Mr.& Mrs. Steven M. Hansen
3953 Brockbank Way
Salt Lake City, UT. 84124
stevehansen25@msn.com

7 October 2011

Ms. Penny Woods
NV Groundwater Projects Manager
Bureau of Land Management, NV State Office
P. O. Box 12000
Reno, NV 89502-0006

RE: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT; CLARK, LINCOLN & WHITE PINE GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT; PROJECT RIGHT-of-WAY

Dear Ms. Woods:

Thank you for the opportunity for us as residents of Utah and property owners in Nevada to comment on the subject project. We appreciate your time and of the NV office of the BLM to review and consider our recommendations presented herewith.

First, let us congratulate the BLM & all the participating agencies who contributed to this very thorough, comprehensive and complete study and analysis of subject project. We have read and reviewed the EIS in detail and, I believe, are now well informed as to all the facts, studies, statistics, and especially your environmental studies and conclusions reached.

Secondly, let us say that after due diligence, study, and consideration of the pertinent facts involved, we wholeheartedly and unanimously approve and recommend moving forward with this project. Our reasoning and rationale will follow.

We are full-time Utah residents & homeowners in Salt Lake City. We also are Nevada property owners. As such we believe we can be and are more objective in our opinions of this project than many who live only in the state of Utah. We purchase our municipal water at our home in Las Vegas from LVVWD/SNWA. Since we have owned an interest in a home in Las Vegas, we have been under stringent conservation measures in our use of water: 1) mandatory limiting of watering days of each week; 2) constant reminders each month by the LVVWD/SNWA to conserve and report any observed waste of water to them.

As you know, 90-95% of Las Vegas' municipal water supply is from only one source; Lake Mead. For several years now, the water supply and the level of Lake Mead has been in a severe drought condition requiring all the conservation measures possible. The water level has continued to drop to dangerous levels, necessitating the construction of lower intake towers for supplying water to Las Vegas valley.

In spite of the current recession, esp. in Las Vegas, the need for additional water to supplement the diminishing supply from Lake Mead should be very obvious to all informed observers outside as well as citizens of Las Vegas valley. **We feel subject project should be implemented as soon as practicable considering the remainder of the final draft of the EIS and all approvals and stipulating agreements between the parties are reached.**

Based on our studies and analyses, it would appear that the potential supply of good quality municipal grade water available in the five hydrologic basins in question are largely untapped and most likely will remain so for the long range future except for the small amounts that are currently being drawn now for local municipal and agricultural use around Ely and the small farming communities on the Utah side of the border.

Consequently, it would appear to us that any water supplies to be drawn from each of these basins' aquifers would create NO measurable hardship on the residents or agricultural needs for water in the foreseeable future.

Two very important mitigating factors to this plan that any opponents of the project have either overlooked or have not read and are not aware of are:

1) The production wells will be drilled to depths of 1000 to 2000 feet (Para. 2.5.2.1) to the aquifer level above bedrock, and even though the water level would eventually be drawn down depending on the rate of re-charge of the sources of water should present no problem to any current local users of water in each of the five basins.
It is very difficult to believe that water drawn from aquifers as deep as 1000-2000 ft. in depth could create any more surface dust than currently exists; or deprive any native grasses or sagebrush from any irrigation they currently receive from rain or streams. Any wildlife living around the five basins must now survive on surface water such as springs, streams, reservoirs which we do not believe would be affected at all by water being drawn from very deep wells proposed in this project. We have seen no studies conducted or published to support the conjecture that any of these issues would be created.

Even critics as far away as Salt Lake City speculate that any additional dust created by this project **COULD** blow dust as far away as the Wasatch Front, the center of which is Salt Lake City, 165 miles from Snake Valley, the closest basin to Salt Lake. We don't believe this is a serious concern, which is conjecture only with NO evidence to back it up.

2) Another fact that some opponents have overlooked or are simply not even aware of is the proposed very slow build-up rate of volumes of water to be produced from the project. (Fig. 2.6-1) which indicates a planned rate of 30 years (2020 to 2050) to finally reach the proposed maximum rate of water production of ~177,000 afy. We believe that such an extremely low rate of increase in production would cause no hardship, or probably would not even be noticeable to the residents surrounding the five basins, especially over a period of 30 years to final total build-up.

The ~21,000 afy currently and recently being pumped from the Snake Valley basin apparently is utilized by the few farms in and around Snake Valley for some municipal & mostly agricultural use. We do not believe that an additional ~36,000 or ~50,000 afy at the final build-up max. volume by 2050 would have any negative impact on the current users of water in this basin. It is unlikely that any farms who pump water from this basin have drilled wells as deep as 1000-2000 ft. in depth and consequently would probably not be drawing water from the same aquifer as subject project would draw from. If such is the case, water production from this basin, should have NO impact at all on current agricultural users, either on the NV side or on the UT side.

Based upon our analyses of the draft EIS, and upon studies of the Topographical map, (Vol. I), the Aerial Maps (Vol. II)., & the Exploratory Area Maps (Vol. III), **it is our opinion and recommendation that subject project be approved and allowed to proceed.**

We would like to make recommendations of the alternatives in the following preferred order: (Table 2.1-1)

1) Alternative B - Points of Diversion Pumping at Application Quantities

2) Alternative A - Distributed Pumping at Reduced Quantities

3) Alternative E - Distributed Pumping at Reduced Quantities - Spring, Cave, Dry Lake, & Delamar Valleys

We feel that the concept of "Points of Diversion" pumping may be more feasible in order to minimize any possible negative impact to any populated areas within each of the five basins.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the BLM EIS for subject project application. Should you have any questions, or request any additional information, please contact us at the address or online website indicated above.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Hansen