

broad powers to control any factor which adversely and unreasonably impairs the quality of the waters of the State for beneficial use.

Water quality control agencies are rather gingerly approaching their new assignment. For the most part, they have little experience with water supply and in water resources development.

The boards to date have failed to recognize that water quality and water quantity cannot be viewed as separate avenues but instead constitute closely interrelated segments of water resources development. The problem of water quality can no more be solved without reference to other aspects of water resources development than can the problems of water supply be met without reference to quality.

Recommendations have been made regarding the reorganization of the State government by the so-called Little Hoover Commission which would help to eliminate this increasing dichotomy with regard to water in California. The commission's recommendations with regard to water quality control on a statewide basis were as follows:

The dangers of the existing organizational separation of water quality control from the other water programs of the State are becoming more apparent with the implementation of the Water Plan. The existence of one central and nine regional bodies, each with its own staff and with standard-setting and decision-making authority in the quality of coordinated action. The problem has reached critical proportions, particularly in the San Francisco Bay and Delta areas.

It is recommended that the State Water Quality Control Board be merged with the California Water Commission.

Water quality standards would be set, statewide and by river basin, by the Department of Water Resources subject to review by the Water Commission, which would hold needed public hearings in connection therewith. The Commission would assume the Water Quality Board's role in the approval of loans and grants for local projects and for research.

At the Federal level we see already much of what the Little Hoover Commission proposed be done in California with comparable State functions and agencies.

In California we will need to work diligently to avoid granting independent power over quality maintenance on a regional basis to one group of boards and separate power over quality maintenance on a statewide basis to a different board.

*How can the training and equipping of local officials be coordinated with industrial pollution control personnel?*

As a part of the present procedures for establishing waste discharge requirements as provided for in the California Water Quality Control Act of 1965, it is necessary for pollution control officials to meet and work closely with local officials so that they can understand the meaning of the requirements prior to their adoption by the control board involved.

During the course of these meetings any needs for training or equipping local officials can be brought forward and appropriate measures taken to remedy them.

In addition, local professional groups, mainly the California Water Pollution Control Federation, provide short courses, technical meetings, and group seminars to provide training and exchange ideas in technical matters.

This approach seems to work fairly well in the populous areas but needs improvement so far as the more remote or less populous areas are concerned.