

7

Ms. Jayne Harkins  
Bureau of Reclamation  
P.O. Box 61470  
Boulder City, Nevada 89006-1470

March 25, 2002

RE: Review of Existing Coordinated Long-Range Operating Criteria for Colorado River Reservoirs, Federal Register Notice Vol. 67 No. 44 Wednesday March 6, 2002.

I do not want my name or address for public review.

The comment period due March 29, 2002. Comments are being sought regarding the if a change to the Operating Criteria is warranted. Reclamation is also requesting feedback to determine if a public meeting should be held to solicit comments from the public to revise the Operating Criteria.

At this time due to the lack of information I cannot make a reasonable comment on this matter at this time but would like to in the future.

I have several concerns regarding the issue as in this Federal Register Notice there is mention of the Mexican Water Treaty, the Colorado River Compact, and the Arizona v. California. In reading the Federal Register it is not clear what the true intent of the Operating Criteria is to be. There is mention of a "Report of the Committee on Probabilities and Test Studies to the Task Force on Operating Criteria for the Colorado River", I have not been afforded a copy of this report. It appears historic stream flows, uses; future depletions are to be examined, as well as storage, releases and spills. Does this mean the Mexican Treaty is going to be rewritten? Is the water storage of Colorado in jeopardy of California, Arizona and other states wanting more water so they can ensure water to keep their gulf courses green? What is the hidden agenda for this to be Fast Tracked with only twenty-six days to respond and no information provided even when requested? To make the claim, "Don't worry your pretty little heads about this water, our attorney's will take care of it for you", is a fatal flaw, especially with consideration of Colorado water law.

There is misinformation being posted on the World Web Internet which includes a claim of Dawson Reservoir being in this area. Dawson Reservoir does not exist. What other things are being misrepresented? Is this what we have to look forward to with this Mexican Treaty, Arizona v. California?

Have the Indian Nations been included in these actions? Provide me with a list of all Indian Nations involved in this process as well as a complete list of all that are part of this working group. Include all non-governmental groups (NGO's) who are involved.

At this time I am unable to make a responsible comment on account of information not provided me nor is it reasonably accessible. I am aware of other citizens who would have liked to comment on this matter. Public comment should be extended and information made more available. Regarding the public meeting I was told it would be one day in the future held in the State of

**Nevada. If you are seeking public comment shouldn't there be more than one meeting in one state to provide reasonable access to the public, might this involve meetings in several locations throughout the states most affected? Or has this agenda already been decided in the backroom?**