

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN AND FOR THE STATE OF UTAH

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE ADOPTION OF A
LONG-TERM EXPERIMENTAL PLAN FOR THE FUTURE OPERATION OF
GLEN CANYON DAM

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
JANUARY 5, 2007 6:00 PM
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
HILTON HOTEL

Reported by: Linda Smurthwaite, RDR
File No. 010507

INTERMOUNTAIN COURT REPORTERS
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

1 APPEARANCES

2

FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION:

3 Randy Peterson

Dennis Kubly

4 Jayne Kelleher

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0002

I N D E X

1		
2		
3	COMMENTS BY	PAGE
4	John Weisheit, Living Rivers	16, 27
5	Leslie James, CREDA	22
6	Richard Quist	25
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Salt Lake City, Utah, January 5, 2007, 6:00 PM.

2 MR. PETERSON: Well, good evening. Can everybody
3 hear me okay? Very good. Welcome tonight and thank you
4 for coming out. My name is Randy Peterson, I'm the
5 manager of the Environmental Resources Division for the
6 reclamation hearing in Salt Lake.

7 We are starting an Environmental Impact Statement
8 and are starting that with a scoping period that's
9 rather lengthy and tonight is another step in that. We
10 want comments from the public regarding a number of
11 things that we'll cover in a few minutes. This is our
12 agenda tonight.

13 We'll be talking about what brought us to this
14 point, and the explicit nature of the proposed action,
15 how we intend to link this or tier it from previous NEPA
16 documents, and a little bit about how we see the process
17 going from here, scheduling, things like that. There
18 will be a chance for you to ask questions, and also at
19 the end a chance for you to make verbal comments.

20 We have a court reporter here with us that will
21 capture your comments verbatim. I think it's also
22 important to note that the comment period is going to be
23 open for about two months and written comments are
24 wonderful as well, and we'll have an address for you
25 there to send your written comments to us if you'd like.

1 We'll start with a little bit of background about
2 the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Program and why we
3 are embarking on an experimental program within that
4 framework, and of course the purpose of tonight's
5 meeting is to receive your comments on that issue.

6 Glen Canyon Dam was authorized in 1956, completed
7 in '63, and provides really the largest amount of
8 storage in the Upper Colorado River Basin for delivery
9 to the lower basin during drought periods. I think in
10 one sentence that captures the purpose of Glen Canyon
11 Dam. Those -- the last bullet shows the primary
12 purpose. The first 15 miles are, of course, of the Glen
13 Canyon National recreation area, trout fishery and day
14 use, rafting opportunities, and below that is the Lees
15 Ferry compact point and below that is the Grand Canyon
16 down to Lake Mead. That's the geographic scope of this
17 experimental effort.

18 In 1992, Congress passed and the president signed
19 the Grand Canyon Protection Act and that required
20 several things. First of all, that we complete an EIS
21 on the operation of Glen Canyon Dam, and that was
22 finished in 1996. That altered historic hydropower
23 operations of the dam primarily altering many of the
24 daily fluctuation cycles. Another thing that it
25 accomplished was to establish the Adaptive Management

1 Program.

2 At the time of the signing of the ROD there was
3 great uncertainty about the effects of any of the
4 proposed actions that would be taken as part of the ROD.
5 Adaptive Management is a concept pioneered in the 60s
6 and 70s and 80s wherein testing and observation of the
7 outcome of those experiments would be used to fine tune
8 or improve processes, whether they are manufacturing
9 processes or dam operations. So, we use the Adaptive
10 Management Program in that regard. It's a committee
11 that makes recommendations to the Secretary of the
12 Interior directly on the operation of that dam, and also
13 other management actions that might be undertaken in the
14 national parks downstream.

15 Of course the last thing that the Act required was
16 a protection of the downstream resources. And that
17 effort was to be accomplished within the sideboards, if
18 you will, of existing Treaty, Statute, Compact
19 requirements. By that I mean water deliveries are
20 scheduled from the dam to meet Treaty and Compact
21 requirements. The Grand Canyon Protection Act did not
22 change those.

