

# **Appendix W**

## **Copies of Unique Comment Letters**

### **W.1 Business Comment Letters (B)**

**From:** <SchubeCM@aol.com>  
**To:** <strategies@lc.usbr.gov>  
**Date:** 7/26/05 8:56AM  
**Subject:** Public Comment-Glen Canyon

To Whom It May Concern:

As a guide on the Colorado Plateau that has seen a lot of different stages of how Glen Canyon and Lake Powell have operated over the years, it is quite obvious that government officials seriously need to take a hard look at new management strategies on the operation of Glen Canyon Dam, Lake Powell, the Grand Canyon and Lake Mead. There are serious issues that need to be dealt with. I am not a "radical" viewpoint and realize that the total de-commission of Glen Canyon Dam is probably not realistic but it is obvious that the Colorado Compact needs to be "redone" and management issues for Grand Canyon need to be seriously dealt with. As far as Glen Canyon and Lake Powell, it is too late, the damage has been done. It is an eyesore and I am somewhat embarrassed to take customers into the upper regions of the "lake" and show them what has been done to it. Most people just shake their head in disgust. The lower basin needs to get in gear and get serious about how they are or need to adjust to inadequate water supplies.

Lynn Schuett

| 1



## **Absurd Computer Models of Evaporation and Sedimentation**

For the Lake Powell Meeting of 7.28.2005 by USBR

### **Evaporation**

Computer models of evaporation loss may be right in their narrow focus, but the summer evaporation is not really a "loss" of water, just a loss of canal and pipeline water for downstream water users. Summer clouds are initially beneficial for the shade they cause and ultimately the precipitation they become.

### **Sedimentation**

Computer models of sedimentation were not used before 200 B.C when three dams on the Oronte River in Lebanon and Syria were built, using large hand-hewn basalt blocks and a primitive mortar.

The Homs "Lake" has held water for over 2,200 years and plays today still an important function of the irrigation culture of the Oronte Valley. There is some silt buildup and the dam has been raised twice during its existence. Sedimentation is a certainty for any artificial impoundment, but its rate of anticipated progress need not be exaggerated. | 1

Mindless extrapolation of "anticipated" silt buildup of an artificial impoundment is absurd, or "junk science", but quite useful as a fund-raising device among politically motivated activists.

### **Conclusion**

Agenda-driven panic is not the right solution. Sane, detached, neutral, professional consideration of all factors is called for in matters that may influence our actions beyond the current century. | 2

Werner A. Ruemmele PE

## Kucera, Cindy

---

**From:** Paul Rusanowski [paul.rusanowski@shingleygroup.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2005 10:10 AM  
**To:** strategies@lc.usbr.gov; strategies@uc.usbr.gov  
**Subject:** Comments - lakes Powell and Mead

**Attachments:** Co R planning.doc



Co R planning.doc  
(99 KB)

See attached document. Hard copy sent in the mail.

Paul C. Rusanowski, Ph.D.  
Regional Manager  
The Shipley Group  
1584 S 500 W, Ste 201  
Woods Cross, UT 84010  
888-270-2157 (Off)  
888-270-2158 (fax)  
801-499-7831 (cell)

August 30, 2005

Regional Director  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Upper Colorado Region  
Attention: UC-402  
125 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84318-1147

Regional Director  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Lower Colorado Region  
Attention: BC00-1000  
PO Box 61470  
Boulder City, NV 89006-1470

Subject: Comments on Development of Management Strategies for Lake Powell and  
Lake Mead Under low Reservoir Conditions

Gentlemen:

I recommend that the following three management strategies be considered in the above planning process by the Bureau of Reclamation (BR).

The first strategy concerns the use of reclaimed water within the Colorado River above Lake Mead. During low reservoir conditions the BR should consider the value of utilizing reclaimed water from major cities to supplement natural river flows. Contracts could be negotiated with major cities (populations greater than 5,000) to return 50 -75% or more of the water withdrawn from the Colorado River for City purposes after treatment to meet water quality requirements. Such contracts would help to stabilize, and possibly increase, low summer flows during periods of drought. Under normal reservoir management conditions the Cities would still be able to use reclaimed water for secondary/industrial purposes rather than contracted discharge back into the river. | 1

The second strategy concerns use of reclaimed water in the greater Las Vegas area. During low reservoir conditions the BR should consider the value of utilizing reclaimed water from the Greater Las Vegas area to supplement flows into Lake Mead. Treated and reclaimed water could be piped to the Moapa area and discharged into the Muddy River to flow back into Lake Mead. Again, a contract could be negotiated with the City of Las Vegas and/or the SNWA to ensure that 50-75% of the reclaimed water from the City is discharged into the Muddy River when low reservoir conditions exist. When such conditions do not exist then reclaimed water could be used for other industrial and commercial uses.

