

OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED		
OCT 29 2012		
October 25, 2012		
REPLY:	YES	NO
IN-O. COPY TO:		
DATE	INITIAL	TO
		Signe

J. Signe Snortland, Reclamation Environmental Specialist
Bureau of Reclamation
Dakotas Area Office,
PO Box 1017, Bismarck ND 5850

Dear J. Signe Snortland,

I am writing as a student attending the University of Colorado Boulder, I submit the following comments regarding the proposed action for the Arkansas Valley Conduit Long-Term Excess Capacity Master Contract. Thank you for taking the time to review my comments of the proposed project and alternative actions.

After reading the drafted EIS I have drawn a few conclusions. I support the overall goal of the project to provide people with a long-term plan of quality drinking water supply. It is just unsafe to have people consume natural contaminants from their current drinking water supply. The idea of proposed project split into three components AVC, interconnect and master contract is a great approach to meet the future demand. I find that six of the seven alternative actions share common elements of the proposed project but different options. The data and calculations for the proposed project and alternative actions were clearly defined in the appendices. I still have concerns about the EIS and felt that some things were overlooked. I am unable to know alternatives that existed before the screening process I feel that one key alternative was left out. The alternative action was to install treatment facility to treat the groundwater but was thrown out because of how much it would cost to deal with the naturally occurring contaminates. If that alternative action were included in the EIS it would give the audience an understanding maybe why exactly it was not included and maybe some perspective. These contaminates are naturally occurring and travel through groundwater. Groundwater travels from high head to low head. Since water is traveling through the mountains is it likely that the contaminated groundwater will travel to lower elevations and make its way into rivers which people downstream will have to deal with. Could the action of pumping and treating existing water supply be a better option to treat contaminates now where the locations of contamination are known. Opposed to deal with the naturally occurring contaminates in the future when it begins impact another regions drinking water supply. If you continue to carry through with the proposed action

I suggest to implement a program that will use monitoring wells to monitor the level of naturally occurring contaminants portion. The data could eventually help with future planning to pump and treat groundwater when it may become a problem again. I still stand by the goal of providing clean drinking water to this region but still feel that the naturally occurring contamination of the aquifer is being neglected when it should be treated now before it can spread over a larger area and dealt with later. Thank you again for taking the time to read my comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael Wetterau".

Michael Wetterau
460 South 41st Street
Boulder, CO 80305