

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**PUBLIC MEETING**  
**US DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**  
  
**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**  
**Overview and Opportunity for Public Comment**

Held at the Henderson Convention Center  
200 South Water Street  
Henderson, Nevada

On Tuesday, April 3, 2007  
6:15 p.m.

Reported by: Lori M. Judd, CCR #233, RMR

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES:

Terrance J. Fulp, Ph.D  
Area Manager, Boulder Operations Office

Nan Yoder  
Amber Cunningham  
Boulder Canyon Operations Office

Public Attendees as indicated on  
Sign-in sheet

\* \* \* \* \*

1 HENDERSON, NEVADA, APRIL 3, 2007, 6:15 p.m.

2 \* \* \* \* \*

3 (Introduction and overview by Nan Yoder.)

4 (Project presentation by Terry Fulp.)

5 QUESTION BY MR. DANOS: Have you had  
6 any requests to extend the comment period yet?

7 MR. FULP: No, we have not. We are  
8 hopeful to stay on schedule, by the way. We will  
9 certainly listen to such requests.

10 (Continuation of presentation by Mr. Fulp.)

11 (Question and answer session as follows:)

12 MR. FULP: Are there any other  
13 questions that we could take and answer?

14 QUESTION BY MR. DANOS: What was the  
15 basis of the assumption that the YDP would not be  
16 operated for any of the alternatives?

17 MR. FULP: That's a good question.

18 Well, we had a couple things in mind.  
19 The primary one was we wanted to look at kind of the  
20 worst case impact, particularly to Lake Mead. And so  
21 those bypass flows coming from the Wellton-Mohawk  
22 return flows, we assumed those would happen every  
23 year. And that in some sense gives us a worst case,  
24 at least with regard to that decision at Lake Mead.  
25 That's water leaving the system, which would lower

1 the lake and continue those types of impacts. So  
2 that was primarily a worst case.

3 Now a couple of alternatives assume  
4 some other things can happen to replace those bypass  
5 flows, primarily due to conservation, conservation  
6 mechanisms, but none of them assumed that the YDP  
7 would operate. Again, in order to get to that  
8 maximum impact of water leaving the system.

9 Any other questions?

10 QUESTION BY MR. BARON: Alex Baron,  
11 UNLV. Which models are used to predict the inflows?

12 MR. FULP: It's actually a pretty  
13 simple technique that we have used on the system for  
14 quite awhile. We take the 100 year historical  
15 record, and we just sample out of that record and so  
16 we do not create any future inflow sequences that  
17 have not been seen in 100 year records and we also  
18 don't create any magnitudes that we have not seen in  
19 the 100 year historical record.

20 With that technique, what we did do in  
21 this EIS, this draft is we did a sensitivity analysis  
22 and it's in an appendix, so if you are interested in  
23 that, we did look at three other alternative  
24 techniques of looking at future inflows that do, in  
25 fact, generate sequences we have not seen in the past

1 and magnitudes we have not seen in the past and we  
2 did that again as a sensitivity analysis on the  
3 hydrologic resource. We did not continue that all  
4 the way through all the resource analyses.

5 Does that help a little bit? So one  
6 of the key pieces of information that the three  
7 scenarios used, the real key one was we looked at  
8 tree ring construction data and used it in a couple  
9 of ways to generate that.

10 Any others?

11 QUESTION BY LESLIE JAMES: Leslie  
12 James, from CREDA. I have a pretty small question.

13 I'm interested in why the reference in  
14 a couple of places to the beach/habitat building  
15 flows -- BHBF -- because I don't believe the analysis  
16 assumed any specific BHBF, and given the controversy  
17 and the current state of discussion -- I just came  
18 from an all-day meeting on that today -- I was  
19 interested in why reference was included on that.

20 MR. FULP: Well, let me clear up  
21 something and make sure that I explain what we really  
22 did do and then perhaps we didn't disclose that in a  
23 reasonable or understandable way.

