

Appendix G

November 1, 2005, Salt Lake City, Utah Public Meeting Documents

G.1 Sign-In Sheet

Appendix G

November 1, 2005, Salt Lake City, Utah Public Meeting Documents

G.2 Transcript

Public Comment Forum

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3

4 FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

5

6 RANDY PETERSON, SLC

7 TERRY FULP, BOULDER

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Comment Forum

1 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, November 1, 2005, 6:00 P.M.

2 MR. PETERSON: Evening, welcome to this public
3 meeting on the development of shortage guidelines and
4 coordinated management strategies for Lakes Powell and
5 Mead. I'm Randy Peterson, I'm with the Bureau of
6 Reclamation here in Salt Lake.

7 (Power Point Presentation).

8 I think with that we'll open it up for comments.
9 Let's talk about the comment period, there's a couple
10 opportunities here. I think this slide covers basically
11 what we've shown before and this is the focus of where
12 we're headed toward alternative developments. Help us
13 with that in your comments and this is the place to send
14 them. We'll take them by fax, E-mail, regular mail, by
15 public comment tonight, or written comment on the
16 comment cards. So with that, I think we'll open it up
17 to public comment. If you'd be so kind to spell your
18 name for the court reporter, that will be helpful.

19 MR. WECHSLER: Good, we get the delight of spelling
20 my last name. Jim Wechsler, that's W-e-c-h-s-l-e-r.
21 And I'm with the Sierra Club, but I'm part of a group
22 that, Sierra is part of a group including Defender's of
23 Wildlife, Environmental Defense, National Wildlife
24 Federation, Pacific Institute, and the Senoras (sic)
25 that have already submitted a proposal called

Public Comment Forum

1 Conservation Before Shortage. We're really pleased that
2 an EIS is being done, and with a complete analysis of
3 the cost and benefits and the environmental
4 implications.

5 We also think that the shortage criteria should be
6 crafted for the long haul, and implemented as a
7 permanent policy. The recent drought is quite possibly
8 only a preview of what's to come, given what we have
9 learned from the long term record of the Colorado River,
10 from what we know about long term drought periods in
11 North America which appear to be the orders of
12 centuries, and the probability of climate change to
13 reduce inflows over the next several decades. And I
14 don't know, is everybody in this room familiar with the
15 CBS proposal? Because there's no reason for me to
16 mention why it's good if everybody is familiar. All
17 right.

18 I've only got one page, so it's not bad.

19 The Conservation Before Shortage proposal is much
20 like some other proposals that are being considered by
21 the states. It has triggers at which point there would
22 be conservation within the lower basin. One of the
23 differences is that the conservation is to be sort of
24 prearranged voluntary conservation and compensated.
25 Monetary compensation for say a rancher who was

Public Comment Forum

1 conserving water or a farmer. Some of its benefits are
2 reduced need for new water projects that introduces
3 flexibility into Colorado River management and will
4 allow those who are willing and able to reduce their
5 usage to be compensated for doing so and avoids needing
6 to impose restrictions in water use on those who cannot.

7 By eliminating the potential for water shortage is
8 when they cannot easily be accommodated. This policy
9 will limit the need for costly new projects. Of course
10 the point that's -- would cause a group of environmental
11 groups to come up with a proposal is we would like to
12 see protection for the environment. The fish wildlife
13 and natural areas on the Colorado do not, for the most
14 part, have their own water rights, they are last in line
15 for water. And they're the most vulnerable of all the
16 water users to a drought. The Conservation Before
17 Shortage proposal reduces overall water consumption in
18 dry years, decreasing the risk of shortage that can
19 disproportionately impact environmental uses in the
20 future, and also by increasing protection against
21 shortage for water users that have inflexible demands.

22 It will allow some water to stay there for the
23 fish and wildlife that need it to survive, and still
24 meet critical human needs. It improves power
25 production, consistent maintenance of the reservoir

Public Comment Forum

1 storage and power head above baseline conditions in
2 average to low flow conditions. It will result in
3 increased power production, improve power revenues as
4 well as elimination of the risk if the elevations at
5 Lake Mead will drop below the minimum power head, and
6 thereby will improve the reliability of power
7 protection. It gives an increased certainty for water
8 users. And it will significantly reduce the likelihood
9 of involuntary and uncompensated shortages in the lower
10 basins at levels above 500,000 acre feet, which is the
11 approximate level at which a shortage exceeds the
12 ability of the Arizona water bank to buffer. I think
13 the Conservation Before Shortage proposal is interesting
14 because it offers an active anticipatory approach that
15 protects Colorado River water users and the environment
16 from abrupt reductions in the amount of water available.

17 The proposal would create a predictable rational
18 system for water users and distribute the costs between
19 water and power users and the federal government.

20 And finally, CBS, the Conservation Before Shortage
21 proposal, includes Mexican water users in the solution,
22 as they could be the ones conserving the water, and
23 thereby reducing the need for conservation among US
24 water users.

25 Finally, what's not in the typed up comments, is I

Public Comment Forum

1 don't really expect our proposal to be adopted whole
2 cloth, but I think it's an example, has a number of good
3 things in it, is an example of the way we would like to
4 see this approached, and hope it will be approached, and
5 think that maybe when developing the alternatives it may
6 be worth it to take some parts from one set of
7 suggestions and some parts from others to make a final
8 plan.

9 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Jim. Other comments
10 from our guests?

11 (End of public comments.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Comment Forum

1 STATE OF UTAH)

2

3 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

4

5

6 I, Linda J. Smurthwaite, Certified Shorthand
7 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and notary
8 public within and for the county of Salt Lake, State of
9 Utah do hereby certify:

10 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
11 me at the time and place set forth herein, and was taken
12 down by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into
13 typewriting under my direction and supervision.

14 That the foregoing pages contain a true and
15 correct transcription of my said shorthand notes so
16 taken.

17 In Witness Whereof, I have subscribed my name this
18 2nd day of November, 2005.

19

20

21 LINDA J. SMURTHWAITE
22 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

23

24

25

26