

491. JERRY NELSON

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Wade Anderson [wcand@cut.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 5:58 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Comment on Narrows Project

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 04 '10

491-1 Where has Carbon Counties honesty & integrity been for the past 70 years?
An honest agreement should be upheld.
Sanpete deserves its allotment.

Jerry R. Nelson
115 East 200 North
Fairview, Utah 84629

Reply Date	Date	Initials	Code
		WAS	100
		WAS	105
		WAS	107
		RS	700
	6/10/10	WAS	770
			774cy

Action:
Classification: ENV-6.00
Narrows
10039705
122816

493. BRANDY NIELSEN

ORIGINAL

May 25, 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston,

493-1

I am a life long resident of Sanpete County. A family member served on the water conservancy board for many years. He worked really hard on getting the Narrows Project to come to pass. There have been many points of view expressed on the project, but the bottom line is that it is our water and we need to have a way for it to be delivered to Sanpete County. There is no water storage available for the northern half of Sanpete County. If we could get the late water from the Narrows Project we could possibly grow a 3rd crop of alfalfa and we could utilize our pastures better because we would have water for our animals.

The people who years ago filed on that water knew how important it would be to our area. I feel that there would be many good benefits come from the Narrows Project. The dam would provide not only the water we need but would boost the local economy through recreation. Municipalities would also benefit from having this water for future growth.

It just seems that if this is our water, and there seems to be no dispute about that, we should be able to get the water. It's just wrong that Carbon County has been able to use our water all these years and has forced us to spend thousands of dollars to fight for something that should have been done 60 years ago.

If this is our water, I just don't understand why the Narrows Project is being debated at all. It's time to do the right thing and for politicians to stop pandering to Carbon County in the hopes of being re-elected. I think it's also a shame that for the price of a postage stamp, environmental groups can stop the work that decent, honest men have spent years working on.

I hope you will be fair in your decision because right is right and wrong is wrong. The right thing to do is to give Sanpete County a way to get the water that is our.

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 01 '10

Sincerely,

Brandy Nielsen

Brandy Nielsen
160 N. 200 W.
Ephraim, ut 84627

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
6/13/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/21/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	774cy

Action:
Classification: ENV - 6.00
Project: NARROWS
Contract No: 10038000
Serial No: 1122816

494. MARILYN NIELSEN

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Casey Blackburn [cblackburn@dalboinc.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:36 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Support Narrows Project

To Whom It May Concern:

494-1

Sanpete really needs this project to happen for many reasons. We need the economic benefits, Jobs, the water [which is legally ours] and is the life blood for our people in Sanpete. Water conservation is very important to all of us and will continue to be so. The money that would be generated from the recreational benefits would be a Shot is the arm for our county. This narrows project has been promised to Sanpete for many years, please support us in helping us to finally get this project started and completed. Thank you.

Marilyn Nielsen
360 N 400 E
P. O. Box 137
Moroni, Utah 84646

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Reply Date	Reply	Cost
	PC	100
	PC	105
	PC	107
6/23/10	PC	700
6/23/10	PC	770
	PC	774cy
Action:		
Classification: ENU - 6.00		
NARROWS		
10042033		
1122816		

495. RICHARD NIELSEN

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Casey Blackburn [cblackburn@dalboinc.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:32 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Support Narrows Project

To Whom It May Concern:

495-1 Sanpete really needs this project to happen for many reasons. We need the economic benefits, Jobs, the water [which is legally ours] and is the life blood for our people in Sanpete. Water conservation is very important to all of us and will continue to be so. The money that would be generated from the recreational benefits would be a Shot is the arm for our county. This narrows project has been promised to Sanpete for many years, please support us in helping us to finally get this project started and completed. Thank you.

Richard Nielsen
360 N 400 E
P. O. Box 137
Moroni, Utah 84646

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Apply Date	Amount	Code
	100	
	105	
	107	
	700	
6/23/10	770	
6/23/10	774.00	

ENR - 6.00
NARROWS
10042034
- 1122816

496. RUSS NIELSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Gene Christensen [gchristensen@moronifeed.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 8:11 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: My comments

496-1 I am a resident of Spring City, Utah. I am very excited about this project. I hope and Pray it will go through. I have water restrictions every summer causing me to restrict the size of my garden. My horse pasture does not do as good as it could because of lack of water. I have been considering doing away with my grass and going desert because of lack of water. I live in the county at the top of the water line so I have very little water pressure. I went to a drip system for my garden because there is not enough water pressure to run a sprinkler. My prayers are out to all who is involved in this great project.

Thank you very much,
Russ Nielsen
Resident of Spring City Utah for 14 years

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
MAY 29 2010

	RS	100
	RS	105
	RS	107
	RS	100
6/20/10	RS	770
7/22/10	RS	774.00

ENV - 6.00
Narrows
-10045891
1122816

497. BRIAN NIELSON

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Brian Nielson [brian@grumpy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 7:19 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project for Sanpete County

497-1 The Narrows Project needs to happen for a number of reasons. The first and fore most issue in my opinion is it is the right and legal thing to do. The water in questions is unmistakably ~~property~~ of Sanpete County. This project is ridiculously overdue. I am a generational citizen of Sanpete County and believe this is a great place to live, work and recreate. This project supports each of those.

Thank you
Brian Nielson

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 10 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>Parker</i>	107
	<i>K</i>	700
4/23/10	<i>Butt</i>	770
6/23/10	<i>PC</i>	774cy
Action:		
Classification:	ENV-600	
Project:	Narrows	
Case no.:	0041903	
File ID:	1122816	

498. BURKE AND DIXIE NIELSON

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Gaye Deen Zabriskie [gayedeen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 9:09 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: support of Narrows project

498-1 We offer our support of this project. This is water that has been promised to Sanpete County. We need the water this will provide for several reasons--future growth in our area, jobs that will be created, the economical boost for our county. We need the irrigation water and storage are this will provide.

Burke and Dixie Nielson
900 E. 100 N.
Moroni, UT 84646

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 8 '10

		100
		105
		107
	KS	200
7/8/10	ECM	770
7/12/10	PC	774.04

ENV-6.00
Narrows
0045041
1122816

499. J. NEIL NIELSON

ORIGINAL

To Whom It May Concern;

499-1 I am strongly in favor of the Narrows Project. This project is very necessary for the north of Sanpete County. The water belongs to Sanpete County and needs to go where it rightfully should go.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,



J. Neil Nielson
PO Box 220307
Centerfield, Utah 84622

J. N. Nielson
PO Box 220307
Centerfield, UT 84622

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
MAY 25 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
6/4/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	110
6/21/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	114cy

Action:
Classification: ENV-6.00
Project: NARROWS
Contract No: 100 35340
ID: 1122816

500. RICHARD NIELSON

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Bonnie Nielson [7suns@cut.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 5:04 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

Bureau of Reclamation
Attention: Peter Crookston, PRO-774
302 E 1860 S
Provo, Utah 84606

Mr. Crookston,

500-1

Sanpete County is in need of more water for both Farm and Ranching and Drinking water for families. We own 3000 acres of land that could be farmed and cultivated if we had the water that has been promised for so long. We have raised and sold breeding stock for nearly 100 years, but because of so many dry years and not enough water we could be forced out of business. Sanpete is entitled, by ownership, to the water that was promised so many years ago and would be such a benefit economically to many people. We encourage the Bureau of Reclamation to please issue a favorable decision on the Narrows Project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Nielson
56 W 300 N
Ephraim, Utah 84627

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

RECEIVED

JUN 6 '10

DATE	NAME	AMOUNT
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	LS	700
6/30/10	But	770
7/22/10	PC	77400

END - 6.00
Narrows
10044415
11228/6

501. WAYNE NIELSON

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Wayne Nielson [wayne.nielson@nsanpete.k12.ut.us]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 4:05 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: support narrows proj

501-1 I am writing in support of the narrows project. I feel the time is right to build this project. The water rights are Sanpetes and have been for years. we have been denied the use of this water for the same time because of the refusal of the exercise of the right to build this dam. We have waited many years for it.

The building of this dam would increase the productivity of the land in sanpete, it would provide additional recreational activities for us. It would provide jobs at a time when jobs are needed.

This project is needed, there is not a better time to build it. build it now.

Wayne Nielson

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 07 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	WLN	100
	WLN	105
	WLN	107
	WLN	700
6/2/10	WLN	770
6/2/10	PC	774cy

Action:
Classification: EAD-650
Project: Narrows
Comment No: 10040553
Date: 1122816

502. WAYLON NUNLEY

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Waylon Nunley [Waylon.Nunley@imail.org]
Sent: Sunday, May 09, 2010 12:53 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Sanpetes water

502-1 What belongs to Sanpete should go to Sanpete. Carbon has nothing to worry about they have all the reservoirs on the mountain and Sanpete is just asking for 1!!!!!!! Share the wealth!!!!!!

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

DATE	INITIALS	QTY
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	RS	700
7/8/10	BCW	770
7/12/10	PC	774cy

ENV-6.00
DARRONS
10044063
1122816

503. WAYNE NUNLEY

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Wayne Nunley [wayne.nunley@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:21 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

503-1 After all the promises that have been made over this project, all the fighting needs to come to an end and the projects needs to completed! There are so many people that will benefit from it. It DEFINATELY needs to be completed!!!!

Wayne Nunley
535 E 700 S
Mount Pleasant Utah 84647
435-462-3904

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Learn more.](#)

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Date	By	Cost
	W. Nunley	100
	W. Nunley	105
	W. Nunley	107
	W. Nunley	100
6/23/10	PC	770
6/23/10	PC	770

END-600
Narrows
10041586
1122816

504. DAVID NUTTALL

May 3, 2010

To: Bureau of Reclamation

504-1 I feel the narrows dam project should proceed for several reasons.

- Sanpete County owns the water, therefore, they are entitled to it in a manner of most beneficial use. Currently, farms and ranches here in Fairview, Oak Creek, and Milburn are prevented from getting two full crops of hay, not by growing season, but because we run out of water. The narrows project would allow us sufficient water for two full crops and then some feed for our livestock in the fall.
- Carbon County lost the lawsuit and, in a letter from 1984, agreed in writing that the narrows project should be built.
- The recreational use of the narrows reservoir also comes with a big economic benefit for the Sanpete County area. I have heard estimates of a million dollars per year. That money is badly needed in a rural area that tends to get a large percentage of income from the recreation industry.

These are core reasons for my support of the narrows project. There are many more reasons, but I feel they all fall under these few general reasons.

David Verl Nuttall

RR 1 Box 186

Fairview Utah, 84629

505. CRAIG AND DIANE OBERG

HL

ORIGINAL

May 25, 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston,

505-1 I am a life long resident of Sanpete County. A family member served on the water conservancy board for many years. He worked really hard on getting the Narrows Project to come to pass. There have been many points of view expressed on the project, but the bottom line is that it is our water and we need to have a way for it to be delivered to Sanpete County. There is no water storage available for the northern half of Sanpete County. If we could get the late water from the Narrows Project we could possibly grow a 3rd crop of alfalfa and we could utilize our pastures better because we would have water for our animals.

The people who years ago filed on that water knew how important it would be to our area. I feel that there would be many good benefits come from the Narrows Project. The dam would provide not only the water we need but would boost the local economy through recreation. Municipalities would also benefit from having this water for future growth.

It just seems that if this is our water, and there seems to be no dispute about that, we should be able to get the water. It's just wrong that Carbon County has been able to use our water all these years and has forced us to spend thousands of dollars to fight for something that should have been done 60 years ago.

If this is our water, I just don't understand why the Narrows Project is being debated at all. It's time to do the right thing and for politicians to stop pandering to Carbon County in the hopes of being re-elected. I think it's also a shame that for the price of a postage stamp, environmental groups can stop the work that decent, honest men have spent years working on.

I hope you will be fair in your decision because right is right and wrong is wrong. The right thing to do is to give Sanpete County a way to get the water that is our.

Sincerely,

Craig + Diane Oberg
Ephraim, UT 84627

300 W 100 N
Ephraim, UT
84627

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 01 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	[Signature]	100
	[Signature]	105
	Billan	107
	KS	700
6/16/10	RS	770
6/21/10	PC	7740

Action:
Classification: ENU-6.00
File #: Narrows
Classification: 100-7577
Date: 1122.816

506. CRAIG OBERG

Crookston, Peter L

From: Craig Oberg [craig101@cobuildings.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 3:24 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

Mr. Peter Crookston,

506-1 My name is Craig Oberg. I am a resident of Sanpete County. I own and operate three commercial business entities in Ephraim and farm about 400 acres of agricultural land all in Sanpete. I have a hands on feel, as do many others, the need we have for water here in Sanpete.

