

COLORADO RIVER INTERIM GUIDELINES FOR LOWER BASIN SHORTAGES
AND COORDINATED OPERATIONS FOR LAKE POWELL AND LAKE MEAD

- - - - -

KEY ASPECTS OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC MEETING

Q&A SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona
April 4, 2007
6:17 p.m.

REPORTED BY:
RABIN' MONROE, RMR, CR
CERTIFIED REPORTER
CR #50653

PREPARED FOR:
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

(COPY)



3030 North Central Avenue
Suite 1102
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

T 602.264.2230
888.529.9990
F 602.264.2245

www.griffinreporters.com

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

PUBLIC MEETING

1
2
3 BE IT REMEMBERED that the Public Meeting was taken
4 before RABIN' MONROE, RMR, CRR, Certified Reporter #50653,
5 in and for the County of Maricopa, State of Arizona, on
6 Wednesday, April 4, 2007, commencing at 6:17 p.m., at the
7 PHOENIX AIRPORT MARRIOTT, 1101 North 44th Street, Buckhorn
8 Room, Phoenix, Arizona.

9
10
11 A P P E A R A N C E S

12
13 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION:

14 TERRY FULP
15 NAN YODER
16 ROBERT ZOBIA
17 GREGG ROY
18 JAYNE HARKINS
19 CAROL ERWIN
20 AMBER CUNNINGHAM
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3 (Presentation by Terry Fulp.)

4 TERRY FULP: If there's any other questions, we'd
5 be glad to answer them, and if not, we're gonna turn it over
6 to see if you have any formal comments.

7 Yes, sir.

8 PLACIDO DOS SANTOS: Saw that there was
9 consultation with Mexico.

10 TERRY FULP: Yeah.

11 PLACIDO DOS SANTOS: And I was wondering if the
12 results of that consultation -- consultation are public.
13 Can we learn what they said?

14 TERRY FULP: They -- certainly we can provide the
15 materials we presented. In terms of their comments, they
16 also have been asked to submit formal comments. Those will
17 obviously be published and everyone can see those. But at
18 this point we've not planned to make these meetings, what's
19 been discussed, exactly available. We can make our
20 materials available to you, sir.

21 NAN YODER: Can you --

22 TERRY FULP: I'm sorry. Could we have your name?

23 PLACIDO DOS SANTOS: I'm sorry. I'm Placido dos
24 Santos with the Arizona Water Institute.

25 TERRY FULP: Yeah, that's a very good question.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Might -- if you don't mind, I might just try to explain
2 something there, make sure it's very clear to us.

3 This is a U.S.-only action. The Secretary of the
4 Interior is only adopting these -- this proposed action
5 would only adopt it for U.S. users. It would not extend to
6 Mexico.

7 Now, in the draft EIS we made some modeling
8 assumptions with regard to how Mexico might share in
9 shortages, but that's essentially what they are, is
10 assumptions, modeling assumptions. We've certainly in our
11 consultations with Mexico explained that to them, explained
12 what we've assumed, you know, and explained all the stuff
13 we've talked to you about -- about tonight.

14 But the point I really want to make sure is clear
15 is there's a separate, parallel process through the State
16 Department and the International Boundary of Water
17 Commission that is dealing with how Mexico might in fact
18 incur water reductions under the treaty. It's not -- would
19 not be done in this process.

20 Does that make -- if that makes sense.

21 Any other questions?

22 ROBERT S. LYNCH: There are, however, assumptions
23 in the Seven Basin States Alternative with regard to
24 shortage-sharing by Mexico.

25 TERRY FULP: That's correct. And we, by the way,

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 adopted those assumptions for this model.

2 Now, the key I want to make sure and state there
3 is those assumptions are consistent through all the
4 alternatives. We aren't changing between alternatives these
5 assumptions on how shortages will be shared.

