The December 16, 1999 Public Scoping Meeting at the City of Needles City Hall consisted of formal presentations by Metropolitan and P&D Environmental staff, followed by public comment. The transcript for this meeting includes both the formal presentations and the public comments. The transcript of the formal presentation is on pages 1 through 19 of the transcript. The part of the transcript for public comments is on pages 19 through 31 of the transcript. There are also intermittent public comments on pages 31 through 48 of the transcript.

## COPY

1	METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
2	
3	CADIZ GROUNDWATER STORAGE AND DRY-YEAR SUPPLY PROGRAM
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
9	THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1999
10	AT NEEDLES CITY HALL
11	1111 BAILEY STREET, NEEDLES, CALIFORNIA
12	AT 7:05 P.M.
13	
14	
1.5	
16	
17.	-
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	REPORTED BY: LINDA S. LANE, C.C.R., R.P.R. CALIFORNIA C.C.R. #7300
25	

MS. SALENIUS: I'D LIKE TO START THE 1 MEETING. I'M VERY HAPPY TO SEE ALL OF YOU HERE THIS 2 3 EVENING. MY NAME IS SYLVIA SALENIUS. I AM WITH P & D 4 ENVIRONMENTAL. WE ARE THE FIRM THAT WAS HIRED TO ASSEMBLE 5 THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. THIS MEETING TONIGHT CONCERNS 6 THE CADIZ GROUNDWATER SUPPLY AND DRY-YEAR GROUNDWATER --7 GROUNDWATER STORAGE AND SUPPLY PROJECT. I OUGHT TO GET 8 THAT RIGHT BY NOW. WE'RE HERE TO DISCUSS THE ADEQUACY OF THE 10 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE RELEASED LAST MONTH. 11 THERE IS A COMMENT PERIOD THAT EXTENDS TO THE LATTER PART 12 OF FEBRUARY. AND TONIGHT THIS MEETING IS BEING HELD TO 13 GIVE YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE SOME INPUT TO THAT 14 15 PROCESS. DIRK REED IS THE PROGRAM MANAGER FOR 16 METROPOLITAN. DIRK WILL BE MAKING A PRESENTATION ABOUT THE 17 PROJECT AND SOME OF THE FINDINGS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL 18 DOCUMENT. 19 WE ALSO HAVE IN THE AUDIENCE JACK SAFELY. JACK 20 HAS BEEN WORKING WITH DIRK ON THIS PROJECT FOR 21 22 METROPOLITAN. KEN ASHFORD IS HERE ALSO FROM METROPOLITAN. KEN 23

IS GOING TO BE TAKING COMMENT CARDS FROM YOU. SO WHEN YOU

CAME IN THE DOOR, IF YOU PLAN ON SPEAKING, IF YOU WOULD

24

25

PICK UP A COMMENT CARD FROM KEN AND FILL THAT OUT AND GIVE 1 IT BACK TO KEN, THEN HE WILL KNOW THAT YOU WISH TO SPEAK 2 THIS EVENING. AND YOU CAN DO THAT AT ANY TIME DURING THE

PRESENTATION, IF YOU SO DESIRE.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COMMENT CARDS ARE ALSO SET UP IN A WAY THAT THERE ARE CERTAIN ONES THAT ARE -- THAT HAVE PRE-STAMPS ON THEM THAT YOU CAN MAIL THEM BACK WITH YOUR COMMENTS. CAN ALSO USE THEM AS A SOURCE FOR THE MAIL-BACK ADDRESSES, IF YOU PLAN ON SENDING A LETTER OR SOMETHING OF THAT TYPE.

SO THAT'S BASICALLY HOW WE HAD THAT RESPONSE MECHANISM SET UP.

MOLLY BRADY FROM THE B.L.M. IS ALSO HERE THIS EVENING. THE B.L.M. IS THE CO-LEAD AGENCY ON THIS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

METROPOLITAN IS PROPOSING THE PROJECT AND THEIR BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL ULTIMATELY MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER THEY WISH TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT OR NOT. THEN THE B.L.M., BECAUSE THEY HAVE JURISDICTION OVER QUITE A BIT OF THE LAND THAT IS PART OF THE ROUTE OF THE PIPELINE FACILITIES, THEY HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION TO WHETHER THEY ALLOW THE USE OF THAT LAND.

SO, AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING TONIGHT IS TO DISCUSS THE ADEQUACY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND ITS FINDINGS, ITS ALTERNATIVES.

THERE IS A FULL 90-DAY PERIOD OF PUBLIC REVIEW ON

- 1 THIS PROJECT. TYPICALLY, THERE IS A 45-DAY PERIOD OF
- 2 REVIEW UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND
- 3 A 60-DAY PERIOD OF REVIEW UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL
- 4 PROTECTION ACT. AND IN THIS CASE WE ARE ALLOWING A 90-DAY
- 5 REVIEW.
- 6 THE LAST DAY TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENTS IS
- 7 FEBRUARY 23RD OF 2000. SO THAT'S THE LATTER PART OF
- 8 | FEBRUARY.
- 9 THE WAY THE MEETING WILL PROCEED THIS EVENING IS
- 10 THAT DIRK WILL MAKE HIS PRESENTATION. THAT SHOULD TAKE
- 11 ROUGHLY 20 MINUTES OR SO. AFTER HIS PRESENTATION, WE WILL
- 12 BE TAKING DOWN YOUR COMMENTS.
- 13 NOW, WE DO HAVE A COURT REPORTER HERE THIS
- 14 EVENING, SO I WOULD REQUEST THAT WHEN YOU ARE MAKING YOUR
- 15 COMMENTS, THAT ONLY ONE PERSON SPEAK AT A TIME SO THAT OUR
- 16 COURT REPORTER CAN MAKE SURE THAT SHE'S GETTING CORRECT
- 17 INFORMATION. IT'S VERY DIFFICULT FOR HER TO TAKE DOWN TWO
- 18 CONVERSATIONS AT ONCE.
- 19 AFTER WE RECEIVE YOUR COMMENTS, WE WILL TAKE
- 20 APPROXIMATELY A TEN-MINUTE BREAK SO THAT IF THERE ARE ANY
- 21 QUESTIONS THAT WERE RAISED OR ANY COMMENT PERIOD, THEN WE
- 22 WILL HAVE A CHANCE TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS FOLLOWING THE
- 23 BREAK. AND SO WHILE YOU ARE DOING YOUR COMMENTS, AS I DID
- 24 AT THE SCOPING OF THE MEETING -- I DON'T KNOW WHETHER YOU
- 25 WERE HERE THEN -- I WILL BE WRITING DOWN YOUR COMMENTS ON

1 THE PAD AND THEN WE WILL GO THROUGH THOSE AND ANSWER THE 2 OUESTIONS AFTER THE BREAK.

I WANT TO POINT OUT THIS ADDRESS. THIS IS A WEB SITE THAT THE B.L.M. HAS, W-W-W DOT C-A DOT B-L-M DOT GOV/ NEEDLES. THAT IS THE SITE WHERE YOU CAN ALSO READ THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. AND THIS IS THE FULL E.I.R./E.I.S. DOCUMENT, THE 600-PLUS PAGE DOCUMENT, WHICH HAS ALL OF THE EXHIBITS AND ALL OF THE TEXT ON ALL OF THE SPECIAL ISSUES THAT WERE LOOKED AT FOR THIS PROJECT.

WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER -- OH, ONE MORE THING. WE ALSO HAVE DOCUMENTS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE A COPY OF THE FULL BIG DOCUMENT, YOU WANT TO LOOK AT IT, THERE ARE COPIES OF THE DOCUMENT AVAILABLE IN THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN NEEDLES, SAN BERNARDINO, BARSTOW AND TWENTYNINE PALMS. SO IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT THOSE DOCUMENTS, AND YOU ONLY RECEIVED THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU CAN GO FIND THOSE IN THOSE LOCATIONS.

THEY'RE ALSO AVAILABLE AT THE B.L.M. OFFICE HERE
IN NEEDLES OR YOU HAVE NEEDLES AND RIVERSIDE ALSO. AND
THEY'RE ALSO AVAILABLE AT METROPOLITAN'S DOWNTOWN OFFICE.

DIRK, YOU'RE ON.

MR. REED: THANKS. THANKS A LOT, SYL.

BASICALLY, WHAT I'M GOING TO DO IS JUST GIVE YOU

A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS AND

THEN GO INTO A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL ABOUT THE PROJECT

1 ITSELF AND THEN GO INTO -- TURN IT BACK OVER TO SYL, LET
2 HER TAKE US INTO THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THIS
3 MEETING.

THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS ARE BEING HELD TO OBTAIN COMMENTS ON THE DOCUMENTS. LIKE SYL MENTIONED TO YOU AT THE VERY BEGINNING, NOT JUST E.I.R. AT THE LIBRARY, ALL THE DOCUMENTS WITH THIS ENVIRONMENTAL E.I.R./E.I.S., INCLUDES ALL THE TECHNICAL REPORTS, THE WATER RESOURCES REPORTS, THE OTHER ONES, THE BIOLOGY AND OTHER ONES ALSO. THEY'RE ALL AT THE LIBRARIES THAT SYL MENTIONED A FEW MINUTES AGO.

WHAT WE'RE GOING TO ALSO DO, YOU HAVE SEVERAL AVENUES TO COMMENT. ONE, YOU GET UP AND SPEAK TODAY; TWO, YOU CAN RETURN A COMMENT CARD LIKE SHE MENTIONED OR WRITE US A LETTER. THE MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF THAT IS YOU GET US THE LETTER BEFORE FEBRUARY 23RD. I KNOW THIS SAYS FEBRUARY 22ND; IT IS FEBRUARY 23RD, YEAR 2000.

WE GO INTO A LITTLE BIT ABOUT METROPOLITAN
THEMSELVES. EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS WHO METROPOLITAN IS AND
WHAT WE DO. IT WAS CREATED IN 1928. WE ARE A STATE PUBLIC
AGENCY. WHAT WE DO IS SUPPLY WATER TO THE SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA REGION COVERING VENTURA, CALIFORNIA; ORANGE,
RIVERSIDE, SAN DIEGO AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES.

WE SUPPLY ABOUT 60 PERCENT OF THE WATER USED IN THAT REGION. IN PARTICULAR, METROPOLITAN PROVIDES ABOUT

1 TWO-THIRDS OF THE WATER USED IN -- IMPORTED WATER -- USED 2 IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY. BY 2020, WE WILL BE PROVIDING

ABOUT 300,000 ACRE-FEET PER YEAR, SAN BERNARDING COUNTY.