I, like many other Sanpete County Residents, am writing to express my feelings concerning the Narrows Project which, in the beginning, was to benefit Carbon County and Sanpete County. It is hard to put into words the distaste I have for what has taken place for some 70 to 80 years.

Have we completely lost our sense of right and wrong in this country?

It is no secret what the original plan was, yet it has been distorted in any and every way possible to prevent Sanpete County from receiving what it right fully belongs to Sanpete County.

There have been two family members here in Ephraim that have been involved in this since the 1930's. I have heard all the stories about Court Battles, Environmental Impact, Corrupt this and that, etc. The time has long since passed when common sense should prevail.

It is now time to put all the "Politics" aside and put into motion the right thing, that is to get this project done and deliver the water to Sanpete County that it is right fully entitled to have, regardless of the opinions and objections from the East Side of the mountain. Carbon County "DOES NOT OWN THE WATER". That fact is not disputed. Yet someone allows them to have all the say for all these years. NONSENSE.

Sanpete County is growing along with all other counties in Utah. Water is the lifeblood to sustain us all. WE NEED OUR FAIR SHARE IN SANPETE COUNTY JUST AS MUCH AS THE REST. The time to do it is NOW!!

I could go on, I'm sure you have had an ear full about this and that concerning this matter. Please, see that Sanpete County gets what is right fully ours and has so wrong fully been denied for so many years.

Thank You

Craig D. Oberg
Sanpete County Resident

507. DIANE OGDEN

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Diane L. Ogden [diane.ogden@snow.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 1:38 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: comment from a citizen of Sanpete County

To Whom It May Concern:

507-1 I would like to add my voice to the many who have commented on the proposed Narrow's Project. The citizens of Sanpete County have been patient long enough. This projects was originally proposed in the 1930s . Too many times Sanpete county has been passed over and forgotten. This is an economically depressed area partly because we are often forgotten and overlooked. The people have been patient in this issue but the people shouldn't be punished for their patience.

As I understand it, the project has been pushed aside time and time again in favor of other more pressing needs. The time is now for the project to be completed. The project would allow for more water to the county and for opportunities for more economic development. When we lost the railroad in the 1980s, it took a long time for this county to rebound. The project would definitely be a step in the direction of improving the economic future of Sanpete County.

Sincerely,

Diane L. Ogden

Diane L. Ogden, Director
 Snow College International Center

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
 JUN 07 '10

Reply Date	Name	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
6/6/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/21/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	774cy
Action:		
Classification:	EAD-600	
Project:	Narrows	
Client/In. No.:	10040695	
File No.:	1122816	

508. G.O. (UNIDENTIFIED NAME)

42

ORIGINAL

May 25, 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston,

508-1

I am a life long resident of Sanpete County. A family member served on the water conservancy board for many years. He worked really hard on getting the Narrows Project to come to pass. There have been many points of view expressed on the project, but the bottom line is that it is our water and we need to have a way for it to be delivered to Sanpete County. There is no water storage available for the northern half of Sanpete County. If we could get the late water from the Narrows Project we could possibly grow a 3rd crop of alfalfa and we could utilize our pastures better because we would have water for our animals.

The people who years ago filed on that water knew how important it would be to our area. I feel that there would be many good benefits come from the Narrows Project. The dam would provide not only the water we need but would boost the local economy through recreation. Municipalities would also benefit from having this water for future growth.

It just seems that if this is our water, and there seems to be no dispute about that, we should be able to get the water. It's just wrong that Carbon County has been able to use our water all these years and has forced us to spend thousands of dollars to fight for something that should have been done 60 years ago.

If this is our water, I just don't understand why the Narrows Project is being debated at all. It's time to do the right thing and for politicians to stop pandering to Carbon County in the hopes of being re-elected. I think it's also a shame that for the price of a postage stamp, environmental groups can stop the work that decent, honest men have spent years working on.

I hope you will be fair in your decision because right is right and wrong is wrong. The right thing to do is to give Sanpete County a way to get the water that is our.

Sincerely,

177 West Center
Ephraim UT 84627

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 01 '10

Reply Date	Date	Initials	Code
	5/27/10	[Signature]	100
	5/27/10	[Signature]	105
	5/27/10	[Signature]	107
	5/27/10	KS	700
	6/1/10	PC	770
	6/1/10	PC	774

Action:
Classification: ENU - 6.00
Topic: Narrows
Control No: 10037583
File No: 1122816

509. MERRILL OGDEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Merrill Ogden [dland@manti.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 7:17 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project in Sanpete County, UT

Attn: Peter Crookston

509-1 Please let this correspondence show my support for the implementation/construction of the Gooseberry Narrows project. I've been a resident of Sanpete County for more than 25 years and have been hearing about the project the entire time I've lived here. From what I gather of the history of the issue including court adjudications, etc., I think it's high time that the project move forward.

I'm in the land title business. As a result of that and especially since the Utah Legislature made law changes in the 1999 session, I've had some experience in the water rights arena. Given Sanpete's ownership in the rights and the need for the beneficial use of those rights in Sanpete County - I feel that whatever impediments exist can and should be cleared.

For the sake of brevity, I won't pontificate further.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Merrill R. Ogden

Merrill R. Ogden - Mgr
D Land Title
120 North Main
P.O. Box 10
Manti, UT 84642
voice: (435) 835-2241
fax: (435) 835-2200
dland@manti.com

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUL 10

	<i>RS</i>	<i>100</i>
	<i>JK</i>	<i>105</i>
	<i>Hillman</i>	<i>107</i>
	<i>KS</i>	<i>700</i>
<i>6/30/10</i>	<i>RS</i>	<i>770</i>
<i>7/22/10</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>774 of</i>

END - 6.00
Narrows
10045877
1122816

510. TOM OGDEN

AL

ORIGINAL

**Comments submitted by
Tom Ogden
1480 West 360 North
Price, Utah 84501**

**Home phone (435) 637-2575
E-mail togden@emerytelcom.net**

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY

RECEIVED

JUN 01 '10

Reply Date

Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
4/16/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/2/10	TC	774cy

Action:

Classification: ENV - 6.00
Date: Narrows
Number: 10037663
Date: 1122816

Note: Page numbers referenced are from the PDF file.

Comments on the Gooseberry Narrows Project 2010

510-1 This project is for an additional 4,281 ac/ft. to north Sanpete County for irrigated farm ground and 855 ac/ft. is for municipal use. Page 17 & Table 2-1 Page 84
The Fish & wildlife Service states that the project would provide 4,920 ac/ft of water for irrigation and 480 ac/ft for municipal supplies. Page 382 The loan application uses 500 ac/ft for the initial M&I allotment. Which is correct?

510-2 At the top of the active capacity water level for the Proposed Action, the proposed project's facilities are expected to attract a total of 43,911 (46,400 visitor days on Page 141) additional visitor days per year of total developed recreation use. These use rates are based on use rates of Joe's Valley Reservoir. Page 35
The surface acres of Joe's Valley Reservoir is 1,183 acres when full. The proposed project is 604, surface acres, about 51% of the size of Joe's Valley, at an elevation 1,810 feet higher than Joe's Valley. The recreational season will be much shorter at the Proposed Project. How can you expect the project to receive similar recreational use? The expected visitor days are unrealistic.

Table 3-22.—Proposed Recreation Use at the Narrows Project (elevation 8,690') Page 219

Proposed Action	604 X 72.7 = 43,911
Mid-Sized Reservoir	489 X 72.7 = 35,550
Small Reservoir	362 X 72.7 = 26,317

Source: Reclamation gathered information from USDA Forest Service records (2003-08); visitor days per year at Joe's Valley Reservoir (85,000), divided by 1,170 surface acres.

Table 3-23.—Proposed Recreation Use at the Narrows Project Including Impacts to

Scotfield	visitor days Gooseberry	visitor days Scotfield	overall visitor days
Proposed Action	43,911	-12,708	31,203
Mid-Sized Reservoir	35,550	-12,059	23,491
Small Reservoir	26,317	-10,853	15,464

- Source: Reclamation gathered information from USDA Forest Service and State Parks (2003-08); visitor days per year at Joe's Valley Reservoir (elevation 6,880') (85,000 visitors), divided by 1,170 surface acres; and Scofield Reservoir (elevation 7,618') (105,200 visitors to State Park), divided by 2,268 (2,282 acres page 389) (average surface acres)
- 510-3 Page 219 Scofield State Park receives an annual visitation of about 105,200 visitors!!
Page 216
There are considerably more visitors that utilize Scofield Reservoir than the ones that enter the State Park. There are property owners, boaters, anglers, and wildlife watchers. Using that incomplete information to formulate the lost visitor days to Scofield is flawed.
- 510-4 Table 2-8 Page 141 Under Recreational and Visual the table lists the change in the number of fishing days lost on Scofield and then lists the increase in recreational days at the proposed project and the increased use of dispersed camping including fishing at the project. Why in world would you skew the data so badly? You are comparing apples and oranges. From that comparison alone it appears as if the BOR favors completing this project. You should also determine lost fishing days on Upper Fish Creek, Lower Fish Creek, and the Price River below Scofield Reservoir. With the decreased flows in the streams the fishing opportunities will diminish in all of these waters. This would also decrease the use of dispersed camping in those areas.
- 510-5 Also on Table 2-8 there is an 11% increase in farm income. Is this a net income after deducting the loss of farm income from the lack of water in Carbon County?
- 510-6 Table 2-8 the table shows 439 ac/ft less water for Carbon County for the proposed project. Page 141. How much water do the Carbon County irrigators actually lose, 753 acre feet (page 158) or 439 acre feet (page 141)? I don't understand how Sanpete County can gain 5,318 ac/ft and Carbon County only lose 439 ac/ft.
- 510-7 Table 3-2 Page 156 The table shows that in the month of May with the proposed project on an average year there would be no flow in the Price River below Scofield.. How is that going to work?
- 510-8 Table 4 Page 416 The table shows the reccomended plan for an average water year would have no flow in the Price river below Scofield for the months of March, April, and May. Again, I ask, How is that going to work?

Proposed Project to be 454 surface acres (average level) (604 surface acres when full - Page 37) (average loss to Scofield Reservoir 290 surface acres. Page 140) - mid-sized project, 277 surface acres (average level) (489 surface acres when full - Page 91) (average loss to Scofield Reservoir 284 acres. Page 140) - small-sized project, 238 surface acres (average level) (362 surface acres when full - Page 91) (average loss to Scofield 258 surface acres. Page 140). There is a number of conflicting surface acre numbers for the project throughout the document.

- 510-9 There is a 2,500 acre feet conservation pool regardless of reservoir capacity. This is dead storage that is below the level of the tunnel. Page 90 It is not like SWCD is making any kind donation with this conservation pool. This in no way is to be considered mitigation for impacts to fisheries.
- 510-10 As an element of the reasonable and prudent alternative to the Narrows proposal, the Recovery Program was directed under the 2000 biological opinion to fund a study to determine seasonal endangered fish use in the Price River and develop recommendations for year-round in-stream flow requirements in the Price River for Colorado pikeminnow. The Recovery Program has completed field investigations to address this element of the reasonable and prudent alternative and is planning to release a summary of flow requirements for internal committee review and approval during autumn 2009. Page 146 Where are the results of this study? What about in-stream flow requirements?
- 510-11 SWCD would purchase 150 acres of conservation easements adjacent to the Narrows Reservoir. These easements would impose restrictions on land use that would benefit impacted species. In addition, the conservation easements would provide a setback of about 500 feet on the west side of the reservoir for any new development or construction on private land adjacent to the reservoir. Page 106 Is the 500 foot setback from the high water line? What about the other sides of the reservoir?
- 510-12 The four endangered species of fish, what offsets for the project impact are available other than onetime payment of \$102,369.00 from Sanpete County? \$18.29 per ac/ft. (2009) compensation for annual average depletion of flow in Lower Fish Creek of 5,597 ac/ft Page 146 Could this money be used to purchase in-stream flow in Lower Fish creek for endangered fish? I'm not sure what the fish would do with the money.
- 510-13 Scofield Reservoir from 1960 - 2002 has filled and spilled 17 times in 42 years. The assumption is that the reservoir fills and spills every two or three years. Page 21 Data from the BOR web site indicates the reservoir has spilled 10 times in the last 34 years (data only available from 1975-2009). That means that Scofield Reservoir reached its full active capacity every three to four years. The last time Scofield Reservoir spilled was in 1999.
- 510-14 As a result of constructing Narrows Reservoir, the operation of Scofield Reservoir would be altered within the normal historic range. Scofield Reservoir would operate at a lower level with implementing the Proposed Action as shown in figure 3-1. (On page 159) Under project conditions, the average total contents of Scofield Reservoir would be reduced from about 42,360 acre-feet to about 31,500 acre-feet (that is 48% of the full active

level). Scofield Reservoir is already on the EPA 303D list of impaired waters and decreasing the active storage level and decreasing inlet flows will increase the chances of poor water quality. Average reduction in storage releases to irrigators in the Price area would be about 753 acre-feet per year. How can you reduce the capacity of the reservoir by 10,860 acre-feet and only reduce the water to the irrigators by 753 acre-feet? The total depletions to the Price River drainage would average 5,597 acre-feet per year. Both the volume and frequency of spills from the reservoir would be reduced. With the No Action (looks like it should be for the small reservoir?) Alternative, the average reservoir surface area would be reduced from 2,370 acres to about 2,125 acres. This is about a 10% reduction or about 245 acres of the surface area of the No Action Alternative. Page 158

The primary purpose of the Narrows Project is to enable SWCD to develop an irrigation and M&I supply source for users in north Sanpete County, Utah, whereby the average annual shortages to irrigators in the project area might be reduced as nearly as possible to 5 percent (%), which is considered full irrigation supply for Reclamation projects. Page 13

510-16 Under the Proposed Action, water supplies in the San Pitch River Basin would increase by an average of 5,227 acre-feet per year due to releases from Narrows Reservoir. Irrigation water shortages would be reduced to about 10,878 acre-feet per year or about 21.1% of the diversion demand. Page 161 Are you saying that even with the proposed project that Sanpete County will still be short on water by 21.1%?