6 So we -- again, because we're not doing that
7 analysis in this process, but ...

8 NAN YODER: And your name?

9 ROBERT S. LYNCH: I'm Bob Lynch. I'm an attorney
10 here in Phoenix, and among others I represent the Irrigation
11 and Electrical District Association of Arizona.

12 TERRY FULP: Great.

13 ROBERT S. LYNCH: I had a follow-up.

14 I've only had a chance to go through the executive
15 summary so far, but somewhere in the document do you explain
16 the differentiation among surpluses? There are four
17 surpluses on the river.

18 TERRY FULP: Yes.

19 ROBERT S. LYNCH: There's gonna be California,
20 Interim Surplus, RofA, and Treaty. And they use the same
21 word, but they use them in different contexts.

22 TERRY FULP: Yes, they do.

23 ROBERT S. LYNCH: And it can be very confusing.
24 I'm just wondering if -- if that sorting-out process is in
25 chapter two.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 TERRY FULP: It's not in two. It's sorted -- I
2 mean, there's some preliminary materials in one, chapter
3 one, introduction that addresses some of that, albeit maybe
4 not exactly to the detail you -- you propose there.

5 But in chapter four in the Water Delivery section,
6 we do look at the different types of surpluses, the
7 probability of them occurring, and try to make that
8 distinction particularly with regard to the idea of surplus
9 for the Treaty.

10 But again, we'd certainly accept any comment if --
11 if you thought that ought to be even made more clear. But
12 we've attempted to.

13 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Are there in these A1 -- in the
14 substantive alternatives are there off-ramps?

15 TERRY FULP: Off-ramps meaning if it didn't work
16 out there's --

17 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Well, you start -- the nice
18 thing about the annual operating plan is every year you're
19 taking another look at where you are and -- with updated
20 data.

21 You lock into some assumptions in 2008 for a
22 19-year period, you get four or five years down the road
23 this isn't working, what's the mechanism -- do you have to
24 go back through the same process? Is there an off-ramp? Is
25 there a t- -- is there a default position like going back to

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 the AOP and -- and bagging this whole thing?

2 TERRY FULP: Yeah ...

3 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Is that -- is that cranked into
4 any of these alternatives?

5 TERRY FULP: It's not at this point.

6 A couple things to say there. I think the answer
7 to one of your questions, what would we have to do. Yes, if
8 we wanted to implement other guidelines, we'd have to go
9 back through a similar type of process.

10 I believe we're -- when that'll come out would
11 really be in the development of the guidelines. That would
12 be where that discussion would happen.

13 I'll look at any of my project team to -- to chime
14 in there if you think it's somewhat different.

15 But when we develop those guidelines, that's where
16 we would discuss that; are there off-ramps. If so, what are
17 they, how they work.

18 That allows me to stand on the thing that I've
19 probably forgotten, and that is we plan to publish some
20 draft guidelines in the final EIS so at least you can see
21 what -- what we're thinking before we go -- get all the way
22 to the record of decision.

23 Did that answer that?

24 NAN YODER: We actually --

25 TERRY FULP: I think he had his hand up first.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Sam?

2 SAM SPILLER: Sam Spiller, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
3 Service, Phoenix.

4 Could you discuss further, Terry, in regard to
5 just -- just what the parameters are regarding how Mexico
6 would share? That was mentioned earlier that they -- to use
7 the Basin States Alternative in regard to how they recommend
8 it?

9 TERRY FULP: Yes.

10 SAM SPILLER: Can you define more --

11 TERRY FULP: What it is? You bet.

12 These assumptions, again, are consistent between
13 all the five alternatives. What it basically does is come
14 up with a fixed percentage for each of the entities that
15 would share in the shortages. Now, that's essentially the
16 concept.

17 The way we came up with the numbers, or that this
18 proposal came up with the numbers, is a ratio of the
19 entities' apportioned value to the total delivery
20 apportioned value.