WE GET OUR WATER FROM TWO BASIC SOURCES: ONE, FROM NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO BAY-DELTA, VIA THE CALIFORNIA AQUEDUCT; SECOND ONE WE GET IS COLORADO RIVER WATER VIA THE CALIFORNIA RIVER AQUEDUCT.

MOST EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS THE GROUNDWATER BASINS IN THE DESERT AREA BUT, BASICALLY, THERE'S TWO KINDS OF GROUNDWATER BASINS IN THE DESERT. THERE'S THE KINDS THAT DRAIN BACK TOWARD THE COLORADO RIVER, SUCH AS THE PIUTE AND CHEMEHUEVI. AND THERE'S THE KIND THAT DRAIN TOWARD DRY LAKE BEDS WHERE THE WATER THEN EVAPORATES AWAY SUCH AS FENNER, BRISTOL AND CADIZ.

SHOWN ON THIS MAP, YOU CAN SEE THAT THERE'S A LOT OF DIFFERENT GROUNDWATER BASINS DIVIDED IN THE DESERT REGION. THESE GROUNDWATER BASINS ARE DIVIDED BY ROCK STRUCTURE IN BETWEEN THEM THAT SEPARATE NOT JUST THE TOPOGRAPHIC, BUT THE SUBSURFACE FLOWS.

A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE PROJECT ITSELF. THE CADIZ GROUNDWATER STORAGE AND DRY-YEAR SUPPLY PROGRAM HAS BASICALLY THREE COMPONENTS TO IT. FIRST COMPONENT, WE'RE LOOKING TO STORE COLORADO RIVER WATER THAT'S AVAILABLE METROPOLITAN IN WET YEARS IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN.

THE SECOND COMPONENT, WE'RE LOOKING TO EXTRACT

- 1 THAT WATER FROM THE GROUNDWATER BASIN, MOVE IT BACK TO THE
- 2 | COLORADO RIVER AQUEDUCT AND MOVE IT BACK INTO
- 3 METROPOLITAN'S SERVICE AREA.
- 4 THE THIRD COMPONENT IS A TRANSFER OF SOME OF THE
- 5 INDIGENOUS GROUNDWATER IN THE BASIN BACK TO THE COLORADO
- 6 RIVER AQUEDUCT AND BACK INTO THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE AREA.
- 7 FENNER VALLEY COVERS ABOUT 1300 SQUARE MILES.
- 8 | IT'S A LARGE GROUNDWATER BASIN. IT RISES IN ELEVATION TO
- 9 ABOUT 7,500 FEET UP IN THE NEW YORK MOUNTAINS. THESE
- 10 MOUNTAINS HAVE SNOW ON THEM AT TIMES. AND IT DROPS DOWN TO
- 11 ABOUT 500 FEET ELEVATION DOWN BY THE BRISTOL/CADIZ DRY LAKE
- 12 BEDS.
- 13 AVERAGE RAINFALL IN THIS BASIN IS 12 TO 13 INCHES
- 14 PER YEAR. THE BASIN WITH THAT RAINFALL AND THE SNOWFALL
- 15 HAS ABOUT 30,000 ACRE-FOOT PER YEAR OF NATURAL
- 16 RECHARGE THAT MOVES THROUGH THIS BASIN DOWN TOWARD THE
- 17 | CADIZ AND BRISTOL DRY LAKES AND EVAPORATES OFF.
- 18 YOU CAN TELL THERE'S A DIFFERENCE IN DRY LAKE
- 19 BED. THE CADIZ AND BRISTOL DRY LAKE BEDS ARE WHITE. THAT
- 20 IS BECAUSE THE GROUNDWATER MOVES TOWARD THE DRY LAKE BEDS
- 21 SUBSURFACE AND EVAPORATES OFF. WATER BELOW THE SURFACE IS
- 22 ABOUT FIVE FEET BELOW THE SURFACE.
- OTHER DRY LAKE BEDS, SUCH AS HAYFIELD VALLEY,
- 24 LOCATED ALONG THE 10 FREEWAY, IS BROWN IN COLOR. THAT DRY
- 25 | LAKE BED HAS NO EVAPORATION OF GROUNDWATER. GROUNDWATER

1 THERE IS ABOUT 600 FEET BELOW SURFACE. A BIG DIFFERENCE IN 2 THE TWO KINDS OF DRY LAKE BEDS; KIND OF GIVES YOU AN IDEA

WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THE GROUNDWATER ITSELF.

- IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROGRAM, A LOT OF

  FACILITIES NEED TO BE CONSTRUCTED. IN ORDER TO MOVE THE

  WATER UP INTO THE GROUNDWATER BASIN FOR STORAGE,

  METROPOLITAN NEEDS TO CONSTRUCT A 35-MILE PIPELINE TO RUN

  FROM THE IRON MOUNTAIN FACILITY PUMPING PLANT UP TO THE

  CADIZ AND FENNER VALLEY.
  - IN ORDER TO INFILTRATE -- GET THE WATER INTO THE GROUND, METROPOLITAN IS GOING TO HAVE TO CONSTRUCT ABOUT 400 ACRES OF SPREADING BASINS. AND THEN TO EXTRACT THE WATER BACK OUT OF THE GROUND, APPROXIMATELY 30 EXTRACTION WELLS WILL BE CONSTRUCTED.
  - THOSE ARE THE FACILITIES THAT WERE NEEDED IN

    ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THOSE THREE OBJECTIVES OF STORING

    WATER, EXTRACTING WATER AND TRANSFERRING SOME OF THE NATIVE

    GROUNDWATER.
- AS PART OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS, A NUMBER OF CATEGORIES WERE STUDIED. SOME OF THESE CATEGORIES WERE DEVELOPED AS PART OF THE SCOPING PROCESS, THE SCOPING MEETINGS WE HAD AT TWENTYNINE PALMS, CADIZ RANCH SITE AND HERE. THESE COVERED SUCH THINGS AS HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, PALEO -- THE BONES AROUND THE DRY LAKE BED -- DOWN TO HAZARDOUS SERVICES, HAZARDOUS WASTE HAZARD.

IN THIS CASE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT UNEXPLODED

ORDNANCES IN THE DESERT AREA. WHAT I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT

IS MAINLY A FEW OF THEM THAT MOST OF THE PUBLIC HAD

QUESTIONS ABOUT, THAT HAVE SOME ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

I'M GOING TO GO ACROSS A FEW OF THESE. THESE ARE
DISCUSSED IN DEPTH IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT ITSELF.

FOR INSTANCE, HYDROLOGY; A LOT OF PEOPLE WANTED TO KNOW
WHAT'S GOING TO BE THE EFFECT WHEN METROPOLITAN STORES
APPROXIMATELY A MILLION ACRE-FEET OF WATER IN THE
GROUNDWATER BASIN, WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN WITH THE
GROUNDWATER BASIN ITSELF?

AS YOU CAN SEE ON THIS ILLUSTRATION, WHAT YOU CAN SEE IS YOU WILL SEE A GROUNDWATER MOUND FORM UNDERNEATH THE SPREADING BASINS. APPROXIMATELY A HUNDRED AND EIGHTY FEET MOUND WILL BE FORMED UNDERNEATH THAT SPREADING BASIN. THAT WATER WILL FAN OUT TO WHERE IT GETS ABOUT A FOOT OF THE INCREASED GROUNDWATER ELEVATION OVER THE NATIVE GROUNDWATER ITSELF.

YOU CAN SEE THAT THE MARBLE MOUNTAINS AND THE SHIP MOUNTAINS ISOLATE THIS MOUNDING RIGHT OVER THE TOP OF THE CADIZ PROPERTY OF THE CADIZ LANDHOLDING IN THE FENNER VALLEY HERE.

NEXT BIGGEST QUESTION WAS WHAT HAPPENS WHEN METROPOLITAN EXTRACTS WATER FROM THE GROUNDWATER BASIN, NOT

1 JUST THE WATER WE STORED THERE, BUT IF WE EXTRACT ADDITIONAL WATER, NATIVE GROUNDWATER, FROM THE GROUNDWATER 2 BASIN, WHAT'S GOING TO BE THE EFFECT?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

YOU CAN SEE HOW THIS ILLUSTRATION -- WHAT HAPPENS IS IT ENDS UP CREATING ABOUT A HUNDRED AND EIGHTY FOOT HOLE IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN. AGAIN, LOCATED UNDER THE CADIZ PROPERTIES, FANS OUT TO ABOUT A FOOT OF DISTANCE BETWEEN THE NATIVE GROUNDWATER WHERE IT WOULD HAVE BEEN WITHOUT THE PROJECT.

WHEN THE BIG AREAS DOWN IN THE BRISTOL DRY LAKE WAS A BIG CONCERN HAVING TO DO SALT MINING AND SALT MINING OPERATION THAT ARE LOCATED DOWN THERE, WE HAD SEVERAL QUESTIONS OF WHAT WOULD BE THE EFFECT ON THE SALT MINING OPERATIONS OF BRISTOL DRY LAKE.

OVER TIME, THE BRISTOL DRY LAKE IS GOING TO SEE A CHANGE IN ELEVATION. IT'S NOT GOING TO BE ALL POSITIVE; NOT GOING TO BE NEGATIVE. AS YOU CAN SEE, THIS IS BEING INCHES ON THE SIDE OF THE BOARD. AS YOU CAN SEE, WHEN WE PUT WATER IN, BRISTOL DRY LAKE IS GOING TO SEE AN ELEVATION RISE IN THE GROUND WATER ABOUT 12 INCHES.

BY THE -- HALFWAY THROUGH THE PROGRAM, YOU ARE GOING TO SEE ABOUT A 12-INCH DECLINE IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN. AS IT MOVES, OVER TIME, IT'S GOING BACK TO EQUILIBRIUM, BACK TO ZERO EFFECT ON THE GROUNDWATER BASIN ITSELF.

SEVERAL PEOPLE WANTED TO KNOW IF THERE'S GOING TO

BE AN EFFECT ON WATER QUALITY. BY INTRODUCING COLORADO

RIVER WATER IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN, WHAT WOULD BE THAT

EFFECT?

COLORADO RIVER WATER HAS A DIFFERENT QUALITY THAN
THE GROUNDWATER DOES. AS YOU'RE OPERATING THE GROUNDWATER
BASIN, PUTTING WATER IN AND TAKING WATER OUT, WHAT'S GOING
TO HAPPEN TO THE QUALITY OF THE WATER?

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THAT, WHAT HAPPENS WITH THE SALINE INTERFACE, IN ESSENCE, GOT FRESH WATER IN FENNER VALLEY, SALINE WATER IN THE DRY LAKE BEDS, WHAT'S GOING ON BETWEEN THOSE TWO WHEN YOU OPERATE THIS PROGRAM?

