REGIONAL CONTROL OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION
IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Automobiles and industry daily pour their poisons into the San Francisco air. Sewage facilities daily discharge their contaminants into the waters of San Francisco Bay. Between the years 1960 and 1990 the population of the Bay Area will double.¹ This increased population, its automobiles and its industries will produce tremendous amounts of wastes; and the problems of pollution will be complicated by a growing need for cleaner air and water.

To alleviate the problems of air and water pollution, regional programs have been developed. Air and water pollution, too complex for solution by local municipalities, are ideally suited for such a regional approach. Other areas with similar problems can learn much from San Francisco's experience. In fact, the successful operation of Bay Area regional pollution control agencies may provide the model for broader forms of regional government. This Comment will analyze the problems of air and water pollution, describe the agencies created to control them and evaluate the effectiveness of these agencies.

I

AIR POLLUTION

By 1948, air pollution problems in the Bay Area had become acute. Although city and county programs were established to solve these problems,² air pollution did not heed governmental boundaries. These local programs could not reach sources of pollution outside each governing body's territorial jurisdiction, and budgets were insufficient to maintain technical personnel and facilities.³ One county's program could be undermined by an uncooperative neighbor and unfavorable winds. California law provided a means for two contiguous counties to merge their air pollution control programs.⁴ For the nine Bay Area counties, however, the process would have been slow, the merger complicated, and the reluc-

¹ It is predicted that by 1990 there will be over 8 million residents in the Bay Area, compared to 3.6 million in 1960. ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS, REFUSE DISPOSAL NEEDS STUDY 16 (1965).
³ JOINT SUBCOMM. ON AIR POLLUTION, supra note 2, at 29.
⁴ CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24330 (West 1967).
tance of one strategically located county to join would destroy the entire merger.

In 1955, therefore, the California Legislature established the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, a regional agency to control sources of air pollution in the Bay Area. In 1960 the Legislature decided that emissions of air pollutants by automobiles was a state wide problem and created the California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board, a state agency with jurisdiction over moving vehicles.

In the Bay Area these regional and state agencies have been successful, however, primarily in controlling, not in reducing, air pollution. Reducing the problem to a tolerable level depends on legal, political and technological advances. Stricter laws must be drafted and enforced; cities and counties surrounding the Bay must also establish control programs; and more effective devices must be invented to control automobile exhaust—the source of more than half of all air pollutants.

A. The Problem of Air Pollution

Smog is a killer. In October 1948 the town of Donora, Pennsylvania, was blanketed by a heavy smog. When rain washed the smog away, six thousand of the town's fourteen thousand residents had become ill, and eighteen eventually died. In December 1952, a deadly smog struck London, causing four thousand deaths. London suffered a similar smog attack in 1962, and New York was attacked by killer smog in 1953 and 1962.

The air pollution in the Bay Area is photochemical smog. Photochemical smog is formed by a chemical reaction chiefly between combustion products of such organic fuels as gasoline. Energy for the reaction is acquired from the ultraviolet rays of the sun. When this reaction occurs and the resultant pollutants are trapped beneath a layer of warmer air, pollutants become concentrated and smog is formed. Air pollution is a problem in the Bay Area because San Francisco is dependent upon a

\[\text{id. } \S 24350.\]
\[\text{id. } \S\S 24383-88.\]
\[\text{BAY AREA AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT, AIR POLLUTION AND THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA 1 (1965) [hereinafter cited as BAY AREA POLLUTION].}\]
\[\text{Those who became ill, but survived, experienced coughing, sore throats, headaches, burning sensation to eyes and vomiting. }\text{id.}\]
\[\text{id.; BAY AREA POLLUTION 10.}\]
\[\text{EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 3.}\]
\[\text{For a description of photochemical smog formation see BAY AREA POLLUTION 5-7, 15-20. Photochemical smog differs from the more toxic forms of smog described in text accompanying notes 8-10, supra, and is not usually strong enough to cause death. Cf. EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 10.}\]
petroleum economy, and the topography and climate of the area are conducive to smog formation.

Air pollution is injurious in many ways. Its most common effects are eye irritation, coughing and chest pains. Studies have shown a striking correlation between exposure to air pollution and such diseases as emphysema, chronic bronchitis and the common cold. Recent tests suggest that air pollution is a decisive factor in the development of lung cancer. Smog is also damaging to animal and plant life. Cattle feeding on contaminated grass become ill, and Bay Area growers suffer an estimated annual loss in excess of 5 million dollars, making air pollution the major cause of plant damage in the area. Air pollution also damages property. It corrodes, weakens and discolors building materials, disintegrates clothing, causes rubber to crack, and dirties clothing, cars and houses. Finally, by reducing visibility, smog makes land, water and air travel more hazardous.

The problems of smog will persist as long as man burns anything. Little can be done to change the topography and weather of the Bay Area, and the development of power sources less polluting than petroleum is still in its infancy. For the foreseeable future, therefore, air pollution controls must be imposed upon petroleum combustion emissions at their source. Thus far California and the Bay Area have attempted to impose these controls with varied success.

B. The Agencies Created to Control the Problem

Control of air pollution in the Bay Area is centered primarily at the regional and state level. Cities and counties may, however, enact local ordinances identical to, or stricter than those adopted by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, the regional agency. The federal govern-

---

12 See EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 4; BAY AREA POLLUTION 10-11.
13 See EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 4-6.
14 Id. at 6. Deaths from lung cancer in urban areas are twice as great as in rural areas, and in laboratory experiments mice and hamsters exposed repeatedly to various air pollutants developed cancer. Id.
15 Id. at 12.
16 BAY AREA POLLUTION 8. Air pollution has damaged such diverse plant life as fir trees, citrus and salad crops, spinach, orchids and garden flowers. EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 15-17.
17 EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 13-14; see BAY AREA POLLUTION 7-8. Air pollution is estimated to cost the nation $12 billion or $65 per capita annually. This figure does not include the cost of health damage or the aesthetic loss because of reduced visibility. EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 18.
18 EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION 13.
20 For a discussion of the feasibility of electric cars, see The Truth About the Electric Car, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, March 20, 1967, at 72-76.
21 CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24360.3 (West 1967). They may also provide by
ment is assuming an increasingly active role in controlling air pollution. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to establish a national research program,\textsuperscript{22} to make grants to air pollution control agencies to subsidize the development and improvement of their programs,\textsuperscript{23} and to establish standards for the emissions of any substance from new motor vehicles.\textsuperscript{24}

1. \textit{At the Regional Level}

The Bay Area Pollution Control District (BAAPCD), established in 1955,\textsuperscript{25} includes six of the nine Bay Area counties.\textsuperscript{26} It is directed to "establish and execute an effective program for the reduction of air contaminants within the district."\textsuperscript{27} To perform this duty BAAPCD is composed of three separate bodies: the Board of Directors, the Hearing Board and the Advisory Council.