21 Give you an example. Mexico, 1.5 million
22 acre-feet is their allotment, and the total in the Lower
23 Basin States plus Mexico is nine million acre-feet. So in
24 the numerator is 1.5, the denominator is 9, and that equals
25 16.7 percent.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 If you substitute Nevada in the numerator, that's
2 a 300,000 over 9 million, that ends up being 3.3 percent.
3 And finally in -- Arizona is assumed to take the rest.

4 It's the -- that's essentially what you were
5 asking, Sam; is that right?

6 SAM SPILLER: (Inaudible response.)

7 TERRY FULP: Yeah. So the Mexico percentage
8 doesn't change no matter how big the shortage gets. It
9 turns out Nevada's percentage doesn't change no matter how
10 large the shortage gets.

11 But Arizona's is a little different, and it's a
12 little complicated, but the idea really is it -- the break
13 point is once all of Arizona's fourth priority has been
14 reduced to zero, there's a shift of the percentages, because
15 California now would come in under these assumptions and
16 start to share somewhat in the shortages.

17 So I know that's a little complicated. It's
18 listed in Appendix G. Is that right? Appendix G if you're
19 interested, in the front part of it, we explain those
20 shortage-sharing assumptions that have been made in more
21 detail. But I hope I addressed your question.

22 NAN YODER: You'll also find it in Chapter 4.3.

23 TERRY FULP: Yeah, probably is there, too, isn't
24 it? Okay.

25 VAL DANOS: Val Danos with AMWUA.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 I'm -- I'm a little confused. You spoke -- you
2 answered one of Bob's questions at the end you were talking
3 draft guidelines in the final EIS. I may be a little slow,
4 but wasn't the purpose of this EIS process to evaluate
5 guidelines for operation of the river under low-flow
6 conditions and the operation of the reservoirs so --

7 TERRY FULP: Yeah --

8 VAL DANOS: -- so what new guidelines -- I mean,
9 are we talking about different guidelines here or --

10 TERRY FULP: No. I didn't make it very clear.
11 Let me try again with you.

12 The -- this draft makes these key -- as I
13 mentioned, these key elements, and we're looking at the
14 differences of what the impacts would be if you determine
15 Lake Powell release, for instance, in a certain way. Right?
16 Similarly if you declare shortages in a certain way. That's
17 what we mean, and that's what this is evaluating.

18 Now, when we talk about the actual guidelines,
19 what I meant to say there were things, like Bob mentioned,
20 about off-ramps. Well, the modeling doesn't know anything
21 about that. This draft doesn't go as far as to say, "Hey,
22 what if by 2010 you wanted to do something different?"

23 That would be done when you implement actually the
24 record of decision and say:

25 "Here's how the guidelines will work. Here's

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 exactly how this prescribed element that we
2 just -- have just mentioned on Powell's release
3 and how that gets determined. Here's how it would
4 exactly work in practice."

5 So it's the same concept; it's just you gotta get
6 it down finally to say, "Here's exactly how it works."

7 Let me give you an example. Maybe that helps that
8 again. I know this is not very straightforward.

9 Lake Mead's operated on a calendar-year basis.
10 And similar if we had dropped it something similar to the
11 way the surplus guidelines works, you're doing your annual
12 operating plan in the fall of the year, ready to go at the
13 start of January.

14 Well, you don't want to wait till January to see
15 where Mead is, because your users need to know what their
16 water deliveries are going to be; right?

17 So you could say in the guidelines, "In August
18 we'll run our midterm operational model, project where Mead
19 will be on January 1st, and that come -- gets compared to
20 those trigger elevations." That's the guidelines.

21 The how it actually works is what we're talking
22 about, those nitty-gritty details that this level of
23 analysis doesn't need to know about and would only make it
24 even more cumbersome. But that's what we mean by the
25 guidelines.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Did that help any, sir?