23 Let's cover for just a minute what's occurred in
24 the past and maybe you can get a sense as to why we're
25 moving -- we're proposing to move forward into an

1 experimental period. This is a brief list of some of
2 the experiments that have been conducted during the life
3 of the Adaptive Management Program over the last decade.
4 Maybe I can explain what the first bullet means. A
5 beach/habitat-building flow is a release of water from
6 the dam that exceeds power plant capacity. In the past,
7 the two tests that we've completed in 1996 and 2004 were
8 about 42 to 45,000 CFS and the dam power plant capacity
9 is about 30,000 CFS. The purpose of those tests was to
10 discover initially if higher flows would redeposit, stir
11 up the sediment in the river and build up and redeposit
12 the sand and fine sediments on beaches thus improving
13 habitat for not only campers and river rafters that go
14 through the canyon, but also habitat to vegetation and
15 terrestrial species.

16 In 2000 we conducted a four-month steady flow test
17 during the summer. The flows were abnormally low, 8,000
18 CFS constant for about -- it was June through September,
19 I think, something like that. We were attempting to
20 discover the impact that more stable and warmer flows
21 might have, particularly on the aquatic environment. In
22 the period 2002, 2003 to the present we have been in a
23 series of structured experiments trying to understand
24 the affect, not only of an additional flow, and we'll
25 get into that in a second, but also how temperatures and

1 non native fish removal might affect the aquatic
2 environment. We'll cover each of those separately.
3 First of all, the 2004 Beach/Habitat-Building Flow
4 test. In 1996 the test was conducted without an
5 antecedent input of sediment in the Paria River. So
6 when it was conducted it basically suspended sediment
7 that had been in the main channel and eddies from
8 previous inputs. The difference in 2004 was that the
9 test immediately followed a fairly large input from the
10 Paria River and the results were pretty extraordinary.
11 If you're familiar with the Grand Canyon, the first 30
12 or 40 miles below the Paria River had beaches that were
13 larger than anyone had ever seen. But below that, the
14 effect was less positive.
15 So we learned a few things about how to conduct
16 this test from that experiment. At the same time the
17 drought was causing a drawdown in the level of Lake
18 Powell, as you're probably well aware. As the level of
19 the lake got closer and closer to the power plant intake
20 level, the water became warmer and warmer that was being
21 released. So nature gave us a natural test, if you
22 will, of the effect of what warmer water might do. The
23 results have been pretty interesting. The native fish
24 have responded positively. For example the bluehead
25 sucker and the flannelmouth sucker populations have shown

1 a sharp increase just in the last couple of years. And
2 other endangered species have shown increases in the
3 population, particularly in the small size classes.
4 And there, of course, was a lot of monitoring and
5 research that accompanied those. And in all these
6 situations we have prepared NEPA documents to evaluate
7 the potential effect of conducting these experiments.
8 And the effects were evaluated for all the resources,
9 economic as well as social, cultural and all the rest.
10 It's our anticipation that the program of
11 experimentation we're going to launch into now will tier
12 off of these and other NEPA documents, so we'll take
13 advantage of what we have learned in the past as we move
14 now into the future. This is the proposed federal
15 action. As you can see, there's a number of complex
16 parts to that. It involves more than just dam
17 operations, and we will be considering modifying the
18 intake structure and that's often times referred to as a
19 temperature control device. What that does is encases
20 the penstock intake in something like a cylinder or tube
21 or a rectangular box structure that allows water from
22 higher up in the reservoir to enter the box and come
23 down into the powerplant intake, therefore withdrawing
24 warmer water and releasing warmer water rather than the
25 relatively cooler water that's currently released. That

1 can be used as a test to find out if warmer temperature
2 indeed will have a positive effect downstream instead of
3 just relying on natural processes like we've just
4 experienced with the drought to produce those warmer
5 releases.

6 Some of the things we've done in the past few
7 years includes the removal of non-native fish. That
8 could be part of the experimental design as well. There
9 might be other things like translocation of species,
10 alteration of flow regimes and things like that that
11 could be part of it. Part of the purpose of the meeting
12 tonight is to get your views on the issues we should
13 address, the methods we should use, and the issues that
14 we should consider for potential testing.

15 This is our purpose and need statement document
16 and this was taken from a Federal Register that was
17 published in December, and you can see there's two parts
18 to it. One is the increase of scientific understanding
19 through rigorous testing and the other is to accomplish
20 the Glen Canyon Dam resource protection.

21 These are some examples of hypotheses that we
22 might address, but we'd like to hear from you if there
23 are others that you would like or you suggest we address
24 in these efforts as well.