Water conservation measures to reduce shortages on irrigated farm lands to 29.5%. Page 17. Approximately 40% of the cropland in the project area is still using flood irrigation.

510-17 Mitigation measures would be implemented to offset adverse impacts. Additional water conservation measures would be required independent of the Proposed Action. To be eligible to receive water from the Narrows Project, water users would be required to use, or agree to implement, conservation measures. Page 12 Who would insure that these agreements are honored?

Four times more likely, under the proposed project, to drain Scofield Reservoir to the dead storage/ conservation pool elevation. Page 23 This is a very important and troubling statistic!

510-18 Appendix B SWCD has applied for a loan based on a 7,900 ac/ft reservoir (small alternative). Page 314 1st paragraph. There is a conflict with the description in the loan application. The paragraph states the dam to be 120' high with a 7,900 ac/ft capacity. The dam would be 100' high with the 7,900 ac/ft, small reservoir alternate. Why haven't SWCD applied for the loan based on the proposed project of 17,000 acre feet?

The Narrows Project, in association with existing Federal projects, will further reduce peak discharge within the Price River. Annual depletions of the Narrows Project are 5,717 AF. Total depletion within the Price River Basin is 88,129 AF. It is our biological opinion that the effects of the Narrows Project, as proposed, are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, razorback sucker, and bonytail through water depletions from the Green and Colorado rivers and is likely to destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat in the Green and Colorado rivers from the confluence of the Price and Green rivers downstream to Lake Powell. In addition, the proposed Narrows Project is likely to jeopardize Colorado pikeminnow currently occupying the Price River and detrimentally impact in-stream habitat conditions of the Price River. Page 343 This project is just another nail in the coffin for the endangered fish in the drainage.

- 510-19** State Road 264 is to be relocated 2.9 miles across the Narrows Dam. Has this routing been approved by home land security? They do not like roads over dams. Page 89, Page 17, and Page 383 (2.6 miles of state road 264 and .3 miles of the road to Lower Gooseberry)?
- 510-20** On-farm conservation measures, including improved irrigation methods such as canal lining, sprinklers, and gated pipe will be required for participants to be eligible for project water. Page 383 It looks like 40% of the participants are still flood irrigated. Who would be responsible to verify that conservation measures are completed before the project is? Page 226
- 510-21** Scofield Reservoir and Lower Fish Creek are designated by the Division of Wildlife resources as Blue Ribbon Fisheries. This reservoir and stream are very high quality fisheries that are very well known and utilized by anglers from throughout this state and surrounding states. Page 388 Upper Fish Creek is on the Division of Wildlife Resources list of potential Blue Ribbon waters.
- 510-22** Mitigation proposal for the purchase of property (220 acres) on Mud Creek in Carbon County is no longer available. Carbon County Recreation has purchased the property and the DWR has a project approved for fencing and habitat improvement for this year. The mitigation proposal to acquire, fence and improve habitat on 2.0 miles of the Price River below Scofield is no longer available. This property has been purchased by the Division of Wildlife Resources and can no longer be used for mitigation. Page 395 Whatever mitigation measures are agreed to for this project, should be completed prior to the filling of the reservoir. Commitments are soon forgotten once the SWCD starts storing water.

- 510-23** There was no mid-sized reservoir proposed for the early US Fish & Wildlife Service comments.
- Measuring devices were to be installed and maintained, at the expense of Sanpete County, as part of this 1984 agreement. This means there should be water use data from Sanpete County after 1984. Where is this information since 1984? There should have been a table to show flows into Sanpete County since 1984. Were these devices not installed?
- 510-24** The Proposed Action would cost approximately \$40.3 million (2008 dollars) and would be funded by SWCD, the State of Utah, and a loan from the Federal Government. Of the \$40.3-million cost, about \$7.6 million would be allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation (table 2-5). Page 110 What is the cost estimate for construction of this project in 2010 dollars? I don't see where the \$7.6 million figure for wildlife and recreation comes from. I get \$5,339,000 for fish, wildlife, & recreation.
- 510-25** Agriculture in Sanpete County is of major economic significance and involves a sizable number of people. From 1992-2002, the census of agriculture data shows the number of farms increased by 9%, whereas the number of acres in production changed by less than 1%. The average farm size decreased from 643 acres in 1992 to 471 acres in 2002. About 55% of the land in Sanpete County is used for agriculture. Of that amount, a total of 113,647 acres or 32% is cropland. Page 225 Why go to the trouble to explain how many acres of cropland there are in Sanpete County when only 15,420 acres, or 13.6% of cropland in Sanpete County, would benefit from the proposed project?
- 510-26** Irrigators in the Fairview area rely on the Narrows Tunnel to convey water stored in Fairview Lakes to Cottonwood Creek. As described in chapter 2, the tunnel is in a critical state of disrepair. Page 226. If this tunnel is so critical to Sanpete County why haven't they repaired it? It is critical whether or not the project is approved. It does not seem appropriate for the BOR to loan money for the rehab work on the tunnel. This should be paid out of the SWCD's O & M budget.
- 510-27** The other thing that worries me about the project is that if the SWCD cannot maintain a 3,100' tunnel how are they going to maintain everything that goes with this project? Such as the fencing, flow measuring devices, automated devices, such as valves and gates, and overall dam maintenance. Does the SWCD have an estimated cost for annual maintenance on this project?
- 510-28** Of the 15,420 acres of irrigated farmland (13.6% of the cropland in Sanpete County) within the Sanpete County project area, an estimated 9,252 acres are irrigated by sprinkler. The remaining acreage is flood irrigated. Page 226 The \$40,255,000 project estimate (2008 dollars) for a third crop of hay on 15,420 acres of cropland would be a hard sell on economic terms.

- 510-29 The Narrows Project would not affect minimum flows of the Price River. Many of the impacts to fishery resources from the 30 Reclamation projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin are the direct result of water depletions. Depletions would occur as a result of the Narrows Project. Page 256. How can the project not affect flows in the Price River?

It is expected that the proposed Gooseberry Narrows Project would detrimentally impact Colorado pikeminnow and result in a decline in the number of individuals using the Price River or possibly inhibiting use altogether. Also, the unknown importance of the Price River as winter or spawning habitat prevents protection of these important life-history elements, if, in fact, they are present. Furthermore, adverse modification of critical habitat for all four endangered fish species from the confluence of the Price and Green rivers downstream to Lake Powell is expected to result in detriment and overall harm to the populations, thereby offsetting recovery efforts elsewhere in the basin. Page 342

In the amended Biological Assessment from Reclamation to the Service (March 1, 1997), Reclamation suggested the following actions be developed into RIPRAP items to offset the Proposed Narrows Project impacts to the Price River and endangered fish species:

- 1) Project sponsors . . . pay the depletion charge for the entire depletion caused by the Narrows Project.'
- 2) The Recovery Program would agree to provide funding for the continuance of the [Price River endangered fish] study for . . . additional . . . year(s) . . . this study could include . . . data. . . to provide a better understanding of the year-round utilization of the Price River by Colorado squawfish (sic); . . . identifying flow needs and potential sources of water . . . for in stream flows needed by endangered fish [in the Price River].'
- 3) The Recovery Program would secure water rights on the Price River that could be used to maintain in-stream flows during critical times of the year for squawfish (sic) in the Price River.' Page 344

- 510-30 Seasonal endangered fish use in the Price River, particularly winter. Recommendation of year-round, in-stream flow requirements for Colorado pikeminnow. Page 347 I do not see the in-stream flows addressed in the document.

In summary, I would like to thank the Bureau of Reclamation for the opportunity to comment on this project. I would like to say that I would be tickled to death to have another flat water fishery and a developed recreation area but not at the expense of losing Upper Fish Creek, Scofield Reservoir, Lower Fish Creek, and the Price River. The document leaves a lot of unanswered questions about responsibility, maintenance, liability, and funding of this project. Do the residents of Sanpete County understand that they will all be paying for a project that benefits less than 14% of the irrigated cropland in their county?

511. BETTY OLIVER

AL

ORIGINAL

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

MAY 04 '10

03 May 2010

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
5/4	BCB	100
		105
	Pullman	107
	LS	700
5/9/10	Bcb	770
5/10/10	PC	7740y

To: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
ATTN: PETER CROOKSTON, PRO-774
302 E. 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606

Action:
Classification: ENV-6.00
Project: Narrows
Contract No: 10029198
ID: 1122816

Dear Sir:

511-1

Regarding the **NARROWS PROJECT**--Sanpete County needs the **WATER SUPPLY** from a reservoir in our county that was **PROMISED** so many years ago! The dam and the reservoir would create **MANY JOBS** in this economic time and much needed **WATER FOR FARMS** in one of the poorest counties in Utah. Sanpete County is very much in need of the Narrows Project for **jobs and water ASAP**.

Thank you for your attention to this matter!. SOON!

Sincerely, a concerned citizen,

Betty J. Oliver
333 E. Hwy. 89 N.
Gunnison, Utah 84634-0074

Copies sent to: Senator Orrin Hatch
Senator Robert Bennett
Congressman Jason Chaffetz
Congressman Rob Bishop
Congressman Jim Matheson



Mrs. Stanley Oliver
333 E Hwy. 89 N
PO Box 74
Gunnison, UT 84634

513. CORINNE OLSEN

AL

Crookston, Peter L

ORIGINAL

From: Darrel Ward Olsen [dwolsen@mail.manti.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 12:04 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows project

May 29, 2010

Dear Bureau of Reclamation,

513-1 I am writing this letter to inform you that I strongly recommend approval and support for the Narrows Project. The benefits far outweigh the costs.

This project is way past due. Other projects done in support of water conservation have been completed for years. Yet, this one has not. I understand there has been opposition and delays have been caused by groups filing law suits and sending letters of opposition. As a result, the people supporting these groups have been allowed to continue to receive water that does not belong to them. This results in most of the water being wasted as it only comes in high water and is not stored.

If this project is supported then not only will Sanpete County benefit, but so will Emery. Both will have increased income from people working on the project and once it's done there will be jobs that deal with managing it. We will also have more people coming to participate in recreational activities and will spend money in our other cities. We will also be able to enjoy the area for recreational use.

Do not be part of the continued misuse of Sanpete water. Do what is morally correct and support the Narrows Project.

Sincerely,

Corinne F. Olsen, RPh
1151 E. Canyon Road
Ephraim, Utah 84627

514. DARREL OLSEN

AL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Darrel Ward Olsen [dwolsen@mail.manti.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 11:21 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows project

May 29, 2010

Dear Bureau of Reclamation,

514-1 The time is right now to move forward with the Narrows Project. We can't afford to let this project not be completed.

On T.V., I continue to hear the slogan "Slow the Flow". Indirectly, we need to conserve water and yet we let huge amounts run off our snow packs. It runs down our streams only to leave our state since it all melts at once and we don't have storage for it. This leaves us very little when the summer is the hottest. We need to "Slow the Flow" and store what we have for when we need it.

There are also benefits to the Narrows Project. We will also have increased jobs which is so badly needed now in this time of economic uncertainty. It will also take pressure off other recreational areas which are over used.

