

(3) The character of the runoff to be impounded would be detrimental to water quality.

(4) Alternatives as recommended by the National Sanitation Foundation are available.

(5) Bureau of Outdoor Recreation report is inaccurate and misleading.

(6) The Fish and Wildlife Service report is unenthusiastic.

(7) Alternate reservoir sites are available and have not been studied.

(8) Future land use requirements of a growing metropolitan region have not been considered.

(9) Future food needs of this population have not been considered.

(10) Thirty million dollars spent for the Mill Creek Reservoir would provide only a stopgap solution, because by 1990 Wash-tenaw County will need supplemental or alternate primary water supply and waste disposal facilities.

We have submitted questions relative to a specific situation in hopes that scientific procedures can be directed toward specific solutions. We are sure that similar problems exist across the country and we hope your work will begin to resolve them.

Therefore in view of the foregoing we hope your committee will attack the problem of furnishing adequate scientific information and proper scientific procedures for evaluation of such projects before they are built. Only in this way can the public be protected from tragic and very expensive mistakes.