The Board of Directors consists of twelve members, two from each county.\textsuperscript{28} One must be a county supervisor, the other a mayor or city councilman.\textsuperscript{29} The Board first determines whether a regulation to control air contaminants is necessary.\textsuperscript{30} This determination is made only after the Board has held a public meeting where all interested persons are afforded an opportunity to appear and present their views on proposed regulations.\textsuperscript{31} If a resolution is adopted, the Board is then empowered to enact the proposed regulation.\textsuperscript{32} The regulation, however, may not specify the ordinance for local enforcement of regulations adopted by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District. \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{23} Id. § 1957c (1964).
\textsuperscript{24} 42 U.S.C.A. § 1857f-1 (Supp. 1966). Also the Secretary can abate any other source of pollution which endangers the public health or welfare. \textit{Id.} § 1857d.
\textsuperscript{26} The primarily agricultural counties of Napa, Solano and Sonoma did not originally join because they were not greatly affected by air pollution problems. These counties may join at any time by resolution of their board of supervisors. \textit{Id.} § 24350.3.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Id.} § 24354.1.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Id.} § 24352.
\textsuperscript{29} The mayor or city councilman is chosen by a city selection committee composed of the mayors of all the cities in the county. \textit{Cal. Health & Safety Code} §§ 24351-52 (West 1967).
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Id.} § 24362.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Id.} Because the BAAPCD is not a state agency, its rulemaking and enforcement procedures are not covered by the California Administrative Procedure Act. For rulemaking, notice must be given by publication. \textit{Id.} § 24362.2. In addition the Board in its discretion sends written notice to all persons the Board believes will be interested. For example, prior to the adoption of BAAPCD Reg. 3 (see note 67 infra) there were about 100 formal meetings and at least 100 informal meetings. Telephone interview with Matthew Walker, Legal Counsel for the BAAPCD, March 21, 1967. Procedures for hearings (see text accompanying notes 38-42 infra) are governed by \textit{Cal. Health & Safety Code} §§ 24367-67.11 (West 1967).
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Id.} § 24362.1.
design or construction of smog abatement equipment nor the particular method to be used to reduce the release of air contaminants.83

The Board appoints an air pollution control officer who enforces the regulations prescribed by the Board.84 If any person refuses to furnish information or analyses requested by the control officer within a reasonable time, or if the control officer finds any regulation is being violated, he may notify the Hearing Board and request a public hearing.85

The Hearing Board, composed of three members, is also appointed by the Board of Directors.86 One member must be an attorney, another a professional engineer and the third may represent any section of the community.87 The Hearing Board must hold a public hearing within thirty days after the control officer's request.88 By a majority vote89 it may find that no violation exists, that a variance should be granted, or that an order for abatement should be issued.90 A variance will be granted if a regulation constitutes an arbitrary or unreasonable taking of property without a corresponding benefit or advantage to the public in the reduction of air contamination.91 If the Hearing Board finds that no variance is justified and that a reasonable time has been allowed for compliance, it will issue an order for abatement.92 A proceeding for mandatory or prohibitory injunction can then be brought to enjoin any person who violates such an order.93

The Advisory Council, consisting of twenty members, is also appointed by the Board of Directors.94 The members are citizens of the community chosen to represent various interest groups.95 They have no

83 Id. § 24362.3.
84 Id. §§ 24355, 24355.2(b). The air pollution control officer is the full-time chief executive of the BAAPCD.
85 Id. § 24362.5.
86 Id. § 24357.
87 Id.
88 Id. § 24362.6. Thus, there is a separation of legislative and adjudicative powers in the BAAPCD. However, for the Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (see text accompanying 113-27 infra) the same body has the legislative and adjudicative powers.
89 CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24367.3 (West 1967).
90 Id. § 24362.7.
91 Id. § 24365.5.
92 Id. § 24368. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition for a writ of mandate. Id. § 24368.4.
93 Id. § 24368.6. This power has only been employed twice. Interview with D. J. Callaghan, BAAPCD Air Pollution Control Officer, in San Francisco, Nov. 30, 1966, on file with the California Law Review.
94 CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24356 (West 1967).
95 The groups represented are the following: colleges and universities, health agencies, agriculture, industry, community planning, transportation, registered professional engineers, general contractors, architects and organized labor. The other ten may represent any other worthwhile community interest as defined by the Board of Directors. Id. § 24356.
regulatory power but merely advise the Board of Directors about the feasibility, fairness, adequacy and justification, both technically and economically, of proposed regulations.\textsuperscript{46}

In analyzing the structure and power of the BAAPCD, one may instructively compare it with the Los Angeles Air Pollution District.\textsuperscript{47} The BAAPCD is a regional district, whereas the Los Angeles District is a single county district.\textsuperscript{48} The Los Angeles District uses a permit system whereby it may specify the devices used to control each pollutant source;\textsuperscript{49} violation of these permits results in misdemeanor sanctions.\textsuperscript{50} The BAAPCD, on the other hand, may not specify how each pollutant source is to be controlled\textsuperscript{51} and depends almost exclusively on civil injunctions to enforce its regulations.\textsuperscript{52}

2. At the State Level

To control pollutants emitted by motor vehicles, the state legislature in 1960 established the California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board (MVPCB).\textsuperscript{53} The MVPCB is composed of thirteen members, nine appointed by the Governor and four ex officio\textsuperscript{54} members from related state agencies.\textsuperscript{55} The MVPCB is empowered to establish criteria for approving motor vehicle control devices.\textsuperscript{56} These criteria may be adopted only after the MVPCB has held a public meeting where all interested persons are afforded the opportunity to present statements in writing.\textsuperscript{57} After these

\textsuperscript{46}Walker, \textit{supra} note 2, at 371.

\textsuperscript{47}Any county may, by resolution of its board of supervisors, declare itself to be an air pollution control district. \textsc{Cal. Health \\& Safety Code} § 24200 (West 1967).

\textsuperscript{48}Consequently, its board of supervisors are members of the District's Board of Directors. \textit{Id.} § 24220. The funds for the Los Angeles District come from the general county budget, \textit{id.} § 24209, whereas the BAAPCD is supported by property taxes collected by each county. The six Bay Area member counties are assessed after the Board of Directors estimates the District's annual budget. This assessment is apportioned among the counties: one-half according to each county's share of real estate value in the District and one-half according to the county's share of the District's population. \textit{Id.} § 24370.1.

\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Id.} § 24263.

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Id.} § 24253. The Los Angeles Board can also petition for injunctive relief. \textit{Id.} § 24252.

\textsuperscript{51}See note 33 and accompanying text \textit{supra}.

\textsuperscript{52}Misdemeanor sanctions for violations of BAAPCD Reg. 1 (see note 67 \textit{infra}) were added in 1965. Punishment consists of a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment not exceeding six months or both fine and imprisonment. \textsc{Cal. Health \\& Safety Code} § 24361.5 (West 1967). These penalties have been used infrequently but their worth can be measured by how many offenses have been prevented. D. J. Callaghan interview, \textit{supra} note 43.


\textsuperscript{54}The directors of the agencies cited in note 55 \textit{infra} are also members of the MVPCB.

