

From: Darrell Cordova
To: [commentletters](#)
Subject: Comments to A-2239(a)-(c)
Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 9:10:03 PM



Dear Clerk to the Board Townsend,

I have been following the State Water Resources Control Board's Draft Order revising the East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition's General Waste Discharge Requirements. As a farmer in California, I am concerned that my operation will be negatively burdened by the Draft Order.

The proposed revisions to the East San Joaquin Waste Discharge Requirements and the impact the changes will have on the currently successful cooperative Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, which has been in place for over a decade, are significant and costly. Given the precedential nature of the Draft Order, it will not only have a severe impact on agricultural operations within the Central Valley, but on all irrigated agricultural operations throughout the state.

I am particularly concerned about the following:

The Draft Order includes requirements that will disrupt the existing successful irrigated lands regulatory program which has been effective in addressing surface water quality concerns and protecting water quality for years.

The cost of compliance for administration and reporting will significantly increase if the Draft Order is adopted. Under the new Order, reporting requirements will uniformly apply to all growers, whereas currently, reporting requirements vary due to vulnerability designations. In addition to higher costs for individual growers, coalition/third-party costs as well as regional water board costs, will increase due to the new requirements to collect and compile all raw data. The influx of all these regulatory programs and overlapping requirements are burdensome and costly, when are we suppose to farm when now all we do is spend time in our offices desperately trying to comply with them.

Given the vast regional differences in California, one-size-fits-all requirements applicable to all areas of the state are not appropriate. The Draft Order gives direction to the Central Valley Water Board and all other regional water boards to update or develop their irrigated lands regulatory programs to be consistent. Different areas of the state have different issues and not everyone grows the same crop every year, which will make this Order extremely difficult to implement, especially the nitrogen management requirements, the multi-year nitrogen applied over removed ratios, and the ratio comparisons to calculated target values. So what happened to local control? It seems like the power has gone to your heads and you wish to dictate to everyone, this is going to collapse the Ag economy, which maybe is your ultimate goal. Good luck to your grandkids if they become dependent on foreign food which won't be as safe nor plentiful. The outlook for future generations might be mass starvation, which you don't seem to be concerned about as your mouths are full.

The Draft Order requires each farm to annually monitor all drinking water supply wells on the property. This is problematic, especially because growers may not have legal authority to access landowner or tenant wells. The Public says they want individual family farms, but with these requirements, we are not going to be able to meet all these requirements. We don't have the staff to keep up with all these issues, only corporate farms have that capability. Family farms would be pushed out.

I also have concerns with the amount of raw data, including field-specific farm evaluation and management practice data and all nitrogen application data by field, that will be submitted to the regional water boards. Not only is the amount of data reported unnecessary, the data, although tied to anonymous identifiers, will now also become publicly available. Currently, third-parties submit data aggregated at the township level and maintain the raw data which is accessible to the regional water board if needed. This system works and doesn't expose my farming practices to competitors or potentially cause privacy concerns.

The result of these requirements will inevitably lead to increased coalition/third-party costs and state regulatory fees,

and the Draft Order does not contain any meaningful cost analysis to justify these new requirements.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,

Darrell Cordova
3824 N Montpelier Rd
Denair, CA 95316
dncorag24@aol.com