

COMMENT LETTER

RESPONSES

SEP. 8. 2000 3:40PM MWD

NO. 236 P. 5

- cont'd | "efficient" should be inserted before "generation" in the sentence quoted above which is on Page 3.3-10. Please provide a quantitative definition for "efficient" as it is used in connection with generation on pages 3.3-10, 3.3-23, and Figure 3.3-10.
- 10 | 8. Insert the phrase "the Yuma Project," before the phrase "the IID" as the All American Canal delivers water to the Yuma Project as well as IID and CVWD according to <http://dataweb.usbr.gov/html/allamcanal.html#general>. (Page 3.4-6, paragraph 4, line 8)
- 11 | 9. Revise the phrase "Since 1996" to "In 1996 and 1997"; and insert the phrase "normal apportionment" and delete the word "entitlement" before the phrase "due to determinations by the Secretary" to be more precise. Reclamation's annual report entitled, "Compilation of Records in Accordance With Article V of the Decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona v. California Dated March 9, 1964" indicates that California's net diversions of Colorado River water totaled about 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet less in 1998 and 1999 than that indicated in the DEIS. (Page 3.4-7, paragraph 1, line 3)
- 12 | 10. Insert the word "normal" before the word "apportionment" to be more precise. (Page 3.4-7, paragraph 3, line 1).
- 13 | 11. Revise the word "entitlement" to the phrase "normal apportionment" to be more precise. (Page 3.4-7, paragraph 3, line 3).
- 14 | 12. The DEIS includes the phrase "for about 700,000 acre-feet of the approximate 2 million af of water that MWD currently delivers." (Page 3.4-7, paragraph 3, lines 6-7) In calendar year 2000 with the initial filling of Diamond Valley Lake, Metropolitan forecasts total deliveries of 2.7 million acre-feet to its service area, the Hayfield groundwater basin, and to Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District for recharge of the Upper Coachella groundwater basin under agreements with those two agencies, with 1.4 million acre-feet of the total being deliveries from the State Water Project. Over the calendar year period 1990-99, Metropolitan delivered between 1.5 and 2.6 million acre-feet.
- 15 | 13. Revise the word "legal" to the word "normal" to be more precise. (Page 3.4-8, paragraph 2, line 2).
- 16 | 14. Revise the number "5.3" to "5.2". (Page 3.4-8, paragraph 3, line 2) Reclamation's annual report entitled, "Compilation of Records in Accordance With Article V of the Decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona v. California Dated March 9, 1964" indicates that California's net diversions have not reached 5.3 million acre-feet in the last 10 years after accounting for unmeasured return flows.
- 17 | 15. Insert the phrase "those in place by" before the number "2015" (Page 3.5-7, paragraph 2, line 3) as the sixth paragraph on this page includes this language.

10: The suggested edit was made.

11: The last sentence of the fifth paragraph in Section 3.4.3.3 has been changed to read as follows - Since 1996, California has received as much as 800,000 af above its annual 4.4 maf normal apportionment due to determinations by the Secretary of surplus conditions on the Colorado River through the AOP process.

12: The suggested edit was made.

13: The suggested edit was made.

14: The last part of the last sentence of the seventh paragraph in Section 3.4.3.3 has been revised to reflect the information provided.

15: The suggested edit was made.

16: The suggested change was made.

17: The referenced paragraph has been removed from the document.

