



**CREDA**  
**Colorado River Energy Distributors Association**

**ARIZONA**  
 Arizona Municipal Power Users Association

Arizona Power Authority  
 Arizona Power Pooling Association

Irrigation and Electrical Districts  
 Association

Navajo Tribal Utility Authority  
 (also New Mexico, Utah)

Salt River Project

**COLORADO**  
 Colorado Springs Utilities

Intermountain Rural Electric Association

Platte River Power Authority

Tri-State Generation & Transmission  
 Association, Inc.  
 (also Nebraska, Wyoming, New Mexico)

Yampa Valley Electric  
 Association, Inc.

**NEVADA**  
 Colorado River Commission  
 of Nevada

Silver State Energy Association

**NEBRASKA**  
 Municipal Energy Association of Nebraska  
 (also Colorado)

**INEW MEXICO**  
 Farmington Electric Utility System

Los Alamos County

City of Truth or Consequences

**UTAH**  
 City of Provo

City of St. George

South Utah Valley Electric Service District

Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems

Utah Municipal Power Agency

**WYOMING**  
 Wyoming Municipal Power Agency

**Leslie James**  
 Executive Director  
 CREDA  
 10429 S. 51<sup>st</sup> St., Suite 230  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85044

Phone: 480-477-8646  
 Fax: 480-477-8647  
 Cellular: 602-469-4046  
 Email: [creda@creda.cc](mailto:creda@creda.cc)  
 Website: [www.creda.org](http://www.creda.org)

April 11, 2017

Senator Tick Segerblom  
 Nevada Assembly  
 Via email only

RE: AJR 4

Dear Senator Segerblom:

The following is in response to your letter dated April 10, 2017, in regard to the Committee hearing of April 6, 2017. Thank you for the opportunity to participate telephonically in the hearing and for including CREDA Board Resolution 2017-01 in the hearing record.

1) Completeness of the 2012 Basin Study You stated that a study of the type called for in AJR 4 is unnecessary due to the completion of the Colorado River Water Supply and Demand Study of 2012. Please elaborate on the incomplete aspects of this 2012 study as identified in the October 12, 2015, letter to then, Interior Secretary Sally Jewell. While we've reviewed Reclamation's February 9, 2016, response to that letter, we do not find sufficient attention to the matters raised in October 12, 2015 letter that invalidates its request that the National Academy of Sciences be engaged.

**RESPONSE: My testimony did not address the 2012 Basin Study.**

2) Flood Routing and Safety measures You suggested that we pursue a briefing with Reclamation staff regarding Glen Canyon Dam's suitability to route the types of floods discussed during the hearing. What would be more helpful to us, however, is if you could provide us the status of Reclamation's changes to flood routing and safety given the findings cited in the aforementioned letter to Sally Jewell (Greenbaum et.al.) This research points out that the Colorado River society should be prepared to accommodate major floods far in excess of what almost brought down Glen Canyon Dam in 1983. Their research shows that the rate and frequency of major floods on the Colorado has historically been three times what Reclamation manages for. In fact, the Colorado River system has yet to experience such an event. So what changes have water managers made to accommodate the types of floods we now know have historically occurred in the basin?

**RESPONSE: My testimony recommended, based on previous comment and testimony during the hearing, that the Bureau of Reclamation could brief the Committee on topics raised by others at the hearing, such as dam safety and security, rule curves, and flood risk. I am not familiar with the referenced letters.**

3) Climate Change Streamflow Reductions The 2012 Basin Study concluded that the Colorado River society and its water managers should prepare for a nine percent reduction in Colorado River streamflow by 2060 due to climate change. Beyond the concerns raised about this conclusion in the aforementioned letter to former Secretary Jewell, forecasts continue to come forward that warn that nine percent is far too conservative. For example, in the Water Resources Research (AGU), Overpeck and Udall point out that the Colorado River society should be preparing for a least a 30 percent reduction by 2050 (The 21st Century Colorado River Hot Drought and Implications for the Future). In the contingency planning process now underway, it's our understanding that water managers are only addressing a small percentage of the types of shortages Overpeck, Udall and others are suggesting. Is this correct? Moreover, Colorado River streamflow reductions since 2000 are nearly 20 percent already. Unpublished output from the Basin Study process, such as the Trace 21 results attached here, show empty reservoirs behind Hoover and Glen Canyon dams for extended periods of time due to streamflow reductions in the vicinity of what we are now experiencing. This appears quite a reasonable scenario for water managers to be

attending to in their contingency planning, not to mention share with the public. Could you elaborate on the status of such planning and public transparency?

**RESPONSE: My testimony did not address climate change.**

4) Sociopolitical Complexity You pointed out that management of the Colorado is complex and the type of study called for in AJR 4 would only complicate this. Could you please elaborate on this given the testimony (attached) provided yesterday by former Reclamation Commissioner Daniel P. Beard in support of this resolution? Thank you again for your input on AJR 4, and I look forward to your reply.

**RESPONSE: My testimony concurred with previous speakers on the complexity of Colorado River management. The CREDA Board Resolution opposes AJR4 for the reasons stated therein**

My testimony, as well as others, made reference to a recent important technical study by Dr. Jack Schmidt. The study can be found at: [https://qcnr.usu.edu/wats/colorado\\_river\\_studies/files/documents/Fill\\_Mead\\_First\\_Analysis.pdf](https://qcnr.usu.edu/wats/colorado_river_studies/files/documents/Fill_Mead_First_Analysis.pdf). In addition, here is the link to an article by John Fleck published yesterday <http://www.inkstain.net/fleck/2017/04/glen-canyon-dam-10-bill-sidewalk/>, linking another recent article (April 7) by Sinjin Eberle of American Rivers <https://medium.com/@americanrivers/why-filling-lake-mead-first-is-a-bad-idea-ec1bcbf12c07>, that would be helpful to the Committee in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

*Leslie James*

Leslie James  
Executive Director

Cc: CREDA Board