\textsuperscript{55}These members are the directors or their nominees of the departments of Public Health, Agriculture, California Highway Patrol and Motor Vehicles. \textit{Id.} § 24383.

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Id.} § 24386(3). In drafting the applicable criteria the Board must consider the cost of the device and its installation, its durability, and the ease of determining whether the device is functioning properly. \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{57}\textsc{Cal. Gov't Code} § 11425 (West 1966). The Board in its discretion may allow oral
criteria have been adopted, the MVPCB then issues certificates of approval for any control device that satisfies the criteria. Misdemeanor sanctions are applied to any person who sells or installs uncertified devices. The MVPCB can enjoin the sale in California of vehicles which do not have certified smog control devices.

Three other state agencies are involved in the control of air pollution. The Department of Public Health sets standards for the quality of air to be maintained in the state. It also establishes standards for maximum emissions of exhaust contaminants from motor vehicles. The Department of Motor Vehicles licenses persons to install, repair, inspect and recharge vehicle control devices in approved stations. The Department will refuse to register any vehicle required to use a control device until a certificate of compliance has been obtained from a licensed station. Finally, the California Highway Patrol may stop vehicles to inspect the effectiveness of the control devices.

C. The Agencies in Action

1. At the Regional Level

The control of air pollution is ideally suited for regional control and the BAAPCD has been very effective because its jurisdiction encompasses the major sources of air pollution in the area. With the exception of moving vehicles there is no need for state control, and the BAAPCD can easily locate and regulate the stationary sources of air pollution. The BAAPCD has been very successful in reducing the release of contaminants by issuing regulations which primarily control open fires, industries and commercial incinerators.

testimony as well. Id. All rulemaking procedures and hearings of the MVPCB are governed by the California Administrative Procedure Act. CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §§ 24386(1), (7) (West 1967). Hearings are for the purpose of issuing certificates of approval, granting exemptions and revoking certificates previously issued or exemptions previously granted. Id.

58 CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24386(4) (West 1967). The Board may exempt certain motor vehicles from using these devices if they are not available or the vehicles can meet state requirements without the use of additional equipment. Id. § 24386(5).

59 Id. §§ 24395-96.

60 Id. § 24391.

61 Id. § 426.3. These standards assist the BAAPCD in formulating regulations.

62 Id. § 426.5. These standards are then used by the MVPCB in approving smog control devices.


64 Id. § 4000.1(a).

65 Id. §§ 2813-14.

66 In 1955 stationary sources in the Bay Area emitted 4,600 tons of air pollutants. In 1964 the figure was reduced to 3,200 tons. Id. Without the BAAPCD the figure would have been 6,250 in 1964. BAY AREA POLLUTION, supra note 7, at 12. Furthermore, in 1966 smog concentrations in the Bay Area were 25% lower than in 1965. San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 2, 1967, § 1, at 3, col. 1, 2 (CCCCAA ed.)

67 BAAPCD Reg. 1, which became effective in October 1957, controls large scale open
While the BAAPCD has had great success, it has been hindered by a number of problems. First, it may not specify the type of equipment used to control sources of air pollution. By contrast, the board in Los Angeles will not issue a permit until the specified equipment is procured. Thus, there is less chance that the pollutants will not be controlled when the equipment is installed. Also the Los Angeles permit system is easier to administer. Because the BAAPCD does not know what type of device is being used to control pollution, it must make numerous performance checks. Control of air pollution by the BAAPCD would also be strengthened if it had misdemeanor sanctions as does the board in Los Angeles.

A second problem of the BAAPCD is that only six of the nine Bay Area counties have joined. This has caused several difficulties. One is that the dissident three counties are not required by law to control their air pollutants as stringently as BAAPCD counties. Thus, winds can transport pollutants into the air of the other six counties. Furthermore, the three counties receive the benefits of the BAAPCD without shouldering the cost. This creates a vicious circle. Because the BAAPCD reduces the number of contaminants blown into the air of the three counties, the problem will not become acute. And until the problem becomes acute, these counties have no reason to join.

2. At the State Level

It is estimated that sixty percent of the air pollutants in the Bay Area originates from automobiles. This does not necessarily mean that the MVPCB is a failure, but it does highlight the need for controlling motor vehicles. The success of the MVPCB was reflected in the state-burning with certain exceptions. Among the most important exceptions are fires for cooking, certain agricultural fires and fires at one and two family dwellings between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and sunset for the disposal of rubbish. BAAPCD Reg. 1, § 3. BAAPCD Reg. 2, promulgated in January 1961, is a comprehensive and technical regulation which controls certain visible emissions from industrial sources, and the emission of hydrocarbons from commercial incinerators. BAAPCD Reg. 3, to become effective January 4, 1968, is designed to regulate the emission of all reactive organic gases from various sources. In addition to this new regulation, the Advisory Council has recommended the strengthening of Reg. 1 by removing the exemption on agricultural fires and rubbish fires from one and two family dwellings. D. J. Callaghan interview, supra note 43.

68 See text & note 49 supra.
69 See text & note 50 supra.
70 See note 26 supra.
71 D. J. Callaghan interview, supra note 43.
73 Of the hydrocarbons emitted by automobiles, 65% are released in exhaust, 25% from the crankcase and 10% through evaporation. Of the 11 million automobiles in the state, 1.4 million have exhaust control devices and these eliminate approximately 70% of the hydrocarbons found in exhaust. Seven million automobiles have crankcase devices and these
ment by Senator Edmund Muskie, Chairman of the United States Senate Subcommittee on Air Pollution, to the chairman of the MVPCB, that the California effort was the "nation's best air pollution control program."  

In accord with this statement, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare adopted the same standard for automobile exhaust emissions as the California State Department of Public Health had adopted.

The achievements of the MVPCB, however, have not been perfect. Only sixty percent of the automobiles with exhaust control devices are meeting the criteria established by the Department of Public Health. Also, although the data is insufficient, there is great concern that these exhaust devices become progressively less effective with the number of miles traveled.

The principal problem encountered by the MVPCB has been technical. Inexpensive and efficient crankcase control devices are not yet available for all used cars, but it is used cars that burn gasoline most inefficiently, and unburned gasoline contains the air pollutants. In addition, exhaust control devices thus far invented are only seventy percent effective in reducing exhaust emissions. Finally, no device has been invented to control evaporation pollution which constitutes ten percent of all automobile pollutants.

Second, air pollution control devices were at one time illegally and carelessly installed. Some licensed stations would, contrary to law, install devices on automobiles whose engines were already defective. Since this caused engines to burn out, much of the criticism directed at the devices should have been directed at the installer. Another problem was
that some licensed stations would approve faulty devices. These problems have been reduced considerably by the revocation of the licenses of many stations by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

A third problem has been caused by gaps and imprecision in the drafting of regulatory legislation. Under present California law, used cars are not required to have crankcase control devices until the vehicle is transferred to a new owner. This means that many used cars for which efficient and inexpensive devices are available are not required by law to have them installed. Crankcase control devices should be required on all nonexempted used cars as a prerequisite to registration. The federal law concerning the establishment of standards on automotive exhaust emissions is also ambiguous as to whether it has preempted the field from state action. Although California has planned to tighten its standards on 1970 model cars, it is uncertain whether it will be able to impose stricter standards than those applied by the federal government.