24 MS. JAMES: I didn't understand it.

25 MR. FULP: What we have assumed is in

1 Lake Powell operation for all the alternatives, that  
2 BHBF would be made under those triggering, I'll call  
3 them criteria that were put in place in about 1997.  
4 So it's at those high reservoir levels of Lake  
5 Powell, that's that criteria that's been built into  
6 here and boy, Leslie, if you ask me to remember the  
7 details of that, I would probably not.

8 MS. JAMES: Not the sentiment  
9 triggering criteria, but the lake level triggering  
10 criteria?

11 MR. FULP: Yes, the lake level, high  
12 level. It's essentially near spill avoidance, if  
13 Powell is near spill avoidance, it's triggered.

14 Now there's a bunch of rules on  
15 forecast, and you understand that. I don't remember  
16 all the details, but it's at that spill avoidance  
17 level.

18 MS. JAMES: We'll probably make some  
19 comment to clarify that, because we just heard  
20 yesterday, in fact, that there is not yet a science  
21 plan that's been put in place to even be able to do  
22 another one of those and there's been a lot of  
23 discussions about utilizing other triggering criteria  
24 besides just sediment triggers, like economic  
25 criteria and other criteria. So it's still very

1 controversial.

2 MR. FULP: I understand that. And I'll  
3 only make one other clarification, I think you know  
4 this, but for everyone else's benefit, those two, if  
5 that happened would not be modeled with those  
6 triggering criteria that are in place in the model.  
7 Those were not done at the high level spill avoidance  
8 level. They were more experimental, I guess is maybe  
9 the proper term.

10 MS. JAMES: That helps clarify for me  
11 because I didn't understand that the triggering  
12 criteria you were talking about were the high levels,  
13 not the sediment triggering criteria that the 1996  
14 and 2004. Okay, thank you.

15 MR. FULP: Correct, we did not do that.  
16 That should be detailed, and it's probably buried in  
17 Appendix A, but I can direct you to Appendix A and  
18 don't worry about all the other flub, but hone in on  
19 the BHBS and it will explain those exactly.

20 Any other questions?

21 Okay. Then I think we get to sit down  
22 and let you, if you would like to make a public  
23 comment to us, we'll capture it, record it, and  
24 essentially listen to you all.

25 (No public comments.)

1 MR. FULP: Well, okay, we've got plenty  
2 of time. Don't feel pressured.

3 MS. YODER: If you didn't want to speak  
4 right now, you can express whatever comments you have  
5 to us in writing. And again, you can fax those  
6 comments to us, e-mail them to us, or if you want to  
7 use the good old postal mail, you can do those as  
8 well. And again, the close of the comment period is  
9 April 30th, so we're hoping to hear from everyone.

10 We put a lot of effort into the  
11 document and putting it out there for your  
12 consideration and we're sure that you will have a lot  
13 of things to share with us as a result. And that is  
14 the end of our presentation tonight.

15 So we thank you all for being here and  
16 if there is any other questions, we will be staying  
17 here through 9:00, should anyone show up late after  
18 having done their civic duty and voted, okay. Thank  
19 you very much.

20 (The floor remained open for public  
21 comment until 9:00 p.m., whereupon the proceedings  
22 concluded.)  
23  
24  
25

## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2  
3 STATE OF NEVADA )  
4 ) ss.  
5 COUNTY OF CLARK )

6 I, Lori M. Judd, a duly commissioned Notary  
7 Public, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby  
8 certify:

9 That I reported the foregoing  
10 proceedings on Tuesday, April 3, 2007, commencing at  
11 the hour of 6:30 p.m.

12 That I thereafter transcribed my said  
13 shorthand notes into typewriting and that the  
14 typewritten transcript of said proceedings are a  
15 complete, true and accurate transcription of my said  
16 shorthand notes taken down at said time.

17 I further certify that I am not a  
18 relative or employee of an attorney or counsel  
19 involved in said action, nor a person financially  
20 interested in said action.

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
22 my hand and affixed my official seal in my office in  
23 the County of Clark, State of Nevada, this 30th day  
24 of April, 2007.  
25

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LORI M. JUDD  
CCR #233, RMR