

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/4/00 8:51AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Kevin Parkey
Address: 1824 West Pampa Ave
City: Mesa
State: AZ
Zip: 85202
Phone: (480)752-2000
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.

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.

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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/22/00 10:07PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: J.J.Petruska
Address: 7105 E.Seattle Dr.
City: Tucson
State: Az
Zip: 85730
Phone: 520-881-8976
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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 8:09AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Nick Patel
Address: 71 Olde Madbury Lane
City: Dover
State: NH
Zip: 03820
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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/14/00 3:22PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: K. M. Pierce
Address: 2909 Florida N. E.
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87110
Phone: (505) 898-5632
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 10:41AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Richard & Gail Potts
Address: PO Box 28
City: Overgaard
State: AZ
Zip: 85933-0028
Phone: 520-535-4724
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.

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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 6:01PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Lisa K. Pritchard. RN. BSN.
Address: 29121 Driftwood Lane
City: Shenandoah,
State: Tx.
Zip: 77381
Phone: 281 -296-6968
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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 10:04AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Virginia Ravndal
Address: 4329 Calle Guillermo
City: Santa Fe
State: NM
Zip: 87505
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.

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.

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

Name: Diana Rempe-Cetas
Address: 5417 E. Holmes St.
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85711
Phone: 520.790.4155
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/28/00 8:47PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Diana Rempe-Cetas
Address: 5417 E. Holmes St.
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85711
Phone: 520.790.4155
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.

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.

Sincerely,
Diana Rempe-Cetas

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 7:42PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Tom Ribe
Address: 51 Feather Rd
City: Santa Fe,
State: NM
Zip: 87501
Phone:
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I have long opposed the Animas La Platte project. As a former Durango resident, I question who the real beneficiaries of the project would be. I don't feel your agency is being honest about the intentions of the project.

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

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

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.

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

Name: Thomas F. Riesing
Address: 4179 County Rd 124
City: Hesperus
State: CO
Zip: 81326-9606
Phone: 970-259-5445
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/8/00 10:40PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: melissa roberts
Address: P.O. box 28715
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip: 98118
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

B

B96

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.

Respectfully,
Melissa Roberts - concerned US citizen
Seattle, WA

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/30/00 9:26PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Roger Robison
Address: 275 Westgate
City: Prescott
State: AZ
Zip: 86305-5072
Phone: 520-778-4136
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 10:47PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Vince Scheidt
Address: 3158 Occidental St
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92122
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. I urge you to explore these alternatives thoroughly.
- 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. These adverse impacts are not mitigable.
- 3) Impacts on rafters, kayakers, fishermen and other river users are downplayed and underestimated in the Bureau's evaluation. Wildland resource uses are a critical component to this regions growing economy, and such uses must not be discounted.
- 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 this

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

region, given other constraints to development. 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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 6:08PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Kris Schmidt
Address: 10354 Danube Ave.
City: Granada Hills
State: CA
Zip: 91344-7213
Phone: 818/892-4616
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 11:49AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Mr. Andrew Schneller
Address: 811 N. 10th Ave.
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85705
Phone: 520-628-1720
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 state of Colorado, and Durango in particular, I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the FSEIS for the Animas La Plata Project:

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.

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.

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

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 B

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/2/00 1:08AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: John Schroeder
Address: 1705 N. Evergreen St.
City: Burbank
State: CA
Zip: 91505-1708
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.

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.

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 8:30PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: John E. Schweitzer
Address: 573 Van Gordon Street, #3-217
City: Lakewood
State: CO
Zip: 80228
Phone: 303-986-7166
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gjs@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/2/00 1:00PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Sharon Sessions
Address: 45 Oak Ct
City: Eugene
State: OR
Zip: 97405
Phone: (541)687-2518
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/9/00 8:25AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Greg Schuett
Address: Box 1108
City: Julian
State: CA
Zip: 92036
Phone: 760.765.2478
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/6/00 10:33PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Dan Silver, MD
Address: 1422 N. Sweetzer Ave., #401
City: Los Angeles
State: CA
Zip: 90069
Phone: 323-654-1456
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/21/00 5:14AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Dave Sime
Address: 3935 C.R. 250
City: Durango
State: CO
Zip: 81301
Phone: (970) 247-3065
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

As a former government employee 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.

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.

I worked for the U.S. forest service for ten years and have a degree in forestry. I was with them at the time the Libby dam was built in Montana and I can speak first hand to the travesty that was the undoing of that beautiful river valley.
Please don't let it happen here!!

Sincerely,

Dave Sime

Remote_Addr: 166.93.79.81
HTTP_User_Agent: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 4.0; Windows 95)
HTTP_REFERER: <http://www.sw-center.org/swcbd/activist/animas.html>
HTTP_From: (null)

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 3:44PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Kathryn Sky
Address: PO Box 4403
City: Durango
State: CO
Zip: 81302
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/22/00 12:22PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Irene Slater
Address: 4228 E. Chaparosa Way
City: Cave Creek
State: AZ
Zip: 85331
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 B

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/8/00 6:30AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Gregory M. Smith
Address: 216 Alcove Dr.
City: Grand Junction
State: CO
Zip: 81503
Phone: 970-243-6736
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.

