


STATE CAPITOL  
P.O. BOX 942849  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0021  
(916) 319-2021  
FAX (916) 319-2121

Assembly  
California Legislature

  
ADAM C. GRAY  
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, TWENTY-FIRST DISTRICT



May 26, 2016

Felicia Marcus, Board Chairwoman  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairwoman Marcus:

This letter is to express our concerns about the Phase 1 update to the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. To this point, the Board has failed to fully engage with many local stakeholders, including local governments and school districts most responsible for water quality, which stand to endure the greatest impacts under the existing draft proposal. These failures in developing Phase 1 raise significant concerns about the manner of operation the Board has chosen to pursue for the second, third, and fourth phases of the update.

Despite years of studies and millions of dollars developing and revising the existing proposal, the Board was unable to supply answers to a number of fundamentally basic questions raised at a meeting about the current Phase 1 proposal held in Modesto in October of last year. This was the case even though the questions had been given to the Board well in advance of the meeting. Board officials made a commitment to respond to the outstanding questions as soon as possible and to put their answers in writing. Subsequently participants were informed the Board's response would instead be included in the update to the proposal itself.


This action from the Board runs counter to the very purpose of the stakeholder outreach process. The Board has a responsibility to consult with and address concerns raised by stakeholders prior to advancing the proposal. Many of the unanswered questions focus on the baseline assumptions and technical data used by the Board in modeling potential impacts. The Board's refusal to address these questions prior to releasing an updated report casts substantial doubt as to the accuracy and credibility of its findings. As a result this timeline, the recommended actions and alternatives will have already been drafted before local stakeholders have a chance to weigh in on the proposal.


We urge the Board to reconsider this approach and fully participate with local stakeholders to answer outstanding questions and vet potentially inaccurate technical data with the communities most intimately familiar with the tributaries and drinking water supplies directly impacted by the report. The updated report should be issued only after the locally impacted communities and




Water Board staff have had the benefit of substantive discussions, and any progress on the pending phases of the update should follow this revised approach.


Sincerely,


  
Assemblymember Adam C. Gray  
21<sup>st</sup> Assembly District


  
Assemblymember Kristin Olsen  
12<sup>th</sup> Assembly District


  
Assemblymember James A. O'Rourke  
3<sup>rd</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Brian Dahle  
1<sup>st</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Rudy Salas  
32<sup>nd</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia  
56<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Shannon Grove  
34<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Devon Mathis  
26<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Frank Bigelow  
5<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

  
Assemblymember Joaquin Arambula  
31<sup>st</sup> Assembly District