

Studies made by the department of water resources are in substantial accord with Dr. Schoonover's report; however, some of the agencies located near the proposed point of discharge are worried about the possible effects of drainage waters on their water supplies.

Before the drainage wastes are discharged to tidal estuaries, we are making intensive studies to measure preexisting or "baseline" quality conditions so that the influence of the drain waters on the prevailing environment can be assessed. This aspect has resulted in numerous differences of opinion because of the lack of generally accepted methods for defining "baseline" conditions for some of the materials which may be carried along with the drainage waters, particularly nutrients and pesticides. These latter materials will be discussed in more detail later.

Financing the proposed San Joaquin master drain is another matter which has caused considerable concern. Nearly everyone agrees to the need for drainage facilities; most disclaim responsibility to pay for them. We are now working on a repayment plan which incorporates the concept of apportionment of costs both to specific and to general beneficiaries. Under this plan, a portion of the costs would be repaid by the persons who actually divert drainage waters into the drain. The remainder of the costs would be repaid by levying a tax on all of the tributary lands within the basin.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Warne, on page 4 of your testimony you refer to Dr. Schoonover's independent study in which he reports that, "the drain can be built with a discharge in the Antioch Bridge without any significant contribution to delta and bay pollution for a decade at least." The question comes to mind, are we accomplishing anything if we are merely forestalling a problem for another 10 years?

Mr. WARNE. We anticipate the extension of the drain further west as required and when required. We already are endeavoring to work out what we call a regional waste disposal program which will include the delta, and the San Francisco Bay area and communities, all the drainage area of the San Francisco Bay.

The thought is that eventually an outfall, perhaps more than one, and a collector system will serve both the agriculture drain and the industrial and municipal drains from the bay communities, carrying the wastes clear into the Pacific.

Now, this doesn't seem to be needed at the moment, but the day will come, we feel certain, when a really extensive program of this sort which will combine the disposal of agriculture wastes and of municipal wastes likely will be needed.

The present discussion actually is not between a drain with an outfall at Antioch Bridge and the ultimate disposal plant, but rather between a drain with an outfall at Antioch Bridge and one that might reach as far west as Port Chicago, which is downstream from the Antioch Bridge.

Mr. DADDARIO. However, can we continue to adjust to the amount of discharge which any stream or bay along the coast can take and then assume that sometime in the years ahead we can move into another area as the old one becomes contaminated to the point where it can no longer sustain such a discharge? Don't we need to get more to the source? For example, we have heard testimony before this committee