D. Summary

The regional approach to air pollution was certainly correct. Perhaps swifter results could have been obtained if the BAAPCD had been granted greater powers through a permit system. Future success will depend on technological advances and on encouraging other Bay Area counties to join. At the state level future success is almost exclusively dependent upon technological advances. Financial considerations affecting these technological advances are of little consequence compared with the enormous damage air pollution causes daily.

II

Water Pollution

The control of water pollution in the Bay Area has had a history somewhat similar to that of air pollution. With industry moving to the

86 Id.

87 There are now 5,106 licensed stations in the state, as compared with 8,000 previously. Id; see CALIFORNIA MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, supra note 75, at 15. The power to revoke licenses of stations is found in the CAL. VEH. CODE § 28504 (West Supp. 1966).

88 CAL. PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24390(d) (West 1967).

89 The previous law requiring devices on these cars was repealed because of ambiguous wording. This was § 24393 of the Health and Safety Code, as amended by ch. 999, [1963] Cal. Stats. 2254. It was repealed by ch. 2031, [1965] Cal. Stats. 4606. For a discussion of the ambiguity, see ch. 3, [1965] Cal. Stats. 872.


91 Cf. CALIFORNIA MOTOR VEHICLE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, supra note 75, at 17-18.

92 In the opinion of Dean Coston, Deputy Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there is nothing in the law to prevent a state from adopting stricter measures. E. GRANT, SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS PRESENTED BEFORE THE MUSKIE COMMITTEE HEARINGS 1 (1967), on file at MVPCB office.
area during World War II, cities developed rapidly on the Bay's shoreline. These industries and cities dumped their raw sewage into the Bay without any preliminary treatment. In 1949 the state legislature divided the state into nine water regions and created regional boards to control the water pollution in each region. The legislature believed that the regional approach was required because the waters of the state varied from one region to another, but because many waters, unlike air, are not confined to a single region, a state board was created to provide supervision for the regional boards.

The water pollution program in the Bay Area has been generally successful. But even though cities and sanitary districts have invested more than 200 million dollars in waste treatment facilities since 1950, the problem of water pollution remains. The future success of the program depends upon greater cooperation between local governments and the regional boards. And because rivers emptying into the Bay carry pollutants from distant parts of the state, more forceful leadership is needed from state agencies.

A. The Problem of Water Pollution

Diseases caused by water contamination, such as dysentery and typhoid, are more severe than those generally caused by smog. While protective measures are usually taken to safeguard the community's drinking water, the purity of other waters is often neglected. These waters can poison fish and wildlife, emit noxious odors and discourage water recreation.

---

93 Address by Grant Burton, Chairman of the Bay Regional Water Pollution Control Board, California Sanitary Districts Ass'n, July 16, 1965, on file with the California Law Review.
94 In 1949 raw sewage from 134 communities representing 20% of the state's population was being discharged into the waters of the state. Statement Before the Assembly Interim Comm. On Water, by the League of California Cities, San Francisco, Nov. 17, 1966. Today less than 0.01% of California residents are served by facilities that do not provide waste treatment. Id.
95 CAL. WATER CODE §§ 13040-64 (West 1956).
96 "[P]roblems of water pollution in this state are primarily regional and dependent upon factors of precipitation, topography, population, and recreational, agricultural and industrial development which vary greatly from region to region." Id. § 13000.
97 Id. § 13010.
98 M. Scott, supra note 93, at 66.
99 E.g. "The dumping of refuse in land-fills in productive areas such as the Berkeley and
The Bay Area has not been able to eliminate pollution from its waters. Increases in waste discharges have overburdened treatment plants to the point of inefficiency, and rivers draining regions far removed from San Francisco transport sewage wastes from many parts of the state into the Bay. Two additional factors seriously compound the problem. First, the supply of fresh water needed to decompose these wastes is being reduced. Streams formerly running into the Bay are being diverted to Southern California. Second, the Bay itself is getting smaller through careless dumpings, industrial filling, and unavoidable bridge, highway and airport construction. Substantial filling of the Bay reduces the cleansing and flushing power of the tides, and by diminishing the volume of water, it decreases the assimilative capacity of the Bay.

B. The Agencies Created to Control the Problem

As with air pollution, control of water pollution is centered mainly at the regional and state level. Cities and counties can, however, adopt regulations for disposal of sewage and industrial waste which do not conflict with state and regional board rulings. In addition, special regional commissions such as the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and the San Francisco Bay-Delta Study Steering Committee, established by the state legislature, will have a great impact.
on future water pollution control in the Bay Area. Finally, as with air pollution, the federal government is taking an increasingly active role in the control of water pollution. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to conduct a coordinated research program,\textsuperscript{110} to make grants to states to establish and maintain water pollution control programs\textsuperscript{111} and to make grants to states, municipalities and intermunicipal agencies for the construction of necessary treatment plants.\textsuperscript{112}

1. \textit{At the Regional Level}

The Dickey Act of 1949\textsuperscript{113} initiated a statewide attack on water pollution.\textsuperscript{114} Principal control powers were vested in nine regional water quality control boards which covered the entire state. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (BRWQCB) encompasses the nine Bay Area counties.\textsuperscript{115} Its seven members are appointed by the Governor for staggered four-year terms\textsuperscript{116} and are selected to represent various interest groups.\textsuperscript{117}

The BRWQCB controls pollution in the Bay Area by issuing requirements for waste discharges.\textsuperscript{118} Any person proposing to discharge sewage or industrial waste,\textsuperscript{119} other than into a community sewer system, must file a report of the proposed discharge with the BRWQCB.\textsuperscript{120} Waste collection, reclamation, treatment and disposal of waste and drainage waste discharges in the waters of the San Francisco Bay-Delta area. Ch. 1351, § 3, [1965] Cal. Stats. 3239.

\textsuperscript{110} 33 U.S.C. § 466 (a) (1964). He accomplishes this objective by publishing reports of such investigations and by making grants-in-aid to public and private agencies and individuals for research. \textit{Id.} § 466c(a)(1)-(2) (1964).

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Id.} § 466d (1964).

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Id.} § 466e (1964). Also, he can abate the pollution of interstate and navigable waters of the state which endangers the public health and welfare. \textit{Id.} § 466g (1964).


\textsuperscript{114} Pollution is defined as “an impairment of the quality of the waters of the State by sewage or industrial waste to a degree which does not create an actual hazard to the public health but which does adversely . . . affect such waters for domestic, industrial, agricultural, navigational, recreational or other beneficial use.” \textit{Cal. Water Code} § 13005 (West Supp. 1966).

\textsuperscript{115} While closely approximating the boundaries of the nine Bay Area counties, the jurisdiction of the BRWQCB does not include all the area of each county.


\textsuperscript{117} The interest groups represented are the following: organizations dealing with water supply, conservation or production; irrigated agriculture; industries; municipalities; counties; recreation and wildlife; and the public at large. \textit{Id.} § 13041.