B.004

The third strategy concerns management and storage of surplus waters within the lower Colorado River drainage. The Las Vegas area has depleted many of its natural ground aquifers. This depletion has created an opportunity to store surplus river water in these partially depleted aquifers. Surplus water could be pumped to these aquifers during periods of excess precipitation and river flows to be withdrawn later during the summer or in periods of drought. Such a water management system would more efficiently utilize available Colorado River water to satisfy uses in the lower river area. It would lessen demand during low flow periods and provide a more equitable distribution of water resources to all users throughout the year. It would also provide more flexibility in management of both Lakes Mead and Powell during low reservoir conditions by altering summer water demand requirements. Aquifers in Clark County, Nevada would be the most logical to utilize for water storage in this management strategy.

I recognize that these three strategies likely involve actions outside of your agency authority. However, the benefits to your mission warrant their consideration at this time. I believe that the inclusion of management strategies that rely on cooperation with other federal, State and local agencies is clearly appropriate in seeking win-win solutions for managing Lakes Powell and Mead under low reservoir conditions. Defining the nature and extent of commitments and cooperating entities, and their willingness to implement cooperative actions for any or all of these strategies, will determine the feasibility and practicality of their integration into your mission.

Please keep me informed of your progress in developing reservoir management strategies and of future opportunities to provide input.

Sincerely,

Paul C. Rusanowski, Ph.D.  
Regional Manager

B-2000 Watermasters.txt  
From: LC strategies [strategies@lc.usbr.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2005 1:05 PM  
To: pfm@watermasters.com  
Subject: Re: Development of Colorado River Management Strategies

Mr. Miller,

Thank you for your interest in Reclamation's Colorado River programs. Jayne Harkins, Deputy Regional Director, Lower Colorado Region, most likely spoke with you at the Arizona Hydrological Society Symposium.

On September 30, 2005, Reclamation will notice our intent in the Federal Register to prepare an environmental impact statement and to solicit comments and hold public scoping meetings on the development of Lower Basin shortage guidelines and coordinated management strategies for the operation of Lake Powell and Lake Mead under low reservoir conditions. The full text of that notice will be posted on our website, <http://www.usbr.gov/lc/riverops.html>, as well updated project information throughout the process. We will also add you to our mailing list.

The notice will include information on four public meetings that will be held to solicit comments on the scope of specific shortage guidelines and other coordinated management strategies and the issues and alternatives that should be analyzed. Oral and written comments will be accepted at the public meetings to be held at the following locations:

Tuesday, November 1, 2005 \* 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Hilton Salt Lake City Center, Topaz Room, 255 South West Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Wednesday, November 2, 2005 \* 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Adam's Mark Hotel, Tower Court D, 1550 Court Place, Denver, Colorado.

Thursday, November 3, 2005 \* 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Arizona Department of Water Resources, Third Floor, Conference Rooms A&B, 500 North Third Street, Phoenix, Arizona.

Tuesday, November 8, 2005 \* 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Henderson Convention Center, Grand Ballroom, 200 South Water Street, Henderson, Nevada.

Written comments on the proposed development of these strategies may be sent by close of business on Wednesday, November 30, 2005, to: Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region, Attention: BC00-1000, P.O. Box 61470, Boulder City, Nevada 89006-1470, faxogram at (702) 293-8156, or e-mail at [strategies@lc.usbr.gov](mailto:strategies@lc.usbr.gov); and/or Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region, Attention: UC-402, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84318-1147, faxogram at (801) 524-3858, or e-mail at [strategies@uc.usbr.gov](mailto:strategies@uc.usbr.gov).

Again, thank you for your interest in Reclamation's projects.

Sincerely,

Nan Yoder  
Program Manager  
Boulder Canyon Operations Office

B-2000 Watermasters.txt

>>> "Paul Miller" <pfm@watermasters.com> 09/27/05 7:11 PM >>>  
I recently attended the Arizona Hydrological Society Symposium conducted 21  
Sept to 24 Sept in Flagstaff, Arizona. One of the featured  
presenters was  
to be Mr. Robert Johnson from the Boulder City office of the  
Bureau of Reclamation. Due to an unexpected meeting in D.C., a  
lady by the first  
name of JANE spoke in his place. Following her presentation I  
spoke very  
briefly with her and at that time I thought I had obtained an  
email address for her, but apparently I was mistaken. I would like  
to make contact with her, if that is possible, as I am very  
interested in pursuing how the public can have "voice" in the  
activities of the Bureau which affect those of us  
dependent upon the Colorado River. Jane, I believe indicated  
there was to  
be public input session in the near future and I would like to  
know the  
nature and location of these events. Thank you

Paul F. Miller

Physical Address: 8686 North Central Ave - Suite 208

Phoenix, Arizona 85020-3153

Mail Address: PO Box 47146

Phoenix, Arizona 85068-7146

Voice - 602-943-2512

Fax - 602-943-2542

Cell Phone 602-228-2357

email ... pfm@watermasters.com

The reasonable man adapts himself to the world;  
the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt  
the world to himself. Therefore, all progress  
depends on the unreasonable man.