Sanpete has paid into the Central Utah water project for many years and continues to contribute but has never received any benefit from the project. We have had many promises of receiving help with projects. None of which have occurred. Now is the time to fulfill your promise and help us to build the Narrows Project, not only helping Sanpete but all of Utah. It is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

Darrel W. Olsen, MD
1151 E. Canyon Road
Ephraim, Utah 84627

515. JAY OLSEN

AL

ORI

Crookston, Peter L

From: jlolsen@mail.manti.com
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 3:56 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project Comments, Sanpete resident (word doc. letter is attached)
Attachments: Narrows Project letter of support.docx

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn. Peter Crookston, PRO-774
302 East 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606

May 28, 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston

515-1 I am writing in support of Narrows Project. Legally Sanpete owns the water rights; ethically the water rights should be delivered, and should have been delivered many years ago.

Professionally, I work with farms and ranchers throughout the Six County area (48 to be exact), many are located in Sanpete, to provide education and training one-on-one in Farm/Ranch Business Management. In addition, I compile data on farms/ranches enrolled in the educational program for establishing benchmarks for the farmers and ranchers to analyze and make management decisions by. Data from 2009 shows that it cost \$102.14 to produce a ton of alfalfa hay which made it just a break-even year if the farmer produced 5 tons per acre from 3 or 4 cuttings (similar costs and yields are seen for the past six years of data). If the farm only produces two cuttings of hay their yields are a little over three 3 tons per acre with many of the same costs, putting their break-even at \$150.15/ton. Economically, the third cutting of hay makes or breaks the farmer. Additional water which the Narrows Project would deliver for later season irrigation use would significantly increase Sanpete County farmers opportunities opportunity to breakeven each year or make a little money.

The application of more water later in the growing season in the upper end of Sanpete Valley will, logically, recharge ground water aquifers and be beneficial throughout all of Sanpete valley.

As Utah's population continues to increase additional recreational opportunities are expected and even demanded. The Narrows project will provide additional much needed recreational opportunities and ease recreational use on other lakes and reservoirs throughout the state. The economic impact of recreation on Utah's rural economy is widely reported and Sanpete as well as Carbon and other neighboring counties will enjoy significant revenue increases as recreational opportunities increase.

Central Utah families will benefit from: increased employment and business growth, increased recreational opportunities all of which strengthens families. Snow College and College of Eastern Utah will benefit from increased tax base, population stability and growth, and increased opportunities for student's recreation and classes that teach and support recreation activities.

Sanpete has gone too long without its use of rightfully owned water. For the reasons listed above and others, and because it's the legal and morally right thing to do I support the Bureau of Reclamation moving forward in an accelerated manner to allow construction to begin on the Narrows Project.

Sincerely

Jay D. Olsen

516. MARGO OLSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Margo Olsen [molsen@cut.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:45 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

516-1 I am writing to express my support for the Narrows Project. There are numerous benefits that this project will bring to Sanpete County for which I am in favor of it. The project will not only bring much needed water supply to Sanpete County, but will also bring numerous recreation activities to the area. The water needed in the area far surpasses the supply and several times in the past when the water has been shut off my Garden has suffered and died. Sanpete County needs more water and the water that is rightfully ours. Not only has this project been promised to Sanpete for nearly 80 years, but the water is Sanpete Counties and the Utah Supreme Court, as well as the US Dept of Justice both acknowledge that the water clearly belongs to Sanpete County. The project will also bring much needed economic growth to the area which in this economy is needed now more than ever. There are many more reasons that I have not mentioned above why I support this project, but I have mentioned a few of the main reasons why I support this project and want to see it moved forward for the betterment of all of Sanpete County.

Sincerely,

Margo Olsen
495 E 100 N
Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 18 2010

Date	Initials	Count
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	KS	700
7/27/10	BSH	770
7/12/10	PC	774af

EAD-6.00
Narrows
10045212
1122814

517. MICHAEL OLSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Margo Olsen [molsen@cut.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:53 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

517-1

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my support for the Narrows Project. I am a lifelong resident of Mt. Pleasant, in Sanpete, and see this project as a great asset to the area. There are abundant benefits that this project will bring to Sanpete County and its residents for which I am in favor of it. The biggest reason I am in favor of this project is that it will bring much needed water supply to Sanpete County. The water needed in the area far surpasses the supply at the present time. My farm requires a large amount of water to sustain the land which supports my cattle and if that water is not available then my farm would cease to function. Sanpete County needs more water and the water that is rightfully ours. Not only has this project been promised to Sanpete for nearly 80 years, but the water is Sanpete Counties and the Utah Supreme Court, as well as the US Dept of Justice both acknowledge that the water clearly belongs to Sanpete County. The project will also bring much needed economic growth to the area which in this economy is needed now more than ever. There are many more reasons that I have not mentioned above why I support this project, but I have mentioned a few of the main reasons why I support this project and want to see it moved forward for the betterment of all of Sanpete County.

Michael Olsen
495 E 100 N
Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647

OFFICIAL FILE CO.
RECEIVED
MAY 31 8 10

		100
		105
		107
		200
7/5/10	But	770
7/2/10	PC	7740y

ENV-6.00
NARROWS
10045214
1122816

518. RICH OLSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Rich Olsen [ro_electric@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 5:26 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: The Narrows Project

518-1 To whom it may concern
it is important to the people of Sanpete County Utah to have this project completed it has been 80 years that it has been on the proposal it is water that would greatly help the farmers in this area to have that water for late Summer. thank you for your considreation

Rich Olsen Manti Utah

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
MAY 31 2010

		100
		105
		107
	KS	200
7/8/10	BCM	770
7/12/10	PC	774.04

ENV-6.00
Narrows
10045092
1122816

519. SCOTT OLSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Scott Olsen [solsen@sanpetecounty-ut.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 4:24 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: narrows project

519-1

Hi, this letter is in regards to the narrows project at the top of Fairview canyon. It has been in the political process way to long, and should have been completed many years ago. Carbon county has been taking the water that belongs to Sanpete county far too long. I am very much in favor of the dam and its location as the very best fesible location. The existing and future water needs of Sanpete County are vital to its progress and sustainability fo its residents. The benefits of water and recreational procedes can and will be very vital to the current residents and its future generations. Thanks for your time and effort to make this happen.
Scott Olsen

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUL 10

	100
	105
	107
	900
6/30/10	BCet 770
7/22/10	PC 774 off

ENU - 600
Narrows
10045870
7/22/10

520. TRAVIS OLSEN

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Travis Olsen [olsentkid@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:25 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS; PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrow project

520-1

I am writing to express my support and feelings regarding the Narrows Project. I strongly support the narrows project and the construction of the project. I have lived in Sanpete County my entire life and want the best for the area. There are many benefits the project will bring to Sanpete County for which I am in favor of it. The project will not only bring much needed water supply to Sanpete County, but will also bring numerous recreation activities to the area such as fishing, camping, hunting, ect. The project will also bring much needed economic growth to the area which in this economy is needed more than ever. The reasons I have mentioned above, along with numerous others, are why I am in favor of this promising Narrows Project and very much want this to be moved forward for not only the present residents of Sanpete County but also the future generations.

Sincerely,

Travis Olsen
481 S 100 E
Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 18 10

		100
		105
		107
		700
7/8/10	RC	770
7/12/10	RC	774cy

END - 6.00
NARROWS
10045163
1122816

521. TYLER OLSEN

Crookston, Peter L

07/12/10

From: Tyler Olsen [tyhunts@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:57 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

521-1 To whom it may concern:
I am writing to express my support for the Narrows Project. There are numerous benefits that this project will bring to Sanpete County and its residents for which I am in favor of it. This project will bring numerous recreation activities to Sanpete such as fishing and hunting, two of my favorite pastimes. Sanpete County needs more water and the water that is rightfully ours. Not only has this project been promised to Sanpete for nearly 80 years, but the water is Sanpete Counties and the Utah Supreme Court, as well as the US Dept of Justice both acknowledge that the water clearly belongs to Sanpete County. There are many more reasons that I have not mentioned above why I support this project, but I have mentioned a few of the main reasons why I support this project and want to see it moved forward for the betterment of all of Sanpete County.

Tyler Olsen
495 E 100 N
Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy: Get more from your inbox. [See how.](#)

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 18 10

		100
		105
	<i>Miller</i>	107
	<i>KS</i>	70.0
7/8/10	<i>Butt</i>	77.0
7/12/10	<i>PC</i>	774.0

END - 6.00
Narrows
10045215
1122816

522. ANNJEANETTE OLSON

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: AnnJeanette Olson [annj.olson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:45 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: The Narrows project

To Whom It May Concern:

522-1

I am writing to you because I am in full support of the Narrow Project. Currently I am a resident of Mt. Pleasant City. As a young girl I grew up in Moroni, my family has lived and farmed in this valley for over a hundred years. My ancestors were some of the first people to settle in this valley. My family has given everything to build this community to what it is today. I want my children, grandchildren, and great-grand children to be able to receive the same kind of benefits and privileges that I have been able to receive. One of the ways they can is through this project. We are currently living on limited water. This in turn limits our growth in population and also affects us economically. It is extremely frustrating to run out of water in July and watch all of our hard work turn brown. This project would benefit our community beyond words. Please deeply consider what this would mean to our community and our lively hood. Thank you for your time.
 Sincerely,
 AnnJeanette Olson

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
 RECEIVED
 JUN 1 2010

Receipt Date	Receipts	Cost
	KS	100
	KS	105
	KS	107
	KS	200
4/23/10	KS	770
6/23/10	PC	774cy

Action:
 Description: ENV-6.00
 Narrows
 Receipt No: 0091766
 1122816

523. GLEN OLSON

AL

ONIG

Crookston, Peter L

From: Glen Olson [gs_olson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 11:30 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: for project

523-1 We need this. Sanpete needs this crucial water. The law and all court rulings are on our side. The economic benefits to sanpete will be felt for generations. Pleas push this project to a finish
Glen S Olson
Mt Pleasant

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 1 5 10

File Date	Initials	Code
	[Signature]	100
	[Signature]	105
	[Signature]	107
	[Signature]	700
6/23/10	BCW	770
6/23/10	PC	774

Project: ENVI-6.00
Location: NARROWS
10041558
1122816

524. LARRY AND SONJA ORTON

ORIGINAL

April 24, 2010

Peter Crookston,

524-1 Sanpete's need for water storage is far more important than any environmental or other considerations that might weigh against the Narrows. Ultimately, water supply is the critical issue. People-- and their need for water-- are far more important than any issues offered by opponents that the Narrows should not be built. Sanpete County badly needs the water storage that would be denied us should the Narrows not be built.

The new recreational facilities will also bring additional economic benefits to Sanpete and surrounding counties. As people travel to reach the Narrows recreational facilities, the communities through which they travel benefit from the various kinds of economic activities that travelers typically produce (sale of fuel, restaurant food, groceries, etc.) These will be significant to the businesses of Sanpete and other communities.

Sincerely,

Larry and Sonja Orton
459 No. State #20-7
Fairview, Utah 84629

525. ANDY OSBORNE

AL

OP

Crookston, Peter L

From: Andy Osborne [aosborne@utah.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 11:39 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Just wanted to put my input in on the project. It would be very important for Sanpete County to see this project go through, not only for the much needed water that we do need, but for the community as a whole. It would definitely help the water s...

525-1 Just wanted to put my input in on the project. It would be very important for Sanpete County to see this project go through, not only for the much needed water that we do need, but for the community as a whole. It would definitely help the water shortage that we do have, and also bring in jobs to our much needed county. I know al of us here in Sanpete look forward to seeing this project start and complete to help the communities in this county
Andy Osborne

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Reply Date	Time	Initials	Code
		<i>[Signature]</i>	100
		<i>[Signature]</i>	105
		<i>[Signature]</i>	107
		<i>[Signature]</i>	700
6/23/10		<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/23/10		<i>[Signature]</i>	774cy

END - 6.00
NARROWS
10041555
1122816

526. MAGGON OSMOND

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Maggon Osmond [maggonosmond@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 3:35 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

Maggon Osmond
PO Box 254
Fairview, UT 84629

To whom it may concern:

526-1 I was raised on a farm in Sanpete County. My whole life, we have struggled against the over-powering odds of water shortage. My father was the first in Northern Sanpete County to put in a pressurized irrigation system, in order to maximize the use of the water. Farmers are conservationists by nature because their very livelihood depends on the stewardship they have over the land. We have created a water system that is most efficient, but no matter how hard we work, we can not make it rain. No matter how efficient we are, we can not keep the snow-pack on the mountain.

I believe that all the required research measures have been met. All we need now is for honorable people to make the right decision and allow the Narrows Project to be fulfilled. Please, please, allow Sanpete Valley to have the opportunity to reap the benefits of decades worth of work.

Thank you,

Maggon Osmond

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 15 '10

Table with columns: Reply Date, Date, Amount, Code. Includes handwritten entries for dates like 6/22/10 and amounts like 100, 105, 107, 700, 770, 774cy. Also includes classification information: ENVI-6.00, Narrows, 10043241, 1122816.