\textsuperscript{118} These requirements prescribe the maximum of certain chemicals to be maintained in the effluent or the receiving waters. For example, see BRWQCB Reg. 683 (1965), discussed in text accompanying notes 172-74 infra.


charge requirements for the proposed discharge and future discharge privileges are then established after a public hearing at which both the discharger and downstream water user have an opportunity to express their views.\textsuperscript{121} The BRWQCB may not, however, restrict the location, type of construction or particular manner in which the waste is treated or discharged.\textsuperscript{122}

If a violation of BRWQCB requirements occurs and the discharge threatens to cause or is causing excessive pollution, the BRWQCB may issue a cease and desist order.\textsuperscript{123} Violations of a cease and desist order are certified by the BRWQCB to a county district attorney who petitions the county superior court for the issuance of an injunction restraining the discharger from further violations.\textsuperscript{124}

Additional duties of the BRWQCB include the formulation, after a public hearing, of long-range plans and policies with respect to water quality control within the region.\textsuperscript{125} Because there are no misdemeanor sanctions for violations of discharge requirements,\textsuperscript{126} an extremely im-

\textsuperscript{121} Id. § 13054. These written requirements may specify the necessary quality of the receiving water or the quality of the effluent prior to discharge or a combination of the above. 16 Op. Cal. Att'y Gen. 203 (1950).

\textsuperscript{122} Cal. Water Code §§ 13054 (West Supp. 1966); id. § 13064 (West 1956); 16 Op. Cal. Att'y Gen. 200 (1950). If the regional board is considered to have taken an inappropriate action, the aggrieved party can appeal to the State Water Quality Control Board. Cal. Water Code § 13025 (West Supp. 1966). Only eight waste discharge requirements have been appealed to the State Board from 1950-1966, and in only one case has the State Board decided that the regional board's requirements were improper. Statement of the League of California Cities, supra note 94. In addition, under § 13054.1 these requirements may be modified upon evidence of changed conditions in the receiving waters.

\textsuperscript{123} Cal. Water Code § 13060 (West Supp. 1966). Prior to 1959, hearings were required under the California Administrative Procedure Act before the issuance of a cease and desist order. Cal. Water Code § 13061 (West 1956). However, it was felt that these hearings were used as a delaying tactic. Statement Before Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, by P. Bonderson, Executive Officer of the State Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco, Nov. 16, 1966. Therefore, these requirements were repealed and hearings are now discretionary rather than mandatory. Ch. 1299, [1959] Cal. Stats. 3454. Between 1959 and September 30, 1966, the nine regional boards have issued 190 cease and desist orders. State Water Quality Control Board, Quarterly Progress Report 4 (Sept. 1966). These orders remain in effect until removed by the regional board. Ninety of these orders have been so removed. Id.

The BRWQCB has established a policy that when it wishes to initiate formal enforcement procedures, it will ask the discharger to file a time schedule with the BRWQCB showing the dates when compliance with the discharge requirements will be met. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Status of Water Pollution Control in Napa County, Appendix A (1966).

\textsuperscript{124} Cal. Water Code § 13063 (West Supp. 1966). Since 1959, twenty cease and desist orders have been referred to a district attorney. In only two of these cases was the state's petition for a court order denied, and in one of these cases the condition complained of had been corrected prior to the final judgment. Statement by P. Bonderson, supra note 123.

\textsuperscript{125} Cal. Water Code § 13052(e) (West Supp. 1966). This policy adopted by the BRWQCB together with the policy adopted by the State Board (see text accompanying note 131 infra) serve as guidelines for establishing waste discharge requirements.

\textsuperscript{126} See text accompanying notes 123-24 supra. These are the only sanctions provided.
important function of the BRWQCB is to obtain coordinated action of water quality control by means of formal and informal meetings with dischargers.\textsuperscript{127}

2. At the State Level

The Dickey Act of 1949 also created a State Water Quality Control Board (State Board), which is composed of fourteen members.\textsuperscript{128} Nine are chosen by the Governor for staggered four-year terms to represent various interest groups;\textsuperscript{129} five directors of related state agencies are ex officio members.\textsuperscript{130} The State Board exercises coordinating, supervisory and review authority over the regional boards. To coordinate and guide the establishing of waste discharge requirements by the regional boards, the State Board formulates a statewide policy for water quality control.\textsuperscript{131} The State Board supervises the financial activities of the regional boards by allocating funds for administrative expenses, directing the flow of federal assistance funds and administering technical research programs.\textsuperscript{132} It may review the action or inaction of a regional board and, upon finding that the regional board's conduct was improper, the State Board may require the regional board, or any appropriate state agency, to take appropriate action, or it may take such action itself.\textsuperscript{133} Finally, in the event a waste discharge in one region affects the water in another region and the regional boards involved disagree over the requirements to be established, either regional board may submit the dispute to the State Board for resolution.\textsuperscript{134}

Other state agencies are involved in the control of water pollution,

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{CAL. WATER CODE} § 13052(a) (West Supp. 1966).
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Id.} §§ 13010-11.
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Id.} § 13011. The represented groups are the following: production and supply of domestic water; irrigated agriculture; industrial water use; production of industrial waste; public sewage disposal; city government; county government; recreation and wildlife; and the public at large.
\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Id.} These members are the directors of Public Health, Water Resources, Conservation, Agriculture, and Fish and Game.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Id.} § 13022.1 See note 125 \textit{supra}. This policy is also designed to aid state agencies in planning their water activities.
\textsuperscript{132} \textit{CAL. WATER CODE} §§ 13023-24 (West Supp. 1966). During the fiscal year 1965-1966 there were 128 applications from local governments which requested $33 million, and the State Board administered fifty federal grants for a total of $19.3 million. Statement Before Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, by R. Gupta, Member, State Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco, Nov. 17, 1966. The research programs of the State Board have concentrated on waste water reclamation, water quality criteria and the effects of various pollutants on marine environment. \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{CAL. WATER CODE} § 13025 (West Supp. 1966). This function includes the review of discharge requirements set by the regional boards and the issuance of cease and desist orders. See text accompanying notes 118-23 \textit{supra}.
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{CAL. WATER CODE} § 13025.5 (West Supp. 1966).
but in the performance of their duties they must give conscious recognition to the policies and standards of water quality control adopted by the state and regional boards. The Department of Public Health has control over water pollution which creates an actual hazard to the public health. It continually surveys public sewage treatment and disposal systems and assists local health officers in preventing health hazards. The Department of Fish and Game can prosecute any person who discharges into state waters any substance or material deleterious to fish, birds or plants. It also determines the levels of toxicity of various pollutants and their effect on fish and game, drafts comments on proposed regional board discharge requirements, and conducts special investigations for the regional boards. The Department of Water Resources is an information gathering agency in the field of water pollution. It conducts investigations on the existing level of water pollution and on the possibility of water reclamation from sewage and industrial wastes. It also provides technical information and assistance to the state and regional water quality control boards whenever requested.

