

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 1997 09:10:19 -0700 (PDT)

From: Vic DeVlaming <vicdv@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov>

Subject: Re: Comments on summary

To: Gfredlee@aol.com

cc: chris@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, Aquasci@aol.com, AWCONSULT@aol.com, bfinlays@hq.dfg.ca.gov, Bherbold@aol.com, bobf@delta.dfg.ca.gov, brucet@sfei.org, dehinton@ucdavis.edu, dmfry@ucdavis.edu, Gfredlee@aol.com, hbailey@evs.wa.com, jay@sfei.org, jtm@crl.com, karent@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov, lhsmith@usgs.gov, lrbrown@usgs.gov, lwintern@water.ca.gov, mjsnyder@ucdavis.edu, MJUNGINC@aol.com, nsinghasemanon@cdpr.ca.gov, Phyllisfox@aol.com, slanderson@lbl.gov, snluoma@usgs.gov, spies@amarine.com, valc@bptcp1.swrcb.ca.gov, wabennett@ucdavis.edu, cdarling@water.ca.gov, rwoodard@water.ca.gov

Actions

Yes Fred Yes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Absolutely correct regarding the bodycounts!! It is ecologically stupid to wait until there are killoffs before remediation action is taken. Yet in ecosystem after ecosystem there are those that want to see a lot of dead bodies before consideration of corrective actions. If we are to have healthy ecosystems we have to get off of the last minute, reactive fire drills and move into an era of proactive protection. Why have scientists around at all if no action is taken until there are major population declines? Best scientific judgement should carry some weight. Or should we defer to the environmental groups to bring suits against state agencies after populations are crashing? We will never have 99% or 100% certainty about contaminant effects.

Again, hooray for you Fred.

Regards, Vic

On Thu, 24 Apr 1997 Gfredlee@aol.com wrote:

> Chris:

> I support your summary of several issues raised by C. Darling. An area that
> may need further clarification is your statement: "The additional evidence
> being that the chemicals are actually demonstrated to cause population
> changes to species of concern." That statement is too strong from my
> prospective. It could imply that we want a "bodycount" before action is
> taken. As I indicated, bodycount should not be the criteria, but instead
> action should be taken when it is the Best Professional Judgement (reasonable
> consensus) among a panel of experts in aquatic chemistry, aquatic toxicology
> and water/ecosystem quality that a constituent from a particular sources is
> present in a potentially toxic/available chemical form that could be harmful
> to the beneficial uses of the Delta resources.

>
> I do not feel that it would require a several year delay to define whether
> the CalFed constituents of concern are likely causing "harm" and therefore
> CalFed needs to start to develop remediation programs in the near term to