

for us, as Members of the Congress, to provide the means with which we can continue our efforts to preserve and protect the quality of our Nation's waters.

At this point, I would like to insert the remarks of a telegram I have received from Mr. W. R. Gianelli, Director of Water Resources of the State of California.

Thank you.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., April 23, 1968.

HON. HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Your letter of April 8, 1968, invited our comments on California's position before the House Public Works Committee hearings on water pollution April 23, 24, and 25. We understand the basic purpose of the hearings is to consider several bills on oil pollution control and grants for water pollution control demonstration projects (S. 2760, H.R. 15906, H.R. 15907).

The State Water Resources Control Board has commended on the subject bills to Representative Don H. Clausen. Their comments include suggested technical revisions to those portions of the bills dealing with oil pollution and support lake eutrophication studies. We concur with the State Water Resources Control Board in support of the proposed provisions for demonstration grants in the field of correction of natural as well as man-made water quality problems in lakes. California is a very suitable recipient of such grants, especially for immediate studies of eutrophication in Clear Lake and Lake Tahoe. California is already moving ahead in such studies. In addition to the immediate bills before the committee, we are concerned with several water quality and water pollution matters.

The definition of coastal waters in Federal Water Quality Action of 1965 has been construed by the Department of the Interior for purposes of water quality standards to include all waters subject to the ebb and flow of tides under this definition the Federal Government includes the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. California submitted its standards for this area under protest of this definition. I strongly believe that the intrusion of Federal standards in Thikeya is unwarranted and urge the definition of coastal waters for purposes of this act be restricted to saline water, which would exclude the Delta. We believe the principles behind the controversy of water quality standards in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta should be examined. The release of vast quantities of stored water to repel solidty intrusion for support of minor diversions must be considered in relation to economic facts.

Since California is an arid region, where water is definitely a limited resource, we must look beyond water quality standards to the water use functions they support. The function must represent the highest and best use of water. It must represent a reasonable and not wasteful use.

It must be the most economical means of providing for the designated use the Federal water pollution control administration has totally failed to perceive these points of feasibility. The adoption of water quality standards along the lines currently being espoused by the FWPCA could wreak havoc with the State's water resources development program.

Further, should the Federal government adopt standards which are incompatible with State policy, a serious breach in Federal-State water resource planning and development relations could occur. The federal agencies would be compelled to plan for the development of water supplies to meet those standards.

We would be forced to oppose the Federal plans because of the incompatibility with the California water plan, and our planning policy for the optimum development for the water resources of the State.

W. R. GIANELLI,
Director of water resources.

Mr. McCARTHY. That concludes our hearing for today. The committee stands adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 24, 1968.)