2 VAL DANOS: Yes.

3 TERRY FULP: Yeah, sorry, it's ... I -- I know
4 that's a bit confusing.

5 Bob.

6 ROBERT S. LYNCH: When you get to the details, are
7 these the kinds of things that are gonna be sorted out in
8 the AOP process? Are we -- I mean, once you've established
9 the shortage criteria, we have surplus criteria, we have
10 interim surplus criteria, all of that affects what we
11 discuss at the end of the operating plan.

12 Should we assume, then, that once this process is
13 set and these criteria are in place that a lot of that
14 dialogue will be occurring in that same fashion?

15 TERRY FULP: Yeah, I think that dialogue will
16 still occur, to -- to answer your straightforward question,
17 but if we -- and again, we haven't written these guidelines
18 yet, so --

19 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Yeah.

20 TERRY FULP: I'm just supposing what they might
21 look like.

22 But much as our domestic surpluses are determined
23 now by this projected January 1st elevation, that's how --
24 what we run and show you in August, and we say, "If
25 Lake Powell is above 1125 or below 1125, it's a normal

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 condition."

2 Well, a similar type of guideline could be put in
3 place here that said, "Hey, if Lake Mead on January 1st at
4 or below 1075, there will be a shortage of X thousand
5 acre-feet."

6 We'd still have the dialogue, of course, because
7 it's an interactive process, but it would be more
8 prescriptive of applying the methodology that the guidelines
9 might outline.

10 Did that help?

11 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Yeah. I -- yeah, we've got
12 stops --

13 TERRY FULP: Yeah.

14 ROBERT S. LYNCH: -- and we talk about 'em, but
15 the stops would be automatic.

16 TERRY FULP: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

17 Yes.

18 GARY PARKER: Gary Parker with the Gila River
19 Indian Irrigation and Drainage District.

20 When you identified the different alternatives and
21 that you're going to after this comment period possibly
22 select parts of any or all of them, are you then going to
23 publish as part of the final EIS the model with those
24 modifications and all of those scenarios that go with that
25 final?

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 TERRY FULP: Certainly.

2 GARY PARKER: And that's going to be open for
3 public comment?

4 TERRY FULP: It would be open for comment, but
5 most likely we wouldn't have a set-aside comment period.
6 Point is we've got a pretty rapid turnaround there to get a
7 record of decision, and we certainly will take comments all
8 along the way, but particularly during that period of time.

9 NAN YODER: If I could just clarify. Certainly
10 when we notice availability of the final EIS there will be a
11 30-day comment period on that final document as is
12 prescribed for all of the NEPA documents. So that will be
13 available.

14 TERRY FULP: Thank you, Nan.

15 GARY PARKER: Could I ask a follow-up to that?

16 TERRY FULP: You bet. Sure.

17 GARY PARKER: If you have -- if you have that
18 final alternative, the preferred alternative, and you go
19 through that, are you also going to have the policy that
20 goes with it at that time? Because --

21 TERRY FULP: Like the guidelines we were just
22 talking about?

23 GARY PARKER: Right.

24 TERRY FULP: Yes. That's the goal --

25 GARY PARKER: They will be done?

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 TERRY FULP: -- is we will have draft guidelines
2 published in that final Environmental Impact Statement, yes.

3 GARY PARKER: Okay.

4 TERRY FULP: Very good question. Thank you.

5 Thanks, Nan.

6 Yes.

7 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Yeah, to clarify a little more,
8 you're gonna come out with the final EIS that'll have the
9 criteria -- and those are, shall we say, automatic stops,
10 elevation, certain things happen -- and draft guidelines.

11 How -- what process do you then envision using to
12 finalize the guidelines related to the criteria?

13 TERRY FULP: Well, again, based on the comments we
14 receive and the things we've heard, we would go through the
15 Department and we would finalize those guidelines in
16 anticipation to publish the record of decision, and I think
17 our goal would be we publish the final guidelines in the
18 decision. And the record of decision would essentially be
19 guidelines plus the other associated information that should
20 be disclosed at that time. And again, that's targeted for
21 December.

