

Mr. Jack Safely
Metropolitan Water District — Water Resources Management Group
P.O. Box 54153
Los Angeles, CA 90054-0153

P104

January 4, 2001

Dear Mr. Safely,

I'm writing to demand that you reconsider the Cadiz Project. The current SEIS on the project falls far short in looking at the consequences of draining the aquifer even partly.

P104-1

1. The SEIS doesn't have complete information on the water quality of the groundwater or of the Colorado River water that would be imported to this aquifer. This is a reckless oversight, considering the recent discovery of high levels of chromium 6 in the groundwater, and given the likelihood that these water sources contain arsenic, radon, MTBE and rocket fuel.

P104-2

2. This project will probably endanger desert wildlife. Remember, deserts are not hardy, indestructible patches of asphalt; like rainforests, they are fragile ecosystems dependent on underground water.

P104-3

3. The area affected by the Cadiz Project includes two national parks and five wilderness areas managed by the BLM. These areas were set aside by Congress to be permanently protected; sucking the groundwater from under their feet is hardly protection.

P104-4

4. The "monitoring and mitigation" plan is ill defined and offers questionable management for environmental impacts. Under this plan, Cadiz, Inc. and MWD will be the primary monitors and decision-makers of groundwater. This is a bad idea: profit-focused people put environmental concerns behind making money. It's in the financial and political interest of these parties to extract as much groundwater as they can.

P104-5

5. The environmental analysis for this project is still incomplete. Although there is a plan for monitoring environmental problems, there isn't one for doing something about them. The plan lacks information on how water quality problems will be addressed. And the BLM's authority is not defined in the latest EIR, and will instead be defined in closed-door meetings. As the Cadiz/MWD plan has an enormous impact on a sizable chunk of California, I demand that this issue be open to public discussion and review.

P104-6

6. The SEIS needs to present safer, sustainable, and less environmentally destructive alternatives to this plan. Los Angeles has historically resisted water conservation tooth and nail. They shouldn't be allowed more water to satisfy the waste that they call "need."

P104-7

Thank you for doing the right thing,

P104-8

Monica Cherry

Marianna Cherry
1040 Balboa St,
San Francisco, CA 94118

P104 - Identical letter sent by Kathleen A. Bouvier
(no address, January 4, 2001)