



Comment on the Study

1 message

Mon, Apr 15, 2013 at 11:06 AM

To: ColoradoRiverBasinstudy@usbr.gov

Thanks for extending an opportunity to comment on this extensive piece of work. My comment relates to geographic scope of the analysis and solutions that reduce demand.

Most portions of the upper and lower basin states that are dependent on water from the Colorado River have semi-arid climates. Even with the deeply subsidized water projects developed by the US Bureau of Reclamation, we are collectively approaching the supply limits of water that the Colorado River can deliver to serve future growth.

In simple terms, it will continue to cost more to accommodate people and businesses that want to move to the upper and lower basin states because water is scarce.

There are other nearby States with declining population and business activity that do not have this natural resource constraint and actively seek growth. My recommendation is to broaden set of solutions to include incentives or benefits to encourage population and business activity to select other locations with fewer natural resource constraints.

Accommodating future population and business growth in any desired location need not be a sacrosanct mandate. This study infers that it is sacrosanct. HUD, the SBA and other federal and regional economic development entities should be invited to brainstorm a wider solution set in concert with other states that seek growth.

Maybe this idea is not attractive to an individual upper or lower basin state, but the US government should be focusing on what good for the country. So, expand your perspective beyond the basin states when considering solutions to the Colorado River water resource constraint.

Jean Townsend