25 This is the reason or the need for the EIS or the

1 proposed action. The first half of the paragraph is
2 paraphrasing part of the Grand Canyon Protection Act and
3 the second part shows that the reason we are doing this
4 is so the decisions the secretary will make in the
5 future can be better informed by better science. In
6 fact, if you distill it down to just a couple thoughts,
7 we want to focus on the core remaining science questions
8 that are currently unanswered in terms of how this
9 ecosystem functions below the Glen Canyon Dam. We want
10 to answer those questions through this experimental
11 program, and that will then allow us to make better
12 informed decisions in the future.

13 We covered the tiering a little bit earlier, but
14 we'll use those previous NEPA documents as well as the
15 1996 EIS. Now, about a year ago we started an
16 environmental assessment on this temperature control
17 device I referred to earlier, and we got part way
18 through that and realized it was pretty complex and
19 pretty controversial, and about the same time we were
20 proposing to commence on the long term experimental
21 design to rigorously test these hypotheses and realized
22 the device was just fundamental to this testing program.
23 So we have decided to combine those two together so that
24 the TCD, if you will, is going to be part of this EIS.
25 So any of the scoping we received on the temperature

1 control device will automatically be part of that, and
2 any of the comments, all of those will be carried
3 forward.
4 This is what we've done to date. A couple federal
5 register notices. The adaptive management work group is
6 an advisory committee, like I referred to earlier. They
7 have been working for about a year and-a-half on this
8 experimental design. They established a science
9 planning group with some input and help from our
10 monitoring and research center, the Grand Canyon
11 monitoring and research center in Flagstaff. That
12 product was brought to our technical work group as part
13 of the program, and finally a few weeks ago the Adaptive
14 Management work group met to make a recommendation to
15 the secretary. They basically forwarded on several
16 options for consideration in this EIS.
17 As I mentioned, the scoping period will conclude
18 at the end of February, so there's plenty of time to
19 bring your comments to us. We'll have a copy, if you
20 haven't already received one, of this presentation.
21 We'll give you these address and E-mail addresses for
22 you to send those comments. I think -- doesn't it also
23 have our website on it as well? We're going to try -- I
24 think since most of the public is internet savvy, we're
25 going to try and flood our website with pertinent

1 information about this effort. So as we develop, for
2 example, these core questions, we'll post them to the
3 website so the public can see the progress and the
4 status of the effort we're making. As we develop
5 alternatives, they'll be there too. We'll probably post
6 results of previous experiments and other information,
7 background on the Adaptive Management Program as well.
8 We'll then post, by the end of March, I'm assured we'll
9 have it done by then, a result of the scoping efforts
10 we're engaging in right now, and make that available as
11 well.

12 Now, the schedule is pretty rigorous. Our final
13 target is a record decision in December of 2008. We
14 expect that we can have a draft out by April of '08, and
15 that will allow a substantial period of time for public
16 comment on both the draft and this scoping opportunity
17 here.

18 With that, I think I'll open it up for any
19 questions from you. Anything you're wondering about?
20 And after we answer any questions you might have we'll
21 open it up for specific comments you might have. Yes?

22 MR. OSTLER: Randy, do you envision the scope of
23 this EIS with regard to management actions to be
24 possibly broad enough to include recovery issues for the
25 humpback chub, similar to what's being done on the upper

1 basin? Is that broader than the scope that you envision
2 for this EIS?

3 MR. PETERSON: What he's referring to, I think, is
4 in the upper basin up here we have a recovery
5 implementation program. So those are formal agreements
6 where state and federal government, other parties come
7 together with specific goals of recovering endangered
8 species. There's a couple of them in play, one on the
9 San Juan River and another one on the rest of the Upper
10 Colorado basin. And there has been some talk about
11 creating such a program in the Grand Canyon or the lower
12 basin. I don't think we have made a decision on whether
13 this effort here will encapsulate the creation of a
14 recovery program, but I think that's one of the purposes
15 for scoping, to get comments like that. And we'll go
16 back and try and figure out what the scope is. John?

17 MR. WEISHEIT: Yeah, I had a question that I
18 formulated back in October during the science symposium
19 by Glen Canyon Dam research center, to a statement that
20 Jack Schmidt said, that basically unless you do sediment
21 augmentation, the beach building habitat flow -- beach
22 habitat-building flows are merely topical and will not
23 really increase the sediment that you need to preserve
24 archeological sites and habitat beach sites. So are
25 you -- it doesn't sound like you're putting a sediment

1 augmentation component into this EIS.