22 Okay. Any other questions? They were all very
23 good questions.

24 Well, with that, I think we'll --

25 VIKKI DEE BRADSHAW: I have one question. I'm

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 sorry.

2 TERRY FULP: No, not a problem.

3 VIKKI DEE BRADSHAW: Dee Bradshaw, Imperial
4 Irrigation District.

5 In the context of the Conservation Before Shortage
6 Alternative, since it is willing conservation, I assume that
7 there will be other areas that would be impacted other than
8 just, you know, Metropolitan Service Area and Southern
9 Nevada Water Authority Service Area.

10 How would you handle with that -- I mean, if that
11 is -- some element of that is part of the preferred
12 alternative, that would mean that the impacts would clearly
13 be addressed for maybe air quality or socioeconomics or
14 something of that nature.

15 TERRY FULP: That's a very good question. Because
16 we don't know who may want to participate in such a
17 voluntary program, it's very difficult to analyze impacts
18 today, and so we have I hope made it fairly clear in the
19 draft that we weren't able to do that. What we were looking
20 at are the impacts to the river corridor of this kind of --
21 of mechanism.

22 And what we'd anticipate is whenever in the future
23 willing sellers or leasers of water come forward and say,
24 "Hey, I want to conserve water and put it in Lake Mead,"
25 then whatever analyses we need to do at that time would get

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 done at that time.

2 And could be a State process more, as you are very
3 familiar with, and it could be very straightforward
4 depending on what the activity is. So we just can't predict
5 them, and so we -- we chose to -- to not try to analyze what
6 we couldn't forecast or even somewhat anticipate.

7 ROBERT S. LYNCH: Is part of the answer to her
8 question that to the extent that you create for short-end
9 purposes a market mechanism is then executed by nonfederal
10 entities, there is no federal action to analyze?

11 TERRY FULP: That's -- could certainly be the
12 case. Again, our goal here is to achieve our environmental
13 compliance for allowing the water to move around in the
14 system, to be put in Mead, taken out of Mead, and
15 corresponding reductions and increases in river flows and
16 any associated impacts of that.

17 And that really is our part in this action, is to
18 allow that to happen. And as Bob said, whatever's
19 appropriately needs to be done with at the time of the
20 activity is proposed, that's what we would have to happen.
21 Could very well be not the feds doing it.

22 Anything to add back there? Okay.

23 I have to look to the environmental compliance
24 folks here to be sure --

25 MITCH HAWS: Terry, Mitch Haws with the Bureau of

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Reclamation in the Phoenix area office.

2 I was asked by one of our local partners here:
3 Are you planning to give one of these meetings in
4 California? Or is there a reason why California's not on
5 the fact sheet?

6 TERRY FULP: We are not -- yeah, we are not
7 planning to. We didn't just over -- omit it by mistake.
8 The idea really was that from the perspective of these
9 critical elements and what we know about them -- and again,
10 saying that we don't know much about what a mechanism
11 might -- how it might want to be used, particularly with
12 regard to shortage -- the risk of California of sharing in
13 shortages is fairly -- is fairly low. Pretty low.

14 And again, due to the '68 Basin Project Act that
15 deemed essentially the fourth priority post-1968 water
16 rights in Arizona to be subservient to California
17 4.4 million acre-feet.

18 So given that, we felt that we could touch most
19 everyone that needs to through either this outreach and/or
20 through other meetings. And I think we're gonna be
21 successful doing that. At least we feel like -- for
22 instance, I'll be honest, some of the California agencies
23 have asked us to come out this month, and we -- IID's one,
24 in fact. And so we'll go there and deal with it that way.

25 Great. Any other -- any other questions?

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Yes.

2 VAL DANOS: What's the nature of these meetings in
3 California? Are they hearings or --

4 TERRY FULP: No, not at all. It's a request from
5 an agency for information, so -- and so we'll -- we'll do
6 that. We try to meet all the requests we get, so ...

