

From: "W Reid White" <DamhRuadh@bellsouth.net>
To: <GCDExpPlan@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 26, 2007 6:51 PM
Subject: Glenn Canyon Dam EIS

Monday, 2007.020.26

Mr. Rick Gold

Regional Director

Bureau of Reclamation

Upper Colorado Region

Attn: UC-402

125 South State Street

Salt Lake City, UT 84138-1147

Dear Mr. Gold:

Thank you for allowing the public opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement on the Long-term Operations for the Future Operations of Glen Canyon Dam. Studies completed in 1996 by the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal, State, Tribal and academic entities more than adequately document that the river ecosystem has been significantly and negatively impacted since 1956 due to the operations of Glen Canyon Dam. The 1996 Record of Decision and the Grand Canyon Protection Act promised that the river environment of the Grand Canyon would improve. Unfortunately there has only been a continued decline in the ecological integrity of the river system.

There is already adequate data for decision making. The new plans for ongoing investigation and experimentation may be beneficial for gathering new data; however, it is unclear how this information will be integrated and implemented into changes in the Glen Canyon Dam operations that will allow for listed fish species to recover.

Please consider implementing the following immediately in order to help secure a future in the Grand Canyon that meets the requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act.

1. Restructure the Focus of the EIS on Native Fish Recovery.

Of the four endangered fish species that historically existed in the Grand Canyon, only the humpback chub remains. Three of the native listed fish species have been eradicated from the Grand Canyon. Only the humpback chub remains, but its population numbers have dropped to perilously low levels. When evaluating the long-term experimental plan for the future operations at Glen Canyon Dam it is important that the information learned be applied to protecting and restoring the species and habitats in the Grand Canyon. It is clear from data collected by the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center that continuing business as usual will lead to negative impacts in the Grand Canyon. Therefore it is recommended that a new suite of operation options be included in the review in the EIS:

- * An evaluation of a natural flow regime operation scenario.
- * The implementation and re-establishment of a water temperature regime consistent with seasonal temperature variation for the Colorado River in Grand Canyon.
- * The implementation and re-establishment of seasonal sediment inputs into Grand Canyon at a level that would provide cover for native fish and provide for the build up of sands and silts necessary for building beaches and backwater habitats.
- * Aggressive non-native species control including plants, birds, and fish.

2. Impacts on Lake Powell and Glen Canyon

The anticipated management of the Colorado River includes a large probability that flow regimes will be reduced due to reduced snowpack and lowered runoff volume. This probability should be acknowledged in the EIS and addressed through alternative scenarios for evaluation of the impacts to the Grand Canyon environment. Changes in the operations of Glen Canyon Dam will have a direct and immediate impact on flow patterns. The long-term monitoring plan should address how this potential will be addressed. Specific recommendations include:

- * Identify potential flow regimes that may occur as a result of changing drought operation patterns at Glen Canyon Dam.
- * Identify potential changes in the elevation levels of Lake Powell and how this will potentially impact the limnological conditions in the reservoir and the resulting quantity and quality of releases to the Grand Canyon.

3. Long-Term Experimental Plan

The long term should provide the basis for each scientific study that is to be conducted in the Grand Canyon and in Lake Powell. Special interest science can be as bad as special interest decisions in that critical research and data collection is not collected, often at the loss of more important information. Specific actions that should be included in the EIS include:

- * Is the USGS the appropriate entity to run the science program in the Grand Canyon?
- * Identification and priority of research. It should be inherently clear and transparent as to how specific science programs are agreed to and the process to get timely data to decision-makers.
- * Adequacy of support to Native American tribes in protecting their resources in the Grand Canyon.

4. Adaptive Management Program

The Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program was administratively initiated when the Record of Decision was signed by Secretary of Interior Babbitt in the fall of 1996. The intent of the program was to build on the success of the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies and to more fully integrate operational decisions at the dam with the increasing scientific information. In October 2005 the U.S. Geological Survey's SCORE report on the success of the Adaptive Management Program was reviewed. The SCORE review did not reflect favorably on the Adaptive Management Program IF the intent was to meet the requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act and the intent of the EIS.

Of concern with the Adoption of a Long-Term Experimental Plan for the Future Operations of Glen Canyon Dam is that it appears that the SCORE report has not been taken into consideration or actions to resolve some of the primary scientific issues identified. The current set up of the Science Program and identified review process does not take into consideration that we cannot continue business as usual if we are to meet the requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act and the recovery of species and their habitats in the Grand Canyon.