2 MR. PETERSON: I think that's part of the reason
3 for scoping, to receive comments like that. I can tell
4 you that the scope of this effort is not yet resolved,
5 nor have we developed alternatives, formal alternatives.
6 I would say that we have thought about some of the core
7 questions and I think long term sustainability of sand
8 resources in Grand Canyon is probably one of the key
9 ones.

10 I can tell you that we've spoken with the Grand
11 Canyon Monitoring and Research Center the night before
12 last, and they cannot right now answer the question as
13 to whether BHBFs timed with tributary inputs in
14 perpetuity is sustainable or not. So I think that's an
15 open question.

16 You will probably see some effort made in this
17 document to rigorously test whether or not that's
18 sustainable. You're probably aware that we have already
19 completed a contract evaluating the possibility or
20 potential for sediment augmentation, and that report, I
21 think, is available or soon to be available through the
22 website. We'd like it, if you have a question, I guess
23 she would like you to say and spell your name. Any
24 other questions?

25 Okay. I'll open it up for comments now. If you

1 could use the microphone that would be great, say your
2 name clearly. And has everyone signed in? Very good.
3 And we do have a list of people that have signed up to
4 give comments, right?
5 MS. KEELER: Yes.
6 MR. PETERSON: John, you are first.
7 MR. WEISHEIT: My name is John Weisheit, it's
8 spelled W-e-i-s-h-e-i-t, and I represent Living Rivers.
9 I'm the Conservation Director. And I also represent the
10 Water Keeper Alliance, Colorado River keeper. Do I have
11 to do this in five minutes or less, or --
12 MR. PETERSON: No.
13 MR. WEISHEIT: I mean, I would like to say that we
14 will be writing more detailed comments and we will be
15 organizing the public as we typically do, and also
16 including other NGOs in this process in the next two
17 months.
18 In October of 1996 the Record of Decision for the
19 Grand Canyon environmental impact statement authorized
20 the preferred alternative known as Modified
21 Low/Fluctuating Flow. In January 1995, the U.S. Fish
22 and Wildlife Service presented their final biological
23 opinion and stated that the preferred alternative, "is
24 likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the
25 humpback chub and the razorback sucker and is likely to

1 destroy or adversely modify designated critical
2 habitat."

3 In October 2005, the Grand Canyon Monitoring and
4 Research Center presented their SCORE report on the
5 state of the ecosystem which dealt with the state of the
6 ecosystem in Grand Canyon which stated, specifically on
7 page 208, "The current MLFF operation has not resulted
8 in any increased survival and recruitment of humpback
9 chub despite the prediction of the EIS."

10 The biological opinion also stated the alternative
11 called the steady seasonal adjusted flow would be the
12 best treatment to remove jeopardy. The biological
13 opinion also explained that steady flow experiments
14 should be conducted and to build a temperature control
15 device at Glen Canyon Dam which they called selective
16 withdrawal, to complete a management plan for the Little
17 Colorado to insure the continued existence of the
18 razorback sucker, to establish a second population of
19 humpback chub and that adaptive management would be
20 active not passive.

21 10 years have passed, and there is no temperature
22 control device, there is no Little Colorado River
23 management plan, there is no second population of
24 humpback chub. The razorback sucker is extirpated. The
25 reports from the one and only steady flow experiment in

1 2000 are not comprehensive, nor are they useful. I
2 appreciated your comments Rich, with Melissa Trammel,
3 but they are not comprehensive or useful and obviously
4 adaptive management is anything but active.

5 The preferred alternative adversity upon the
6 designated critical habitat to endangered fish was, of
7 course, revealed to members of the Colorado River much
8 sooner than the GCPMRC report of 2005, and that it was
9 done through the proceedings of the Adaptive Management
10 Program and through congressional reports from the
11 secretary to congress.

12 The Department of Interior has had sufficient time
13 and cause to initiate a reconsultation with U.S. Fish
14 and Wildlife and did not do so until citizens intervened
15 through a lawsuit which was filed in district court in
16 March 2006, in the 9th District Court. Despite the
17 compelling evidence of poor performance before a
18 watching world, misleading statements continued to
19 emanate from Interior's leadership. Secretary
20 Kempthorne went on record in December 2006 to say that
21 Adaptive Management Program, "is a cutting edge solution
22 that provides an effective framework and process for
23 integrating dam operations, downstream resource
24 protection and management, and monitoring and research.
25 We also are able to better safeguard natural resources

1 and improve recreational opportunities at Glen Canyon
2 National Recreational Area and Grand Canyon National
3 Park."

