

Form Letter B

FORM LETTER B

B1

Mr. Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, Co. 81302

Dear Mr. Schumacher,

Please consider the following input when preparing the FSEIS for the Plata Project:

1. The Bureau has not adequately addressed the practicability of no alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water is available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs and rights purchases.
2. Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and rainbow sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir also will eliminate a corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
3. Impacts of rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
4. Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200 in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely nor desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this high of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau should revise the Project scope and the settlement of Ute water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development area water resources.

Sincerely,

pattie adler

pattie adler

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B2

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/9/00 9:18AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Nancy Alpert
Address: 5162 E. Pasadena Ave.
City: Phoenix
State: AZ
Zip: 85018
Phone: 602-522-0657
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B2

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B3

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 10:52PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Scott P. Anderson
Address: 503 N. Walnut St.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83712
Phone: (208)344-8069
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I have followed the Animas-La Plata project for some time now. I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B3

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B4

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/16/00 10:51PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Julie Arfsten
Address: 435 Gossage Avenue
City: Petaluma
State: ca
Zip: 94952
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B4

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B5

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 7:02AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Suzanne Artemieff
Address: 19 Craggs Rd.
City: Harvard
State: MA
Zip: 01451
Phone: (978)250-7618
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B5

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B6

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 11:06AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Joseph Bail
Address: 2038 Timber Lane
City: Clearwater
State: Fla
Zip: 33763-1441
Phone: 727
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.

2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.

3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.

4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B6

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B7

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/12/00 6:22AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Joseph K. Bail
Address: 2038 Timber Lane
City: Clearwater
State: FL
Zip: 33763-1441
Phone: 734-3162
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B7

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B8

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 1:49PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Steve Barancik
Address: 7831 Leonardo Da Vinci Way
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85704
Phone: 520-297-8237
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B8

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B9

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/26/00 11:06AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Ethan Beasley
Address: 3652 Royston Road
City: Charlotte
State: MI
Zip: 48813
Phone: (517) 645-0290
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B9

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B10

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/15/00 8:22AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Teresa Behm
Address: 345 Forest Highlands Dr.
City: Flagstaff
State: AZ
Zip: 86001
Phone: 520-525-3678
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B10

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B11

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/26/00 11:34PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: EDWARD BENNETT
Address: P. O. 1011
City: Green Valley
State: AZ
Zip: 85622
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B11

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B12

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/26/00 2:04PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Don & Linda Bentley
Address: 301 W. Windsor Ave.
City: Phoenix
State: AZ
Zip: 85003
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B12

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B13

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 12:34PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Christie Berven
Address: 361 County Rd 219
City: Durango
State: CO
Zip: 81301
Phone: 970-375-1445
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B13

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B14

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/2/00 1:11PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Jessie Bhangoo
Address: 2812 W. Highcliff Dr.
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85745
Phone: (520) 743-8652
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B14

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B15

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 8:14AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Mark Boyce
Address: 577 Oberlin Road SW
City: Massillon
State: OH
Zip: 44647
Phone: 330-837-3868
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B15

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B16

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 4:51PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Bob Brister
Address: PO Box 2808
City: Oakhurst
State: CA
Zip: 93644
Phone: (559) 641-7427
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B16

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B17

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/24/00 4:06PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Mark A. Brown
Address: 6625 North Pidgeon Spring Place
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85718-2215
Phone: 520-299-4391
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

As a frequent visitor to the Durango area, I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the Project scope and limit it to the settlement of

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B17

Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B18

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B19

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/5/00 11:56AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Nicole J. Chaika
Address: 76 Banner Avenue
City: Lancaster
State: NY
Zip: 14086
Phone: 1-888-EXCITE2 ext7166816124
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B19

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B20

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 12:08PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Colin Chellman
Address: 103 Charles St. #2FW
City: NY
State: NY
Zip: 10014
Phone: 212-807-8020
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B20

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B21

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 7:08PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Donna Chesner
Address: 401 Purdy Lane
City: Bisbee
State: Az
Zip: 85603
Phone: 520=432-5855
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B21

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B22

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 9:50AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: JOSEPH CIARAMITARO
Address: 6115 N CANYON DRIVE
City: TUCSON
State: AZ
Zip: 85704
Phone: 520-694-6370
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B22

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B23

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 9:38AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: David Coblenz
Address: 200 N Alto Mesa Dr
City: El Paso
State: TX
Zip: 79912
Phone: 915-7475669
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B23

