to be dirt alongside the car and the mailbox. Do you see that?
A. I see in photo 4 where the car is, it is kind of back a little far in the photo and the mailbox. It's kind of hard to make out what's actually over there.
Q. Do you recall if that area was open dirt?
A. Open dirt in the street?
Q. No. The area by the -- above the curb by the mailbox.
A. Oh, I see where you're saying. I believe it was not landscaped. Or not vegetated.
Q. Going back up to photo 3, do you know if some
of the sediment along that curb, could that have been contributed by those adjacent properties?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. The second sentence in the second paragraph says, "A crew from Downstream Services was power washing the curb along Akins to remove accumulated sediment. This indicates that there likely had been a noticeable sediment discharge earlier in the day." Did you ask the crew if there had been a big sediment discharge earlier in the day?
A. I don't remember. But I remember talking to the crew of Downstream Services.
Q. Why do you think that there was a noticeable sediment discharge earlier in the day?
A. It was my understanding through talking with the crewmember that they were out there due to -someone from the construction site had contracted them to come out to power wash the street, and based on my other observations it seemed like it was likely there was sediment discharge onto the street from the construction site.
Q. Did you see the sediment discharge on the street?
A. I saw sediment on the street but I didn't see active discharge from the construction site.
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of the sediment along that curb, could that have been contributed by those adjacent properties?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. The second sentence in the second paragraph says, "A crew from Downstream Services was power washing the curb along Akins to remove accumulated sediment. This indicates that there likely had been a noticeable sediment discharge earlier in the day." Did you ask the crew if there had been a big sediment discharge earlier in the day?
A. I don't remember. But I remember talking to
the crew of Downstream Services.
Q. Why do you think that there was a noticeable sediment discharge earlier in the day?
A. It was my understanding through talking with the crewmember that they were out there due to -someone from the construction site had contracted them to come out to power wash the street, and based on my other observations it seemed like it was likely there was sediment discharge onto the street from the construction site.
Q. Did you see the sediment discharge on the street?
A. I saw sediment on the street but I didn't see active discharge from the construction site.
Q. Could it be that they had just received a lot of inspections and just wanted to do an extra good job to clean it up?

## A. I don't know.

MR. BOYERS: Objection. Speculation.
Now you can answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MS. BERESFORD:
Q. The last sentence of your memo says, "A sample of the power washing discharge water was collected and turbidity was measured at 52"; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is that before the end of the construction site or where exactly is that?
A. I believe that was at a downstream inlet, a storm drain inlet that was outside the property, outside of the construction site property.
Q. Maybe you can look at page 4. I don't know if that will help refresh your recollection. Do you know if the power washing, were they completing that before the inlet?
A. Upstream of the inlet, that's correct.
Q. Do you know, did you calibrate your instrument before you took that sample?
A. I believe so.
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## EXHIBIT I

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION

IN THE MATTER OF:
Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R9-2015-0110
Against San Altos-Lemon Grove, LLC )

DEPOSITION OF JOHN ROBERT QUENZER, witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, taken at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego,

California, on Tuesday, December 29, 2015, at 1:19 p.m., before Marc Volz, CSR 2863, RPR, CRR
typically sampled under the Construction General Permit when sampling is required.
Q. Did you perform this sampling?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you calibrate the instrument before you took the sample?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you produce a calibration log with the