527. KEISHA OTTEN

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: keisha beck [keisha_beck@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 3:41 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS; keisha_beck@hotmail.com
Subject: Narrows Project

527-1 To whom it may concern,
 As a concerned citizen of Sanpete County I am writing this letter in regards to the Narrows Project. I believe that this would be a great asset to our county. Growing up as a farmer's daughter and now I am a farmer's wife, I know the hardship that occurs when there is a shortage of water. If we would be able to store some of the water from abundant years of water to use on drought years it would help all farmers in Sanpete.

Along with the benefit to farmers the Narrows Project would also help stimulate the economy in Sanpete County. It would bring much needed jobs to our county. With the perk of a new recreational facility. It has also been estimated that after construction, the Narrows will create about \$1 million per year of economic benefit, primarily in Sanpete County.

Please help us in receiving what is rightfully ours. It is very important to Sanpete County that we receive the water that is ours. Fundamental fairness dictates that the Narrows be built as soon as possible. It is a matter of integrity. It is not right for promises to be made, then not kept, or for contracts to be signed, then broken. The federal government has promised water storage to Sanpete; that promise is yet unfulfilled. Carbon County has promised to cease objections to the Narrows Project; yet they continue to object.

The most important part of this project is the water storage that would occur. It is much needed and it is Sanpete's time to get it.

Thank You
 Keisha Otten
 PO BOX 220753
 Centerfield Ut, 84622

The New Busy is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. [Get busy.](#)

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 04 '10

Exp Date	Time	Amount	Cred
		100	
		105	
		107	
		700	
4/21/10	BEK	770	
6/01/10	PC	774.00	

Author:
 Description: ENVI - 6.00
 Name: NARROWS
 Number: 10040475
 1122816

528. LYNN AND GENEENE PAGE

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Geneene Page [evonf70@yahoo.com]
 Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 10:28 AM
 To: PRO NarrowsEIS
 Subject: water for San Pete

528-1

Bring water to SanPete , so water will come from Fairview Canyon into the reservoir, Pleasant Creek and Birch Creek . All of FAirview to other farmers of SAn Pete. WE desperately need this.
 Thank you Mr Lynn Page
 Geneene Page
 Paul Keddington
 farmers in Fairview P O BOX 512 84629

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY

RECEIVED

JUN 04 10

Apply Date	Name	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	KS	700
6/2/10	Bat	770
6/2/10	PC	774cy

Action:

Classification: ENVI-6.00

Location: Narrows

Document: 0040509

Page: 1122816

529. CHARLENE PALMER

ORIGINAL

Charlene Palmer
1000 South Palmer Road
Mt. Pleasant, Utah 84647

Mr. Peter Crookston,

529-1

I am a resident of Sanpete County and have been for 35 years. My ancestors were some of the first to come here in the late 1800's. I have known many of the long time farming families in the area. The farm we bought was over a mile from the creek that is our only water source and we put in the first underground irrigation system in the north end of the county because the water loss in the pioneer ditches made it impossible to get enough water to our crops. We would have never survived with out it.

There was not enough water then to make the land profitable and there is even less now. As Sevier, Delta and Gunnison claim this area to be their drainage, we are not allowed to hold any water more than one night, that comes in the Spring run off, for use in the Summer and Fall when we need it. And yet all of these areas water at least three full crops of hay while we get one and a half at best.

We are not asking for anything more than what we own and have been promised. This water project is so very small compared to the amount of water stored in the mountain for Emery and Carbon counties at this moment, and who have decreasing populations. The mind set of opposition that is blindly perpetuated by Carbon County and outside private interest groups, and is so ingrained, they fail to admit this added storage of water, small as it is, would be for their benefit as well, since we have given up over half of what we had originally owned.

I favor the completion of the Narrows Dam and Reservoir in the strongest possible terms for the sake of my children who want to raise their families in this, the valley of their ancestors.

Sincerely,

Charlene Palmer

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
MAY 27 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
5/23/10	BCA	770
5/28/10	PC	774

cy

Action:
Classification: ENV-600
NARROWS
10030127
422814

530. GUY PALMER

ORIGINAL

Guy L. Palmer
P.O. Box 250
Manti, Utah 84642
(435) 835-5113

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: Peter Crookston, PRO-774
302 East 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606

PRO OFFICIAL FILE
RECEIVED

MAY 24 '10

May 21, 2010

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
6/14/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/21/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	774 <i>enf</i>

Action: *ENV-6.00*
 Classification: *NARROWS*
 Project: *NARROWS*
 Control No: *10035051*
 Field ID: *1122816*

530-1

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed Narrows Project in Sanpete County. I farm approximately 80 acres in Sanpete County. I know of the need for more water in our county. We rely on water not only for farms, but for residences and the people of Sanpete County as well. Once our snow pack melts and travels past our communities and towns, we are out of water for the year. In times of low snow pack in our mountains, we will be in trouble if we don't have a system for water storage in place.

The Narrows Project has been promised to our county for eighty years. Sanpete County clearly owns the water rights involved in this project. This is a fact that is supported by and acknowledged by the Utah Supreme Court and the US Department of Justice.

In addition to water conservation and storage, the Narrows Project will create job opportunities for several individuals in our county. In these tough economic times, the need for more jobs is crucial. I would like to close by saying that I strongly support and favor the implementation of the Narrows Project. I believe that this project can be managed carefully and that the environmental concerns will be addressed and taken care of. The need and benefit to our county will far outweigh any negative impacts that could possibly arise to our environment. Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. If you need to contact me for questions or additional comments, I can be reached at the number listed above.

Sincerely,

Guy L. Palmer

Guy L. Palmer

531. KATRINA PALMER

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Katrina Palmer [katrina@npalmer.com]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 11:28 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project Support

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn. Peter Crookston, PRO-774,

531-1 I've lived in North Sanpete for the past seven years, first in Mt. Pleasant city and currently in the county. Sanpete maintains excellent water conservation principles both within its cities and in its various agricultural pursuits. Utah State University has recognized Sanpete County as a leader in water conservation measures. Even so, I've experienced the yearly summer water rationing as a city resident, and witnessed first hand the crop devastation each year beginning in July when we no longer have water for our alfalfa, barley, and oats. Citizens of our cities, as well as our many farmers, would benefit greatly from being able to store our own runoff--our own water.

Repeated environmental impact and engineering studies show there is no better place to build The Narrows Dam and Reservoir. The location is a relatively small area inhabited by sage brush and a small meandering stream. Due to a tunnel ditch and gravity, the proposed site involves no pumping costs. In 1984 Carbon County agreed, in writing, that the Narrows Project should be built, and agreed not to oppose it. I urge you to move forward with this project that began in the 1930's. It's time we had access to our own water.

Katrina Palmer
11010 E. 17050 N.
Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 8 '10

	100
	105
	107
	700
6/30/10	770
7/22/10	774 c/y

ENV-6.00
Narrows
100458/86
1122816

532. KENNETH PALMER

AL

Crookston, Peter L

OPTIONAL

From: Charlene Palmer [kcpalmer@cut.net]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 8:30 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Sanpete Narrows Dam Project

Mr. Peter Crookston,

532-1 My name is Kenneth D. Palmer. I live on a farm two miles east of Mt. Pleasant, Utah. I have lived with my family in a home that was built on this Ranch in 1886. As you may remember I also serve on the Sanpete Water Conservancy Board representing the Mt. Pleasant area.

I have had a keen interest in trying to develop a water system that could meet the agriculture needs of our valley and avoid rationing every summer when the snow melt was gone. I was one of the first farms to constructed a gravity flow Irrigation system(1978) that improved our ability to use the small amount of water that we have.

Carbon County residents talk about the chance that during drouth conditions they may not have enough water. We are in a drouth condition every year. The only year we did not have server restriction was 1983 and that year we had floods. Seven out ten years Carbon opens the flood gates and sends unwanted water down to the Green River.

The last time Carbon County Commissioners contacted our board was when we were about ready to finish the EIS. We met with them and they suggested that there would be a more suitable place to put the reservoir. To accommodate them, we agreed to have a study done and have experts look at the location. The study that was to take less than six months, took THREE YEARS, and came up with the fact that the Narrows site was the best. Carbon accomplished their goal to keep us from building our Dam and make it more expensive.

During the last 10 meetings with Carbon we have made seven concessions, one of which was the 1984 compromise. In that document Carbon agreed not to oppose the Narrows and we agreed to reduce our water right from 17,000 acre feet to 5,400 acre feet. Also, Carbon increased the Scofield Dam by one-third. As usual Carbon quickly completed their part of that agreement and began again to oppose us.

Recently we took Lt.-Governor Bell to the Narrows Dam site. His first question was how big will the lake be when it is full. We answered, one square mile. He said, "Is that all?" His next question as he looked at the basin was how much area will drain into the dam. Our answer was six square miles. With astonishment he said, "IS THAT ALL?".

It is very hard for me to think that Sanpete County is being opposed for such a small amount of water that they have owned for more that 70 years and Carbon has used free of charge. I urge the Bureau to issue a positive Record of Decision on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement , grant the SPRA loan, and begin construction of the Narrows immediately.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kenneth D. Palmer,

533. NATE PALMER

Crookston, Peter L

From: nate@npalmer.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:22 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project Support

533-1 I am a local farmer in the North Sanpete area and have been here for over 35 years. Without the ability to store water, we are 100% dependent on spring run off and when the run-off ends, usually by end of June, so too does our crop irrigation. We desperately need the water promised to us to continue with our crop production. Each year we eek out one and half crops of alfalfa, which is not enough to even pay the expenses. With this Narrows Dam Project, we would be able to get an extra crop, making it possible to sustain our operation and secure a future for agriculture business in Sanpete. I only desire this project to be completed as promised. I have traveled to Carbon County in the fall and observe their continued irrigation of crops well into October. It is only fair, that we recuperate the water that rightfully belongs to us. I urge you, with all of the emphasis I can, to end the bickering and approve this project so we may sustain our desire to preserve our local economy and feed our communities.

Nate Palmer
 11010 E 17050 North
 Mt Pleasant, UT 84647

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
 RECEIVED
 JUN 10

Date	From	Cost
	PAK	100
	Allen	105
	KS	107
6/30/10	Boat	700
7/27/10	PC	774cy

ENV - 6.00
 Narrows
 1004H 269
 1122816

534. STACY PALMER

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Stacy Palmer [stacy@npalmer.com]
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 1:44 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: FOR Narrows

534-1 I am a land owner in Sanpete county. It is essential that this project move forward immediately. The water rightfully belongs to us, as has been proven in court. We are one of the only areas in the state without any reservoirs. We depend solely on the weather. We have been deprived long enough. It is time for this project to move forward. Please quit wasting time on all the frivolous delays. Farmers can become successful with the development of the Narrows Project. It is essential and has already been delayed too long. It will benefit the whole community. As it is, we simply do not have enough water.

Sincerely

Stacy Palmer

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Date	Invoice	Cost
	100	
	105	
	107	
	700	
6/30/10	770	
7/22/10	774cy	

END-16.00
Narrows
100443816
1122816

535. GREG PARKER

Crookston, Peter L

From: GREGORY PARKER [ghp002@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 8:50 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project Supporter

Bureau of Reclamation,
Attn: Peter Crookston, PRO-774

535-1

I am in favor and fully support the Narrows Project. We relocated just outside of Fairview, in Sanpete County, a little over a year ago after three years of land acquisition, subdividing, and house construction. During that same period, numerous new homes have been built -- during a general period of real estate decline in Utah. In other words, Sanpete County is growing!!!

Why would anyone believe that the current water shortage in Sanpete will simply go away or not get worse considering the type of growth that's occurring? I know from personal experience with our small alfalfa farm, that once the snow pack melts, water availability gets scarce quickly. A storage facility makes a lot of sense.

Sanpete County owns the water rights. The Utah Supreme Court and US Department of Justice have recognized those rights. Moreover, the water storage has been promised for many years now. This alone should be sufficient to proceed!

Bottom-line... there is a legitimate need for the water by the growing number of people in Sanpete County; there are legal and acknowledged water rights; and there is both an obligation and opportunity to greatly improve water conservation. Let's not make this simply an issue about which county is most vocal. Please encourage the decision makers to do the right thing and approve the Narrows Project.

Greg H. Parker
11130 E 26000 N
Fairview, UT 84629
435-427-5503

ghp002@msn.com

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 3 7 10

	100
105	
107	
700	
770	
774	

The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars with Hotmail. Get busy.

ENV-6000
Narrows
10045884
1122816

536. CHRISTOPHER PARRY

23 May 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston

536-1 I am writing to comment on the narrows project for Sanpete county.

