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G.1 Sign-In Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How do you prefer to be contacted?</th>
<th>US Mail or E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Barnett</td>
<td>Colo. R. Res.</td>
<td>845 Lakeview</td>
<td>804</td>
<td><a href="mailto:giberre@attglobal.net">giberre@attglobal.net</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wechsler</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>8175 Elwood Ave.,</td>
<td>801-580-3290</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwwechsler@arcs.net">jwwechsler@arcs.net</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Franson</td>
<td>Fronen-Noble</td>
<td>Arvada Park UT 80003</td>
<td>801-756-0309</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmfranson@frontier.com">jmfranson@frontier.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Loitner</td>
<td>WPA</td>
<td>PO Box 11606 SLGC</td>
<td>801-626-0391</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtiltner@comcast.net">jtiltner@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Ostler</td>
<td>Upper Colo. R. Co.</td>
<td>335 So. 400 E SLCA</td>
<td>801-553-2125</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dosler@uc.us">dosler@uc.us</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Henderson</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>324 S. State St. SLCA</td>
<td>801-741-1101</td>
<td>norm.henderson@pspsd</td>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Olsen</td>
<td>Brown and Caldwell</td>
<td>30 S. State St. Pocatello</td>
<td>801-733-5122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jholen@brownwill.com">jholen@brownwill.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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G.2 Transcript
APPEARANCES:

FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

RANDY PETERSON, SLC

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

(Power Point Presentation).

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

MR. WECHSLER: Good, we get the delight of spelling my last name. Jim Wechsler, that's W-e-c-h-s-l-e-r. And I'm with the Sierra Club, but I'm part of a group that, Sierra is part of a group including Defender's of Wildlife, Environmental Defense, National Wildlife Federation, Pacific Institute, and the Senoras (sic) that have already submitted a proposal called
Conservation Before Shortage. We're really pleased that
an EIS is being done, and with a complete analysis of
the cost and benefits and the environmental
implications.

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

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

The Conservation Before Shortage proposal is much
like some other proposals that are being considered by
the states. It has triggers at which point there would
be conservation within the lower basin. One of the
differences is that the conservation is to be sort of
prearranged voluntary conservation and compensated.
Monetary compensation for say a rancher who was
conserving water or a farmer. Some of its benefits are
reduced need for new water projects that introduces
flexibility into Colorado River management and will
allow those who are willing and able to reduce their
usage to be compensated for doing so and avoids needing
to impose restrictions in water use on those who cannot.

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

It will allow some water to stay there for the
fish and wildlife that need it to survive, and still
meet critical human needs. It improves power
production, consistent maintenance of the reservoir
storage and power head above baseline conditions in
average to low flow conditions. It will result in
increased power production, improve power revenues as
well as elimination of the risk if the elevations at
Lake Mead will drop below the minimum power head, and
thereby will improve the reliability of power
protection. It gives an increased certainty for water
users. And it will significantly reduce the likelihood
of involuntary and uncompensated shortages in the lower
basins at levels above 500,000 acre feet, which is the
approximate level at which a shortage exceeds the
ability of the Arizona water bank to buffer. I think
the Conservation Before Shortage proposal is interesting
because it offers an active anticipatory approach that
protects Colorado River water users and the environment
from abrupt reductions in the amount of water available.
The proposal would create a predictable rational
system for water users and distribute the costs between
water and power users and the federal government.

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

Finally, what's not in the typed up comments, is I
Public Comment Forum

don't really expect our proposal to be adopted whole

cloth, but I think it's an example, has a number of good

things in it, is an example of the way we would like to

see this approached, and hope it will be approached, and

think that maybe when developing the alternatives it may

be worth it to take some parts from one set of

suggestions and some parts from others to make a final

plan.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Jim. Other comments

from our guests?

(End of public comments.)
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