AS YOU CAN SEE, THE MAXIMUM INVOLVEMENT OF THAT SALINE INTERFACE, THE PORTION BETWEEN THE SALINE WATER AND THE FRESH WATER, IS ABOUT 2,000 FEET, THE MAXIMUM MOVEMENT OF THE SALINE INTERFACE.

WHAT HAPPENS IS WHEN WE PUT WATER IN, IT STARTS TO MOVE AWAY. WHEN WE TAKE WATER BACK OUT, IT STARTS TO MOVE BACK. IN ESSENCE, WHAT IT DOES, IT MOVES AWAY FROM THE PLACE ABOUT 2,000 FEET AND IT MOVES BACK TO ZERO.

MOST OF YOU MIGHT BE FAMILIAR WITH GROUNDWATER IN SURFACE ELEVATION CHANGES THAT HAVE HAPPENED IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. UP THERE, DUE TO GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION, THEY HAVE SOMEWHERE AROUND 30 TO 60 FEET ELEVATION CHANGE IN THE SURFACE ITSELF. IT'S A MAJOR ISSUE THAT NEEDS TO BE LOOKED

1 AT AS PART OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION PROCESS, AND 2 WE DID THAT ALSO HERE.

BY PUTTING WATER IN AND TAKING WATER BACK OUT,
THERE ARE SATURATING ZONES OF SOIL THAT HASN'T BEEN
SATURATED BEFORE. WHAT YOU SEE IS YOU CAN RE-LAY THE BEDS
OF SOIL AGAIN. WHAT HAPPENS IN DOING THAT IS IT
CONSOLIDATES, IT SUBSIDES. THE MAXIMUM SUBSIDENCE THAT
WE'RE LOOKING AT TO HAVE ON THIS PROJECT IS ABOUT A FOOT
AND A HALF OF SUBSIDENCE LOCATED AGAIN ON THE CADIZ
PROPERTY. THAT'S SPREAD OVER ABOUT THREE MILES ACROSS AND
ABOUT SIX MILES ALONG.

YOU CAN MODEL, YOU CAN CALCULATE, YOU CAN
ESTIMATE WHAT THE EFFECTS OF ANY PROGRAM IS ON THE
GROUNDWATER BASIN, BUT THE BEST THING TO DO IS TO DEVELOP A
GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN TO ENSURE THAT THE EFFECTS THAT
YOU HAVE MODELED THAT YOU DETERMINED WOULD HAPPEN, NOTHING
HAPPENS WORSE THAN THAT. AS A MATTER OF FACT, YOU TRY TO
ALLEVIATE THOSE EFFECTS. THE BEST WAY TO DO THAT AGAIN IS
DEVELOP A GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.

THAT IS WHAT METROPOLITAN IS DEVELOPING IN
WORKING WITH SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY. WE ARE DEVELOPING A
GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THIS PROJECT, GROUNDWATER
MANAGEMENT PLAN WILL BE PART OF THE FINAL DOCUMENTATION AND
WILL BE UPDATED ANNUALLY.

A GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN IS GOING TO

- 1 | REGULATE THE OPERATIONS OF THE PROGRAM. IN OTHER WORDS,
- 2 WHEN SOMETHING IS STARTING TO HAPPEN OUT THERE, WE START TO
- 3 | SEE THINGS CHANGE. WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO IS WE'RE GOING
- 4 TO CHANGE THE OPERATIONS. IT'S ALSO GOING TO IDENTIFY
- 5 | EARLY ANY -- AND PROVIDE MEASURES TO ELIMINATE ANY
- 6 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. THAT IS WHAT A
- 7 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN IS SUPPOSED TO DO.
- 8 THE KINDS OF THINGS WE ARE GOING TO LOOK AT,
- 9 | CHANGES IN THE WATER QUALITY DUE TO THE COLORADO RIVER
- 10 WATER BEING PUT INTO THE GROUNDWATER BASIN ITSELF.
- 11 OTHER ITEMS, FLUCTUATIONS OF GROUNDWATER LEVELS.
- 12 WE WILL HAVE TO MAKE SURE WHAT WE SHOW IS HAPPENING IN OUR
- 13 MODELING IS WHAT HAPPENS IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN.
- 14 WE ARE GOING TO LOOK AT THE MOVEMENT OF THE BRINE
- 15 WATER INTERFACE THAT HAS AN EFFECT ON THE GROUNDWATER
- 16 BASIN; AND ALSO WATCH THE CHANGES IN THE SURFACE ITSELF
- 17 WITH ELEVATION SURVEYS SO THAT WE CAN KEEP A CLOSE EYE ON
- 18 | THAT.
- 19 THIS IS WHAT WE PLAN TO DO IN ORDER TO MONITOR,
- 20 MANAGE AND THIS ALSO HAS MEASURES TO CORRECT ANYTHING
- 21 | THAT'S GOING ON OUT THERE IN THE GROUNDWATER BASIN ITSELF
- 22 DOWN TO CHANGE IN THE OPERATIONS OF THE PROGRAM.
- BASICALLY, WE ENDED UP WITH THREE TYPES OF
- 24 RESOURCES THAT WE COULD NOT MITIGATE BELOW THE LEVEL OF
- 25 SIGNIFICANCE. THOSE THREE RESOURCES COVER BROAD AREAS SUCH

AS PALEO RESOURCES, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE AND HAZARDOUS 2 MATERIALS.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FIRST, THE BOTTOM ONE WHAT THAT HAS TO DEAL WITH, THAT HAS TO DEAL WITH UNEXPLODED ORDNANCES. WE ARE GOING TO BE SERVING IN FRONT OF THE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT TO SEE IF WE HAVE ANY ORDNANCE OUT THERE, BUT THERE IS NO GUARANTEE THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO SEE ALL OF THEM AND REMOVE THEM PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

IF THE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT RUNS ACROSS ANY OF THOSE ORDNANCES, THAT WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, SPECIALLY TO THE PEOPLE THAT ARE IN THE CONSTRUCTION. YOU CAN'T MITIGATE THAT BEYOND THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AND BE SURE. THAT IS THE REASON WHY THAT WOULD BE REMAINING.

SECOND ONE HAS TO DO WITH AIR QUALITY AND NOISE. THERE IS QUITE A BIT OF DUST OUT THERE ALREADY. INCREASED, ANY DUST IN THE AREA IS GOING TO BE CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT. WE HAVE CONSIDERABLE MEASURES THAT WE HAVE IN PLACE TO MITIGATE FOR DUST. BUT THE INCREASE IN ANY DUST DUE TO CONSTRUCTION WILL STILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

THE LAST ONE HAS TO DO WITH PALEO RESOURCES; THOSE ARE BONES. WHAT YOU HAVE WHEN YOU GET AROUND DRY LAKE BEDS IS THE CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF ANIMALS THAT HAVE GONE DOWN TO THE DRY LAKE BEDS, ENDED UP DYING DOWN THERE. WE EXPECT TO GET SOME OF THE BONES AS PART OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PIPELINE. WE WILL MONITOR THOSE. WE

1 WILL RECOVER WHAT WE CAN ON THOSE. WE WILL DO STUDIES ON 2 SOME OF THEM.

METROPOLITAN HAS DONE EXTENSIVE WORK ON PALEO
RESOURCES IN THE PAST AND DO SO ON THIS PROJECT ALSO. BUT
BY EXCAVATING ANY OF THOSE RESOURCES, THUS HAVE A
SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, YOU CANNOT MITIGATE THAT BELOW THE
LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE. THAT IS THE REASON WHY THAT ONE IS
REMAINING.

THAT IS WHERE THE TIME LINE -- YOU REMEMBER WE WERE OUT HERE IN FEBRUARY -- MARCH WHEN WE HAD THE SCOPING MEETING. THAT WAS WHEN YOU COULD GIVE US INPUT ON WHAT ISSUES WE NEEDED TO ADDRESS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. WE BELIEVE WE HAVE ADDRESSED THOSE. THOSE, AS SYL MENTIONED TO YOU, ARE AVAILABLE AT THE LIBRARY FOR YOU TO GO BY AND SEE. TWO FULL SETS AT EACH LIBRARY. ALSO, THEY ARE AVAILABLE AT THE NEEDLES OFFICE.

WE HAVE PREPARED THAT DRAFT E.I.R., PUT IT OUT TO PEOPLE TO READ, COMMENT ON. WE ARE HAVING THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS TO GET YOU THE INFORMATION, TO LET YOU KNOW WHAT'S AVAILABLE, WHERE IT IS.

WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS HAVING A COMMENT PERIOD
THROUGH FEBRUARY 23RD -- AND I KNOW WHAT IT SAYS ON THE
BOARD -- FEBRUARY 23RD, THE YEAR 2000. YOU MIGHT SEE ONE
THING EVERY NOW AND THEN SAYS FEBRUARY 23RD, 1999. THAT'S
NOT THE COMMENT PERIOD DATE EITHER. ONE OF THOSE Y2K

1 PROBLEMS, WHEN YOU TYPE IT IN, DOESN'T QUITE FIX IT. IT IS

2 | FEBRUARY 23RD, YEAR 2000 IS CLOSED COMMENT PERIOD. WE'D

3 LIKE TO HAVE YOUR COMMENT LETTER BY THAT DATE.

C.E.Q.A. HAS A 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD.

N.E.P.A. HAS A 60 DAYS. THOSE ARE THESE PERIODS

FOR CALIFORNIA QUALITY ACT, NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

ACT. THOSE ARE DIFFERENT COMMENT PERIODS. THIS ALSO HAS A

DESERT PLAN AMENDMENT ATTACHED TO IT, HAS A 90-DAY COMMENT

PERIOD. WHAT WE'VE DONE IS EXTENDED ALL OF THEM TO THE

90-DAY COMMENT PERIOD TO ALLOW YOU TO COMMENT, NOT JUST ON

THE PLAN AMENDMENT CHANGES, NOT JUST ON THE C.E.Q.A.

12 CHANGES, EVERYTHING ALL THE WAY THROUGH THE FULL EXTENT OF 13 THE COMMENT PERIODS.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IS METROPOLITAN'S BOARD WILL LOOK AT YOUR COMMENTS.

LET ME BACK UP A STEP FIRST. EVERY COMMENT YOU SUPPLY TO US, EITHER TODAY WHEN YOU GET UP AND SPEAK, OR ON THE COMMENT CARDS, OR EVEN WHEN YOU WRITE A LETTER TO US, WILL BE RESPONDED TO IN WRITING. YOU WILL GET A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THOSE COMMENTS. WHAT I SAY TODAY WILL BE MOSTLY FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE PROJECTS BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW ALL THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM. WE CAN FILL UP THE ROOM WITH THE PEOPLE THAT HAVE DONE THE WORK ON THAT, AND SO WE DECIDED TO LEAVE THOSE PEOPLE HOME, TRY TO GIVE YOU WHAT WE CAN.