C. The Agencies in Action

1. At the Regional Level

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has stated that California has an unsurpassed program for water pollution control. This success


\[136\] Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 5410-12 (West 1967). A contamination is defined as "an impairment of the quality of the waters of the State by sewage or industrial waste to a degree which creates an actual hazard to the public health through poisoning or through the spread of disease." Id. § 5410(c). A "pollution," note 114 supra, and a "contamination" may exist in the same waters simultaneously. 26 Op. Cal. Att'y Gen. 253 (1955).


\[138\] Cal. Fish & Game Code § 5650 (West 1958). These prosecutions may be made without approval of the regional water quality control boards. 42 Op. Cal. Att'y Gen. 53 (1963). The Department filed sixty-eight misdemeanor complaints during the period of January 1960 to January 1962, and of these only six resulted in decisions of "not guilty." Water Resources Engineers, Inc., supra note 137, at 68.

\[139\] Water Resources Engineers, Inc., supra note 137, at 64.

\[140\] Id.

\[141\] Id. at 70, 76.

\[142\] Cal. Water Code § 229 (West 1956).

\[143\] Id. § 230.

\[144\] Id. §§ 13020(g), 13052(c) (West Supp. 1966).

\[145\] See Address by Secretary Udall, dedication ceremonies of the Sunol Filtration Plant, San Francisco, September 1966, quoted in Statement of R. Gupta, supra note 132.
is due to the accomplishments of the regional boards. California was the first state to place planning for water pollution control on a regional basis, and the progress made in the Bay Area demonstrates the soundness of this approach. Fishing has improved vastly. Concentrations of gross pollution which existed offshore have been eliminated. Sewage facilities, a rarity in 1950, are now commonplace and are constantly being improved. And the BRWQCB has developed a successful checking and monitoring system to test the concentrations of treated industrial and sewage waste.

The program in the Bay Area has not, however, been successful in all aspects. Its principal weakness has been its failure to encourage groups of communities to consolidate their waste treatment facilities into one efficient operation. The BRWQCB has a long record of encouraging local governmental agencies to undertake integrated planning for sewerage systems and waste disposal facilities, yet no master plan has been devised to replace small, overladen facilities with large, efficient plants to serve wide areas. There are several unfortunate examples in the Bay Area of the low-cost, small system approach. The public has had to pay for the initial facilities, for their expensive (and usually faulty) operation, and finally for the annexation of the area to a larger system, abandoning the initial system.

146 As an example of the success due to the regional boards, a survey of all agencies concerned with water pollution concluded, "[t]he Regional Water Pollution Control Boards have, in a great majority of cases, administered their programs effectively. The average production effort of the staffs of these boards, per individual, was the highest of any state organization reviewed." WATER RESOURCES ENGINEERS, INC., supra note 137, at 182.

147 Statement Before Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, by G. Burton, Chairman of BRWQCB, San Francisco, Nov. 17, 1966, on file with the California Law Review.

148 Address by Grant Burton to the California Sanitary and Sanitation Districts Ass'n, July 16, 1965, on file with the California Law Review. The number of complaints from fishermen has dropped markedly. Interview with Grant Burton in Walnut Creek, March 15, 1967, on file with the California Law Review. Species of fish which have not been caught in the Bay in forty years are now returning. Id. Also, shrimp in commercial quantities are now found in the Bay. Id.

149 Burton address, supra note 148.

150 Id.

151 Id. This includes self-monitoring whereby the discharger himself must make tests on his effluent. Also, the BRWQCB makes tests with a patrol boat. CAL. WATER CODE § 13055 (West Supp. 1966). Misdemeanor sanctions have been added to enforce the self-monitoring system. Id. § 13055.1.

152 See notes 167-81 and accompanying text infra.

153 STAFF OF THE REGIONAL BOARD, SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGIONAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD—ITS COMPOSITION, METHOD OF ORGANIZATION, ETC. 4 (1963); Interview with James McCormick, vice-chairman of the BRWQCB, in Berkeley, Nov. 22, 1966, on file with the California Law Review. See text following note 184 infra.


156 Id.
The interests of economy and public health demand the consolidation of sewage treatment facilities. Large plants are more efficient than smaller plants and can be more carefully operated. If a small plant suffers mechanical failure and there is no one to repair it, raw sewage will be discharged into public waters. Large plants, on the contrary, can afford a full-time maintenance man. The arguments against consolidation focus on three points. First, politicians dislike taxing residents for sewage expenditures. Second, communities that have invested in treatment facilities fear that under a regional arrangement their investment will be wasted. Third, there exists a desire to retain political autonomy at the local level.

Nevertheless, these considerations are outweighed by the need to purify the polluted waters of the Bay Area. A regional program must be established to integrate the fragmented sewage treatment systems now in operation. This program should stress the most economic means of transmitting wastes to treatment plants, the most efficient type of treatment available and the possibilities of reclamation and reuse. Different systems may be required to transport wastes to treatment areas and to transport reclaimed waters to other areas for use. But the difficult problems of consolidation are "more political than engineering." The conduct and financing of a regional program appear to be the major obstacles to establishing such a system.

The water pollution control program in California rests upon a philosophy of cooperation. The legislature has given the cities the discretion to use whatever treatment system they consider best; the regional boards may not require the use of any specific treatment facility through a permit system. The use of civil injunctions rather than misdemeanor sanctions for violations also reflects a philosophy of cooperation. Constant

---

157 It has been estimated that the treatment cost per million gallons from a treatment plant of one million gallons per day (mgd) capacity is $700. The same cost for a 10 mgd plant is $330. For a 25 mgd plant the cost is $250. Id. at 11-12.
158 Burton interview, supra note 148; see W. Zion, supra note 155, at 12.
159 W. Zion, supra note 155, at 12; M. Scott, supra note 154, at 66. "Appropriations for sewage expenditures occupy about the lowest rung on the expenditures scale." Interview with J. Gilbert, member of the BRWQCB, in Novato, Cal., Nov. 29, 1966, on file with the California Law Review.
160 W. Zion, supra note 155, at 12; M. Scott, supra note 154, at 66.
161 See authorities cited in note 160 supra. See also McCormick interview, supra note 153.
163 McCormick interview, supra note 153. An example of these difficulties occurred in 1964 when San Mateo County developed a countywide plan for the discharge of wastes through the mountains into the Pacific Ocean instead of into the Bay. San Mateo County tried to get Alameda and Santa Clara counties to join. Negotiations began at that time but as of this writing there have been no tangible results. Id.
pressure must therefore be applied to city councils to consolidate and establish better treatment plants. This pressure can come from two sources: the regional boards and the public. For the regional boards to apply this pressure they need larger staffs. An increase of the staff on the regional boards would allow them to apply more pressure on local communities and wage an effective campaign to arouse public resentment against the contamination of the waters of the Bay Area. Although the public becomes easily incensed about air pollution, it is comparatively apathetic about the pollution of its waters.