The EIS scope should include the following:

- * An independent review of the existing Adaptive Management Program with recommendations of actions necessary to make it more effective.
- * A review of the current peer-review process and Scientific Advisory Program. The concept of "conflict of interest" should be addressed to the program head and the group involved in the review.
- * A revision of the membership organization for the Adaptive Management Program to provide balance between development and management interests and conservation interests. The current organization is unfairly tipped in the favor of water and power special interest groups.

The Grand Canyon Protection Act (1992) and the initial EIS on Glen Canyon Dam in 1996 provided a great opportunity for Reclamation to step forward and be a leader in the management of the Colorado River. The past ten years have not provided the information or the process that was envisioned in 1996 and needs to be reviewed and revised in the current EIS process.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

W. Reid White

139 Eagle Drive

Chapel Hill, NC 27517-8548

May all your trails be crooked, winding, lonesome, dangerous -
leading to the most amazing view...
where something strange, more beautiful and more full of wonder
than your deepest dreams awaits.

Edward Abbey

From: <wrusho@comcast.net>
To: <GCDExpPlan@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 13, 2007 2:11 PM
Subject: Glen Canyon Dam releases

Sir or Ms: Adjusting the release flows from Glen Canyon to accommodate the Law of the River and subsequent agreements--such as keeping Lake Powell and Lake Mead equal percentagewise--is incompatible with upgrading the ecological balance in the Grand Canyon. Surge flows have been tried, with great hoopla, in an effort to rebuild beaches and fish habitat, but the quick beneficial results soon disappear as the sand migrates back into the river.

The fact conveniently overlooked is the corosive effect of clear water on river deposits. So long as clear water is the only output from the dam, the corosive effects will continue. We have learned that the silt and sand inputs from the Paria and Little Colorado are too small to causet any long-term beneficial effects.

The only answer is a large and continual transfer of silt and sand from Lake Powell to the Grand Canyon. Since most of the silt is in the upper portion of the reservoir, a pipeline or tunnel must be constructed to convey this silt to the dam and beyond. A pipeline could be laid in the bottom of Lake Powell extending to the dam's outlet tubes, where the discharge could be made. The question is: Can the outlet tube linings withstand the erosion of continual silt passage? Or can some other outlet be devised?

A tunnel from say Hite to Lee's Ferry would be much more expensive, but would maintain the 15 mile trout fishery below the dam.

Either a sediment pipeline or tunnel would rebuild beaches, but it would probably not do much to warm the river adequately for the promotion of endangered fishes. Yet it would discourage exotic fish species, like trout, that prefer clear water.

Implicit in all of this is the effect on Lake Mead of additional sediment input. It would shorten the life of the Mead, but it would help the fish habitat which now suffers from shortage of nutrients.

Other than removing the dam and Lake Powell, there is no perfect solution. The Bureau of Reclamation has done everything it can without the more drastic sediment pipeline or tunnel.

And, of course, there would be engineering problems galore. A challenge indeed!

--

W.L. Bud Rusho
5299 Gurene Dr.
Salt Lake City, UT 84117
801 277-6730

From: "Wesley Christiansen" <christiansen@dixie.edu>
To: <GCDExpPlan@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 16, 2007 10:52 AM

There are thousands of miles of river for "native species" the 15 miles below Glen Canyon dam provides a great fishery for people. and the native species have done well and survived here since the dam was put in. The only drop in native fish populations has been because of the results of scientific experiments. Leave this area alone and it will thrive.

Wes Christiansen
wes kath@msn.com

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

— Comment Card —

COMMENTS DUE BY WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2007

PLEASE PRINT

Date: 1/30/07

Name: Wilbert Odem Title (if applicable): Dr.

Telephone: 928-774-7005 Fax: _____

Organization/Business (if applicable): _____ E-Mail: wilbert.odem@nav.edu

Address: 3706 N. Colton Ranch Rd.

City: Flagstaff State: Az Zip: 86001

Yes, I would like to be added to your mailing list: E-Mail US Mail

The Bureau of Reclamation is seeking public comment on the adoption of a Long-Term Experimental Plan for the future operation of Glen Canyon Dam and other associated management activities. Your input on the scope of the project and the issues and alternatives that should be analyzed is greatly appreciated. Please write legibly.

