

OCT 01 1997

23443 S. Hays Road
Manteca, CA 95337
September 28, 1997

Lester Snow and Fellow BDAC Members
1416 Ninth St., Suite 1155
Sacramento, CA 95814

The purpose of this letter is to comment on the September 25 letter and attachments from CalFed which announced the Scientific Review Panel workshops for the ERPP on October 6 to 9.

The review is important for achieving peer review of the "basic scientific theories and the planning approach of the ERPP" with "focus on conceptual issues". It is acknowledged, however, that the panelists are not expected to "have specific prerequisite knowledge of the Bay Delta system" to which the concepts are to be applied. The review is, therefore, important, but we must recognize that it is limited in scope and specificity.

My concern is that neither this document nor others concerning the ERPP make it clear what other reviews of the ERPP must be made before the ERPP is submitted for approval by BDAC. This lack of clarity, combined with a very short approval schedule, raises the question whether BDAC will be asked to approve the ERPP before it has answers to questions such as the following:

- 1) Are the "Visions" realistically achievable in competition with the impacts that now exist and will occur over the lifetime of the CalFed plan as a result of the growth of both human and exotic specie populations? We can and must do better, but can not expect to restore the environment that coexisted with a much smaller population.
- 2) If the "Visions" are deemed to be achievable, what reductions will be necessary in urban amenities and the production of food, and what would be the social disruption in order for them to be achieved?
- 3) What will be the effect on groundwater overdraft?
- 4) What will be the economic cost of the ERPP and its cost in water?
- 5) Does the ERPP meet the "Solution Principles" or are its authors assuming that it is exempt from that requirement?
- 6) Has it been determined that the "basic scientific theories" are appropriately applicable as proposed in consideration of the terrain, the irreversible changes in hydrology, the existing

encroachments in the flood plain, the ongoing channel aggradation in shallow channels, etc.?

No matter how much we like the Visions, we must be sure they are realistic both technically and politically. Our plan must not prove to be an unachievable dream. We must be realistic about what the public will support when they know the long range cost in dollars, amenities, food supply, etc. Our plan will never be implemented if it is later viewed as unrealistic or unacceptably burdensome.

I urge that we have a clear understanding of what information will be available to BDAC before it is asked to approve the ERPP as part of the "common program".

Sincerely,



Alex Hildebrand