Another way to arouse the public may be to have the people of each region elect regional board chairman. Candidates for the position would certainly bring the water pollution situation into public debate. The argument against such an election would be that an ineffective chairman might be chosen. But if the other six members were appointed, as they are now, they could easily prevail. The benefits of awakening the public seem to outweigh the possibility of having one incompetent member on a regional board.

2. The Livermore Example: A Study in Failure

On October 9, 1956, Livermore, the largest city in the Amador Valley, voted to build a sewage treatment plant that would treat 2.5 million gallons of sewage effluent daily. In March 1957 the BRWQCB passed Resolution 239 which established discharge requirements on the effluent from the treatment plant entering the Arroyo las Positas. Plant operations began in 1960. Late in 1962 the treatment plant ponds filled and improperly treated sewage was discharged in violation of Resolution 239.

165 M. Scott, supra note 154, at 58; Gilbert interview, supra note 159.
166 This selection process of the other six members is subject to further criticism. Choice by the Governor can result in the selection of political favorites rather than the most qualified. However, there are overwhelming advantages to the present system as compared to the system used by the BAAPCD. See text accompanying notes 28-29 supra. The cities and counties rather than industries are the major water polluters. Thus, city representatives might be more reluctant to fulfill their obligations to the region since they would have conflicting obligations. Even if an industry were a major source of pollution in a certain city, the councilman might not wish to antagonize the industry for fear of causing it to move elsewhere, thus destroying the economy of the city.

167 Water from the Arroyo las Positas enters the Alameda county ground basins, which are a major source of water supply for domestic, agricultural and industrial use. BRWQCB Res. 239 (1957).

168 Treatment of wastes usually requires two steps. Primary treatment makes the organic material inactive. Secondary treatment involves holding ponds containing algae, which break down the sewage even further.

169 Letter from John B. Harrison, executive officer of BRWQCB, to the mayor and city council of Livermore, Cal., Jan. 4, 1963, copy on file in BRWQCB Office.
This was the beginning of four years of friction between Livermore and the BRWQCB. The period was characterized by repeated violations of discharge requirements by Livermore and a vacillating policy by the BRWQCB. The blame, however, lies more heavily with Livermore. The situation could have been prevented by regional cooperation, which is presently lacking. There is no guarantee that the problem will not recur in the Amador Valley.

The BRWQCB could have issued a cease and desist order for the violation, but it desired cooperation. Instead it passed Resolution 446 which merely cited the violation and prescribed more explicit requirements as to the chemical content of treated effluent. Between February 1963 and July 1965 Livermore repeatedly violated Resolution 446. At one point the city promised that there would be no further discharges after June 30, 1963, yet discharges in violation of the resolution occurred in July 1963.

On November 19, 1964 the BRWQCB decided that the discharge requirements on the Livermore plant would have to be revised in light of changed conditions in the area. Resolution 683, adopted July 15, 1965, imposed stricter standards on the effluent discharged by Livermore. By changing the discharge requirements, the BRWQCB forced Livermore to choose between expanding its old plant, constructing a new one, or consolidating with other communities in building a plant to serve the entire region. In addition, Resolution 683 directed Livermore to submit by September 1, 1965 a firm and detailed time schedule of proposed actions the city would take to regulate the mineral quality of wastes discharged into its sewerage system. The September 1 deadline was not

---

172 The BRWQCB can revise requirements due to changed conditions in the disposal area or receiving waters. Cal. Water Code § 13054.1 (West Supp. 1966). In the Livermore case, the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone no. 7 had put into operation stream diversion activities, and these facilities were located only 2½ miles downstream from the Livermore treatment plant's point of discharge into the Arroyo las Positas. BRWQCB Res. 683 (1965). Also, the present use of the natural channels of the Alameda Creek system from Altamount to Niles for transportation of imported water was not foreseen in 1957, and this use was therefore not a factor in determining the regional board's previous requirements. Present plans for the ultimate discharge near Sunol Bay Aqueduct of water to the Alameda Creek system near Sunol and conveyance thence to Niles were also not known to the BRWQCB in 1957. Finally, demands for waste assimilative capacity of this stream system had increased greatly since 1957, and this demand would continue to grow. Id.
173 See note 123 supra.
met. No communication from the city of Livermore was received until October 20.\textsuperscript{174}

On October 21, 1965 the BRWQCB passed Resolution 703 setting interim requirements to last until the treatment plant could be expanded to meet the requirements of Resolution 683. These requirements allowed Livermore to spray its partially treated sewage onto uninhabited areas of land. Violations of Resolution 703 occurred in November and January.\textsuperscript{175} A cease and desist order was drawn up at the meeting of January 20, 1966, but its issuance was postponed for one month to allow the city to acquire more land to meet the requirements of Resolution 703. The gravity of the situation was already apparent; effluent discharged by Livermore was appearing in the drinking water downstream.\textsuperscript{176}

Livermore still proceeded very slowly to meet the requirements of Resolution 703. The city manager stated that it would be a waste of money to spend 50,000 dollars, the minimum required to obtain more land, for merely an interim solution.\textsuperscript{177} But because discharges in violation of Resolution 703 continued to occur during February, the BRWQCB, feeling it had been deceived by Livermore's pleas for more time, finally issued the cease and desist order on February 17, 1966.\textsuperscript{178} Over three years of violations had elapsed before the board took this action.

Livermore felt it had been treated unjustly by the BRWQCB.\textsuperscript{179} The city spent 800,000 dollars on a sewage treatment plant in 1958 which was designed to meet the discharge requirements that had been set by the BRWQCB. Seven years later the BRWQCB changed the requirements and Livermore was required to spend another 1.4 million dollars. There is no question but that the law gives the regional board the power to revise requirements due to changed water conditions.\textsuperscript{180} Unfortunately, Livermore had to pay the penalty of the changed conditions. Farsighted planning on a regional basis in 1958, however, would have prevented these problems. Livermore still has no assurance that its present plant will always be sufficient.

Blame must be placed on both Livermore and the BRWQCB. Livermore was shortsighted and intransigent; the BRWQCB was hesitant and

\textsuperscript{174} City Clerk Dorothy J. Hock wrote that an ordinance would be adopted by February 1, 1966. The ordinance was adopted before that date, one of Livermore's few acts of compliance with the BRWQCB. The BRWQCB later discovered that the ordinance was not being strictly enforced, Oakland Tribune, Sept. 16, 1966, at 21, col. 6.

\textsuperscript{175} BRWQCB Res. 725 (1966).

\textsuperscript{176} Statement by Clarence Smith, senior engineer of the Alameda County Water District, minutes of BRWQCB meeting, Jan. 20, 1966.

\textsuperscript{177} Oakland Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966, at 20, col. 1.

\textsuperscript{178} BRWQCB Res. 725 (1966).


\textsuperscript{180} CAL. WATER CODE § 13954.1 (West Supp. 1966).
indecisive. Yet the board’s options were limited. During the ten-year period it had clearly fulfilled its advisory functions by preparing studies recommending region wide consolidation of sewage facilities. In March 1957 the BRWQCB had passed Resolution 240 which stated a “need for and urged commencement of an investigation of integrated sewerage facilities for the [Amador Valley],” and it recommended the development of “large systems” which were “frequently more economical and provide better water pollution control and better sanitation control than a multitude of small sewerage systems serving the same area.” The resolution urged “all responsible legislative and planning bodies not [to] permit development of land in the Livermore-Amador Valley . . . unless integrated facilities . . . will be available to collect, treat and dispose of any sewage and industrial waste resulting from such development.”