4 Therefore, Living Rivers denies that the Adaptive
5 Management and Department of Interior is committed to
6 change its approach to fulfill the mandates of federal
7 law to protect and preserve and restore the park values
8 of Grand Canyon National Park. Furthermore, Living
9 Rivers does not believe jeopardy will be removed within
10 the life span of the LTEP, because the process will
11 continue to be managed through minimalism, as the
12 administrative record already shows. We fully expect
13 the citizens to return to court, which is our privilege
14 when the government forsakes its responsibilities.

15 Some of the things that we would like to see in
16 the EIS, and we'll be much more explicit in our letters
17 in the future, but we definitely think that this program
18 needs to be integrated with the ongoing EIS called
19 shortage criteria, the operations of Lake Powell and
20 Lake Mead. We also think that the National Oceanic and
21 Atmospheric Administration should be a cooperating
22 agency for this EIS. They need to study the future of
23 the long-term yield of the Colorado River at Lees Ferry,
24 severe and sustained drought, the implications of El
25 Nino, La Nina, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and

1 Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation.
2 The reason why is because we're very concerned
3 that it is possible, due to global climate change, that
4 the yield of the Colorado River could significantly
5 reduce the levels of both Lake Powell and Lake Mead
6 which would alter and change the water quality in Grand
7 Canyon National Park. For example, if the conservation
8 pool is completely exhausted there is a possibility that
9 anaerobic bacteria, hydrogen sulfide, and supersaline
10 and metal-rich sediments could be introduced into the
11 Grand Canyon corridor. So we think that there should be
12 involved -- that there should be some sort of funding
13 mechanism in place for emergency operations of the
14 reservoir should the water quality of Grand Canyon be
15 impaired.
16 We think that there should be only one flow regime
17 that should be incorporated, and that's the one in the
18 biological opinion, seasonally adjusted steady flows.
19 We realize that this could be a hinderance to the basin
20 fund through hydropower revenues, but we believe this is
21 much more important. In other words, we don't think the
22 Grand Canyon should suffer because of the inability to
23 pay the basin fund through power revenues.
24 I'm going to skip through some of this stuff if
25 you don't mind so that other people can share. We also

1 believe that besides the temperature control device we
2 should definitely have a funding mechanism -- that it
3 should have a funding mechanism and be involved in this
4 particular EIS as well as sediment augmentation.
5 And in conclusion, when the draft EIS for the LTEP
6 is published, we fully expect to see a budget and a time
7 frame or a management plan on the Little Colorado River
8 as recommended by the biological opinion. There is
9 continuing frustration about the lack of progress
10 concerning projects with the tribes as it relates to the
11 preservation of their cultural heritage. These programs
12 must be integrated into the LTEP with a budget and a
13 time frame. The strategic plan of the AMP includes
14 restoring population of an extirpated species. Such a
15 plan must be incorporated into the LTEP with a budget
16 and a time frame. The AMP needs to finish the studies
17 related to study of the non-market values of Grand
18 Canyon resources with a budget and a time frame.
19 The LTEP must finish and implement the conceptual
20 ecosystem modeling plan with a budget and a time frame.
21 The tributaries are what keeps the Grand Canyon
22 ecosystem alive and they must be consistently monitored
23 and funded. Living Rivers is not overly concerned with
24 managing recreational opportunities because by taking
25 care of the ecosystem and the cultural programs

1 recreation will benefit incidentally.
2 There is no control site for AMP experiments. The
3 National Academy of Sciences has recommended that
4 Cataract Canyon above Lake Powell would serve this
5 purpose, and we would like to see that incorporated into
6 the LTEP.
7 Thank you.
8 MR. PETERSON: Leslie James.
9 MS. JAMES: Thank you. My name is Leslie James,
10 I'm the Executive Director of the Colorado River Energy
11 Distributors Association, or CREDA. Let me describe
12 CREDA a little bit so it will put my comments into
13 context. CREDA is a nonprofit organization established
14 back in 1978, and represents a majority of the
15 purchasers of hydropower from the Colorado River Storage
16 Project in the six western states. All CREDA members
17 and all purchasers of CRSP hydropower are non profit
18 entities. They include cities, towns, co-ops, tribes,
19 military installations, universities, etcetera. The
20 energy from resources of the Colorado River Storage
21 Project, Glen Canyon being the largest resource, about
22 -- over 70 percent of that resource serves five million
23 people in six western states. And I want to emphasize
24 again, that all of these purchasers are nonprofit
25 entities.