7 They are not public hearings. They're just
8 requests for either additional information or some dialogue
9 in terms of explaining what the analysis is.

10 Okay. If that's the case, then we'll turn it back
11 over to you, and ask you if anyone would like to make a
12 public comment, please -- please do so.

13 NAN YODER: Okay. I have one.

14 Was anyone else going to be brave?

15 Okay. Well, then the spotlight is for
16 John Weisheit. And if you would like to get up and give us
17 your comment, we'd appreciate it.

18 JOHN WEISHEIT: My name is John Weisheit. I am
19 the conservation director of Living Rivers. Our base is in
20 Moab, Utah. I'm also a Colorado River Keeper, which has an
21 affiliation of an international organization called the
22 Water Keeper Alliance. As background, we submitted comments
23 as an organization during scoping called the One Dam
24 Solution, and it is a dam-decommissioning alternative to
25 decommission Glen Canyon Dam.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 The reason is to save water through the loss of
2 evaporation because of its existence, to also reduce
3 salinity in the Colorado River, and also to take care of the
4 environmental problems that are being -- that are occurring
5 in Grand Canyon National Park as the result of the
6 operations of Glen Canyon Dam.

7 This alternative was not -- was rejected in this
8 EIS. There is a -- a ban, congressional rider, against
9 federal funds being used to study -- to decommissioning of
10 Glen Canyon Dam, and that is why it was not considered as an
11 alternative.

12 I did bring some copies of our document. It's
13 outside the door on a chair on the right as you're leaving
14 if you care to look at it. I have extra copies in my
15 backpack, too, in case we run out.

16 These are my comments.

17 Models are only as valuable as the inputs they
18 receive. While the sophistication and effort put into these
19 projections are unprecedented and well-appreciated, the
20 models' inputs, however, fail to provide the public the
21 results necessary from which to make an informed decision as
22 to merits of any of the proposed alternatives.

23 Garbage in, garbage out, as they say, but this
24 garbage is so well masked that the people of the Colorado
25 River Basin are being asked to put the rubber stamp on a

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Katrina in the making. Those levees in New Orleans did not
2 hold, nor will the assumptions painted on what otherwise is
3 probably a very valuable model.

4 Scientists have been in agreement for decades that
5 the Colorado River flows through the past century were among
6 the wettest in 1200 years. Scientists are also in agreement
7 that the Colorado River Basin in modern times has warmed
8 upwards to two degrees during this period, and the trend is
9 expected to continue, compromising streamflows upwards of 20
10 percent in the next 50 years.

11 We're now in the longest drought in recorded
12 history. Things are changing all over the Basin, but not at
13 the Bureau of Reclamation.

14 The results produced by their inflated inputs are
15 based on historical streamflows that, while useful, in and
16 of themselves must not alone be used to gauge future runoff.

17 Failing to account for a more long-term historical
18 view of streamflow coupled with the climate change we are
19 already experiencing is tremendously misleading to the
20 public when developing shortage strategies.

21 Even under Reclamation's inflated scenario, this
22 system is headed for an imbalance of water use, namely an
23 oversupply of 400,000 acre-feet annually in the next 50
24 years. Corrected for a more accurate presentation --
25 representation of historical streamflow, this increases to

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 1.1 million-acre-feet.

2 But most importantly, we must begin to accept the
3 reality of climate change. Anyone can notice how the
4 reservoirs are dropping. A ten percent reduction on
5 long-term flow estimates show an annual deficit right now of
6 1.1 million acre-feet rising to 2.8 million acre-feet by
7 2060.

8 Adjust this to 20 percent, as an increasing number
9 of scientists are recommending, and we're looking at a
10 2.6 million -- million acre-feet deficit now, and nearly
11 4 million acre-feet in 50 years.