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.

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 7:58AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Jill J. Smith
Address: P.O. Box 932
City: Corrales
State: NM
Zip: 87048
Phone: (505) 244-9090
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/6/00 6:25PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Erykaa Snyder
Address: Cambridge School of Weston, Georgian Road
City: Weston
State: MA
Zip: 02493
Phone: 781 893 9254
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 4:58PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Georgia Stablein
Address: 935 Buhne #1
City:
State:
Zip:
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/10/00 1:09PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Amy Stevenson
Address: 281 West 600 North #1
City: Logan
State: UT
Zip: 84321
Phone: 435-750-6747
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.

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.

Let's not continue with the legacy of building unwanted and unnecessary dams to benefit a few while causing harm to many. Water does not flow up hill, why try to make it?

From: Aniam - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/29/00 11:08PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Larry Stewart
Address: 1304 Stanford Dr. SE
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87106
Phone: (505)232-2663
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/7/00 4:17PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: J.G. Sugg
Address: 9311 N 58th Street
City: Par. Valley
State: AZ
Zip: 85253
Phone: 480-607-7466
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 B

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 7:04AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Brian Sybert
Address: 3107 Speedway # 102
City: Austin
State: TX
Zip: 78705
Phone: 512/477-1766
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/11/00 4:22PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Matteo Taffa
Address: 1201 Princeton NE
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87106
Phone: 5053658455
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/9/00 10:53PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Peter Tallman
Address: PO Box 3032
City: Edgewood
State: NM
Zip: 87015
Phone: 505 281-9210
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 3:44PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Jerry Sue Thompson
Address: 1717 Del Sur Dr. SW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87105
Phone: (505) 877-5702
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/1/00 10:38AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Scott Triplett
Address: PO Box 1230
City: Thoreau
State: NM
Zip: 87323
Phone: (505)862-8012
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/23/00 5:42PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: olivia tsosie
Address: 3984 agua fria road
City: santa fe
State: nm
Zip: 87501
Phone: (505) 473-5708
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

B

B121

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.

I support the settlement of Ute water rights. I deplore further interference with the movements of grazing native mammals, threats to eagles, and reduction of flow to the detriment of fish, fisherfolk, kayaks and a living river in general. The waste of energy in fighting gravity is counterindicated in the present era. Let's make work and profits some other way.
sincerely
olivia tsosie

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/24/00 7:42PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Don Valdez
Address: 9140 E. Ocotillo Drive
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85749
Phone: (520) 760-9690
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/3/00 2:08PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Dr. Hannes Vogel
Address: 5907 Newcastle Drive
City: Bellaire
State: TX
Zip: 77401
Phone: 7130770-5859
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/1/00 10:26AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Barbara Warner
Address: 1955 Tatum Lane
City: Lebanon
State: KY
Zip: 40033
Phone: 1-270-692-3316
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 purchase.
- 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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/17/00 9:52AM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Amanda Webb
Address: P.O. Box 2368
City: Durango
State: CO
Zip: 81302
Phone: (970) 375-0145
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project
Comments: Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E. 2nd Ave.
Durango, CO 81301

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

I write to you because I am deeply concerned about the proposed Animas-La Plata project.

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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/6/00 10:04PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Eric M. Whiteman
Address: 98 W. El Freda Rd.
City: Tempe
State: AZ
Zip: 85284
Phone: 480 777 5802
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gjs@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/16/00 5:55PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Carol A. Wiley
Address: 15457 Eto Camino Road
City: Victorville
State: CA
Zip: 92394
Phone: (760) 245-8734
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 2/4/00 11:42PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project

Name: Paul Williams
Address: 37 N. Boston Ave.
City: Atlantic City
State: NJ
Zip: 08401
Phone: (609) 345-1808
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.

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.

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 3/3/00 7:04PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: Don Wilson
Address: 2280 N. Camino Rinconado
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85749
Phone: (520) 749-0067
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.

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.

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

Name: Bill & Diane Yanneck
Address: 1349f East Fort Lowell Road
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85719
Phone: 520-327-6913
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.

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.

Peta Zachs
115-64 22057
Jamaica, N.Y. 11411
2/27/00

Pat Schumacher
Bureau of Reclamation
835 E 2nd Ave
Durango, CO 81301

Re: Animas-La Plata Project

Dear Mr. Schumacher:

The Animas La Plata project on the Animas river is a huge waste of taxpayer's money! The project will also cause a myriad of undesirable environmental consequences. The project will block the migration corridor of ot, deer and elk. The project will cause water depletions and threaten river fish species.

I urge you to consider the following observations and recommendations when preparing the F.S.E.I.S. for the Animas La Plata Project.

I urge the Bureau to assess 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 coordination of existing reservoirs and land-water rights purchases.

Sincerely: Peta Zachs

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

From: Animas - La Plata Project <swcbd@sw-center.org>
To: <gis@SW-Center.ORG>, <ALPDSEISComments@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 1/31/00 6:53PM
Subject: Comments: Animas - La Plata Project.

Name: CORY ZIMBLEMAN
Address: 7077 S. CAMINO LIBERTAD
City: TUCSON
State: AZ
Zip: 85746
Phone: 520-883-2861
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

B132

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.