

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Syllabus

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
v. NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.,
ET AL.

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 11–460. Argued December 4, 2012—Decided January 8, 2013

Petitioner Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) operates a “municipal separate storm sewer system” (MS4), a drainage system that collects, transports, and discharges storm water. Because storm water is often heavily polluted, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations require certain MS4 operators to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit before discharging storm water into navigable waters. The District has such a permit for its MS4. Respondents Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. (NRDC) and Santa Monica Baykeeper (Baykeeper) filed a citizen suit against the District and others under §505 of the CWA, 33 U. S. C. §1365, alleging, among other things, that water-quality measurements from monitoring stations within the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers demonstrated that the District was violating the terms of its permit. The District Court granted summary judgment to the District on these claims, concluding that the record was insufficient to warrant a finding that the MS4 had discharged storm water containing the standards-exceeding pollutants detected at the downstream monitoring stations. The Ninth Circuit reversed in relevant part. The court held that the District was liable for the discharge of pollutants that, in the court’s view, occurred when the polluted water detected at the monitoring stations flowed out of the concrete-lined portions of the rivers, where the monitoring stations are located, into lower, unlined portions of the same rivers.

Held: The flow of water from an improved portion of a navigable waterway into an unimproved portion of the same waterway does not

Opinion of the Court

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the preliminary print of the United States Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court Building, Washington, DC 20543, if they have any comments on the text of this opinion. Please include the page number of this opinion in the notification. (Opinion 4 (r280.55T.Se6g -0.00S.202 TGU(e)5(i)i6(es)14(S-1(ra-1(r)11(on2 TGWa3(r)11(oh(

“any *addition* of any pollutant to navigable waters from any point source.” 33 U. S. C. §1362(12) (emphasis added). Under a common understanding of the meaning of the word “add,” no pollutants are “added” to a water body when water is merely transferred between different portions of that water body. See Webster’s Third New International Dictionary 24 (2002) (“add” means “to join, annex, or unite (as one thing to another) so as to bring about an increase (as in number, size, or importance) or so as to form one aggregate”). “As the Second Circuit [aptly] put it . . . , [i]f one takes a ladle of soup from a pot, lifts it above the pot, and pours it back into the pot, one has not “added” soup or anything else to the pot.” *Miccosukee*, 541 U. S., at 109–110 (quoting *Catskill Mountains Chapter of Trout Unlimited, Inc. v. New York*, 273 F.3d 481, 492 (CA2 2001)).

In *Miccosukee*, polluted water was removed from a canal, transported through a pump station, and then deposited into a nearby reservoir. 541 U. S., at 100. We held that this water transfer would count as a discharge of pollutants under the CWA only if the canal and the reservoir were “meaningfully distinct water bodies.” *Id.*, at 112. It follows, *a fortiori*, from *Miccosukee* that no discharge of pollutants occurs when water, rather than being removed and then returned to a water body, simply flows from one portion of the water body to another. We hold, therefore, that the flow of water from an improved portion of a navigable waterway into an unimproved portion of the very same waterway does not qualify as a discharge of pollutants under the CWA. Because the decision below cannot be squared with that holding, the Court of Appeals’ judgment must be reversed.¹

¹The NRDC, Baykeeper, and the United States contend—contrary to the District—that the Court of Appeals understood that no discharge of pollutants occurs when water flows from an improved into an unim-

