

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

We Invite Your Comments!

Southern Delivery System Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Name*	KEN WEBER	Date	2 Apr 08
Company / Organization			
Street Address 200 Starlite Dr			
City, State, Zip Pueblo 81005			
E-mail ken-weber@comcast.net			

* Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from public disclosure, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold a respondent's identity from public disclosure, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public disclosure in their entirety.

Comments are considered substantive if they:

- Question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information in the document
- Question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental analysis
- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the Environmental Impact Statement
- Cause changes or revisions in the alternatives
- Provide new or additional information relevant to the analysis

Would like your name and address withheld from public disclosure*? YES NO

Comments:

① With dams on the fountain or tributaries, how do you keep holders of junior water rights whole? junior divertors are often dependent on high flows from the fountain. Dams hold back the high flows thus changing the timing of the flows and perhaps the total volume, too. It seems dams will necessitate a complex accounting and delivery process to satisfy the holders of junior rights.

(over)

Please continue on reverse side



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

Comments (continued):

② How is it that the "no action" alternative is based on a hypothetical rather than an actual situation? It seems to me that all the options should be weighed against each other and against the existing case - no pipeline. The EIS & the impacts/mitigations would seem more realistic to the public if the proposed actions were weighed against the zero (i.e. ~~no~~ present) case of no pipeline.

Thank you for your comments

Please send any additional comments to the mailing address, e-mail address, or facsimile number below. All comments must be received by **April 29, 2008**.

Attn: Ms. Kara Lamb
Bureau of Reclamation
Eastern Colorado Area Office
11056 W. County Road 18E
Loveland, CO 80537-9711
E-mail: klamb@gp.usbr.gov
Facsimile: (970) 663-3212