I am a lifelong resident of Sanpete county and I have family in Carbon county. For as long as I can remember I have heard talk of the narrows project to bring much needed water to Sanpete county, particularly the north end of Sanpete county.

I have heard many of the arguments for and against the narrows project, and for the most part the arguments against the narrows project do not hold much water (pun intended). Carbon county cannot continue to co-opt Sanpete county water and consider it fair. Even they admit this water rightly belongs to Sanpete county. Many years this water is not used by Carbon and is allowed to flow on down the stream. Sanpete needs this water and will use it efficiently. We have learned to use water efficiently because of our lack of it and we have developed and continue to develop efficient delivery systems for the water in north Sanpete to conserve what we have.

I have reviewed the narrows environmental impact statement and though there are some minor negative impacts to the environment, Sanpete is willing to do more than is required to mitigate these negative impacts to the environment, leaving us with a highly desirable water storage project that will provide many positive economic and recreational opportunities.

Sanpete has been very patient and has worked long and hard to gain approval of the narrows project and it is right and fair that we should at long last be able to use the water which is rightly ours to benefit our community and future generations.

Sincerely,

Christopher L Parry

Chris Parry
310 N 200 W
Mt Pleasant, UT 84647

PRO OFFICIAL FILE

RECEIVED

MAY 26 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	PC	100
	PC	103
	PC	104
	PC	700
5/23/10	PC	710
5/24/10	PC	724 cy

Action:

Classification: ENV-6-00

Project: Narrows

Control No: 10035735

Order I.D.: 1122816

537. KAYCE PARRY

TL

ORIGINAL

May 25, 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston,

537-1

I am a life long resident of Sanpete County. A family member served on the water conservancy board for many years. He worked really hard on getting the Narrows Project to come to pass. There have been many points of view expressed on the project, but the bottom line is that it is our water and we need to have a way for it to be delivered to Sanpete County. There is no water storage available for the northern half of Sanpete County. If we could get the late water from the Narrows Project we could possibly grow a 3rd crop of alfalfa and we could utilize our pastures better because we would have water for our animals.

The people who years ago filed on that water knew how important it would be to our area. I feel that there would be many good benefits come from the Narrows Project. The dam would provide not only the water we need but would boost the local economy through recreation. Municipalities would also benefit from having this water for future growth.

It just seems that if this is our water, and there seems to be no dispute about that, we should be able to get the water. It's just wrong that Carbon County has been able to use our water all these years and has forced us to spend thousands of dollars to fight for something that should have been done 60 years ago.

If this is our water, I just don't understand why the Narrows Project is being debated at all. It's time to do the right thing and for politicians to stop pandering to Carbon County in the hopes of being re-elected. I think it's also a shame that for the price of a postage stamp, environmental groups can stop the work that decent, honest men have spent years working on.

I hope you will be fair in your decision because right is right and wrong is wrong. The right thing to do is to give Sanpete County a way to get the water that is our.

Sincerely,

174 WEST 100 SOUTH
EPHRAIM, UT 84627

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY

RECEIVED

JUN 01 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	[Signature]	100
	[Signature]	105
	Killian	107
	KS	700
6/16/10	RCM	770
6/21/10	PC	7740f

Action:

Classification: ENV-600

Project: NARROWS

Case No: 10037579

File No: 1122816

538. RAMONA PARRY

ORIGINAL

20 May 2010

Dear Mr. Crookston,

538-1 In the West water is the lifeblood of a community, for far to long Sanpete county has been denied use of water which is rightly ours and would benefit this community in many ways.

If approved, the narrows project for Sanpete county will bring much needed economic benefits to the area. According to the draft environmental impact statement and the U.S. Department of Agriculture research service, the positive impact to the economy of north Sanpete and the surrounding communities would be quite significant if the narrows project is built.

Sanpete county continues to grow and we require this water to maintain and enhance the quality of life both economically and for recreational opportunities.

Though there are trade-offs in most things that we do, I feel that the benefits to our communities in Sanpete and even in Carbon, would out-way the negative impacts to the environment and to the communities in Carbon county that would be affected. The plans to mitigate the negative impacts of the narrows project go beyond what is required by law and make this a positive project for all involved.

I would ask that you do all that you can to make the Narrows project a reality, at long last.

Sincerely,

Ramona Parry
Ramona Parry



NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

MAY 20 '10

Reply Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
5/27/10	BCM	770
5/27/10	PC	774

cy

Action:
Classifying: ENV-6.00
Name Rows
Case No: 10035158
1122916

539. KEN PAULSON

AL

05

Crookston, Peter L

From: Kenneth Paulson [kenpaulson@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:40 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Gooseberry Dam Project

539-1 Gentlemen, I believe that this project should not proceed as reduced water flows out of Gooseberry Dam and down into Scofield Reservoir would greatly adversely affect the Fish Creek River. That river is a significant spawning grounds for fish inhabiting Scofield Reservoir. Additionally, the reduced flows of water into Scofield will significantly affect the reservoir volume in Scofield Reservoir upon which the city of Price depends for their drinking water. It appears that the proposed Gooseberry Dam is being considered for the benefit of a few at the expense of many. It sounds to me as if this is a poorly considered project that should **not** proceed based on the projected destruction of a pristine river and the adverse affects on a vital public drinking water system.

Ken Paulson
Salt Lake City, Utah

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 10

Reply Date	Initials	Cover
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
4/23/10	BCM	770
6/23/10	PC	774 cy

Subject: ENV-6.00
Narrows
10041470
1122816

540. DALE PEEL

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Maren Peel [maren@peelfurniture.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:40 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: In favor of the Narrows Project
Attachments: "Certification"

540-1

I am a fifty-one year old resident of Mt Pleasant, Sanpete county. As a child and young man I recall my father discussing the Gooseberry Narrows. His perspective and opinion was that this project would be a balancing act that would make our water rights equal to those of surrounding areas. Currently and for many years the folks in the south end of the county and those in the Sevier drainage, receive all the water from our end of the county between October first and April first and any excess run off during our high water period. In addition they caused a moratorium to be placed on new irrigation wells so no new irrigation wells have been drilled in our end of the county for about fifty years. Of course the south Sanpete and Sevier drainage areas are able to store water in the Gunnison Reservoir and Yuba Reservoir in quantity such that they have essentially the same quantity usage in the spring as they have in late summer.

And it is worth noting that since the wide use of sprinkler irrigation the excess run off from our end of the county has increased significantly. In contrast our usage is between April first and October first. Our run off slowly increases until high water time at the end of May usually peaking in the first week or two of June. Then it quickly diminishes to a fraction of high water time. Our late summer water usage is only eight to twelve percent of spring time.

To the east of us the people in Emery have the five reservoirs which drain down Huntington Canyon and the large Joes Valley reservoir, among others. They have good storage rights which enable them to irrigate well through the summer.

The Price drainage area have the large Schofield Reservoir, which was completed at the time when Sanpete County was promised the Gooseberry Narrows Dam. They have a large deep drainage region. In fact it could be thirty to fifty miles deep. Where as the north Sanpete area has an average drainage depth of about five miles. So the Price area has a substantial area in which they draw water from and have that wonderful storage at Schofield.

It is a matter of balance and fairness that the Gooseberry narrows project finally be allowed to proceed. It would place the North Sanpete water area on equal ground with the surrounding areas. Rather than having near drought conditions each summer we would be able to irrigate our crops in the same manner that these other drainages are able to do. Of course the availability of additional culinary water and the recreational opportunities afforded by the new reservoir are additional positives. For these reasons I am strongly in favor of the Gooseberry Narrows project.

Dale Peel
 Mt Pleasant Utah

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
 RECEIVED

JUL 1 2010

Date	Initials	Cost
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>Peel</i>	107
	<i>KS</i>	700
6/23/10	<i>PC</i>	770
6/23/10	<i>PC</i>	774.00

END-6.00
 NARROWS
 10041475
 1122816

541. DAVID PEEL

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: David Peel [dave-pjr@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:18 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: proposed narrows project

541-1 I David K. Peel. Jr. am a life long resident of sanpete county, I was raised on a family farm and have since had to opportunity to take over the family farm. I remember as a young boy hearing my father talk about the gooseberry dam project, and how it would benefit the farm, and now as the operator of that farm, I can see the real need for that dam to be built for the benefit of northern Sanpete county. It is a much needed dam for us Sanpete residents not only for the farming end of it but also for the use of the cities in the northern end of the county. I raise mostly hay on the 65 acre farm that I run part time. We generally are complete out of water for the farm by July 15th of any given year, it would be a huge benefit to be able to draw water from some type of storage facility which northern Sanpete county has none to be able to sustain a 3rd crop of hay for the season, we have plenty of growing season to get a 3rd crop from, but simply no water to use for that crop. As a local farmer I would really like to see the dam built, after all it has been agreed on by the opposing county two different times, it is time to make carbon county live up to their word on the signed documents and let the dam be built to store the water that legally belongs to Sanpete county, it would be a nice thing to rely on later in the growing season and for any type of future growth in our part of the world.

Thanks
David K. Peel Jr.
765 South 100 East # 67
Mt. Pleasant, Utah, 84647

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search chat and e-mail from your Inbox. [Learn more.](#)

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 1 2010

Date	Initials	Count
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
6/23/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/23/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	774

ENV-1000
Narrows
10091551
1122816

542. SETH PETERSEN

ORIGINAL

To: Peter Crookston

542-1

I am writing this letter to tell you that I am in favor of the narrows project 774. The water belongs to Sanpete; so let us use it.

We have owned that water for eighty years; so let's get started on the Narrows Project NOW. So we can use what belongs to us NOW.

THANK YOU

Seth H Petersen

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY

RECEIVED

MAY 26 '10

Reply Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
5/27/10	PC	770
5/27/10	PC	774

Action:
Classification: ENV-10100
Narrows
10025152
1122916

543. CHARLES PETERSON

AL
Bureau of Reclamation, Centerfield Utah
Attn: Peter Crookston
25 May 2010

ORIGINAL

543-1

Dear Sir:

I hope encourage the Bureau of Reclamation to issue a favorable Record on the Narrows Dam and Reservoir. Sanpete needs the water storage and is more important than other environmental issues against the Narrows Project.

I favor the creation of the Narrows Dam and Reservoir project in the most urgent possible terms

PRO-OFFICIAL FILE		
RECEIVED		
MAY 27 '10		
Reply Date	Initial	Code
	MS	100
	MS	105
	MS	106
	MS	107
	MS	108
	MS	109
	MS	110
	MS	111
	MS	112
	MS	113
	MS	114
	MS	115
	MS	116
	MS	117
	MS	118
	MS	119
	MS	120
	MS	121
	MS	122
	MS	123
	MS	124
	MS	125
	MS	126
	MS	127
	MS	128
	MS	129
	MS	130
	MS	131
	MS	132
	MS	133
	MS	134
	MS	135
	MS	136
	MS	137
	MS	138
	MS	139
	MS	140
	MS	141
	MS	142
	MS	143
	MS	144
	MS	145
	MS	146
	MS	147
	MS	148
	MS	149
	MS	150
	MS	151
	MS	152
	MS	153
	MS	154
	MS	155
	MS	156
	MS	157
	MS	158
	MS	159
	MS	160
	MS	161
	MS	162
	MS	163
	MS	164
	MS	165
	MS	166
	MS	167
	MS	168
	MS	169
	MS	170
	MS	171
	MS	172
	MS	173
	MS	174
	MS	175
	MS	176
	MS	177
	MS	178
	MS	179
	MS	180
	MS	181
	MS	182
	MS	183
	MS	184
	MS	185
	MS	186
	MS	187
	MS	188
	MS	189
	MS	190
	MS	191
	MS	192
	MS	193
	MS	194
	MS	195
	MS	196
	MS	197
	MS	198
	MS	199
	MS	200
	MS	201
	MS	202
	MS	203
	MS	204
	MS	205
	MS	206
	MS	207
	MS	208
	MS	209
	MS	210
	MS	211
	MS	212
	MS	213
	MS	214
	MS	215
	MS	216
	MS	217
	MS	218
	MS	219
	MS	220
	MS	221
	MS	222
	MS	223
	MS	224
	MS	225
	MS	226
	MS	227
	MS	228
	MS	229
	MS	230
	MS	231
	MS	232
	MS	233
	MS	234
	MS	235
	MS	236
	MS	237
	MS	238
	MS	239
	MS	240
	MS	241
	MS	242
	MS	243
	MS	244
	MS	245
	MS	246
	MS	247
	MS	248
	MS	249
	MS	250
	MS	251
	MS	252
	MS	253
	MS	254
	MS	255
	MS	256
	MS	257
	MS	258
	MS	259
	MS	260
	MS	261
	MS	262
	MS	263
	MS	264
	MS	265
	MS	266
	MS	267
	MS	268
	MS	269
	MS	270
	MS	271
	MS	272
	MS	273
	MS	274
	MS	275
	MS	276
	MS	277
	MS	278
	MS	279
	MS	280
	MS	281
	MS	282
	MS	283
	MS	284
	MS	285
	MS	286
	MS	287
	MS	288
	MS	289
	MS	290
	MS	291
	MS	292
	MS	293
	MS	294
	MS	295
	MS	296
	MS	297
	MS	298
	MS	299
	MS	300
	MS	301
	MS	302
	MS	303
	MS	304
	MS	305
	MS	306
	MS	307
	MS	308
	MS	309
	MS	310
	MS	311
	MS	312
	MS	313
	MS	314
	MS	315
	MS	316
	MS	317
	MS	318
	MS	319
	MS	320
	MS	321
	MS	322
	MS	323
	MS	324
	MS	325
	MS	326
	MS	327
	MS	328
	MS	329
	MS	330
	MS	331
	MS	332
	MS	333
	MS	334
	MS	335
	MS	336
	MS	337
	MS	338
	MS	339
	MS	340
	MS	341
	MS	342
	MS	343
	MS	344
	MS	345
	MS	346
	MS	347
	MS	348
	MS	349
	MS	350
	MS	351
	MS	352
	MS	353
	MS	354
	MS	355
	MS	356
	MS	357
	MS	358
	MS	359
	MS	360
	MS	361
	MS	362
	MS	363
	MS	364
	MS	365
	MS	366
	MS	367
	MS	368
	MS	369
	MS	370
	MS	371
	MS	372
	MS	373
	MS	374
	MS	375
	MS	376
	MS	377
	MS	378
	MS	379
	MS	380
	MS	381
	MS	382
	MS	383
	MS	384
	MS	385
	MS	386
	MS	387
	MS	388
	MS	389
	MS	390
	MS	391
	MS	392
	MS	393
	MS	394
	MS	395
	MS	396
	MS	397
	MS	398
	MS	399
	MS	400
	MS	401
	MS	402
	MS	403
	MS	404
	MS	405
	MS	406
	MS	407
	MS	408
	MS	409
	MS	410
	MS	411
	MS	412
	MS	413
	MS	414
	MS	415
	MS	416
	MS	417
	MS	418
	MS	419
	MS	420
	MS	421
	MS	422
	MS	423
	MS	424
	MS	425
	MS	426
	MS	427
	MS	428
	MS	429
	MS	430
	MS	431
	MS	432
	MS	433
	MS	434
	MS	435
	MS	436
	MS	437
	MS	438
	MS	439
	MS	440
	MS	441
	MS	442
	MS	443
	MS	444
	MS	445
	MS	446
	MS	447
	MS	448
	MS	449
	MS	450
	MS	451
	MS	452
	MS	453
	MS	454
	MS	455
	MS	456
	MS	457
	MS	458
	MS	459
	MS	460
	MS	461
	MS	462
	MS	463
	MS	464
	MS	465
	MS	466
	MS	467
	MS	468
	MS	469
	MS	470
	MS	471
	MS	472
	MS	473
	MS	474
	MS	475
	MS	476
	MS	477
	MS	478
	MS	479
	MS	480
	MS	481
	MS	482
	MS	483
	MS	484
	MS	485
	MS	486
	MS	487
	MS	488
	MS	489
	MS	490
	MS	491
	MS	492
	MS	493
	MS	494
	MS	495
	MS	496
	MS	497
	MS	498
	MS	499
	MS	500
	MS	501
	MS	502
	MS	503
	MS	504
	MS	505
	MS	506
	MS	507
	MS	508
	MS	509
	MS	510
	MS	511
	MS	512
	MS	513
	MS	514
	MS	515
	MS	516
	MS	517
	MS	518
	MS	519
	MS	520
	MS	521
	MS	522
	MS	523
	MS	524
	MS	525
	MS	526

544. MARJORIE PETERSON

ORIGINAL

Mr. Peter Crookston
Bureau of Land Management
Pro 774
302 East 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606

RE: Narrows Project

PRO OFFICIAL FILE

RECEIVED

MAY 24 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Corr.
		100
		105
		107
May 23, 2010	PC	100
4/14/10	PC	770
6/11/10	PC	774cy

Action:

Classification: ENV - 1000

Project: NARROWS

Contract No: 10035052

Folder I.D.: 1127816

544-1 This letter is in support of this project going forth to strengthen our efforts to improve the economic situation in Sanpete County.

I served as Mantli City Mayor and prior to that I served a chairman of a community committee established under the direction of the previous mayor and council to determine long range plans for our City.

As we solicited information from the citizenry about what they would like to have happen in our City, it became obvious that jobs and employment opportunities so that people could live and support families in this area was a primary concern.

We talked of development of tourism along highway 89 and of cooperatives which might benefit agricultural growth and marketing. However, a basic need in our area is the lack of sufficient water to grow marketable crops on a competitive basis.

Under my administration we made great progress in improving the infrastructure of our City and of preparing it for a good future. We could not, however, win the fight to bring a better economy.

The Narrows project may not solve all of our problems, but it will help us to play on a more level field as we seek to improve our economy.

This project has been too long delayed by bureaucratic maneuvering and in behalf of all of our citizens in Sanpete County, I appeal for this project to be approved and move forward. This water is a long established right which has not yet been delivered.

Thank you for the consistent effort which the Bureau makes to administer federal lands well and fairly.

Sincerely,

Marjorie M.. Peterson

197 East 200 South
Mantli, Utah 84642

545. RUSSELL PETERSON

AL

05101111

Crookston, Peter L

From: RUSS . [rtpete@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 6:24 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: The Narrows Project

To Whom It May Concern;

545-1 For many decades, the citizens of Sanpete County have sought to right an injustice that has persisted for many years regarding the Narrows Project and to access irrigation water promised by earlier agreements. In an effort to do the right thing during the war, we willingly set aside our preeminent right and first position to meet an immediate need required by our nation in the war effort, and agreed to allow the improvements to the Scofield Reservoir to be completed prior to the Goosberry project ("the Narrows Project"). The time has long since passed to allow this project to move forward and to make right an injustice that was unforeseen by those who put country before their own welfare. Sanpete County should not be penalized for doing the right thing (especially when there is an almost immediate remedy). Agricultural water is vital to our ability to maintain adequate crops and we remain frustrated year in and year out as we see our ability to irrigate diminish in mid summer. Carbon County has been on the wrong side of this issue for too long and it is high time that they do the right thing (as the residents of Sanpete did many years ago) and not stand in the way of this project moving forward. If they are unwilling to support the rightness of Sanpete County's cause, then the government should honor the prior commitments that are demanded by justice and allow the Narrows Project to move forward immediately. I dare say that if the roles were reversed, that Sanpete would honor and respect an agreement forced in patriotism many years ago (as we once did).

Sincerest Regards,

Russell Peterson
 PO Box 67
 Fairview, Utah 84629

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
 JUN 1 2010

Copy Date	By	Count
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
6/23/10	Scott	770
6/23/10	PC	770 copy

Classification: ENV - 6.00
 Narrows
 100 42021
 1122216

546. WILLIAM AND CINDY PETERSON

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: palisadepais@mail.manti.com
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 10:08 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project Support

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: Peter Crookston PRO-774
302 East 1860 South
Provo, UT 84606

To Whom it May Concern:

546-1 To remind the Bureau of Reclamation that Sanpete County has the water rights in question is only restating the obvious. This project should have been completed many years ago and it is a travesty that it has not.

The environmental concerns will, in my opinion, be far outweighed by the benefits created not only for the plants and wildlife in the immediate area of the project, but for the citizens of Sanpete County as a whole.

Sanpete County's population will only continue to grow and the water storage that has consistently been promised will be needed by those future populations.

I sincerely hope that you will see fit to complete this project.

Thank you,

A. William & Cindy Peterson
302 South Main
Manti, Utah 84642

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 01 '10

Reply Date	Date	Initials	Code
		<i>[Signature]</i>	100
		<i>[Signature]</i>	105
		<i>[Signature]</i>	107
		KS	700
	6/10/10	BCH	770
	6/13/10	PC	774cy

APPROVAL
Classification ENVU-10.00
Narrows
10039148
1122816

547. JASON PIPES

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Jason Pipes [bakodgid@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 10:40 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

547-1 I would like to voice my support for the construction of the Narrows Water Project. I live just south of Mount Pleasant in Sanpete County and have seen the hardship of the farmers in the area due to a lack of sufficient water. I find it appalling that with a legal right to the water rights, along with Federal promises made so long ago, that this project is even in question. It is time to make things right and secure the future of the economy in northern Sanpete County and provide for sustainability in an area that has been denied its right for far too long.

Respectfully,
Jason Pipes
9105 E 16750 N
Mount Pleasant, UT 84647
(435) 462-0218

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 04 '10

Reply Date	Name	Code
	RS	100
	RS	105
	RS	107
	RS	700
6/24/10	BCN	770
6/24/10	PC	774cy
Version:		
Classification: ENV-12.00		
Project: NARROWS		
Drawing: 10040510		
Sheet: 1122816		

548. JIM BOB PIPES

Jim Bob Pipes

495 N 500 W
Manti, UT 84642

Tel. 435-835-8091

jb@pipesfamily.org

May 25, 2010

Peter Crookston
Bureau of Reclamation
302 East 1860 South
Provo, UT 84606

Mr. Crookston,

548-1 I am writing to voice my support for the Narrows Project. There are a multiplicity of reasons why this project must come to fruition.

In the 1930's—over 70 years ago—water storage was promised to Sanpete County, and the doubling of Scofield Reservoir for additional water storage was promised to Carbon County. In fairly short order Carbon County received their 30,000 acre-feet of additional water storage. And to date Sanpete is *still waiting* to receive the mere 5,400 acre-feet that was promised.

The project has been well planned, with many alternatives being examined. However, the alternatives are more costly to build and maintain as well as less environmentally sensitive. Many independent engineering studies agree with the SDEIS's observations and conclusions. In addition, over 10% of the budgets for the Narrows are devoted to measures to mitigate any impact that might be caused by the Narrows Project.

Far and away the most important benefit in our agricultural area is the increased water storage itself. Sanpete County desperately needs the water storage from the Narrows project. Our farmers and ranchers have suffered for over 70 years under an increasing burden caused by a lack of water—rightfully ours by law—in large part because of the opposition by Carbon County who has at the same time enjoyed their promised water.

The Utah Supreme Court and the US Department of Justice have both acknowledged the water belongs to Sanpete County. Both the Utah House of Representatives and State Senate passed resolutions in 2008 and 2009 in support of the Narrows project. More than once Carbon County has agreed—in writing—that the Narrows Project should be built, and have agreed not to oppose it. Yet they continue to do so.

It is time to end the legal wrangling and build the Narrows dam and reservoir. No ifs, ands, or buts. The water is ours.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely yours,



Jim Bob Pipes

549. DON AND JOAN POLLOCK

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: jrp84044donp@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 8:37 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

549-1 We are in favor of the Narrows Project being completed. We were promised it would happen many years ago. We have been waiting and wanting it to happen. It would benefit our community and other communities around us. Please make it happen!!

Don and Joan Pollock Fairview, Utah

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 18 2010

		100
		105
		107
	KS	700
7/8/10	BCH	770
7/12/10	PC	7740y

EXD-6.00
Narrows
10045145
1122816

550. CODY AND LINDA POULSEN

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Linda Poulsen [cody_lindapoulsen@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 5:18 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS

550-1 To whom it may concern,
We are in favor of the Narrows Project. Thank you.
Cody and Linda Poulsen

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy. Get more from your inbox. [See how.](#)

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 07 '10

Reply Date	Date	Initials	Code
		[Signature]	100
		[Signature]	105
		[Signature]	107
		KS	700
	4/21/10	BCA	770
	6/21/10	PC	774cy

Action:
Classification: ENV-6.00
Project: NARROWS
Consultant: 0040647
File ID: 1122816

551. CHRISTIAN PROBASCO

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: eric probasco [eprobe2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 22, 2010 12:54 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: In favor of Narrows Dam

Attention: Peter Crookston
narrowsSDEIS@usbr.gov

5-22-10

Dear Mr. Crookston:

551-1 I believe the proposed dam at Gooseberry Narrows should be built.

Sanpete County has been subsidizing the economy of Carbon County since the Narrows Dam was not built several decades ago. Carbon County is rich compared to Sanpete, and that's partly due to their theft of our water and subsequent use for recreation, farming, mining and power production. Their wealth has allowed them to block the construction of the dam at each instance where it had the political momentum to move forward. Carbon County is essentially using our own resources against us.