YOU TELL US WHAT YOUR COMMENTS ARE, WE WILL
RESPOND TO YOUR COMMENTS IN WRITING PRIOR TO ANY BOARD
ACTION OR ANY ACTION WITH THIS PROJECT. THOSE COMMENTS,
THIS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, WILL ALL BE PROVIDED TO
METROPOLITAN'S BOARDS FOR ACTION, INCLUDING B.L.M., PRIOR
TO ACTION, THAT WAY YOU GET -- YOU KNOW THAT YOUR COMMENTS
ARE PART OF THE PROCESS.

IF THE PROJECT MOVES FORWARD, WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS ABOUT 12 TO 14 MONTHS WORTH OF CONSTRUCTION. THAT'S HOW LONG IT'S GOING TO TAKE TO BUILD THE PROJECT. IT'S A LARGE PROGRAM, A LOT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. IT WILL TAKE ABOUT A LITTLE OVER A YEAR TO CONSTRUCT THIS PROJECT. SO YOU ARE LOOKING FOR IT TO BE ON LINE, OPERATIONAL, SOMETIME AROUND SPRING OF 2001.

WITH THAT BEING SAID, WHAT I WILL DO IS TURN IT BACK OVER TO SYL, LET HER TAKE US INTO THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THE MEETING. SHE'S GOING TO BE WRITING DOWN THE COMMENTS ON THE BOARD. THE STENOGRAPHER IS GOING TO BE TRYING TO RECORD YOUR COMMENTS YOU GOT TO -- REASON TO SAY YOUR NAME, SHE CAN GET THAT STRAIGHT, WE CAN GET IT ALL ON THE RECORD SO WE GET THEM RESPONDED TO.

THANK YOU.

MS. SALENIUS: HAS EVERYONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK THIS EVENING FILLED OUT A COMMENT CARD? GET ONE FROM KEN THERE. COULD YOU RAISE YOUR HANDS IF YOU'D LIKE A

```
1
    COMMENT CARD?
                   (NO HANDS RAISED.)
 2
                   MS. SALENIUS: OKAY. I JUST WANT TO MAKE
 3
    ANOTHER STATEMENT ABOUT THE RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS.
 4
    RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS WILL BE COMPILED IN A DOCUMENT
 5
    THAT WILL BE USED AS THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
 6
    STATEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT; SO THEY WILL ALL BE
 7
    TOGETHER IN ONE DOCUMENT AND AVAILABLE FOR YOU TO REVIEW.
              I'D LIKE TO TAKE THE FIRST SPEAKER, IF WE HAVE A
 9
10
    NAME.
                   LINDA STARR: NO, NO. THAT'S OKAY. I'M NOT
11
12
    QUITE READY.
                 MS. SALENIUS: PARDON?
13
                   MR: ASHFORD: THAT'S THE ONLY ONE WE HAVE SO
14
    FAR, MRS. STARR.
15
                   MS. SALENIUS: ALL RIGHT.
16
                   RUTH LOPEZ: I WILL GIVE YOU MINE.
17
                   MS. SALENIUS: I WILL WAIT A MOMENT.
18
                   RUTH LOPEZ: I WILL JUST -- QUESTION ONE.
19
    MY FIRST ONE IS WHO WILL BE MAKING A DECISION ON THIS
20
    PROJECT, SPECIFICALLY NAME, PHONE NUMBER, ADDRESS; AND WHAT
21
    INTEREST THEY HAVE IN THIS PROJECT? WHAT SHARES THAT YOU
22
    HAVE ALREADY GIVEN THEM IN THE COMPANY AND ANYBODY ELSE
23
    INVOLVED IN DECISION MAKING, IF THEY HAVE BEEN -- ALSO BEEN
24
    GIVEN SHARES IN THE COMPANY, THE PUBLIC WOULD LIKE TO KNOW.
25
```

WHAT INTEREST THEY HAVE, AND WHO'S GOING TO MAKE THE DECISION WHAT INTEREST IN THE PROJECT THEY HAVE?

THAT'S MY FIRST QUESTION.

MS. SALENIUS: OKAY.

RUTH LOPEZ: COULD YOU PLEASE GIVE US AN

ANSWER?

MY NAME IS RUTH LOPEZ, 420 E. STREET, NEEDLES, CALIFORNIA; PHONE NUMBER (760) 326-4318; ALSO 2519.

MESSAGE: 4318.

I AM DIRECTOR OF PEOPLE AGAINST

RADIOACTIVE DUMPING. I AM FORMER COUNCIL PERSON OF THE

CITY OF NEEDLES, ALSO FORMER EMPLOYEE ARCHEOLOGIST AT THE

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT WITH REINSTATEMENT RIGHTS -- BY

THE WAY. AND I WAS AN EXEMPLARY EMPLOYEE WITH THE B.L.M.

I RECEIVED MANY CERTIFICATES AND HONORS AND RECOGNITION OF

THAT FACT AND WAS DENIED REINSTATEMENT TODAY BY MAIL -
THANK YOU -- UM, FOR SOME UNKNOWN REASON.

ANYWAY, I THINK IT MIGHT HAVE SOMETHING TO DO WITH THE FACT OF MY POSITION POLITICALLY OBJECTING TO A PROJECT SUCH AS CADIZ SO VOCIFEROUSLY OUTSPOKENLY.

UM, MY E-MAIL ADDRESS IS PARDNERS AT C-T-A-Z DOT COM. AND ANYBODY CAN E-MAIL ME AND GET TOGETHER WITH THE ASSOCIATION THAT WE'RE TRYING TO PULL TOGETHER DURING THIS REVIEW PERIOD.

UM, PEOPLE ALL OVER SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ARE GOING

M3-3

TO BE AFFECTED. PEOPLE FROM ARIZONA ARE GOING TO BE AFFECTED, FROM MEXICO ARE GOING TO BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED. ALL OF THESE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED.  $\mathcal{M}$ IF YOU'D LIKE TO GET INVOLVED, GIVE ME A CALL OR M E-MAIL ME OR WRITE TO ME. AND YOU CAN PUT MY E-MAIL ADDRESS UP THERE ALONG WITH THE B.L.M.'S, PLEASE. 8 COULD WE HAVE AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION BEFORE? 9 MS. SALENIUS: WE ARE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK 10 AFTER. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK 11 AFTER WE GET THE TESTIMONY SO THAT WE CAN DETERMINE WHICH 12 QUESTIONS WE ARE ABLE TO ANSWER -- BECAUSE WE HAVE 13 INFORMATION THIS EVENING -- AND WHICH QUESTIONS ARE GOING 14 TO HAVE TO APPEAR IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT WITH 15 ANSWER. BECAUSE SOME OF THE QUESTIONS YOU ASK, WE MAY NOT HAVE THE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE TONIGHT TO BE ABLE TO ANSWER 16 17 THEM. 18 MS. LOPEZ: IN OTHER WORDS, IF WE ASK A 19 QUESTION, YOU ARE NOT GOING TO ANSWER? 20 MS. SALENIUS: THERE MAY BE SOME QUESTIONS 21 THAT WE DO NOT HAVE THE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE TO RESPOND TO 22 THIS EVENING. 23 THERE WERE A LOT OF GEOHYDROLOGISTS WHO WORKED ON 24 THIS PROJECT, A LOT OF BIOLOGISTS.

THIS IS NOT A TECHNICAL QUESTION. GO THROUGH

YOUR QUESTIONS AND THEN WE WILL BE ABLE TO DETERMINE WHICH 1 2 ONES WE CAN ANSWER. 3 RUTH LOPEZ: I HAVE TO HAVE AN ANSWER TO THAT BEFORE I CAN GO ONTO MY NEXT QUESTION; WHO IS GOING TO MAKE THE DECISION ON THIS PROJECT? IF WE DON'T KNOW THAT, 6 HOW CAN WE EVEN --MS. SALENIUS: WE WILL TAKE THAT INTO 7 8 CONSIDERATION WHEN WE GO TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS. TO GET YOUR QUESTIONS AND THEN WE ARE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK 9 AND THEN WE WILL RESPOND TO YOUR QUESTIONS TO THE EXTENT 10 11 THAT WE ARE CAPABLE OF RESPONDING THIS EVENING. WHAT -- THE THIRD 12 RUTH LOPEZ: OKAY. OUESTION THEN IS ACTUALLY THE SECOND QUESTION THAT YOU HAVE 13 NUMBERED FOR NUMBER THREE, WHAT IS THE CRITERIA FOR 14 EVALUATING WHETHER OR NOT THIS PARTICULAR DOCUMENT, WHICH 15 THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF LOS ANGELES AND CADIZ, 16 17 ALONG WITH THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT HAVE -- HAS 5 WRITTEN? WHAT IS THE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING WHETHER IT'S 3 18 19 SUFFICIENT AND ADEQUATE? DO YOU HAVE C.F.R. OR STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS? 20 WHAT REQUIREMENTS ARE YOU GOING TO GO BY? 21 22 MY FOURTH QUESTION IS WHAT NEW LAWS HAVE GONE IN 23 EFFECT SINCE THE LAST TIME YOU'VE HAD A PUBLIC MEETING 0 WHICH WOULD AFFECT THIS PROJECT? 24 WHAT NEW LEGISLATION WAS PASSED ON A STATE AND 25

M3-6

M3-7

M3-9

FEDERAL LEVEL? AND WAS THIS LEGISLATION INCLUDED IN THE DOCUMENT THAT IS -- HAS BEEN SENT TO THE PUBLIC FOR REVIEW?

THE NEW STATE LAWS AND FEDERAL LAWS THAT WOULD -- REGULATIONS THAT WOULD AFFECT THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT AND -- AND WHAT EFFECT THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT'S POSITION CONCERNING MANAGEMENT OF THE DESERT WATER?

WHICH LEADS ME TO THE FIFTH QUESTION, AND THAT IS
WHO OWNS THE WATER THAT IS BEING SURPASSED -- SURPASSED FOR
TRANSFER FROM ONE LOCATION TO ANOTHER?

AND WHAT RIGHT DO THE PEOPLE HAVE WHO HAVE
HISTORICALLY MANAGED AND CONTROLLED THE WATER THAT HAVE
SEEMED TO BE LEFT OUT OF THIS, UM, DECISION-MAKING PROCESS
AS FAR AS THEIR RIGHTS TO THE WATER?

MS. SALENIUS: OKAY.

