5/19 CEQA Scoping Mtg Phase II - SQO Deadline: 5/28/10 by 12 noon



California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

"An Advocate for Fisheries, Habitat and Water Quality"
3536 Rainier Avenue, Stockton, CA 95204
T: 209-464-5067, F: 209-464-1028, E: deltakeep@aol.com, W: www.calsport.org

27 May 2010

Ms. Jeanine Townsend
Clerk to the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 "I" Street, 24th Floor
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95814
commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov



A: Electronic Submission Hardcopy if Requested

RE: Comment Letter - Phase II 1 Sediment Quality Objectives

Dear Ms Townsend and Members of the State Board:

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) appreciates the chance to comment on the scope of the Phase 2 Sediment Quality Objectives (SQOs), and the efforts staff has made in addressing these complex issues.

As we have stated before, the phase 2 effort must address the risk of bioaccumulatives in sediment to both human consumers, to aquatic life, including fish, and wildlife. This is especially important as knowledge about risks to fish and wildlife might facilitate informed decisions on risk thresholds for human consumers.

Additionally, due to a number of reasons stated by CSPA and other environmental groups in comments on the phase 1 documents and also CSPA's scoping comments on potential changes to the Listing Policy (which are included as part of this comment letter), the SQOs implementation program adopted in phase 1 do not provide an adequate level of protection to benthic organisms, and did not receive the proper level of environmental review, including proper impacts analysis and endangered species consultation. These inadequacies in the currently adopted "Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan - Part 1" must be fixed during the phase 2 effort.

The scope for phase 2 must include a thorough antidegradation analysis, and any degradation that is allowed must be shown to be to the benefit of the people of the State.

The approach for the SQOs should be towards minimizing the concentrations of toxins in benthic sediments, not to attempt minimize requirement for dischargers so that the levels of allowable pollution to just below thresholds for a minimum level of protection. If levels of protection greater than "acceptable risk" thresholds can be achieved, then the SQOs should be set at those levels.

The scope for the phase 2 must also acknowledge that the Delta is severely impacted in many ways, which warrants the development of protective standards.

Thank you for considering these comments. If you have questions or require clarification, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Bill Jennings, Executive Director

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance