

Appendix C

Native American Scoping Comments

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

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

Native American Coordination Meeting

Systems Conveyance and Operations Program
Environmental Impact Statement

Taken on Wednesday, March 31, 2004

at the Avi Resort & Casino

Laughlin, Nevada

at 2:00 p.m.

Reported by: Sharon E. Bradley, CCR, RMR, CRR
Arizona CCR #50040 / California CCR #4003 / Nevada CCR #101

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

Appearances:

Doug Karafa, Program Administrator

Carrie Stewart, PBS&J

Bill Shephard, Clark County Water Reclamation District

Tim Smith, City of Henderson

Anthony Vigil, Bureau of Reclamation

Chad Smith, Fort Mojave Tribe

Gloria Hernandez, Tribal Chair Paiute Tribe, Las Vegas

Pat Hicks, Bureau of Reclamation

1 MS. STEWART: Welcome, everyone. I'd like to
2 thank everyone for coming here today. I'm Carrie Stewart.
3 I'm the PBS&J Project Manager for the Environmental Impact
4 statement.

5 Right now I would like to ask Chad to give a
6 lesson.

7 (A Tribal blessing was given by Mr. Smith.)

8 (A presentation was presented.)

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Some of the Tribal Members
10 were wondering if it's possible to get this DVD to bring to
11 their Tribal Councils to show a copy of this?

12 MS. STEWART: Sure.

13 MR. KARAFI: I think I have -- How many --
14 I've got one with me.

15 MS. STEWART: Gloria wanted one definitely.
16 Did you want one?

17 MR. KARAFI: I think I've got a spare in the
18 briefcase. There's one in the computer. I've got more in
19 the office.

20 MS. STEWART: And we can have one made.

21 MR. KARAFI: We can always send more.

22 MR. SMITH: If you could send one to the
23 Colorado River Indian Tribes as well.

24 MS. STEWART: Okay. Doug right now is going
25 to talk about the project in more detail, and he's going to

1 describe some things that have happened since that video was
2 made.

3 (Mr. Karafa made his presentation.)

4 MS. STEWART: I'm going to leave it to you as
5 to whether or not you want to take a break ask one-on-one
6 questions or you can ask questions now or we can just move
7 into the public comment period if somebody would like to
8 speak.

9 (No response.)

10 MS. STEWART: Does anybody have a preference?

11 MS. HERNANDEZ: Let's take a break for a
12 minute.

13 MR. KARAFKA: We can always, if you'd like to,
14 look at any of the pictures around the room. We can discuss
15 individual questions.

16 MS. STEWART: The pipeline alignment,
17 although Doug showed them in the presentation that display,
18 does show the alignment for the proposed alignments that
19 would be analyzed in the EIS so you can get a closer look at
20 those.

21 Okay. Let's take ten minutes.

22 (There was a short break taken at 3:06 p.m.
23 until 3:24 p.m.)

24 MS. STEWART: Okay. I'd like to open up --
25 I'd like to open up the meeting now for public comment.

1 Would anybody like to make a comment?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. SMITH: I just have some questions. We
4 didn't do questions.

5 MS. STEWART: Okay. Well, Doug can answer --
6 or several people here --

7 MR. KARAFa: Shoot.

8 MS. STEWART: -- can probably ask -- or
9 answer them.

10 MR. SMITH: It's not that he went through the
11 DVD real fast, you know, and -- But somewhere in there it
12 said these three groups collectively represent anyone who
13 has anything to do with water shed management in Southern
14 Nevada; and I didn't see tribes mentioned or even BIA,
15 Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the interior.

16 And just this as an aside, I noticed one acronym
17 in there, about the time when it showed Oscar Goldman at the
18 one public meeting and one of the perhaps county supervisors
19 for Clark County that's now in hot water, if you'll excuse
20 the pun; and the acronym was D-A-F-T, DAFT.

21 Do you know what -- And it was up on a board in
22 the meeting.

23 MR. KARAFa: Yeah. That shot was just of
24 a -- It was really portraying some of the tours that
25 citizens had around the plant.

1 And DAFT is just one of the processes in the
2 treatment plant. That stands for dissolved air flow
3 thickening sources, but it was just -- it doesn't have any
4 political significance or anything. It's just a name for a
5 treatment process.

6 MR. SMITH: Sometimes they call it the
7 flocculation?

8 MR. KARAFKA: It's a little bit different, but
9 when the solids came out of case water. They have a way of
10 concentrating the solid, so they that can eventually dry
11 them up and haul them off to a land fill.

12 MR. SMITH: Do you know what it means in
13 England?

14 MR. KARAFKA: I'm afraid to ask.

15 MR. SMITH: So often people will pick an
16 acronym for something or that's just the name of what the
17 process is. And DAFT means off your rocker or crazy.

18 MR. KARAFKA: Oh, that kind of DAFT, yes.

19 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I think some of the folks
20 would chuckle a little bit on that one.

21 MR. KARAFKA: A lot of the people that work in
22 wastewater treatment plants are a little DAFT anyway.

23 MR. SMITH: So the ADS alternatives relates
24 to the dissolved --

25 MR. KARAFKA: Well now, the term ADS used in

1 this was -- it stood for Alternative Discharge Study, which
2 eventually would change the name of that to SCOP, which is
3 the thing up there which stands for Systems Conveyance and
4 Operation Program.

5 The early phase of this, we were just essentially
6 studying alternative places to go with the wastewater
7 effluents; and as that turned into more of a program and
8 started to be more than just a study phase in terms of
9 moving forward with EIS and so on, we just renamed it to
10 SCOP to be a little more fitting for what was going on.

11 MR. SMITH: And wasn't there an algae bloom
12 two years ago?

13 MR. KARAFEA: In 2001?

14 MR. SMITH: Maybe three years.

15 MR. KARAFEA: 2001, yes, a major one.

16 MR. SMITH: It's interesting.

17 MR. KARAFEA: That's one of the things we're
18 trying to prevent from happening.

19 MR. SMITH: I know that one concern and it's
20 a little maybe naive or unrealistic on the part of City of
21 San Diego.

22 They have regulations, I think, ordinance, that no
23 waters can be used in the city municipal water system that
24 contain effluent that has effluent discharged into the
25 source; and yet they run a three- to five-mile five-foot

1 diameter pipeline out into the Pacific Ocean from San Diego.

2 And San Diego County Water Authority is one of the
3 major players in the downstream river issues, the
4 quantification settlement agreement, and other water
5 exchanges of water rights with the farmers in Imperial and
6 Coachella Valleys to supply the very southern part of
7 Southern California with water that's exchanged for other
8 waters.

9 And several years ago, one of the county people
10 was talking about that at one of our Inter-Tribal Waters
11 Protection Network meetings that -- we've had several,
12 including one here at the Avi.

13 And we try to have one each year of tribes that
14 are within the catchment or water shed of the Colorado
15 River, which is really from Wyoming with the Green River on
16 down to and further south of the Mexican border with Cocopah
17 being south of the border, and the Continental divide over
18 in New Mexico, which includes many of the Pueblo Tribes, and
19 over to the Pacific Ocean really or at least this side of
20 the coastals.

21 And then finally, you may not know the exact
22 construction technique -- and it's just more curiosity on my
23 part -- of the construction of the pipeline on out into the
24 lake, let's say to Boulder Islands, which is what, seven
25 miles?

1 They'll do that with barges and assembled parts of
2 it and then drop it.

3 MR. KARAFI: Well, that's a good question.

4 There's -- The route would be from someplace along
5 the Las Vegas Wash all the way out to here.

6 This entire area from here to here would all be
7 tunneled through the mountain. There would be nothing on
8 the surface.

9 The only thing on the surface would be, obviously,
10 the holes where they started and where they came back out on
11 the other end.

12 And then we're still talking about construction
13 techniques down here where we surface with a tunnel getting
14 across through the Boulder Beach area and out to Boulder
15 Islands.

16 This, of course, as you know, a highly used area
17 by recreationists, particularly in the summer.

18 We're talking about possibly doing some tunneling
19 here. We may do some open construction off season, the
20 park -- We're working with the park service -- correct me if
21 I'm saying this wrong.

22 We haven't exactly settled how we're going to do
23 this, but there's three or four construction techniques.

24 Once we get out under water, a hundred feet under
25 water or so, then we would actually just lay a pipeline

1 along the bottom of the lake.

2 And so at -- When everything's done, of course,
3 this would all be out of sight. There may be some temporary
4 disturbances like in this area here along Boulder Beach
5 because of construction.

6 MR. SMITH: The tunneling, though, would be
7 tunnel boring machine --

8 MR. KARAFKA: Yeah. We use like a 12- or
9 14-foot diameter tunneling boring machine, yes.

10 MR. SMITH: And then it would lay a pipe at
11 the time within that tunnel or just case it?

12 MR. KARAFKA: Yeah. Usually -- Especially in
13 the mountains here, the good thing about the mountains
14 there, they're solid rock and -- which is actually wonderful
15 for tunneling. They don't have to do any shoring, anything.

16 So they would just bore a hole through the
17 mountain, and then they would go would go back through and
18 either put a pipe inside that area and then grout around it
19 or actually just line the walls of the tunnel, one of the
20 two.

21 MR. SMITH: Any idea on dollar amount, cost
22 of the entire project?

23 MR. KARAFKA: Yes. What we call the net
24 present worth is -- which is, if you put all the money in
25 the bank today, at today's value of dollars to do the

1 project, it's in the neighborhood of about \$700 million.

2 MR. SMITH: Seven hundred million?

3 MR. KARAFEA: Yes.

4 MR. SMITH: -- and possibly a million --

5 MR. KARAFEA: Oh, yeah. Give or take -- At
6 this point, give or take 50 million easy. And these are
7 engineering estimates.

8 We're in the planning level, so a lot of these
9 estimates, you know, are based on so much dollars per foot
10 of tunnel and those kinds of things.

11 MR. SMITH: Do you know in the EIS will there
12 be consideration of carrying capacity of population growth
13 and other issues?

14 You know, you anticipate up to 300 million gallons
15 per day by 2030 or so. And how many acre feet is that? Do
16 you know offhand?

17 I figured it's --

18 MR. KARAFEA: Now you're going to make use a
19 calculator.

20 MR. SMITH: -- 90 or so? Thirty-two thousand
21 acre feet a year.

22 MR. KARAFEA: A million gallons a day is 1100
23 acre feet per year, so 1100 times 300 is 300,000 acre feet
24 roughly.

25 MR. SMITH: I don't know if that's correct.

1 That would equal Nevada's entire water allocation.

2 MR. KARAFI: Yes. But see, some of that
3 water goes in a circle.

4 That -- The water that we return, if we return
5 200,000 acre feet then over here at Saddle Island, they can
6 divert the 300 diversion right -- or consumptive right plus
7 200,000 that got returned, so they'll actually divert
8 500,000 acre feet.

9 And then 200,000 acre feet will come back around
10 the sewer system and circle around. So that's why those --
11 It's not directly regulated to Nevada's consumptive limit
12 but actually to how much we divert, which is a different
13 number.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: I have one here. You just
15 said that -- He just mentioned that that allocation would be
16 similar to Nevada's allocation, but are you saying that that
17 water --

18 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear
19 her.

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: -- along the Colorado River.
21 Gloria Hernandez, Tribal Chair, Las Vegas Paiute
22 Tribe.

23 I was just asking a question off of his statement
24 in that that -- the allocation would be similar to Nevada's
25 allocation; and I was just wondering. So it's not for

1 Nevada only, but it's for all the --

2 MR. KARAFI: Well, the water that we return
3 is not an allocation. It's still our waters.

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: For everybody? Everybody's
5 consumption; not just Nevada?

6 MR. KARAFI: No. Nevada has the right -- has
7 a right to the river to 300,000 acre feet; to consume that
8 water, take it out of the river forever.

9 To the extent that we'd return water to the river,
10 that water is ours, for Nevada's, to use over again and adds
11 to our total amount of water that we can divert.

12 So no, it doesn't just go back to the system for
13 everybody. It goes back in the system for Nevada.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay. So this whole thing,
15 the EIS, is just for the State of Nevada? Is that --

16 MR. KARAFI: Well, no. I couldn't say that
17 the EIS is just for the state of Nevada. The project is.

18 I mean, but obviously, you know, people that are
19 looking at the project are in the state and outside the
20 state.

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: The reason why I ask that
22 because if it's just for Nevada, I was just wondering -- He
23 had mentioned that the Colorado River serves all the way
24 down to New Mexico, so if we're doing -- Are we doing it
25 just for the State of Nevada?

1 How would the other people benefit from this
2 proposal, if any?

3 MR. KARAFKA: Two issues. One is water
4 quantity, as far as the amount of water. The fact that we
5 continue to return -- get return flow present, bring it
6 back, that belongs to Nevada.

7 The other issue is that -- you know, really the
8 bigger issue for us is environmental protection.

9 Now, the environmental protection benefits not
10 only Nevada, but those folks downstream; Indian tribes,
11 States of California and Arizona. All those folks are --
12 have been, you know, tracking with this concern in terms --

13 MS. HERNANDEZ: They're not going to be able
14 to get any additional waters, are they?

15 MR. KARAFKA: Not because of this project,
16 no.

17 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

18 MR. KARAFKA: This project won't affect
19 anybody else's -- any other state's water rights.

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Just Nevada.

21 MR. KARAFKA: Yeah. And again, this doesn't
22 really change our allocation under the law of the river.
23 It's just within the state that we get to reuse our water.

24 MR. VIGIL: That won't change with or without
25 the project?

1 MR. KARAFKA: That's not going to change.

2 MR. VIGIL: If the project doesn't happen,
3 it's still -- they're still going to get their same water?

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Nevada would still get the
5 300 --

6 MR. VIGIL: With or without the water.

7 MS. HERNANDEZ: With or without it?

8 MR. KARAFKA: Right.

9 MR. VIGIL: It won't impact any water rights.

10 MS. HERNANDEZ: So the main reason we would
11 do it is prevent the erosion of that wash?

12 MR. KARAFKA: It's mainly for environmental
13 reasons.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: For environmental reasons?

15 MR. VIGIL: This is just a pipeline to move
16 the water from one place to another so it gets the water in
17 the -- you know.

18 (The court reporter interrupted the
19 proceedings to obtain the speaker's name.)

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: I thought that by doing this,
21 that the Tribes, along with the communities, would be able
22 to get more water, but it's --

23 MR. KARAFKA: No.

24 MR. SMITH: But Southern Nevada, or Nevada --
25 really we're talking Las Vegas. These other communities

1 right there.

2 At present, they put around a hundred fifty
3 million gallons a day back in, which if 300 million is
4 11,000 acre feet per year -- I mean, 300,000 acre feet, then
5 it would be around a hundred fifty thousand acre feet.

6 So their actual annual usage, the 300,000 acre
7 foot allocation and the 150,000 acre foot credits with
8 effluent discharge into the Colorado River, into Lake Mead,
9 the real water usage is around 450,000.

10 MR. KARAFI: Exactly right. Exactly right.

11 MR. SMITH: The Tribes consulted I know are
12 pretty much Tribes that could be affected along the Colorado
13 River; and Tribes like Navajo and Hopi, whose waters that
14 originate on their reservations flow into the Colorado
15 River; and then they -- and White Mountain Apache Tribe is
16 not on this list, and not that we would necessarily comment
17 from there on this issue -- although White Mountain being
18 one of the last Tribes to not sign a water agreement with
19 the State of Arizona holding the position that a much
20 greater acre footage is due the White Mountain Apache Tribe
21 than what was offered by the Feds and the State should be
22 consulted.

23 MR. KARAFI: Okay. That's --

24 MR. SMITH: And I can provide that
25 information.

1 MR. KARAFKA: If you'd provide that to Carrie.

2 MR. SMITH: Because they are -- We are
3 interested in water issues in general.

4 And then as well, probably the Inter-Tribal Water
5 Protection Network would wish to be consulted; and I'm sure
6 you've heard from some of the environmental groups --

7 MR. KARAFKA: Yes.

8 MR. SMITH: -- as well or you will --

9 MR. KARAFKA: We will.

10 MR. SMITH: -- on the issues.

11 MR. KARAFKA: Do you have -- Is there a
12 contact for the Inter-Tribal; the water group that you're
13 talking about?

14 MR. SMITH: Me.

15 MR. KARAFKA: Okay.

16 MR. SMITH: We're -- Well, I wouldn't say
17 dormant, but there's been some restructuring, and it's not
18 an official organization. I don't think we're even a 501-C
19 yet, you know.

20 But it does have the authorization of the various
21 Tribal governments; and most of the people are either --
22 Their representatives are either in water -- municipal water
23 distribution for Tribes or Tribal EPA's or that.

24 MR. KARAFKA: So if we contact you, would that
25 be -- would you then relay our objective?

1 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

2 And we've participated in the consultations at the
3 lake -- I mean -- Well, at Lake Las Vegas when it was BLM
4 and there was land exchange and there's Mohave cultural
5 resources there that are of great concern to the Tribe.

6 And then the Las Vegas Wash archaeological study
7 that took place recently, too; and we noted that much of the
8 impacts to those sites at Las Vegas Wash were as a result of
9 the effluent discharge; and, of course, it was pretty
10 obvious that the effluent was going back in close to the
11 outtake at the Saddle Island. Of course, it being upstream.

12 So really, this -- this project isn't going to
13 facilitate a further effluent discharge that would not go
14 through Las Vegas Wash into the lake were there to be the no
15 action alternative chosen.

16 MR. KARAFI: That's right.

17 MR. SMITH: But, you know, we do have some
18 concerns, as some in the Las Vegas area do, of the
19 unfettered growth aspect and urban sprawl.

20 And I know it can be a headache for people on both
21 the water providing side and the water treatment side, too.

22 Like here's another 5,000 person subdivision going
23 in miles out there, and they're gonna want water and sewage
24 and paved roads and the rest of that; and when we found out
25 recently that Southern Nevada Water Authority gets ten

1 percent of all BLM land sales money that are generated in
2 Southern Nevada, it seemed like a vicious cycle fostering
3 unfettered development and growth.

4 And the new plans for hundred plus mile long
5 pipelines that come from Lincoln County and some of the
6 other ground water sources, were those to be built and large
7 quantities of effluent from that water use going into Lake
8 Mead -- Of course, the other side of that is that it would
9 to an extent raise the water level in Lake Mead and then be
10 drawn back out.

11 Some of those issues, would they be considered
12 under cumulative effects or related effects?

13 MS. STEWART: The EIS will analyze the impact
14 of putting the 450 million gallons per day -- and that's
15 just off the top of my head. I know that's not the exact
16 number -- into the lake.

17 And that is based on population growth. What --
18 As the city continues to grow at the rate it has been,
19 that's the amount of effluent that would need to be treated.

20 MR. SMITH: Some of the concerns about a
21 ceiling on growth or attempts to limit growth, would they be
22 addressed in some of the --

23 MS. STEWART: No.

24 MR. SMITH: -- portions of the EIS?

25 MS. STEWART: No. That is beyond this

1 project.

2 MR. SMITH: It could even be that another
3 conveyance system would be necessary in the future?

4 MS. STEWART: Well, we're hoping no. We're
5 hoping that this will take care of it.

6 MR. KARAFKA: And I think you alluded early on
7 actually I think the planning period for the EIS is 50
8 years?

9 MS. STEWART: Yes.

10 MR. KARAFKA: So I mention things that are at
11 30 years out, but the size of this facility is actually
12 based on 50 years predictions, as good as we can project.

13 MR. SMITH: Were it to be within three years
14 or so of the studies done and all -- everything ready to go,
15 five years construction? Three years construction?

16 MR. KARAFKA: Probably like something around
17 five years.

18 Our goal would be to try to get this project
19 constructed by about 2010 or 2011. That is the window where
20 the treat -- if we don't get this project done, the existing
21 wastewater treatment plants will be put in the position of
22 having to do something drastic about their treatment status,
23 so...

24 MR. SMITH: Well, we often comment -- and I'm
25 with the Cultural Office, you know -- on NEPA documents,

1 environmental assessments, and even Environmental Impact
2 Statements, which will have a section on cultural resources
3 that are addressed with the requirements of the National
4 Historic Preservation Act; that we can't really comment on
5 the NEPA study until we receive and review the
6 archaeological survey report and whether there's sites found
7 and effects anticipated to those sites and treatment plans
8 for those sites.

9 And with the proposed tunneling through the
10 mountain itself, it seems that well, why would they do an
11 archaeological survey up over the mountains if they're going
12 to tunnel through it? But there could be indirect effects
13 to -- from maybe vibrations or other things.

14 So going into it, I can tell you we would probably
15 recommend that the area of potential effect of the tunneling
16 would be the surface of the earth even if it's to be at some
17 depth.

18 And there might be other activities related that
19 could have the potential to effect cultural resources, so we
20 would recommend an archaeological survey and a -- some sort
21 of an ethnographic study and traditional cultural places
22 study.

23 And with some of the pipeline itself before the
24 tunnel and out of the beach end, were sites to be found and
25 be not avoidable in the construction phase or possibly even

1 in proximity to the exact impact zone, we would recommend
2 Native American monitoring like was conducted at Las Vegas
3 Wash excavation.

4 MR. KARAFKA: One of the things that's kind of
5 lucky for us, the part of this area goes near the
6 Las Vegas Wash; and what's happened, there's been a lot of
7 survey work done on that area, and so we can build on a lot
8 of that work already. That's one good thing for us.

9 MR. SMITH: The southern alternative depicted
10 there that would go, I guess, to the Boulder Islands, it
11 would go in proximity to the Lake Las Vegas development?

12 MR. KARAFKA: The first leg would stop about a
13 mile or mile and a half upstream on the Las Vegas Wash from
14 where the Lake Las Vegas development is; and then -- We
15 wouldn't actually be going near it. We would be going south
16 of it.

17 Here's Lake Las Vegas right here. And this is --
18 The route that we take actually would be fairly south from
19 there.

20 We literally would be tunneling from this point
21 all the way down to -- in the mountains up back behind
22 Boulder Beach.

23 There's a water tank in area here that's already
24 disturbed for some pits and things in there.

25 MR. SMITH: There's a little bit of Boulder

1 City is -- Yeah.

2 MR. KARAFKA: See a little bit of Boulder City
3 there.

4 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

5 MR. KARAFKA: Obviously, in a project like
6 this, we're looking for -- where we have to do things on the
7 surface, for areas that have already been disturbed and
8 surveyed and so on as much as we can.

9 So we've had pretty good, I guess, luck at finding
10 those kind of areas for this project.

11 MS. STEWART: And there are archaeological
12 studies being done and reports will be furnished will be
13 provided to the Federal agencies, so...

14 MR. SMITH: There's archaeological surveys
15 ongoing?

16 MS. STEWART: Yes.

17 MR. SMITH: We might like to either
18 participate or go to some of the sites that are found; field
19 trip type of activities with the other Tribes at some point
20 in the process. We often do.

21 MR. KARAFKA: That can be done as well.

22 MS. STEWART: I think you would coordinate
23 through Reclamation and National Park Service.

24 MR. SMITH: Mm-hmm.

25 MS. HICKS: Las Vegas -- The Las Vegas

1 inventory reports, the wash inventory reports, those apply?
2 The east and west sites? Those documents?

3 MR. SMITH: The anticipated total cost of EIS
4 preparation, of which cultural is a small part of the dollar
5 amount, in comparison with the cost of the entire
6 undertaking, what are you looking at overall for EIS with
7 in-house staff time expenditure that is covered by the
8 project proponents, I think.

9 Because often, you get the -- Like with the
10 proposed bridge, second bridge, up between Laughlin and
11 Bullhead City, some public sentiment that -- These
12 environmental and cultural studies hold up the show and
13 they cost an arm and a leg.

14 And I mean, what are you looking, million and a
15 half maximum or five hundred thousand or something like
16 that?

17 MR. KARAFa: The cost of the entire EIS?

18 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Is there a tracking going
19 on?

20 MR. KARAFa: It's more than a million
21 dollars.

22 MS. STEWART: I can tell you what the
23 consultant portion is; but I don't know how you add in the
24 Federal agency portion of that.

25 MR. KARAFa: Oh, I can tell you -- I can

1 answer that part.

2 We have reimbursement contracts with both the Park
3 Service and Bureau of Rec. Those two contracts total
4 \$500,000.

5 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

6 MR. KARAFKA: And then we have our contract
7 with the consultants, which is something around a million
8 and a half, I believe.

9 MR. SMITH: So if it's 2 million and it cost
10 a billion to build it --

11 MR. KARAFKA: As a percentage of the project,
12 yeah.

13 MR. SMITH: -- you're looking at 1/50th or
14 less of the cost; and it's often not that way in the general
15 public's mind.