RUTH LOPEZ: AND CONCERNING THE WATER THAT
WOULD BE DELIVERED FROM THE COLORADO RIVER UNDER THE, UM,
SUBJECT OF HAZARDOUS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, UM, THE ONLY
THING THAT WAS SPOKEN ABOUT TONIGHT -- AND I'M NOT SURE
EXACTLY WHAT'S BEEN WRITTEN IN THE DOCUMENT BECAUSE IT'S
TOO EARLY FOR A LOT OF US TO HAVE REVIEWED IT SINCE WE
JUST, UM, GOT A COPY OF IT RECENTLY, AND IT'S QUITE LARGE.
WHAT, UM, DOES THE DOCUMENTS SAY OR SINCE IT WAS LEFT OUT
OF THE LITTLE INTRODUCTION TONIGHT CONCERNING THE, UM, THE
AMOUNTS OF RADIOACTIVITY IN THE COLORADO RIVER WATER THAT
WOULD BE TRANSPORTED TO THE DESERT AQUEDUCT FIRST AND WHAT

25

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

0

EFFECT WOULD THIS HAZARDOUS MATERIAL OR RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL HAVE UPON THE EXISTING, UM, PRISTINE WATER THAT IS IN OUR DESERT AREAS?

IF IT WAS NOT MENTIONED IN THE DOCUMENT, I WOULD THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE ONE THING THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED INADEQUATE -- INADEQUATELY REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED.

AND, YOU KNOW, DO YOU HAVE AS FAR AS HAZARDOUS --EFFECTS TOO, I DIDN'T HEAR MR. DIRK -- DIRK REED --MR. REED -- DIRK REED -- MR. DIRK REED SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE HAZARDOUS EFFECTS OF, UM, THE LACK OF WATER THAT'S REACHING MEXICO OR THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA. AND WHAT EFFECT IT WOULD HAVE ON THE WILDLIFE THERE AND THE OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES -- FLORA-FAUNA (PHONETIC).

THE COURT REPORTER: I AM SORRY. I COULDN'T HEAR YOU.

RUTH LOPEZ: -- TO YOUR HEALTH, SAFETY.

AND I'D LIKE TO SEE A COMPARISON OF THE AMOUNT OF WATER, UM, THAT'S PROPOSED TO BE HEISTED, SIPHONED AND STOLEN FROM US OUT HERE LIVING OUT HERE AND TRANSFERRED TO THE LOS ANGELES RESIDENTS.

I'D LIKE TO SEE A COMPARISON OF THAT AMOUNT OF WATER WITH OTHER WATER HEISTS IN THE PAST SUCH AS -- AND PLEASE USE THE WORD HEIST OR THEFT OR SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT BECAUSE, OTHERWISE, YOUR E.I.S. WOULD BE CONSIDERED INADEQUATE BY THOSE OF US WHO ARE REDEEMING, WHO WANT TO BE HONEST AND FORTHRIGHT.

PLEASE COMPARE THAT AMOUNT OF WATER WITH THE

AMOUNT OF WATER THAT HAS BEEN HISTORICALLY TAKEN FROM OTHER

PARTS OF THE COUNTRY SUCH AS OWEN'S VALLEY, HOW MUCH MORE

WATER ARE YOU TAKING FROM THIS AREA THAN WHAT YOU WERE EVEN

TAKING IN OWEN'S VALLEY?

I MEAN, M.W.D. IS ALREADY TAKING WATER FROM THE COLORADO RIVER AND THE TOTAL AMOUNT, VOLUME WISE, OR ACRE-FEET IN COMPARISON TO WHAT'S BEEN TAKEN FROM OWEN'S VALLEY. JUST SO PEOPLE CAN GET AN IDEA OF, YOU KNOW, WHAT A -- WHAT A HORRIBLE IMPACT THAT THIS PROJECT IS GOING TO HAVE ON THE LOCAL RESIDENTS HERE.

I KNOW THAT THERE'S A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE

AUDIENCE HERE WHO DON'T LIVE HERE, WHO ARE FROM OTHER

PLACES, AND THEY MAY HAVE NEVER EVEN CONSIDERED THE FACT

THAT THIS IS, YOU KNOW, A THEFT OF LOCAL RESOURCES. BUT

MAYBE AFTER TONIGHT, AND MAYBE, YOU KNOW, SOMEWHERE IN YOUR

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, YOU CAN MENTION THAT.

MAYBE AS YOU CAN CHANGE THE TITLE TO THE MORE
HONESTLY REFLECTED, THAT WHAT IS ACTUALLY HAPPENING INSTEAD
OF THE DRY-YEAR SUPPLY PROGRAM, CADIZ GROUNDWATER STORAGE,
MAYBE YOU CAN SAY THE DOMENIGONI (PHONETIC) DAM EAST VALLEY
RESERVOIR RECREATION PROJECT. YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT WOULD
MORE ADEQUATELY DESCRIBE THE PROJECT. OR MAYBE EVEN THE
COLORADO RIVER DESERT PRISTINE DESERT WATER RESOURCES

1

5

6

HEIST. THAT MIGHT MORE ADEQUATELY REFLECT THE PROJECT.

CHANGE OF TITLE. IT'S A VERY DISHONEST MISLEADING TITLE FOR YOUR -- FOR YOUR PROJECT. DRY-YEAR SUPPLY PROGRAM IS A LITTLE BIT OF A JOKE.

WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN MEXICO? WHAT ABOUT THEIR THEY'VE GOT A DRY-YEAR FOR YEARS AND DRY-YEAR SUPPLY? YEARS AND YEARS NOW, AND TO CALL THIS A DRY-YEAR SUPPLY PROGRAM IS VERY VERY MISLEADING. IT'S MORE OR LESS LET'S KILL OFF THE MEXICANS. I MEAN, THAT WOULD BE A GOOD HONEST TITLE FOR THIS PROJECT.

HOW ELSE ARE WE GOING TO KILL THE MEXICAN PEOPLE? I MEAN, LET'S GO TO WAR AGAINST MEXICO. LET'S TAKE THEM THAT IS WHAT THIS IS ENDING UP BEING. LET'S TAKE MORE ON. COLORADO RIVER WATER THAT WILL NEVER EVER REACH THOSE PEOPLE.

I MEAN, DOES ANYBODY ELSE WANT TO SPEAK YET? HAS ANYBODY ELSE SUBMITTED A CARD?

MS. SALENIUS: IF ANYBODY HAS SUBMITTED A CARD, YOU SURE CAN AT ANY TIME --

RUTH LOPEZ: BY THE WAY, THIS IS NOT MY COMPLETE COMMENTS REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THIS DOCUMENT. I MEAN, I AM JUST SPEAKING OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD RIGHT NOW. I DON'T HAVE ANY NOTES. I HAVEN'T REALLY EVEN LOOKED AT THIS REPORT.

MS. SALENIUS: ANYONE HAS A RIGHT TO SUBMIT

20

21

16

17

18

19

22

23

25

ANY NUMBER OF COMMENTS THAT THEY WISH TO. 1 RUTH LOPEZ: WOULD YOU GO INTO DETAIL ABOUT HOW MUCH WATER IS BEING PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN FROM WARD VALLEY IN PARTICULAR? UM, CAN WE HAVE A SECOND CHANCE? MS. SALENIUS: PARDON? 5 RUTH LOPEZ: I MEAN, ARE WE ONLY LIMITED 6 7 TO --MS. SALENIUS: THIS IS THE PART OF THE 8 9 PUBLIC HEARING RIGHT NOW? 10 RUTH LOPEZ: I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM SOMEBODY 11 ELSE, IF THERE'S ANY COMMENTS. YOU KNOW, I'M SURE I'M NOT 12 THE ONLY ONE HAS COMMENTS. WELL, WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER PEOPLE? DO YOU HAVE 13 ANYTHING IN THAT DOCUMENT ABOUT HOW THIS WATER TRANSFER 14 PROJECT IS GOING TO AFFECT THE QUALITY OF THE WATER IN --15 IN WELLS THAT ARE IN THE CADIZ AREA? AND DO YOU MENTION 16 THE LAND OWNERS OUT THERE, WHOSE WELLS WOULD BE AFFECTED? 17 ARE THOSE PEOPLE MENTIONED? IS THERE ANYTHING THAT'S GOING 18 19 TO BE OFFERED TO THEM FOR COMPENSATION FOR ANY ADVERSE 20 IMPACT THIS PROJECT MIGHT HAVE UPON THEIR -- THEIR EXISTING 21 RESOURCES? I MEAN, I DIDN'T SEE IT UP THERE ON YOUR LIST 22 OF ITEMS THAT WOULD BE ADDRESSED. 23 ALSO, THIS IS KIND OF AN ASIDE, JUST UNTIL 24 SOMEBODY ELSE WANTS TO SPEAK, BUT WHEN MR. REED SPOKE OF ന THE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES, HE MENTIONED THOSE ARE THE 25

	I	
M3-17	1	BONES THOSE ARE THE BONES SEVERAL TIMES. I'D JUST
	2	LIKE TO SAY THAT THAT IS ACTUALLY INVOLVES MORE THAN
	3	BONES. AND I WAS KIND OF SURPRISED WHEN HE SAID THAT THERE
	4	WERE WERE WERE BONES OUT THERE AND IN THESE DRY LAKES
	5	IN THE DESERT. AND I WONDERED, YOU KNOW, I REALIZE THAT
	6	THERE WERE THERE WERE FOSSILS THAT WERE FOUND OVER IN
	7	THE DOMENIGONI (PHONETIC) EAST VALLEY RESERVOIR AREA THAT
	8	WAS, UM, HEADLINES IN THE LOCAL PAPERS IN SAN BERNARDINO
	9	AREA, BUT ARE YOU FINDING THE SAME TYPE OF PALEOLOGICAL
	10	RESOURCES IN THESE OTHER DRY LAKES ALREADY? I'M JUST OUT
	11	OF CURIOSITY? PREHISTORIC ARTIFACTS, MAMMOTHS.
M3-18	12	UM, IF THIS IF THIS PROJECT IS REVIEWED AND A
	13	DETERMINATION IS MADE THAT THAT IT SHOULD GO FORWARD AND
	14	PROCEED, COULD THAT HAPPEN EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE ADVERSE
	15	IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED? WILL THAT HAPPEN WHETHER
	16	THERE'S UNMITIGABLE IMPACTS OR NOT?
	17	AND, UM, HOW MUCH MONEY HAS ALREADY BEEN SPENT ON
	18	THIS PROJECT TO DATE? AND OUT OF WHAT FUNDS HAS THE
	19	FUNDING COME FROM? IS IT PUBLIC FUNDS?
	20	I'D LIKE TO KNOW EXACTLY WHERE THE MONEY'S COMING
	21	FROM FOR PROCESSING THIS MONUMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
	22	DOCUMENT.
	23	AND, OH, IF IF A DETERMINATION IS MADE THAT
M3-20	24	THERE IS IMPACTS OR NO IMPACT, OR WHATEVER THE
	25	DETERMINATION IS MADE, AND SOMEBODY DECIDES WHOEVER THAT

,

1 2

1

2

MAY BE THAT MAKES A DECISION -- DECIDES THAT YES, THIS

PROJECT IS A GO, EXACTLY WHEN WOULD THAT DECISION BE MADE?