12 We're at ground zero tonight. Phoenix, Chandler,
13 Tucson are not going to be protected by token changes in
14 reservoir operations or even its ground-water banking
15 Arizona is first in line for cuts, and there is no plan or
16 how -- for how the state will survive if the rosy inputs put
17 into this model evaporate away as Lakes Powell and Mead drop
18 lower and lower.

19 The public is quite fortunate that the National
20 Research Council has completed its recent Colorado River
21 Report at this time. It reiterates the warnings that have
22 yet found their way into the assumptions used by this model.
23 We certainly hope these changes in the final EIS will
24 present a more realistic view of what the future may hold.

25 And the public would also benefit from a more

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 comprehensive presentation of what the real benefits are to
2 these minimal dam operational changes it is being asked to
3 support.

4 Chart 4.3, dash, 26 and 27 illustrate that a
5 significant amount of water savings, at least in terms of
6 increased levels for Lake Mead, occur not because of new
7 operating plans that are the focus of these documents, but
8 the results of anticipated but as yet mostly undetermined
9 water-conservation activities.

10 It's already clear in looking at the plotted data
11 represented from the 50th percentile the net volume of
12 stored water in Lake Powell and Mead is greater under the No
13 Action Alternative than what the Basin States -- States hope
14 to implement.

15 Reclamation must present a comparable analysis of
16 strictly the reservoir-operation component of the Basin
17 States Alternative, not volumes of studies and charts based
18 on undefined activities that may be exaggerating these
19 limited benefits.

20 There is no question that the objective of this
21 DEIS is critical or that valuable work has not gone into
22 developing the model, but the public is anxiously awaiting
23 some assurances that the water managers they rely on will
24 develop a real strategy to guide us through what looks to be
25 a very parched future ahead.

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 Unfortunately, Reclamation is still hoping history
2 repeats itself and high flows will bail us out as demand
3 continues to grow and temperatures continue to rise. But
4 we're already at the end of what the river has historically
5 provided.

6 There's no water left, and climate change is
7 taking what their -- what's there back. It's time for
8 Reclamation to admit this and get on with the real task
9 ahead: Developing a solution for managing the system headed
10 for failure.

11 Thank you.

12 NAN YODER: John, thank you for your comment.

13 Is there anyone else? No?

14 Okay. All right. So we'll remind you one more
15 time that we're in our public-comment period. It closes
16 April 30th. And we are more than welcome to hear from you
17 tonight or also from here forward to fax or e-mail. And
18 again, your input is valuable to our process. Thank you
19 very much.

20 (Whereupon the presentation was concluded at
21 7:30 p.m.)

22 (Whereupon the public-comment session at this
23 public meeting was concluded at 9:00 p.m.)

24

25

PUBLIC HEARING - 4/4/07

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

4 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing Public Meeting was
5 taken before me, RABIN' MONROE, RMR, CRR, a Certified
6 Reporter, No. 50653, in and for the County of Maricopa,
7 State of Arizona; that the proceedings were taken down by me
8 in machine shorthand and thereafter transcribed by
9 computer-aided transcription under my supervision and
10 direction; that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 24,
11 inclusive, constitute a true and accurate excerpt of all the
12 proceedings had upon the taking of said public meeting, all
13 done to the best of my skill and ability.

14 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to
15 any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in
16 the outcome hereof.

17 DATED in Phoenix, Arizona, this 20th day of April,
18 2007.

19
20
21
22 
23 RABIN' MONROE, RMR, CRR
24 CR #50653
25

Speaker Request Form

Please write clearly so that we do not misspell any personal details. Give the completed card to a project representative prior to the meeting's comment session.

4/4/07

Date

JOHN WEISHEIT (WHY-SIGHT)

Name*

PO BOX 466 MOAB UT 84532

Address*

Please check this box if you'd like your address withheld from publication

LIVING RIVERS

Organization

435-259-1063

Telephone