16 MR. KARAFKA: Yes.

17 MR. SMITH: And then, of course, the idea
18 behind NEPA, to not foul your own nest to such an extent or
19 the unforeseen consequences, things like that.

20 MS. STEWART: Does anyone have anything else?
21 Any other Comments? Questions?

22 (No response.)

23 MS. STEWART: Okay. I want to reiterate that
24 comments can be provided in writing.

25 Comments will be accepted throughout the process;

1 but comments as a result of what you've heard here today, if
2 you could get them to us by April 30th, which is a little
3 bit over 30 days -- or a little bit under 30 days. I guess
4 this is the 31st.

5 Let me -- If I can get back to the slide that has
6 all the addresses on it.

7 MR. SMITH: We got some of that in the
8 handout?

9 MS. STEWART: You do have it in the handout.
10 It's in the middle of the presentation. It's probably the
11 fifth or the sixth slide.

12 MR. SMITH: So I take it there won't be the
13 alternative of cessation of effluent discharge into the
14 Colorado River --

15 MS. STEWART: (Shakes head.)

16 MR. SMITH: -- and into Lake Mead --

17 MS. STEWART: No.

18 MR. SMITH: -- as an alternative? Of course,
19 that could be -- No, that wouldn't be in the no action
20 because with the no action you would still -- Well, we very
21 likely are going to comment that that should be an
22 alternative that would be considered because of downstream
23 water quality and cumulative discharges of other communities
24 into the river.

25 Because by the time much of it gets over to the

1 end user, you've got a lot of problems that are somewhat
2 added to by the amount -- You know, this is a massive amount
3 of effluent.

4 A quantification in comparison with the City of
5 Needles, which the entire -- Of course, it goes by
6 population. I'm sure there's a formula in there of how many
7 gallons of effluent are produced per day --

8 MR. KARAFI: Per person, yes.

9 MR. SMITH: -- ball park for a population of
10 such and such people with such and such technology of water
11 treatment, sewage treatment, and --

12 MR. KARAFI: Just to help you out, the flow
13 right now is about two to three percent -- The flow that
14 comes out of the Las Vegas Wash is about two or three
15 percent of the total Colorado River flow.

16 MR. SMITH: And that was one of the comments
17 that one of the tribal leaders had at the meeting when I was
18 instructed to attend this meeting, was the great concerns
19 about the perchlorate issue and the effluent issue.

20 And there really would have been even further
21 increased concerns if it were to have been put into the
22 Colorado River south of Hoover Dam, you know; so -- And then
23 to the other side of it, it can be a real problem with the
24 community.

25 What do you do? You know. And we've come a long

1 way in terms of water quality and the rest of that, but you
2 sure couldn't tell it when you turned on the tap up there in
3 Vegas.

4 But I'm sure it has to be treated; and most people
5 now days, as I do, drink bottled water; that processing and
6 that.

7 So we will provide written comments through our
8 Tribal Environmental Office separately from the Cultural as
9 well.

10 MS. STEWART: Okay. Good. Well, I
11 appreciate you all coming today if you have any additional
12 questions, they won't be recorded unless you talk to the
13 Court Recorder (sic) directly, but there are plenty of
14 people here to answer questions.

15 Thank you very much for coming.

16 (The proceedings were concluded at 3:58 p.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Certificate of Reporter

2 State of Arizona)

3)

4 County of Mohave)

5 I, Sharon E. Bradley, CCR, RMR, CRR, do hereby
6 certify that I took down in shorthand (stenotype) all of the
7 proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and
8 place indicated, and that thereafter said shorthand notes
9 were transcribed into typewriting at and under my direction
10 and supervision, and the foregoing transcript constitutes a
11 full, true and accurate record of the proceedings had, all
12 done to the best of my skill and ability.

13 In Witness whereof, I have hereunto affixed my
14 hand the 1st day of May, 2004.

15
16
17
18
19 ORIGINAL
20
2122
23
24
25

Sharon E. Bradley
Sharon E. Bradley, CCR, RPR, RMR, CRR
AZ CCR #50040 / CA CCR #4003 / NV CCR #101