



<newviv@erols.com>
12/30/00 05:08 PM

To: <james_williams@blm.gov>
cc:
Subject: STOP MOJAVE WATER GRAB!

P118

December 31, 2000

Mr. James Williams
Bureau of Land Management
California Desert District
6221 Box Springs Boulevard
Riverside, CA 92507-0714

Dear James Williams,

As a fan of the California Desert I am writing to comment on the draft supplemental environmental impact statement on the Cadiz Groundwater Storage and Dry-year Supply Program. To my mind the possible impacts this project could have on the Mojave National Preserve and several desert Wilderness Areas should be of paramount concern. Yet this environmental review does not adequately address the potential threats and outlines so-called safeguards clearly inadequate for protecting the environment.

P118-1

The plan for monitoring and mitigation is not well defined and offers questionable management for environmental impacts. The plan gives too much authority for decisions affecting the desert ecosystem to Cadiz, Inc. and its customer, Metropolitan Water District, both of which have an economic interest in extracting groundwater and neither of which has responsibility for or reason to be protective of the ecosystem. Allowing profit-focused decision-makers to be in charge of the protection of our public resources does not protect the public interest -- that is your job!

P118-2

Please go back to the drawing board and identify (and require) alternatives that are based on water conservation and prevent pollution.

P118-3

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I am writing to comment on the draft supplemental environmental impact statement on the Cadiz Groundwater Storage and Dry-year Supply Program. I am concerned about the possible impacts this project could have on the Mojave National Preserve and several desert Wilderness Areas. I do not believe that this environmental review adequately addresses the potential threats. I also feel that the safeguards outlined to protect the environment will be sufficient.

P118-4

Specifically, I am concerned that the plan for monitoring and mitigation is not well defined and offers questionable management for environmental impacts. The plan gives too much authority for decisions affecting the desert ecosystem to Cadiz, Inc. and its customer, Metropolitan Water District, both of which have an economic interest in extracting groundwater. Allowing profit-focused decision-makers to be in charge of the protection of our public resources does not protect the public interest.

P118-5

The document needs to examine alternatives that are actually sustainable, safer and less environmentally destructive, including water conservation measures. The review of such viable alternatives is legal requirement. I believe much more progress should be made in water conservation before parks and natural areas are further threatened by projects such as this. Alternatives that

P118-6

should be considered include other existing, planned or feasible water storage projects and a host of easily adopted water conservation measures that have successfully reduced water demand in other areas.

P118-6

Finally, I am concerned about the possible air pollution that could result if the water table under the nearby "dry" lakes drops even a few feet. We have already seen what can happen when this occurs, namely Owens Lake. In addition to the nearby inhabitants, this pollution threatens public lands including two national parks and five wilderness areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

P118-7

These lands were set aside by Congress to be permanently protected for their nationally significant natural and cultural resource values. This project is likely to undo that protection for future generations.

Please support the public interest and reject this proposal.
Thank you.

P118-8

Vivian Newman
PO Box 388
South Thomaston, ME 04858-0388