1 We will be providing some specific comments within
2 the time frame allocated but I wanted to make a couple
3 of general comments. First of all I think it is timely.
4 Let's look at this from a more regional/national
5 perspective. John mentioned climate change. Just
6 yesterday, the first day of the 110th Congress, in fact
7 Senator Harry Reed of Nevada introduced legislation S6
8 called the National Energy and Environmental Security
9 Energy or Act of 2007. It's a very short bill, but in
10 particular it -- one of its purposes is to reduce the
11 dependence of the United States on foreign and
12 unsustainable energy sources.

13 Another purpose of that legislation is to reduce
14 burdens on consumers of rising energy prices. Now, I
15 mention that because the energy resource of the Colorado
16 River Storage Project and specifically Glen Canyon Dam,
17 is a clean renewable resource. This is a resource that
18 could be enhanced. This is a resource that has been
19 pretty substantially impacted since changed operations
20 back in 1996, about a third of the capacity of the
21 resource has not been usable due to the environmental
22 restrictions. So, let me put -- that kind of puts in
23 context one of my general comments.

24 Randy's presentation gave you some background on
25 the 1956 Colorado River Storage Project Act that

1 authorized Glen Canyon Dam as well as the 1992 Grand
2 Canyon Protection Act. The decision from the 1996
3 record of decision included the selection of existing
4 operational alternatives which would achieve an
5 appropriate balance, and that word is used throughout,
6 so that the operation of Glen Canyon Dam would conform
7 to the direction given in the Grand Canyon Protection
8 Act while remaining in compliance with other legal
9 mandates. And I will quote, "To balance competing
10 interests and to meet statutory responsibilities for
11 protecting downstream resources, and producing
12 hydropower."

13 The concept of balance was integral to the
14 selection of this alternative and is repeated in several
15 related documents. "The goal of selecting a preferred
16 alternative was not to maximize benefits for the most
17 resources, but rather to find an alternative dam
18 operating plan that would permit recovery and long term
19 sustainability of downstream resources, while limiting
20 hydropower capability and flexibility only to the extent
21 necessary to achieve recovery and long term
22 sustainability." And that's a quote from the ROD as
23 well. We clearly support the description contained in
24 the proposed action. We have a small concern regarding
25 the purpose and need statement as it's currently

1 written.

2 Part of the purpose and need statement and I
3 quote, "increasing scientific understanding of the
4 ecosystem downstream from Glen Canyon Dam", that should
5 be secondary to efforts by the secretary to meet the
6 legal mandates while again, "Improving and protecting
7 important downstream resources which includes the
8 generation of hydropower to the maximum extent
9 practicable in accordance with the Colorado River
10 Storage Project Act. And again, we'll be providing
11 additional comments. Thank you.

12 MR. PETERSON: Thank you Leslie. Mr. Richard
13 Quist. Am I saying that right?

14 MR. QUIST: My name is Richard Quist, I'm a river
15 runner. My family owns and operates a company called
16 Moki Mac River Expeditions. We've been doing this
17 since -- well, we've been doing it all of our lives.
18 We've been doing it officially as a company since 1969,
19 and before that my dad started plucking us away out of
20 mom's reach and taking us down the rivers of Utah and
21 Arizona when we were just little tiny kids. So, we've
22 had a real connection to the river canyons of the
23 Colorado River plateau including the Grand Canyon.

24 I just looked through the statistics of use,
25 recreational use in the Grand Canyon before I came here

1 this evening and I have to say it pales in comparison to
2 the power constituency that I just heard stated here of
3 five million, is that what you said, five million
4 people? And probably it pales in comparison to the
5 constituency of the water users who I guess benefit from
6 Glen Canyon Dam. But I don't suspect that the number --
7 I looked at the numbers from a nine year period, 1998
8 through 2006, and there were 215,491 people who went
9 down the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon during
10 that time period.

11 And I would say that the emotional impact on those
12 people far exceeds anything that water users or power
13 users get from the dam because they don't even know
14 where the power is coming from and they don't know where
15 the water is coming from really, I suspect, when it
16 comes right down to it.