COMMENT LETTER

RESPONSES

SEP. 8. 2000 3:41PM MWD

NO. 236 P. 6

18. Considering the data presented in Table 3.5-7, revise the word "almost" to "about" and revise the phrase "California Alternatives" to "Alternative". (Page 3.5-24, paragraph 4, lines 4-5)
17. Revise the sentences, "The Tribe maintains a claim to additional lands and reserved water rights in California, which will likely be settled soon recognizing the Tribe's right to additional reserved water rights from the Colorado River in the amount of 3,022 acre-feet. The Tribe and State of California have agreed upon a settlement of that claim which is presently before the US Supreme Court for settlement." to "In its June 19, 2000 Opinion, the US Supreme Court accepted the Special Master's uncontested recommendation and approved the proposed settlement of the dispute respecting the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation. Under the settlement the Tribe is awarded the lesser of an additional 3,022 acre-feet of water or enough water to supply the needs of 468 acres." (Page 3.14-7, paragraph 3, lines 18-23) Revise the phrase, "The attached tables incorporate the proposed" to "The above tables incorporate the". (Page 3.14-7, paragraph 3, line 23)
18. In Table 3.14-1, in row 11 labeled "M&I Priority" please review the phrase "(should be 18,135)" with the values "18,145" in the columns "Likely Future without GRIC" and "With GRIC Settlement" for that row. In row 12 labeled "Indian Allocation (AkChin)(minus losses)" please review the "1" found in the "With GRIC Settlement" column. (Page 3.14-12)
19. In Table 3.14-2 in the row labeled "Colorado River -- Yuma Mesa and Wellton Mohawk", the columns from left to right "Likely Future without GRIC", "Total Water", and "With GRIC Settlement" show the value of "68,400". However, the next column to the right, "Total Water" shows a value of "64,800". It appears that this value should be "68,400" as it is the 68,400 value which when added to the second row value of "801,574" in the "With GRIC Settlement" column sums to "869,974" in the column to the right labeled "Total Water" in the second row. Should "GAGRD" in the fifth row label be "CAGRD", the acronym for the Central Arizona Groundwater Replenishment District? (Page 3.14-2)
20. It is stated that "At that elevation Lake Mead has a nominal 'live capacity' of 27,377,000 acre-feet and an active capacity of 17,353,000 acre-feet above elevation 1083 feet msl, the minimum elevation for power generation." (Attachment A, page 1, paragraph 3, line 8) It is also stated that "The minimum water surface elevation for efficient power generation is 1083 feet." (Page 3.3-23, paragraph 1, lines 4-5) Please clarify whether the word "efficient" should be inserted before "generation" in the sentence quoted above in Attachment A.
21. Revise the word "Protection" to "Policy". (Attachment H, Six States Alternative, page 2, paragraph 5, line 2) The same comment applies for the California Alternative, and the Shortage Protection Alternative.

18: Comment noted. This section has been revised to incorporate information resulting from modeling conducted for the FEIS.

19: We agree the second subparagraph under paragraph 3.14.2.6 needs to be revised to recognize the Supreme Court's recent opinion. However, in revising the paragraph, we relied primarily on the suggested rewording from the Ten Tribes Partnership. See response comment 53-14.

20: In Table 3.14-1, San Carlos Apache, M&I Priority, 18,145 acre-feet per year is listed as the M&I allocation under both the future with the GRIC settlement and the future without the GRIC settlement. This volume of water is based on the CAP Simulation Study and the draft EIS for the CAP Reallocation, dated June 2000. A note is provided in Table 3.14-1 stating that 18,135 AF per year is the volume of water which should be listed because that volume was allocated in the legislation. A footnote was written in the FEIS to explain the two numbers. The "1" in Table 3.14-1, San Carlos Apache, Indian Reallocation (Ak Chin) (minus losses), will be corrected to read "30,800".

21: The quantity and acronym have been corrected.

22: The sentence referred to is in Attachment C of the FEIS. It has been modified as suggested.

23: The correction will be made.

COMMENT LETTER

SEP 8, 2000 3:41PM MWD

NO. 236 P. 7

- 24
22. Revise "August-July" to "July-July". (Attachment I, Draft: Last Revision, August 28, 2000, page I-11, first table, row 7)
- 25
23. Please expand Table 6, "Hoover Dam Elevation and Output", Attachment N, to include elevations 1083 and 1050 feet.

- 24: This correction has been made.
- 25: Median reservoir elevations, which were used for the power analysis, remain above 1083 feet throughout the period of analysis. Therefore, elevations 1083 and 1050 feet were not included in the table.