AUG 18 1999 1068

CALFED
BAY-DELTA
PROGRAM

Public Comment

AUG 18 1999

Date_____

The CALFED Bay-Delta Program welcomes your participation. Please use the space below for your written comments (attach additional sheets if necessary).

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Would you like to be added to our mailing list?

_____ Check Here

Please return this form to:

CALFED
BAY-DELTA
PROGRAM
1416 Ninth St., #1155
Sacramento, CA 95814

For more information,
(916) 657-2666
(800) 700-5752
http://calfed.ca.gov

1068

AUG 18 1999

Name: Bruce Mettler

Address: 17901 N. Cherry Rd., Lodi, Calif. 95240

Thank you for allowing this time for public input. I find many problems with the CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM as presented. Because of the time limitations, I will address only the most glaring discrepancies.

The MISSION STATEMENT and SOLUTION PRINCIPLES as stated are unattainable without going farther than the proposed solution. Stated goals include:

(1). Water supply reliability
(2). No water quality degradation
(3). Equitable solutions
(4). Economically viable over time
(5). No redirected impacts from one group to another

All of the above need the addition of significantly more storage than is stated in the present plan for the proposed plan to succeed. To do otherwise would be to guarantee failure from the start.

We have not done any water development projects in over 30 years. We can not continue to add:

(1). Increased urban needs
(2). Additional flows for environmental concerns

Without taking water from agriculture unless we have additional supplies- that is supplied by additional storage.

You can not reach the stated goals without violating the stated principles. You are setting the program up for guaranteed failure and the consequences that result. That makes the entire proposal a sham.

More subtle in the report, but very detrimental to agriculture, is the impact on productive agricultural acreage. Levee setbacks, habitat restoration, increased need for open space, all put demands on agricultural land.

I realize that this report has been a long time coming and a difficult product to develop. But to propose a solution that is certain to fail due to lack of storage/or new water, is not acceptable.

There are hard realities to be faced concerning the future of water and water supply in California.

We in agriculture can not accept this inadequate solution.

Environmentalists should not accept this solution.

California will not be served by this solution.

I urge the commission to take the work done so far and re-do their report to reflect the reality of the amount of water available. Additional storage is an indispensable part of the solution.

Thank you.