

HCB
HERUM CRABTREE BROWN
Attorneys At Law

Karna E. Harrigfeld
kharrigfeld@herumcrabtree.com

December 8, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ms. Song Her
Clerk of the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
Post Office Box 100
Sacramento, California 95812



Re: Comments on Amended Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary

Dear Ms. Her:

Stockton East Water District (SEWD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) regarding the Revised Draft of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta WQCP Plan), dated November 29, 2006.

State Water Board staff has added an additional emerging issue – San Joaquin River flows (pages 6-7). In light of the fact that no revisions were made to the San Joaquin River flows (February through June), we support a workshop to receive scientific information on the status of the San Joaquin River fall run Chinook salmon population and the spring flows needed on the San Joaquin River to support the fishery. However, we strenuously object to the State Water Board characterization of the fishery population contained on pages 6-7. The language states that “fish species within the Delta and San Joaquin River basin have not shown significant signs of recovery since adoption of the San Joaquin River Spring Flow and Pulse Flow Objectives in the 1995 Plan...and “some species have shown significant declines.” Which fish, what tributaries, where is the **science** to support these statements? These statements are inflammatory and based on select testimony submitted by the fishery agencies and environmental interests and completely disregard other testimony submitted by many in the water user community.

These types of statements are not needed in the Revised Draft Bay-Delta WQCP Plan, especially in light of the fact that none of the evidence was submitted under oath or subject to cross-examination. We request the first two sentences found on the bottom of page 6 and

Ms. Song Her
December 8, 2006
Page 2 of 2

top of page 7 of the San Joaquin River flows section be deleted. Furthermore, we suggest for future workshops that evidence and testimony be submitted under oath and subject to cross examination, so that a complete record is before the State Water Board.

Finally, SEWD notes that one of our comments on Central Valley salinity was not addressed with a response from the State Water Board. SEWD wants to ensure that on-going processes will not be postponed or delayed awaiting the Salinity Management Plan. In specific, the State Water Board since 1995 has directed the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to adopt salinity objectives upstream of Vernalis on the San Joaquin River. In D-1641, the State Water Board once again directed the Regional Board to adopt salinity objectives upstream of Vernalis. And, most recently, at the January 2006 workshop, the State Water Board again directed the Regional Board to adopt objectives upstream of Vernalis and return these objectives to the State Water Board by November of this year. The Regional Board has failed all of these mandates by the State Water Board and is now projecting salinity objectives by September 2007. We respectfully request the State Water Board not allow development of the Salinity Management Plan to slow down in any way development and adoption of salinity objectives upstream of Vernalis.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment and should you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,



KARNA E. HARRIGFELD
Attorney-at-Law

KEH:rl