OR WHAT IS THE PREDICTED PROJECTED TIME FRAME THAT THAT

DECISION WOULD BE MADE?

AND, ALSO, I'D LIKE TO SEE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, IF IT'S NOT ALREADY THERE, THE ISSUE ADDRESSED AS TO HOW THE PUBLIC CAN CONTEST OR APPEAL THE DECISION IF IT IS, UM, IN FAVOR OF PROCEEDING, THE APPEAL PROCESS.

AND I'D LIKE TO KNOW IF THE PUBLIC HAS -- WAS TO APPEAL THIS PROJECT, ARE THEY GOING TO HAVE TO DO IT THROUGH THE STATE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THROUGH SOME OTHER, UM, MUNICIPALITY SUCH AS M.W.D.?

I MEAN, HOW MANY APPEAL PROCESSES WOULD THE

PUBLIC BE REQUIRED TO TAKE ON IF THEY WANTED TO OBJECT, AND

WOULD AN APPEAL PROCESS BE NECESSARY BEFORE, UM, BEFORE A

PUBLIC -- A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC OR A GROUP COULD -- COULD

ACTUALLY GET A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION?

WHAT -- WHAT I'M SAYING IS WHAT -- WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE HERE FOR US? DO WE HAVE -- DO WE STAND A CHANCE? I MEAN, USUALLY WHEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT DECIDES TO BLOW THIS MUCH MONEY ON A PROJECT, THEY TELL US.

EVERYBODY SEEMS TO THINK THIS IS A DONE DEAL AND I -- YOU KNOW, I'D LIKE THE PUBLIC TO KNOW THAT IT'S NOT ALWAYS A DONE DEAL, AND THAT THEY CAN STOP THIS. AND WE

STOPPED WARD VALLEY, AND WE CAN STOP THIS. 1 AND BUT HOW, YOU KNOW, HAS THERE BEEN CHANGES IN THE LAW THAT MAKE UP -- MAKE THAT MORE DIFFICULT? 3 THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT, I.E., THE PEOPLE WHO ARE WRITING THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, HAVE A DUTY TO THE PUBLIC TO LET THEM KNOW WHAT THEY CAN DO TO STOP THIS 0 PROJECT. 7 M I MEAN, THERE IS -- YOU KNOW, IT SEEMS TO BE 8  $\supset$ TAKEN FOR GRANTED THAT THIS PROJECT IS GONNA HAPPEN AND, 9 10 UM, WE WANT -- I'D LIKE TO KNOW -- AND I KNOW OTHER PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW -- HOW THEY CAN STOP IT. 11 HOW MANY -- HOW MUCH -- HOW MUCH MONEY HAS BEEN 12 N 2 HOW MANY SHARES HAVE BEEN GIVEN TO VARIOUS PUBLIC SPENT? 13 'n Σ 14 OFFICIALS, LOCAL OFFICIALS, COUNTY OFFICIALS? I NOTICE THAT THERE WERE SOME OFFICIALS THAT WERE 15 APPOINTED BY GRAY DAVIS WHO HAVE SHARES IN THE CADIZ LAND 16 3 2 17 COMPANY. I'D LIKE TO HAVE A LIST OF ALL THE PEOPLE WHO M HAVE SHARES IN THE CADIZ LAND COMPANY. I THINK THAT WOULD  $\geq$ 18 19 BE VERY REVEALING. 20 WERE THERE COMMENTS AT THE OTHER LOCATIONS WHERE 21 YOU HELD PUBLIC MEETINGS? AND WHAT WERE THEY? 22 AND MY FINAL QUESTION FOR RIGHT NOW IS WHY WERE 23 NOT THE PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE FORTHCOMING PRIOR TO 24 TONIGHT, SUCH AS THE LAST MEETING YOU HELD HERE AND THE 25 MEETINGS YOU HELD IN OTHER PLACES, WHY WERE THESE COMMENTS

NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT? AND WHY WEREN'T THEY ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT?

MS. SALENIUS: OKAY.

RUTH LOPEZ: ONE MORE THING. LET'S JUST

MAKE IT 20. I'M VERY SADDENED TO SEE THAT THERE WAS NO

ANNOUNCEMENT OR ANNOUNCEMENT IN THE LOCAL NEWSPAPER HERE.

THE NEWSPAPER DIDN'T EVEN REPORT THAT THERE WAS A MEETING.

AND I THINK THAT IT'S SHAMEFUL THAT THE LOCAL PEOPLE HERE

IN THIS ENTIRE VALLEY WERE NOT NOTIFIED BY ANNOUNCEMENT IN

THE PAPER -- THAT A MEETING AT THE NEW COLLEGE HERE IN TOWN

WAS ANNOUNCED, HEADLINED, FRONT PAGE, WEDNESDAY, BUT THERE

WAS NOTHING REGARDING THIS MEETING FOR TONIGHT.

AND, YOU KNOW, I CAN EVEN GET AN ANNOUNCEMENT FOR MY GIRL SCOUT EVENTS IN THE LOCAL PAPER. AND IF I REALLY PRESS IT, HE MIGHT EVEN PUT IT ON THE FRONT PAGE, BUT THERE WAS NOTHING.

IF YOU WOULD HAVE JUST CALLED THE NEWSPAPER AND TOLD THEM WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A MEETING, COULD YOU PLEASE MAKE AN ANNOUNCEMENT, THEY PROBABLY WOULD HAVE -- I BELIEVE HE WOULD HAVE ANNOUNCED IT BECAUSE HE PLAYS A -- HAS A PLACE FOR MEETINGS TO BE ANNOUNCED; AND YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE TO PAY A CENT TO GET IT ANNOUNCED.

MS. SALENIUS: ARE YOU READY FOR US TO TAKE

A BREAK?

RUTH LOPEZ: YES.

M3-25

Ž

MS. SALENIUS: YOU SAID THAT WAS THE LAST 1 2 QUESTION? 3 RUTH LOPEZ: YES. I'M IN CHARGE NOW. MS. SALENIUS: THIS PART OF THE MEETING, THE 4 PUBLIC IS IN CHARGE. SO THAT'S WHY I ASKED YOU THAT 5 6 OUESTION. BECAUSE I'M JUST WONDERING YOU MENTIONED THIS 7 WAS THE LAST QUESTION. 8 RUTH LOPEZ: CAN WE HAVE A CHANCE TO ASK 9 QUESTIONS WHEN THEY'RE ADDRESSING OUR QUESTIONS? 10 MS. SALENIUS: WE -- TYPICALLY, THAT'S NOT 11 THE WAY WE'VE BEEN RUNNING THE MEETING, BUT IT'S -- WE WILL 12 SEE HOW IT GOES. OKAY? 13 RUTH LOPEZ: OKAY. 14 MS. SALENIUS: ARE WE READY FOR A BREAK? 15 I UNDERSTAND THAT IT MAY BE TIME FOR A BREAK. 16 AND IF YOU ARE FINISHED WITH YOUR COMMENTS, I'D BE HAPPY TO 17 TAKE A BREAK. 18 RUTH LOPEZ: SURE. MS. SALENIUS: WE WILL BE BACK IN ABOUT TEN 19 MINUTES. 20 THANK YOU. 21 22 (THERE WAS A SHORT BREAK TAKEN AT 7:58 P.M. 23 UNTIL 8:19 P.M.) MS. SALENIUS: WE'D LIKE TO RECONVENE THE 24 MEETING NOW. IF WE COULD HAVE PEOPLE TAKE THEIR SEATS, 25

```
PLEASE.
```

EXCUSE -- EXCUSE US. EXCUSE ME. WE'D LIKE TO
RECONVENE THE MEETING AT THIS TIME. IF YOU COULD PLEASE
TAKE YOUR SEAT. WE'D LIKE TO RECONVENE THE MEETING AT THIS
TIME, IF YOU'D PLEASE TAKE YOUR SEAT.

PLEASE SIT DOWN.

THANK YOU.

OKAY. WE ARE GOING TO MAKE AN EFFORT TO TRY TO ANSWER SOME OF THE QUESTIONS, IF WE CAN.

RUTH LOPEZ: EXCUSE ME. BEFORE YOU START, I
HAVE A QUESTION. UM, SOME QUESTIONS CAME UP DURING THE
RECESS AND WE'RE HOPING TO GET THESE ON THE QUESTIONS TOO
FOR THE PUBLIC. AND SOME OF US -- SOME OF THE PEOPLE ARE A
LITTLE BIT SHY TO SPEAK OUT. I THOUGHT WITH ALL THESE
OUTSPOKEN COUNCIL PEOPLE SITTING BACK HERE, THEY MIGHT
BRING IT UP, BUT WE'D LIKE -- I THINK A LOT OF US WOULD
LIKE TO KNOW WHO'S GETTING PAID FOR THIS WATER? WHO GETS
THE MONEY FOR THE WATER? I MEAN, THAT'S THE EASIEST
SIMPLEST WAY TO PUT IT. WHO IS GOING TO MAKE THE BUCK OFF

NOW, AT ONE POINT, THE CITY OF NEEDLES HAD A WATER PROJECT. IT WAS NOWHERE NEAR WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED HERE -- A LITTLE WATER PROJECT -- HAD TO DO WITH DRILLING SOME WELLS IN WARD VALLEY AND SELLING IT TO THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT. AND, OBVIOUSLY, OUR LITTLE

1 1

1|3

1|5

WATER PROJECT HERE IN NEEDLES GOT STOLEN. I MEAN, IT'S

OBVIOUS TO ME, MY OPINION, A LOT OF OTHER PEOPLE'S OPINION,

NOW -- NOW OUR PROJECT HAS BEEN TURNED INTO A MONSTER.

THIS IS WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED. WE'D LIKE TO
KNOW IF THE CITY OF NEEDLES IS NOT BEING PAID, CHEMEHUEVI,
MOHAVE OR PEOPLE HISTORICALLY USED THIS WATER, WHICH WATER
IS TRIBUTARY TO OUR GROUNDWATER, OUR WELLS AND SUPPLIES,
OUR WELL WATER, WHO IS GETTING PAID?