If does not appear that a range of dam de-commissioning scenarios is intended or envisioned in this effort. If endangered species and sediment transport (beach loss/rebuilding) are truly concerns, then it is remiss to not look at dam de-commissioning. The need for such an honest + thorough evaluation is inevitable. Please consider including it in the scope - if we don't then we're continuing to ignore the proverbial elephant in the room.

Please submit your comments in the space provided, fold the card in half, tape the edges, and mail the completed card back to:
Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region, Attention: UC-402, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138-1147.
Comments must be received by February 28, 2007.

From: "WILLIAM C THORNTON" <cactusworld@msn.com>
To: <GCDExpPlan@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 26, 2007 11:09 AM
Subject: Colorado River Ecosystem

February 26, 2007

Mr. Rick Gold

Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation

Upper Colorado Region

Attn: UC-402

125 South State St

Salt Lake City, Utah 84138-1147

Dear Mr. Gold: In my opinion the Long Term Plan for the Colorado River Ecosystem must address mechanisms to:

- Restore flow regimes to properly transport the sediment and nutrients within Grand Canyon, when and where it belongs. The reduction in size and distribution of beaches, a result of Dam operations, has had significant impacts on downstream ecology and on associated recreational use.

- Restore the seasonally variable water temperature in the main stem of the Colorado River through Grand Canyon.

- Implement a restoration and recovery program for the Colorado River corridor in Grand Canyon that includes the recovery of all species known to be native to Grand Canyon prior to the operation of Glen Canyon Dam. Only four of eight native fish species continue to exist in the Grand Canyon. The Humpback Chub will fail to recover and likely go extinct if action isn't taken to reverse the degradation posed by Glen Canyon Dam

- Implement a non-native eradication program to minimize alien species in the Grand Canyon river corridor with a priority on those that prey on, compete with, or otherwise impair the health of native plants and animals.

Thank you for your consideration.

William C. Thornton

2955 E. Chula Vista Dr.

Tucson, AZ 85716

E-mail: Cactusworld@msn.com

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

— Comment Card —

COMMENTS DUE BY WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2007

PLEASE PRINT

Date: _____

Name: WILLIAM H. WOLVERTON Title (if applicable): _____

Telephone: 435-826-4877 Fax: _____

Organization/Business (if applicable): _____ E-Mail: CANYONRAT@SC.INTERNET.NET

Address: Box 393

City: ESCALANTE State: UT Zip: 84726

Yes, I would like to be added to your mailing list: E-Mail US Mail

The Bureau of Reclamation is seeking public comment on the adoption of a Long-Term Experimental Plan for the future operation of Glen Canyon Dam and other associated management activities. Your input on the scope of the project and the issues and alternatives that should be analyzed is greatly appreciated. Please write legibly.

Why squander still MORE precious tax dollars "studying" this abomination that has already been studied to death with nothing gained from it? The Grand Canyon is still starved for sediment and always will be, the river ecosystem with its endangered native fish is a disaster and always will be, and the sediment continues to fill in Glen Canyon and always will, as long as the dam remains. There is only one viable solution to the problems caused by the dam in Glen Canyon: remove it or breach it and let the river flow free. All else is nothing but tinkering with a dying patient that cannot be saved in any possible way, no more than Band Aids that will never stop the hemorrhaging. The sediment WILL have its way with the reservoir in Glen Canyon, whether it only takes a hundred years or five hundred – nothing can stop it and nothing can save the reservoir from its ultimate fate of becoming one vast mudflat. I have spent much of the last almost 28 years visiting various canyons of the Glen Canyon system, and have seen all too well the staggering amounts of sediment that has accumulated in them. I have also seen just how quickly it washes away when the reservoir is low.

There can be no question that the Bureau of Reclamation knows very well what the future of this reservoir is. It is long past time that they and all other concerned interests face up to the reality of the temporary nature of it and figure out how to get along without it. Future generations are going to have to eventually anyway, so we might as well start now while there is still some reasonable possibility that a majority of the sediment will wash out of Glen Canyon. And while we are at it let's start figuring out how to dredge it out of the Mead reservoir, since the vast majority of it there comes into it in just one place that is much more accessible than the myriad of inaccessible places that it is accumulating in Glen Canyon. And once the dredging starts it will become very obvious just what the true cost of relying on the Colorado River for water really is.

I realize that I am wasting my time writing this, and that these comments will be summarily dismissed as no more than the ravings of another environmentalist crackpot. But that's OK. He who laughs last always laughs best, and I WILL have the last laugh, even though it will be from the grave.



William H. Wolverton
Box 393
Escalante, UT 84726