Abigail C. Johnson, P.O. Box 183, Baker, NV 89311

September 30, 2012

The Honorable Ken Salazar
Secretary of the Interior
By email: feedback@ios.doi.gov

Amy Lueders
BLM State Director
1340 Financial Blvd.
Reno, NV 89502
By email: nvgwprojects@blm.gov

RE: Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development Project Final EIS

Secretary Salazar and Director Lueders:

I believe that procrastination is healthy, and often a task delayed until "just in time" is one accomplished at the right moment. Just today, before I wrote this letter, I discovered the following quote from President Theodore Roosevelt, from an address that he made to Congress in December of 1907.

> *"But there must be the look ahead, there must be a realization of the fact that to waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed."*

It is descriptive of the decision before you in considering your agency's responsibilities for the SNWA Groundwater Development Project.

You already possess the information to choose, justify and defend the No Action Alternative for the above referenced FEIS. BLM has done a competent job of disclosing the extent to which the SNWA Pipeline Project, known as the Las Vegas Water Grab, will devastate and defoliate a vast and exquisite part of Nevada and Utah, and a significant portion of the Department of Interior's resources. Roosevelt described it well; "to skin and exhaust the land."

In brief this project will: threaten the resources and health of Great Basin National Park, drop the water table 10-200+ feet; create a 525 square mile area of five foot + subsidence, dry up fragile springs and stream,

eliminate essential wildlife habitat (and the wildlife too), generate dust storms, destroy precious wetlands, and cause an economic and agricultural collapse as dramatic as the horrific subsidence.

You have within the FEIS the evidence and justification to reject this rapacious and ruinous project, and you have the power and obligation vested in you as stewards of the land to choose the No Action Alternative in the Record of Decision. Alternative F is a smokescreen that delays, not prevents, the predicted devastation of Snake Valley. The mitigation measures proposed, and the new COM plans will be ineffective and unenforceable. The "cease and desist" order is a misleading apparition, to make it appear that BLM can force SNWA to stop pumping. In reality, SNWA's pumps will continue to exploit the aquifers and fill the gargantuan pipeline while SNWA sues the federal government and BLM's resources further degrade.

The best and only way to protect BLM's natural resources is to stop this project now, by choosing the No Action Alternative. To reiterate President Roosevelt, *"… to waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increases its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed."* BLM's responsibility is to protect the land, the natural resources, so that the land's usefulness will increase, for future generations rather than be squandered.

The irony of the water grab is that this massive $16+ BILLION project is predicated on the assumption that the water will be there for centuries. In fact, it is common knowledge and concern in White Pine and Lincoln counties that the water tables are already dropping just from the agricultural use of the water within targeted valleys.

BLM approvals for this project are premature, and extraordinarily detrimental to the concept of public land protection and private property rights. This project is far too risky for rate and tax payers, and for investment by government or the private sector.

Abigail C. Johnson

Please use your own FEIS disclosure document, which clearly estimates the serious and damaging impacts to a very large area that are irreversible, irretrievable and cannot be mitigated. Choose the No Action alternative because the project is not needed at this time, there a no plan in place to pay for it, and it directly threatens the resources you are sworn to protect. At this time, the "No Action" alternative is timely, healthy and your only choice to protect the resources based on the information in the FEIS.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Abigail C. Johnson