I THINK THIS IS REALLY THE FUNDAMENTAL MOST

IMPORTANT QUESTION. I GUESS IT WAS SUCH AN OBVIOUS

QUESTION, DIDN'T COME TO ME AT THE FIRST PART OF THE

MEETING. I THINK IT'S BEEN RAISED AT OTHER MEETINGS. DID

YOU RAISE IT IN THIS DRAFT? AND IF IT ISN'T DISCUSSED IN

THE DRAFT, I THINK THE DRAFT'S INADEQUATE AND IT NEEDS TO

BE ADDRESSED.

MS. SALENIUS: DIRK, WOULD YOU LIKE TO GO BACK TO THE QUESTIONS IN THE BEGINNING AND SEE -- START ANSWERING SOME OF THE QUESTIONS?

MR. REED: FIRST QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH IS WHO WILL MAKE THE DECISIONS ON THE PROJECT?

BASICALLY, WHAT IT GETS DOWN TO -- AND I WILL

SPEAK TO IT ON THE METROPOLITAN SIDE -- METROPOLITAN IS A

STATE PUBLIC AGENCY. WE HAVE 52 BOARD DIRECTORS SITTING ON

OUR BOARD. THEY WILL MAKE THE DECISION AS FAR AS

METROPOLITAN WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROJECT.

ON B.L.M. --

MS. BRADY: AND THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, ANY PLAN THAT CONTINUES -- A PLAN, HAVE THOSE THAT AREN'T FAMILIAR, AS WELL AS THE PLAN AMENDMENT, THIS AREA IS COVERED BY THE DESERT CONSERVATION PLAN OF 1990, IDENTIFIED CORRIDORS FOR UTILITIES, AND IT ALSO INDICATED THAT ANY -- ANY PIPELINE OF GREATER THAN INCHES THAT WAS GOING TO BE PROPOSED OUTSIDE OF THOSE, ANY OF THE DESIGNATED CORRIDORS, HAD TO GO THROUGH A PLAN --EQUIVALENT OF A PLAN -- A PLAN PROCESS.

WE'RE EFFECTIVELY MAKING AN EXCEPTION TO THE PLAN. THIS PARTICULAR PART OF THE PIPELINE PROPOSAL IS NOT WITHIN THE CORRIDOR, SO ANY PLAN AMENDMENT DECISION ON THAT PLAN AMENDMENT IS MADE BY OUR STATE DIRECTOR, THAT'S THE ORGANIZATION OF THE B.L.M. WE HAVE STATE DIRECTORS AND THEN CALIFORNIA DESERT, WE HAVE DISTRICT MANAGER, AND THEN I'M THE FIELD MANAGER. SO IT'S TWO LEVELS ABOVE ME THAT THE DECISION IS MADE.

THE ACTUAL GRANT, THE RIGHT OF WAY GRANTS CAN BE MADE BY EITHER THE DISTRICT MANAGER OR MYSELF, BUT BECAUSE IT IS COMBINED WITH THE PLAN AMENDMENT, IT WILL PROBABLY BE THE STATE DIRECTOR.

MR. REED: BASICALLY, WHAT IS THE CRITERIA

FOR EVALUATING THIS DOCUMENT, IF SUFFICIENT OR ADEQUATE ON
THE STATE'S SIDE.

1 SYL WILL GO THROUGH A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE 2 CRITERIA HAVING TO DEAL WITH THE TOPICS THAT WERE DEFINED. 3 MS. SALENIUS: BOTH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENT QUALITY ACT AND THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACT 4 DEFINE THE TOPICAL AREAS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE 5 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. AND THEY'RE, FOR EXAMPLE, THE 6 7 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENT QUALITY ACT HAS A THING CALLED A 8 CHECK LIST THAT IS KIND OF A CATCHALL LIST OF ALL THE 9 DIFFERENT CONCERNS THAT ONE WOULD ADDRESS. 10 THE LAW ALSO REQUIRES US TO GO THROUGH A PROCESS ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL CALLED SCOPING. AND WHEN WE GO 11 12 THROUGH THAT PROCESS, WE IDENTIFY ISSUES THAT THE PUBLIC 13 WANTS US TO ADDRESS. 14 NOW, THAT WAS DONE FOR THIS PROCESS AND THE 15 PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM THAT FIRST PROCESS ARE LISTED IN THE 16 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DOCUMENT WHICH WAS ONE OF THE 17

DOCUMENTS THAT'S IN THE LIBRARIES. IT'S ABOUT AN INCH THICK. IT DISCUSSES ALL THE TOPICS THAT WERE RAISED AT THE MEETINGS.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SO, BASICALLY, THOSE TWO SETS OF LAWS DEFINE WHAT WE HAVE TO PUT IN THE DOCUMENT.

ONCE THE DOCUMENT IS PREPARED, THEN IT GOES TO THE TWO AGENCIES THAT ARE THE LEAD AGENCIES AND THEIR STAFF AND THEIR TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS EVALUATE WHETHER THE STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE TO PROPER TECHNICAL SUFFICIENCY.

SO YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE BIOLOGISTS LOOKING AT BIOLOGICAL STUDIES, GEOLOGY, TECHNICAL STUDIES, CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES. LOOKING AT STUDIES, THEY DETERMINE INTERNALLY WHETHER THAT DOCUMENT IS SUFFICIENT. WELL, AT THAT POINT, THE DOCUMENT GETS PRINTED AS A DRAFT.

AFTER THEY'VE AGREED IF IT'S SUFFICIENT AND YOU AS THE PUBLIC, GET AN OPPORTUNITY, AND ALSO OTHER AGENCIES THAT ARE OUT THERE, GET AN OPPORTUNITY TO STATE WHETHER YOU THINK THE DOCUMENT IS ADEQUATE AND PRESENT OTHER TECHNICAL INFORMATION THAT EITHER AGREES WITH OR DOESN'T AGREE WITH WHAT'S IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

SO THAT'S KIND OF THE PROCESS.

AND, FINALLY, IT GOES TO METROPOLITAN'S BOARD AND THEY HAVE TO CERTIFY WHETHER THEY THINK THE DOCUMENT IS ADEQUATE OR NOT. SO THAT'S PART OF THE ACTION THAT THEY TAKE WHEN THEY MAKE THEIR DECISION.

ONCE THEY DETERMINE THAT THE DOCUMENT IS

ADEQUATE, THEN, AND ONLY THEN, CAN THEY MAKE A DECISION

ABOUT WHETHER THEY WANT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT OR NOT.

MR. REED: WHAT NEW LAWS, LEGISLATION HAVE STATE AND FEDERAL -- WE WILL HAVE TO GET BACK TO YOU ON THAT ONE, NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE LAWS STATE AND FEDERAL.

AND WE WILL RESPOND TO THAT ONE.

MS. SALENIUS: I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CHANGES WOULD CHANGE WHAT WE'VE DONE THUS

1	FAR.
2	MR. REED: WHO OWNS THE WATER? WE WILL
3	COMBINE THAT WITH WHAT WATER RIGHTS DO PEOPLE HAVE?
4	WHAT BASICALLY AND, AGAIN, WE'RE NOT LAWYERS,
5	WE WILL GIVE YOU A MORE DETAILED ANSWER ON THAT IN THE
6	WRITTEN RESPONSES BUT, BASICALLY, IT GETS DOWN TO OVERLYING
7	LAND OWNER HAS THE RIGHT TO USE THE WATER AS SEE FIT ON THE
8	PROPERTY.
9	METROPOLITAN IS NOT A LAND OWNER IN THE VALLEY.
10	WE'RE SUBSERVIENT TO THEM. IF THEY WANT TO USE THE WATER
11	FOR THEIR PROPERTY ON THEIR PROPERTY, WE CAN DO THEY CAN
12	DO WHAT THEY WANT WITH IT.
13	AGAIN, THAT IS WATER LAW AND THE LAWS.
14	AND WE'LL GET YOU A FORMAL RESPONSE IN WRITING ON
15	THAT ONE.
16	RUTH LOPEZ: ABOVE THE LAW THEN, THEY DON'T
17	JUST HAVE TO USE THE WATER ON THEIR OWN PROPERTY, THEY CAN
18	TRANSFER IT FROM ONE GROUND BASIN TO ANOTHER; IS THAT
19	CORRECT?
20	MR. REED: AS I JUST MENTIONED, THERE IS
21	OVERLYING LAND OWNERS GET TO USE THE WATER ON THEIR
22	PROPERTY.
23	METROPOLITAN IS NOT AN OVERLYING LAND OWNER. WE
24	CAN TRANSFER THE PROPERTY OUT OF GROUNDWATER BASINS JUST
25	LIKE ANYONE ELSE CAN, BUT THE OVERLYING LAND OWNERS, THE

ORDNANCE. 1 WHAT QUALITY AFFECTS THE INTRODUCTION OF WATER IN 2 THE GROUNDWATER BASIN, WATER QUALITY ON THE WATER ITSELF? 3 4 WE RAN NUMEROUS WATER SAMPLES ON GROUNDWATER 5 BASINS AND NUMEROUS WATER SAMPLES OF THE COLORADO RIVER 6 WATER AND DONE ANALYSIS ON THAT AND PRESENTED IT IN THE 7 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. THIS PIECE HAS TO DO WITH REGIONAL 8 ACTIVITY. AGAIN, I'M NOT AN EXPERT IN WATER QUALITY 9 ISSUES, BUT THERE IS A -- THERE IS NATURALLY-OCCURRING 10 ELEMENTS IN THE GROUNDWATER. THERE IS NATURALLY-OCCURRING 11 ELEMENTS IN THE SUBSURFACE SUPPLIES THAT WAS EVALUATED AND 12 13 DISCUSSED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER. 14 RUTH LOPEZ: WHAT ABOUT COLORADO RIVER 15 16 WATER? MR. REED: THAT IS PART OF SURFACE SUPPLIES. 17 NUMBER ONE, WE WILL DO THAT COMPARED TO WHAT 18 WE'RE POSING AS PART OF THIS PROJECT. 19 HOW MUCH WATER IN WARD VALLEY? WARD VALLEY IS 20 NOT PART OF THE PLAN. I THINK THAT WAS ON THE BOARD. 21 HAD A BOARD TO SHOW THE DIFFERENT VALLEYS. WARD VALLEY IS 22 NOT IN THIS PROGRAM. WE ARE IN FENNER VALLEY. 23 RUTH LOPEZ: IT IS IN THE DOCUMENT. IT'S 24

ADDRESSED IN THE DOCUMENT. IT IS AN ALTERNATIVE.