These recommendations fell on deaf ears. Late in 1962 the willingness of Livermore and surrounding communities to cooperate was described as nil: “The best they can offer in the way of progress is that they’re talking to each other . . . after six years and 10,000 dollars have been spent.”181 A potentially productive study was launched in late 1961 when Livermore and Pleasanton cooperated in forming the Valley Sewer Study Committee. In August 1965 the Committee reported that valleywide use of the 2 million dollar Valley Community Services District sewage plant was legally and physically possible.182 Livermore and Pleasanton could purchase capacity rights in the plant and operate it under some form of joint power agreement. Livermore had to decide whether to participate in the plan or expand its own plant. It chose to expand and retain its political autonomy. Today the cities in the Amador Valley continue to hold social “get-togethers”183 to discuss consolidation. But it is apparent that nothing can happen as long as they “want to protect their little kingdoms.”184

The BRWQCB applied as much pressure as it could with respect to consolidation but Livermore chose to remain autonomous. The BRWQCB might have issued a cease and desist order sooner but that would not have solved the problem. As Livermore did not have the facilities to meet the requirements, it had to violate them or allow sewage to accumulate. The solution to this type of problem therefore is the construction of large regional treatment systems.

Regional treatment systems can either be established through legis-

---

183 McCormick interview, supra note 153.
184 Id.
lative mandate or through voluntary action by the various communities of the Bay Area. If the BRWQCB had been granted authority to issue permits whereby it could dictate the specifications of treatment facilities, a regional system could have been established. However, the legislature chose not to give such power to the BRWQCB, which could then force a city to spend millions of dollars on a treatment plant. Since there are political problems for the legislature in granting such power to a regional board, voluntary action by the Bay Area communities may be the most feasible solution. Encouragement from the public and the regional boards is needed to expedite such voluntary action. Increases in the staff and budget of the BRWQCB would facilitate such encouragement. Popular election of the chairmen of the regional boards perhaps could arouse the public which in turn might force the cities to relinquish their treasured autonomy.

3. At the State Level

One problem which may be corrected at the 1967 legislative session is the ineffectiveness of the State Water Quality Control Board. The State Board has been unsuccessful as a coordinating force since its inception. Although charged with a legislative mandate to help the regional boards set waste discharge requirements and aid in coordinating the activities of other state agencies in the maintenance of water quality, it failed for seventeen years to adopt a statewide water quality control policy. The inefficiency of the State Board is partly the fault of the state legislature. The budget and staff of the State Board have been inadequate. In addition, the composition of the State Board has inhibited leadership. This cumbersome body, consisting of part-time, uncompensated public members who meet only once a month cannot adequately supervise the fight against water pollution. Because of their

188 The inefficiency of the State Board is partly the fault of the state legislature. The budget and staff of the State Board have been inadequate. In addition, the composition of the State Board has inhibited leadership. This cumbersome body, consisting of part-time, uncompensated public members who meet only once a month cannot adequately supervise the fight against water pollution. Because of their
greater expertise, the ex officio members have been able to dominate the board. And because these members are directors of agencies which discharge wastes, participation in board activities often "involves the wearing of two hats and therefore at times [results] . . . in a conflict of interest."

In 1967 the California Legislature will vote on a proposal to combine the State Water Quality Control Board with the State Water Rights Board to form the State Water Resources Board. Proponents of the measure argue that California can no longer view the problems of water supply and water quality separately. Diversions of fresh water often inhibit the assimilative capacity of the receiving water, and the State Water Rights Board has not previously given enough consideration to the effect on downstream users when it approves applications to appropriate water from one area to another. The new Water Resources Board would be composed of five, full-time experienced members. It would be guided by an advisory committee, composed of representatives from various interest groups. Under the proposal the regional boards will be unaffected. This is further evidence of the success of the regional boards.

Another problem which exists at the state level is the lack of coordination between the various state agencies involved in water pollution control. Their responsibilities often overlap as their legislative grants...
of authority are quite broad. The Department of Public Health has the power to examine any condition affecting the public health and welfare. The Department of Water Resources is directed to develop a plan for the utilization of the state's water resources. And the Department of Fish and Game is directed to protect fish and wildlife. Often the three agencies study the same body of water but for different purposes. For example, there are four distinct sources of waste water quality information: the surveillance of sewage treatment facilities of the Department of Public Health; the waste monitoring program of the Department of Water Resources; the self-monitoring program developed by the BRWQCB; and the waste monitoring the BRWQCB does itself. These programs often produce duplication of effort.

A continual liaison between the various state agencies is required to apprise the others what each agency is doing. The results of past investigations need to be catalogued systematically so that one agency will not make a study another has already made. Improved cooperation could be achieved by making the staffs which are responsible for water pollution studies in the agencies file a report of each study with the proposed Water Resources Board. Perhaps a sounder approach would be to transfer all investigatory and regulatory functions of the state agencies pertaining to water quality to the proposed Water Resources Board.

D. Summary

The regional approach to water pollution, though not perfect, has been successful in achieving some purity in the state's waters. Future success of the program is now dependent upon the communities of the Bay Area consolidating their sewage treatment facilities. Stronger leadership is needed at the state level and it is hoped that the proposed Water Resources Board will provide this leadership.

III

CONCLUSION

Success of the regional approach to problems of air and water pollution should encourage a similar approach to other problems which by their


203 Cal. Fish & Game Code §§ 1000-08 (West 1958); Water Resources Engineers, Inc., supra note 200, at 135.

204 Water Resources Engineers, Inc., supra note 200, at 130-47.

205 Id. at 140.

206 Id.
nature are not confined to a single community. For example, the problem of solid waste disposal is conducive to regional solution. Present landfill methods are proving inadequate, and the solid waste may have to be burned or dumped into the Bay unless planning on the regional level develops a more organized or new approach to dispose of solid waste. Some thought should be given to combining the agencies controlling air and water pollution and waste disposal. The San Francisco Bay-Delta Study Steering Committee may succeed in developing a plan for a comprehensive waste collection and disposal system which will serve the entire Bay Area. Thus far the Study has concluded that "[c]oordinated, comprehensive, multipurpose planning is needed to provide region-wide collection, disposal, reuse, reclamation and other control of wastes for the protection and improvement of water quality." Such a consolidation would have to separate regulatory agencies from service agencies, so that an agency performing a service would not be regulating itself, which might result in a conflict of interest.

Doug Haydel

207 By this method, refuse is dumped onto the land and then covered with earth. For a discussion of the problem of the diminishing amount of land available for this purpose see ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS, REFUSE DISPOSAL NEEDS STUDY (1965).

208 Ch. 135, § 3, [1965] Cal. Stats. 1086.