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B24

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/6/00 4:40PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project

Name: Shan Collins
Address: 3653 Fairesta St
City: La Crescenta
State: CA
Zip: 91214
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B24

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B25

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/5/00 9:24PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Sue Conklin
Address: PO Box 1365
City: Socorro
State: NM
Zip: 87801
Phone: 505-838-2304
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B25

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B26

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/7/00 11:34AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Kevin R Cook
Address: 3503 Monterey
City: Farmington
State: NM
Zip: 87401
Phone: (505) 326-2641
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

1) This is a political compromise that makes very little economic or environmental sense. Continuing this ALP game only ruins our chances for progress and real political consensus HERE IN THE FOUR CORNERS. Also, as others have noted:

1a) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.

2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.

3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.

4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B26

200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B28

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 1:27PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Ms. Davy Davidson
Address: 2133 Beach Street
City: San Francisco
State: CA
Zip: 94123
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B28

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B27

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 11:49AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Linda Corbn
Address: P.O.Box 353
City: Blue Diamond
State: NV
Zip: 89004
Phone: 702-898-2625
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B27

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B29

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gjs@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/30/00 1:39PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Robert Dean
Address: 4365 E. 13th Circle
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85711
Phone: 520 881 5166
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B29

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B30

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/25/00 9:22PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Marilyn Dinger
Address: 164 North 650 East
City: Kaysville
State: UT
Zip: 84037-2169
Phone: (801) 544-9229
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B30

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B31

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/18/00 4:49PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Ed Eaton
Address: 76 S. Second St.
City: Carbondale
State: CO
Zip: 81623
Phone: 970-963-8855
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B31

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B32

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/30/00 7:30PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Constantina Economou
Address: 10 Panoramic Way
City: Berkeley
State: CA
Zip: 94704
Phone: 510-845-6903
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B32

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B33

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 7:00PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Bill Ellett
Address: 3010 E. Seneca St.
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85716
Phone: (520) 323-2848
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B33

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B34

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/5/00 4:14PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Ann Marie Falknor
Address: 601 Alto Penasco Pl.
City: El Paso
State: TX
Zip: 79912
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B34

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B36

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/7/00 9:27AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Jessica Flagg
Address: 120 East 34th St., Apt 14k
City: new York
State: NY
Zip: 10016
Phone: 212-683-3562
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.

2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.

3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.

4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B36

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B35

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 10:12PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Holly Finstrom
Address: 1901 N. Avenida Azahar
City: Tucson
State: az
Zip: 85745
Phone: 520 743 9879
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B35

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B37

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/8/00 4:50PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: John Furrow
Address: 436 E. Fillmore St.
City: Tempe
State: AZ
Zip: 85281
Phone: 480-941-2661
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B37

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B38

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/8/00 4:50PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Gauri Gadgil
Address: 436 E. Fillmore St.
City: Tempe
State: AZ
Zip: 85281
Phone: 480-941-2661
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B38

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.

FORM LETTER B

B39

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 5:33PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Racheli Gai
Address: 3624 N. Forgeus
City: tucson
State: AAZ
Zip: 85716
Phone: (520) 323-2851
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

- 1) The Bureau has not adequately assessed the practicability of non-structural alternatives to its Preferred Structural Alternative. Adequate water can be made available through a combination of improvements in the efficiency of irrigation and delivery systems, the coordinated operation of existing reservoirs, and land-water rights purchases.
- 2) Negative impacts on wildlife and endangered species preclude the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Especially worrisome are the detrimental impacts to the endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. In addition, significant concerns of bioaccumulation exist for the bald eagle and other fish eating raptors. The reservoir will also eliminate a major elk migration corridor and large wintering range for resident elk.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation.
- 4) Regional municipal and industrial needs are vastly overestimated in the DSEIS. The Preferred Alternative would supply enough water for another 200,000 people in the Project area. This amount of growth is not likely or desirable for the region. Clearly no current or near-term demand exists to justify this huge quantity of M&I water.

In preparing a FSEIS the Bureau must revise the

This letter is nearly identical to Comment Letter IN124. Please refer to the responses made to the original comment letter.

FORM LETTER B

B39

Project scope and limit it to the settlement of Ute Indian water rights claims, as quantified in the 1986 Settlement Agreement. These water rights can be met without the structural component of a dam in Ridges Basin reservoir and without large depletions from the Animas river. Regional municipalities should be responsible for independent development of area water resources.