The leaders of Carbon County, which is probably one of the leading contributors to the buildup of greenhouse gasses on the planet, say they are worried about the effect the dam will have on the local environment of Fish and Gooseberry Creeks. Their concerns are transparently hypocritical, especially in light of their failure to seriously consider the possibility of decommissioning their own decades-old dam at Scofield, which must be causing considerable havoc to the ecosystem on the far side of the mountain.

Officials in Carbon County have joined with lawyers and environmental groups to once again raise the possibility of adopting the alternative water storage and conservation schemes which have been independently studied and debunked repeatedly, at the expense of Sanpete County, the State of Utah and the federal government. There is no alternative which will deliver to Sanpete County the 5,400 acre-feet of late-season water which every government agency in Utah, the nation and the entire cosmos concedes belongs to us. Officials in Carbon County are aware of this fact. Environmental groups such as the Utah Rivers Council are well aware of this fact. And I hope, after all of the work that has gone into the latest SDEIS, which reaches the same conclusion about the superior efficacy of the Narrows option as have all previous, official in-depth studies, that everyone at the BOR is aware of it too.

I encourage you to approve the project and move forward with construction of the dam at Gooseberry Narrows.


Yours,

Christian Probasco
206 S. 100 East
Mt. Pleasant, Utah
(435) 851-6485
Eprobe2002@yahoo.com

552. SARAH PROBASCO

552-1

The need for water here is important. The 70 or so years this has been going on is plenty of time to resolve the situation. Lets get this project under way.


Sarah Probasco
Mt. Pleasant

553. DARIN RAY

TL

ORIGINAL

Darin A. Ray
81 E 820 S
Centerville, UT 84014
Tel: 801-294-0158

May 27, 2010

Mr. Peter Crookston
PRO-774
Bureau of Reclamation Provo Area Office
302 East 1860 South
Provo, Utah 84606-7317

Re: Gooseberry Narrows Dam Project

Dear Mr. Crookston,

553-1

As a citizen of Utah and I am writing to express my deep concern over the proposed building of the Gooseberry Narrows dam. I oppose the building of the Gooseberry Narrows dam for the following reasons.

Environmental and Wildlife Implications - The building of the dam would impact the water flow in the Fish Creek drainage, Scofield Reservoir and Price River which support a diverse population of wildlife over a very large area. While canoeing on Scofield reservoir last summer I was awed by the presence of two Great Blue Herons - if water levels drop too much I may not be able to witness these majestic birds at Scofield again. We must consider how the Gooseberry Narrows dam would affect the habitats both near and far, in wet years as well as in years of drought, such as the lower Price River which is home to the endangered Colorado River Squawfish.

Waste of Money - Simply put, this project would be a waste of money. Money would be better spent improving irrigation and water distribution systems than building the dam. These types of improvements would save more water, at a lower cost, than would be supplied by a reservoir at Gooseberry Narrows. Difficult problems like the one that is presented here call for innovative, win-win solutions, which the Gooseberry dam is not.

Carbon County Residents at Risk - While the dam would undoubtedly benefit some in Northern Sanpete County it would come at the expense of most Carbon County residents. This project would put much of Carbon County's population at risk as water levels drop and water quality is degraded. With the dam in place, Scofield reservoir, the primary source of culinary water for Carbon County, will likely run out of usable water during periods of drought.

The list of reasons to oppose the dam could go on, but please let the preceding suffice. Let me end by saying that I am confident that a solution which meets the water needs of both Carbon and Sanpete counties can be realized, however, it does not appear that a dam at Gooseberry Narrows is part of that solution.

I thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns and trust that you will consider this letter as you make decisions related to the proposed project.

Sincerely,


Darin A. Ray

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 01 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initials	Code
	[Signature]	100
	[Signature]	105
	KS	700
6/16/10	BCB	770
6/22/10	RC	774cy
Action:		
Classification: ENU-6,00		
Topic: Narrows		
File # 10037615		
1122816		

554. PAUL AND JANICE RAY

AL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Paul and Janice Ray [jray@mail.manti.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:09 AM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

Leaders Narrows Project
To whom it may concern:

554-1 I believe it is time for justice to be served for the people of Sanpete and all those who have gone before us who fought so hard for our water rights here in Sanpete County. I am a resident of Sanpete County and believe this has gone on long enough. Please give us back our water, we really need it. Thanks you for allowing our voices to be heard.

Paul and Janice Ray
375 S. Main St. Manti, UT

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 2010

Reply Date	Date	Initial	Code
		<i>[Signature]</i>	100
		<i>[Signature]</i>	105
		<i>[Signature]</i>	107
		<i>[Signature]</i>	100
5/22/10		SCM	770
6/22/10		PC	774cy

ACTION
Classification: ENVI-6.00
NARROWS
Case No. 10042031
Date: 1122810

555. REBECCA REES

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Becky Rees [brees@cut.net]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:13 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrow project

555-1 As resident of Sanpete County, I am writing pleading with you to consider the Narrows Project. Sanpete County has been limited in its growth for years because of its lack of water. I am a resident of Wales and we have had a building moratorium in place for two years now. This moratorium is in place due to a lack of water. My understanding is that the water already belongs to Sanpete County. I don't understand why we are even having this debate. This project has been on hold for more than 40 years. It is time to cut through the red-tape and grant us the ability to use the water that is already ours. Any additional water to Sanpete County will benefit the county and towns. Sincerely,
Rebecca Rees

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 5 '10

Entry Date	Entry	Entry
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
6/23/10	BCM	770
6/23/10	RE	77400

ENV - 6.00
Narrows
10041582
1122816

556. GEORGE RICHARDSON

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Suzan Richardson [srich_geo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 10:35 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

May 29, 2010

To: Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: Peter Crookston, PRO-774

From: George Richardson
270 West 500 South
Manti, UT 84642

Mr. Crookston,

556-1 I have been concerned about the water resources in Sanpete for a long time. I know that water is very important. I am in favor of completing The Narrows project and feel like it is long overdue to complete it. If The Narrows dam and reservoir were completed, it would be a source of water that would benefit everyone downstream in Sanpete county. We need more reservoirs and access to water. The Narrows would certainly help.

Thank you,

George B. Richardson

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 8 '10

DATE	BY	TIME
	AS	120
	ML	195
	CS	107
3/8/10	Beut	720
7/12/10	PC	774 af

EMV - 6.00
Narrows
10045042
1122816

557. SUZUAN RICHARDSON

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Suzaun Richardson [srich_geo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 10:56 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

29 May 2010

To: Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: Peter Crookston, PRO-774

From: Suzaun Richardson
270 West 500 South
Manti, UT 84642

Dear Peter Crookston,

557-1 When I was a young girl, I recall my father and grandfather, who was a farmer in Sanpete County, talking about the water situation in the county. They were discussing the fact that water storage was in short supply and much more was needed. That was nearly 40 years ago. Today, the issue is the same, the storage of water is critical for Sanpete County. The Narrows Dam and Reservoir is the project that will help Sanpete County meet this need. It has been studied and looked at for a very long time. The present proposal for the Narrows Project is the most productive, cost effective and environmentalyy-friendly plan available and needs to move forward.

I add my support to the many who have worked so hard to see this plan go forward.

Sincerely,

Suzaun Richardson

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUL 18 '10

		100
		105
		127
	KS	700
7/8/10	SCM	770
7/12/10	PC	774af

EXU-600
Narrows
10045074
1122816

559. REBECCA ROSAS

PHL

Crookston, Peter L

ORIGINAL

From: Rebecca Rosas [becca.rosas@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:14 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Sanpete County Water Storage

To Whom it May Concern:

559-1 We agree with the third party study on the narrows project. Sanpete County is in need of more water storage at the proposed location and size. We would appreciate this matter to be taken seriously as it will be beneficial to many.
Thank you,
Rebecca Rosas

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 1 '10

Date	Initials	Code
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	<i>[Signature]</i>	700
6/23/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	770
6/23/10	<i>[Signature]</i>	774cy

ENV - 6.00
Narrows
10041544
1122816

560. ERIC ROUSKA

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Rouska [erro@mail.manti.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 4:35 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: comment on the project

May 31, 2010
To whom it may concern:

560-1 I am writing for the proposed dam project for the narrows project. I think that for this to be held up in courts and litigation for the last 70 years is ridiculous. We need the water and have the rights to it. Let's get this project going.

Thank you for your time,
Eric Rouska
Ephraim Ut.
435-283-4603

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 15 '10

Reply Date		
Date	Initial	Cost
	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	KS	700
6/22/10	BM	770
6/22/10	PC	774cy

Address: _____
Classification: EIV-6.00
Narrows
Contract no: 10043248
1122816

561. KARLA ROUSKA

AL

Crookston, Peter L

ORIGINAL

From: Rouska [erro@mail.manti.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 4:38 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: narrows dam project

561-1 I am for the Narrows Dam Project. It is time to get our water where it belongs. Let's get this moving along, it has taken way too long.

Karla Rouska
Ephraim Utah
435-283-4603

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 15 '10

Reply Date	Initials	Code
	ER	100
	ER	105
	ER	107
	RS	700
6/22/10	ER	770
6/22/10	PC	774cy
Action:		
Classification:	EALU - 6.00	
Project:	Narrows	
Case No.:	10043252	
Doc. No.:	1122816	

562. WARREN ROYALL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: Warren Royall [warren@three-sixtymedia.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 1:04 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: The Narrows Project

To whom it may concern:

562-1 Give Sanpete their water. It's more than fair. It's right!

Warren Royall
1375 Hobble Creek Dr.
Springville, UT 84663

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED

JUN 18 '10

	<i>[Signature]</i>	100
	<i>[Signature]</i>	105
	<i>[Signature]</i>	107
	KS	700
6/30/10	SENT	770
7/22/10	PC	774cys

ENV = 6.00
Narrows
10045895
1122816

563. MARGARET RUIZ

AL

Margaret A. Ruiz
409 N. State St.
Mt. Pleasant, Ut 84647

APRIL 25, 2010

Bureau of Reclamation. ATT Peter Crookston
302 E. 1860 So
Provo, Ut 84606

Gentlemen:

563-1

Ever since we moved to Sanpete County in 1969, we have heard of the possibility of great things when the Narrows Dam would finally be built. Now that it could actually happen, I'm asking that you decide to give a favorable decision.

Sanpete County needs this water storage for so many reasons. I'm sure you have heard them all. They are all valid reasons. It would be such a blessing to the people in Sanpete County.

Please allow this much needed water storage to be built.

Sincerely

Margaret A. Ruiz



Mrs. Margaret Ruiz
409 N State St.
Mount Pleasant, UT 84647

564. ROBERT RUNYAN

AL

ORIGINAL

PRO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
APR 30 '10

Narrows Project Supplemental Draft EIS
Public Hearing Comments
April 28, 2010 - Manti, Utah
April 29, 2010 - Price, Utah

Reply Date	Day	Initials	Code
5/3		RS	100
		RS	105
		RS	107
5/10		RS	700
5/10/10		RS	770
		PC	770cy

Name: ROBERT R RUNYAN

Affiliation: (self/organization) LANDOWNER

Address: PO Box 551 - 25940 N MILBORNE
FAIRVIEW UT 84629

Phone number: 435-427-3592

Email address: _____

Comments:

564-1

*With the population growth
Sanpete county, will need more water -
The narrows project will be very important
part of the future for the county, without
water, there is no future.*

Thanks

Comments can be handed in here at the public meeting or mailed to Reclamation's Provo Area Office up until **Tuesday, June 1, 2010**. Written comments should be addressed to: Bureau of Reclamation, Attention: Peter Crookston, PRO-774, 302 East 1860 South, Provo, UT 84606 7317, Telephone: 801-379-1152, Facsimile: 801-379-1159.

Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to narrowsSDEIS@usbr.gov.

565. BRYAN RUSSELL

565-1 I am tired of my water being turned off in
late summer. we helped THEM over the mountain
now it's time to help US! We need the
water, Now,
Bryan Russell
Fairview

566. CAROL RUSSELL

AL

ORIGINAL

Crookston, Peter L

From: carol russell [ccrus777@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 12:45 PM
To: PRO NarrowsEIS
Subject: Narrows Project

To whom it may concern:

566-1 Yes please go forward with the Narrows project. We need the water and the jobs for Sanpete County. We love it here and our family will do anything that we can to help with this project.

Carol Russell and family, Manti

NO OFFICIAL FILE COPY
RECEIVED
JUN 04 '10

Reply Date	Title	Initials	Cost
		<i>[Signature]</i>	100
		<i>[Signature]</i>	105
		<i>[Signature]</i>	107
		KS	100
6/6/10		BCA	770
6/21/10		PC	774cy

Amount:
Classification: ENU-6.00
Narrows
File # 10040319
1122 816