

From: [Mr. & Mrs. Mike and Jonnalee Dunn](#)
To: [commentletters](#)
Subject: Comments to A-2239(a)-(c)
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 9:40:04 AM



Dear Clerk to the Board Townsend,

I am strongly opposed to the State Water Resources Control Board's Draft Order revising the East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition's General Waste Discharge Requirements.

I believe that every Californian has the right to safe drinking water, but I'm not convinced that the current program, and the new draft order, solves that.

My husband and I farm 40 acres of walnuts in Colusa County and 60 acres of almonds in Yolo County. We have been complying with the current irrigated lands program since its inception. It is frustrating that the requirements and documentation continues to increase as well as the fees and the scope of what the program encompasses.

We are also opposed to the one-size-fits all approach. Given the vast regional differences in California, one-size-fits-all requirements applicable to all areas of the state are not appropriate.

When the State Water Board first started requiring all of these reporting requirements over 10 years ago I remember farmers more experienced than I (I was in my 20's) saying that this is just the beginning. They predicted that this was just the opening to more and more requirements every year--requirements that confuse most and take time and money to comply with. If these new regulations pass then I was too naive at the time to believe them, but they were right. My question is, where does it stop? Why one size fits all? Why not target issues locally? Show me the nitrogen contamination issues in my farming area and prove to me that my additional required fees and documentation (that are hard to interpret and figure out) is solving this problem otherwise it just feels like taxation and documentation without representation.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,

Mike and Jonnalee Dunn
1540 Tudor Ct
Modesto, CA 95358
jonnalee.dunn@gmail.com