17 And so I would urge and hope that this process
18 would include the need to, inasmuch as possible, given
19 the presence of Glen Canyon Dam, to protect the Grand
20 Canyon and protect the ecology down there and protect
21 the resource so that we can continue taking these people
22 down there so they can benefit from this emotional and
23 mental benefit that they get from the experience in --
24 for the ideas and their benefit of protecting national
25 parks in general, and protecting these resources in the

1 country which I think are just hugely hugely important.

2 And as we read through this as a company, we'll
3 certainly be submitting more comments and more specific
4 comments about what we think the process should be, and
5 that's about all I had to say. Thank you very much.

6 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Anyone else like to
7 make a comment or a statement? John?

8 MR. WEISHEIT: Yeah, if that's okay. I forgot to
9 mention, we'll be asking for the decommissioning
10 alternative. But three things I think that need to be
11 the most clearly stated as far as Living Rivers is
12 concerned. Seasonally adjusted steady flows. Build a
13 temperature control device. Build a sediment
14 augmentation device. The reason why is because these
15 are the three things that will prove if Adaptive
16 Management works or not. And that is actually the
17 charge, I believe, of this EIS and this group, is
18 because until -- I mean, as far as I have read the
19 literature, Adaptive Management is a theory. It has not
20 actually ever been applied to the operations of a big
21 dam successfully. And this is the mandate of the
22 Adaptive Management Program. You should be doing these
23 programs to prove that this is a way to not only manage
24 this dam, but all future dams in the world. So you
25 should be committed to do this.

1 And we fully expect to see these things happen and
2 develop because what's been going on for the last 10
3 years is nothing. I mean the program has absolutely
4 nothing to show for it, and that has to change. And
5 that's why we're filing the lawsuit and that's why we'll
6 file another one if we feel compelled to do this, and we
7 will.

8 But Leslie, I'm sorry, hydropower is not a clean
9 energy source. I would love to take you on a Cataract
10 Canyon trip to show you the hydrogen sulfite and the
11 methane gas that comes out of the sediment deposits in
12 upper reservoirs. The hydropower alters water quality,
13 it is not a clean source of energy. I would much prefer
14 a different kind of renewable energy than hydropower. I
15 don't think it's a good clean source of power.

16 MR. PETERSON: One point I want to make again is
17 that the written comments are every bit as valuable as
18 any verbal ones, and we read every one of those, every
19 card that comes in, every E-mail that comes in, so
20 please take advantage of that. In the handout we do
21 have the E-mail address. Maybe I can introduce Dennis
22 Kubly, he's the program manager for the program, and his
23 E-mail and phone number is there as well as mine. And
24 like I said earlier, we will be committed to having a
25 pretty thorough and descriptive website as the months

1 unfold here. If you've got questions about anything,
2 please give us a call, so that what we're doing is
3 clear.
4 Any other comments? If not, we'll be around until
5 8:00 so feel free to talk to us.
6 MR. WAYNE COOK: The time frame for the EIS, did
7 you do that?
8 MR. PETERSON: That's the schedule there. The
9 scoping meeting is one of the first things we do.
10 Actually we had a Federal Register notice in early
11 November at the start of the process and announced to
12 the public that we intended to create an EIS. So if you
13 think about the November and December time frame, we're
14 allowing four months to have public input on the scope,
15 things that should be studied, the methodology, things
16 like that. Very interested in what you have to say.
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just for clarification, you
18 say develop alternatives May 2007. Does that mean it
19 starts then or ends then?
20 MR. PETERSON: They would be done by then. And
21 our scoping reports would be available at the end of
22 March, I hope. Other comments or questions? Thank you.
23 Have a good evening and thanks again for coming.
24 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned.)
25

1 STATE OF UTAH)
2
3 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

4
5

6 I, Linda J. Smurthwaite, Certified Shorthand
7 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and notary
8 public within and for the county of Salt Lake, State of
9 Utah do hereby certify:

10 That the foregoing proceedings were taken by me at
11 the time and place set forth herein, and was taken down
12 by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into
13 typewriting under my direction and supervision.

14 That the foregoing pages contain a true and
15 correct transcription of my said shorthand notes so
16 taken.

17 In Witness Whereof, I have subscribed my name this
18 7th day of January, 2007.

19
20

21 LINDA J. SMURTHWAITE
22 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

23
24
25