George Bernard Shaw

**Kucera, Cindy**

---

**From:** Craig Morgan [craigmorgan@avalex.info]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2005 4:25 PM  
**To:** strategies@lc.usbr.gov  
**Subject:** Colorado River Reservoir Operations: Development of Lower Basin Shortage Guidelines and Coordinated Management Strategies for Lake Powell and Lake Mead Under Low Reservoir Conditions  
**Attachments:** EIS Scope Comments.doc

Attached please find my comments on the proposed shortage guideline development

Craig W. Morgan P.E.  
Avalex Inc.

P.O. Box 550218  
South Lake Tahoe, California 96155

591 Tahoe Keys Blvd., Suite D6  
South Lake Tahoe, California 96150

(530) 543-3200  
Fax (530) 543-3201  
[craigmorgan@avalex.info](mailto:craigmorgan@avalex.info)

VIA EMAIL

November 30, 2005

Mr. Robert W. Johnson  
Regional Director,  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Lower Colorado Region, Attention: BCOO-1000  
P.O. Box 61470  
Boulder City, Nevada 89006-1470

**Re: Colorado River Reservoir Operations: Development of Lower Basin Shortage Guidelines and Coordinated Management Strategies for Lake Powell and Lake Mead Under Low Reservoir Conditions**

Dear Mr. Johnson,

The following scoping comments are provided in response to the notice to solicit public comments on the development of alternatives considered in the development of shortage guidelines and coordinated management strategies for the operation of Lake Powell and Lake Mead under low reservoir conditions (70 Fed. Reg. 57322, dated September 30, 2005).

It is understood that the purpose of the shortage guidelines and management strategies are to 1) inform the Secretary of the Department of the Interior's (Secretary's) decision in the Annual Operating Plan process during periods of shortage; and 2) provide a degree of certainty to the water users in the Lower Basin. In order to achieve these purposes, it is expected that the Secretary in its role as Water Master for the Colorado River will uphold the collection of statutes, interstate compacts, regulations, court decisions, court decrees, and international treaty and tribal water rights that are known as the "Law of the River". The development of shortage guidelines that are inconsistent with this body of law will only circumvent the second goal as outlined by the Bureau – that of providing a degree of certainty to water users. Indeed, the fact that the Secretary has undertaken the development of shortage guidelines has already introduced uncertainty and doubt among many water users on the river, in as much as the specter now exists that the Secretary may change the "Law of the River".

One of the foundations of the "Law of the River" is the longstanding precept of "first in time, first in right". This precept, which is a major tenet of Western Water Law, provides a measure of certainty to all water users. The precept exists to resolve questions of water use during periods of a shortage and it is expected that all of the alternatives considered in the development of the shortage guidelines will abide by it. Suggestions by some observers that urban water users should be given a higher priority during a shortage on the river because they have a greater need are misplaced and only encourages many of these junior appropriators to be even less prudent in their water supply planning efforts than they are today. This will only lead to further and more significant conflicts on the river in the future. It is the responsibility of each water user on the river to prudently plan for their

own water supply needs given the limitations that exist, and other users on the river should not be penalized for the failure of those who do not do so properly. It is important, therefore, that the Secretary in the development of alternative shortage management strategies identify how each alternative adheres to the "Law of the River". Unless this is done, it is difficult to ascertain whether a specific alternative is reasonable or feasible.

1

With respect to the development of specific criteria in determining when a shortage should be declared, the Secretary should revisit how it determines "normal" or "surplus" conditions on the Colorado. The determination of "surplus" and "normal" conditions has a direct bearing upon when a "shortage" will occur and, therefore, should be included in any analysis regarding shortage guidelines. For example, as has been observed by others in recent comments to the Bureau, if the trigger for declaring a surplus is set too low, then surpluses may be determined in years when in fact no such surplus occurs leading to unwarranted shortages in subsequent years.

2

In establishing a "shortage" trigger elevation, it is recommended that less significance be given to an arbitrary elevation in Lake Mead that some view as necessary to protect the Southern Nevada Water Authority's lower intake structures and a minimum power pool, and more significance be given to utilizing a minimum storage elevation that optimizes the water availability for all water users on the river taking into consideration water right priorities. The same observation applies with respect to any similar elevations established for Lake Powell.

3

4

There is no doubt that assessing the impacts of each selected alternative will entail a complicated analysis of the environmental and economic impacts of not only the river system, but of each of the river's water users and their area of use. This analysis should encompass both the direct impacts of each management alternative and the indirect impacts of which there will be many. For example, any further reductions in flow to agricultural users in the Imperial Valley will correspondingly result in reductions in flow to the Salton Sea causing significant impacts to air quality if no mitigation is provided. Another significant impact that requires careful evaluation is the impact of shortage management strategies on the water quality below Lake Mead.

5

6

Thank you for considering these comments. I would appreciate being adding to your mailing list for correspondence related to this project.

Sincerely,

*/c/ Craig W. Morgan*

Craig W. Morgan, P.E.  
Principal Engineer  
Avalex Inc.

Cc: Michael Abatti  
James Abatti