## documents that you produced?

A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you have a calibration log?
A. I did not find one, no.
Q. What EPA method did you use when you analyzed these samples?
A. I don't know the name of the EPA method. I used a Hanna Instruments turbidity meter. I don't recall the exact model number of the meter, although I certainly could find that.
Q. Did you have a QA/QC log?
A. Is that different than a -- are you talking about the calibration log.
Q. Yes. The quality assurance/quality control $\log$.
A. I did not have one, no.
Q. So you did not have one. I just want to be
Q. Why did you do it on that day?
A. At the time that I went to the site there was no discharge anymore because there was no rain and no runoff at the time that I was there. But there was water that had collected immediately next to the discharge point from the Valencia site. And so the reason that $I$ took the sample and then agitated it is that most likely -- not most likely, typically what happens is that after water that has sediment in it is still in a ponded location for a matter of time, then sediment particles will start to drop out of the water, and therefore the turbidity of the water that is sampled after its been sitting for some time will typically be lower than what it was at the time it was flowing before.
Q. Are there EPA methods that you're supposed to follow when taking turbidity sampling?
A. Are there EPA methods for any kind of turbidity sampling? Are we talking about sampling analysis or turbidity.
Q. I'm talking about when you take a sample. Is
there a protocol that's supposed to be followed when you're taking a sample?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. Does disturbing a pond follow any sort of
standard protocol that is recommended for this type of
sampling?
A. I'm not aware of a standard protocol prepared by anyone about that, no.
Q. About swirling a puddle.
A. I am not aware of a standard protocol about swirling a puddle, no.
Q. Did you calibrate the instrument before you took any of your samples?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you find the calibration $\log$ for this
event?
A. No, I did not.
Q. So you did not produce it.
A. That is correct.
Q. Is that unusual that you can't find your
calibration logs?
A. It is somewhat unusual, yes.
Q. Does it surprise you that you couldn't find them for either of the sampling events for this property?
A. No, it did not.
Q. Why not?
A. It didn't surprise me because I remembered that -- I should clarify my answer. It didn't surprise

HUTCHINGS LITIGATION SERVICES - GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES 800.697 .3210
me because I couldn't remember where I put the calibration logs.
Q. Does D-Max have a protocol of where you're supposed to put them?
A. We do. But typically they go into a binder
that we have. So I guess it would be surprising that I did not find them in that binder.
Q. You did not observe stormwater with sediment in it being discharged to the storm drain on December 31st; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did you discuss this memo with anyone from the city of Lemon Grove after you prepared it?
A. I don't remember details of any discussions. I know that I emailed it to them. And I remember letting them know that I was not able to take a sample of stormwater runoff because it was not raining at the time that I was there.
Q. Did you ever talk to anyone at the Regional Board about this memo?
A. I did not, no.
Q. The memo, the version that you have there's yellow highlighting on there. Did you do that highlighting?

```
A. I did not, no.
```


## EXHIBIT J

# CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO REGION 

IN THE MATTER OF: )

ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT NO. R9-2015-0110
AGAINST SAN ALTOS - LEMON GROVE, LLC,

THE DEPOSITION OF MALIK TAMIMI, a witness herein, noticed by Opper \& Varco, LLP, at 225 Broadway, Suite 1900, San Diego, California, at 3:33 p.m., on Monday, December 28, 2015, before R. Jerrod Jones, CSR 11750, RPR

Litigation Services Number 598612
A. Yes.
Q. And when you had Mr. Harper conducting
inspections, was the goal of those inspections to evaluate sites for the consistency with your JURMP?
A. Consistency with JURMP and with the
grading ordinance.
Q. Was the goal for Mr. Harper to inspect
sites to evaluate consistency with the General
Construction Storm Water Permit?
A. NO.

MS. BERESFORD: All right. And let's mark that as Exhibit 5. This is Exhibit 5 to the deposition, although it says Exhibit Number 8 at the top of the document.
(Exhibit Number 5 was marked for
identification.)
THE WITNESS: What would you like me to do with this exhibit?

BY MS. BERESFORD:
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. I may have seen it, but I may have not read it.
Q. Okay. For purposes of the record, I will represent that Exhibit 5 is a Facility Inspection Report dated December 15, 2014, by the California
A. I did not make my own independent. But I was provided information that there were discharges; and that the site did not adequately erosion control deployed; therefore, warranting follow-up inspections as if there was a rain event, as the City does not want a discharge into its storm drain system.
Q. Was the City concerned about getting penalties, the Water Board issuing penalties to the City?
A. Yeah, that would be a fair statement.
Q. And why was the City concerned about that?
A. Because I think every city is concerned about getting a penalty from the Regional Board for program implementation; in other words, not enough was done to prevent the discharge.
Q. So would you say some of the purposes of your visits to the Valencia Hills site was to demonstrate that the City was doing enough?
A. I would say the follow-ups were intended to comply with our JURMP and our ordinance; to make sure that if a follow-up is required, that we followed up, and we didn't drop the ball by not following up.
Q. Does the JURMP have specific requirements about when follow-up is required?
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