N5-28

MR. REED: THERE IS NO WATER COMING OUT OF 1 2 THIS PROGRAM FOR WARD VALLEY. 3 NEXT QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE TRANSFERENCE EFFECT; HOW WILL TRANSFER AFFECT WATER QUALITY IN WELLS? 5 RUTH LOPEZ: WHOSE PROJECTS ARE YOU 6 ADDRESSING TONIGHT? I MEAN, THERE'S LIKE ALTERNATIVES 7 PROJECT; CORRECT? I MEAN, MAYBE THE FIRST ALTERNATIVE WON'T GET SELECTED, AND MAYBE SOME OTHER ALTERNATIVE THAT 8 INCLUDES WARD VALLEY WOULD; IS THAT CORRECT? 9 10 I MEAN, YOU'RE TRYING TO ANSWER THAT. 11 MR. REED: PUT THAT DOWN AS NUMBER 22. 12 RUTH LOPEZ: THAT'S ACTUALLY PART OF THE 13 SAME QUESTION. 14 MR. REED: PART OF NUMBER 22. 15 RUTH LOPEZ: DON'T GET UPSET, MR. REED. 16 AM TRYING TO MAKE IT EASY ON YOU. I DON'T WANT TO UPSET 17 YOU. YOU ARE NOT UPSET, ARE YOU, MR. REED? 18 MS. SALENIUS: EXCUSE ME. 19 RUTH LOPEZ: MR. REED. 20 MS. SALENIUS: EXCUSE ME. EXCUSE ME. CANNOT HAVE A COOPERATIVE EFFORT IN RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS 21 22 AND ANSWERING QUESTIONS, AND DO IT WITHOUT INTERRUPTION, 23 I'D LIKE MR. REED TO BE ABLE TO PROCEED WITHOUT 24 INTERRUPTION BECAUSE WE TOOK THE TIME AND DID NOT INTERRUPT

THE PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE PRESENTED.

THE QUESTIONS, TO THE EXTENT THAT HE IS ABLE TO DO THAT
THIS EVENING, AND IF THAT CANNOT OCCUR, THEN I THINK WHAT
WE NEED TO DO IS SIMPLY GO BACK AND RESPOND TO EACH ONE OF
YOUR QUESTIONS IN DETAIL AND PRESENT THOSE RESPONSES IN OUR
ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

WE DON'T -- ONE OF THE THINGS THAT HAPPENS AT MEETINGS LIKE THIS IS WE ARE ACTUALLY BEING -- WE'RE EXTENDING OURSELVES BY OFFERING RESPONSES THIS EVENING.

TYPICALLY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING OF THIS NATURE,

YOU JUST TAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS AND EVERYONE GOES HOME; AND

SO WE'RE TRYING TO BE MORE RESPONSIVE THAN IS REQUIRED FOR
A PUBLIC HEARING.

SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS ALLOW MR. REED TO PROCEED. IF WE CANNOT PROCEED, THEN I'D LIKE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AND ALLOW US TO PRESENT THE RESPONSES IN OUR FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

THANK YOU.

MR. REED: NEXT ONE HAS TO DO WITH PALEO RESOURCES.

YOU ARE RIGHT, IT'S -- IT COVERS MORE THAN BONES.

MOST PEOPLE DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ARE. I TRIED TO DO AS PART OF MY PRESENTATION NARROW IT

DOWN TO ISSUES AND EXPLAIN IT TO THE PUBLIC IN TERMS OF

THAT THEY CAN UNDERSTAND WHAT SOME OF THESE WORDS MEAN.

1 PALEONTOLOGIC RESOURCES COVER A LOT MORE THAN 2 JUST BONES. 3 THIRTEEN -- AND ALL THE ISSUES UNDER PALEO DISCUSSED IN YOUR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, WHAT THE EFFECTS 5 ARE. THIRTEEN, IF DECIDED TO PROCEED, CAN IT --7 MS. SALENIUS: CAN YOU DO --8 MR. REED: OKAY. WHAT THAT'S GETTING AT, AS I MENTIONED ON THE ONE BOARD, THERE'S THREE ISSUES SUCH AS 9 10 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION 11 RESOURCES ARE APPLIED. 12 ANSWERS IS YES, CERTAIN THINGS SUCH AS THOSE WE 13 CAN PROCEED ON THE PROJECT BY OVERRIDING THEM. IN OTHER 14 WORDS, WE LOOK AT OUR BOARD, THE AGENCIES THAT REVIEW THE 15 PROJECT LOOK AT THE BENEFITS, LOOK AT THE IMPACT AND THEN 16 DECIDE WHETHER TO MOVE ON WITH THE PROJECT AS IT IS. 17 HOW MUCH MONEY IS SPENT TO DATE, PUBLIC FUNDS? 18 RIGHT NOW, EXACT NUMBER, I DON'T HAVE. APPROXIMATELY 3.2 19 MILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION 20 STUDIES. THIS INCLUDES GROUNDWATER EVALUATIONS, 21 FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS ON THE FACILITIES, BIOLOGY CULTURAL. 22 ALL THE ISSUE ITEMS IN THE DOCUMENT COME UP TO ABOUT 3.2 23 MILLION DOLLARS. 24 IT ALSO INCLUDES STAFF TIME AND TIME OF EXPERTS

FOR THESE -- FOR THESE MEETINGS ALSO.

WHEN WOULD -- HOW MUCH PUBLIC FUNDS --1 METROPOLITAN HOLDS CONTRACTS ON THAT AND SPENDING THE MONEY 2 OUT OF METROPOLITAN FUNDS. 3 MS. BRADY: CAN I ADD SOMETHING ALSO? 4 METROPOLITAN ALSO PAYS FOR THE -- ANY B.L.M. OR 5 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY -- THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S TIME 6 AND EFFORT ON THIS ALSO UNDER WHAT THEY CALL A REIMBURSABLE 7 ACCOUNT. 8 MR. REED: WE DO THAT ALSO WITH COUNTIES, 9 NOT UNCOMMON IN ORDER FOR THEM TO REIMBURSE FOR STAFF. 10 WHEN WOULD DECISIONS BE MADE ON THE PROJECT, TIME 11 12 FRAME? AND THEN THE NEXT ONE GOES HAND IN HAND WITH 13 ISSUES OF THE PUBLIC CAN CONTEST. 14 REALLY, 16 OUGHT TO BE IN FRONT OF 15 BECAUSE THE 15 DECISIONS, ULTIMATE DECISIONS, ON PROCEEDING WITH THE 16 PROJECT FOLLOW ULTIMATE DECISION OF MOVING FORWARD WITH THE 17 18 PROPER CERTIFICATION. THE PUBLIC HAS THE RIGHT TO PROTEST AND APPEAL 19 THOSE DECISIONS. AND THEN MOVING FORWARD ON THE PROJECT 20 21 HAPPENS FOLLOWING THAT PROCESS. THE EXACT TIME FRAMES AND DATES ON THAT, I AM NOT 22 THE EXPERT ON IT, BUT WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS NOT A REAL 23 SHORT PERIOD. AND IT'S NOT ON COMMENT DUE DATES OF 24

FEBRUARY 23RD, YEAR 2000, BUT WE'D HAVE TO GET BACK WITH

THE EXACT TIME FRAMES ON THAT.

BASICALLY, WHAT IT GETS DOWN TO, THERE IS TIME FRAMES IN THERE FOR PUBLIC PROTEST AND APPEALS, AND THERE IS TIME FRAMES ON PROCEEDING WITH THE PROJECT.

MS. BRADY: I CAN BE MORE SPECIFIC, IF YOU'D LIKE, WITH RESPECT TO THE FEDERAL LAW.

THE PLAN AMENDMENT, WHEN IT GOES OUT IN THE FINAL E.I.S. AND THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT, THE PUBLIC HAS 30 DAYS TO PROTEST THAT DECISION TO OUR DIRECTOR OF THE B.L.M. AND THAT CAN TAKE UP TO A YEAR TO RESOLVE, YOU KNOW, IF IT'S A VERY CONTROVERSIAL ACTION.

THEN ALSO THIS PARTICULAR CASE, ONCE THE -- IF

THE ACTION, IF THE PLAN AMENDMENT IS APPROVED AND THE

RIGHT-OF-WAY GRANT IS ISSUED, WHEN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY GRANT

DECISION IS MADE.

THEN THERE IS A 30-DAY APPEAL PERIOD IN WHICH YOU CAN APPEAL THE DECISION IF YOU'RE AFFECTED, AND YOU'RE FOUND TO BE, YOU KNOW, THAT YOU HAVE STANDING TO APPEAL, THEN YOU CAN APPEAL THE ACTION, THE ISSUANCE OF THE GRANT TO THE INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS. AND THAT CAN TAKE THREE TO FOUR YEARS.

WHEN HE TALKS ABOUT LONG PERIODS OF TIME, IT CAN
BE EXTREMELY LONG IN CONTROVERSIAL PROJECTS.

MS. SALENIUS: THE FEDERAL -- EXCUSE ME -THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENT QUALITY ACT ALSO HAS A 30-DAY

- APPEAL PERIOD FOLLOWING THE CERTIFICATION OF THE 1 2 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. MR. REED: NEXT ONE HAS TO DO WITH HOW MANY 3 SHARES HAS BEEN GIVEN? AGAIN, I DON'T HAVE AN IDEA ON THAT. I DO KNOW 5 CADIZ PUBLICLY TRADED, CO-PUBLICLY TRADED. YOU CAN BUY 6 STOCK. I DON'T KNOW WHO OWNS WHAT. 7 MS. BRADY: ONE ISSUE, I DON'T KNOW ABOUT IN 8 YOUR CASE, BUT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, ALL OF THE MAJOR PLAYERS 9 IN THIS -- ALSO, I HAVE TO FILL OUT, FOR EXAMPLE, A 10 FINANCIAL STATEMENT EACH YEAR, AND ALL OF THAT IS AVAILABLE 11 TO THE PUBLIC. 12 MR. REED: SAME WAY WITH THE STATE AGENCIES. 13 EVERY YEAR, WE HAVE TO FILL OUT A FINANCIAL STATEMENT 14 EXPLAINING EXACTLY WHAT OUR MONEY IS, WHERE OUR MONEY IS. 15 MS. BRADY: WHAT INTEREST WE HAVE. 16 MR. REED: PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD. 17 EIGHTEEN: WERE THERE COMMENTS AT THE OTHER 18
  - FIRST ONE, THE 19 ONE, COMMENTS, THERE IS A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT AVAILABLE AT THE LIBRARIES ABOUT AN INCH THICK, ALL THE COMMENTS ALSO RECEIVED ON THE PROJECT, HAS THE COMMENTS THAT WERE RECEIVED IN THE MEETINGS LISTED IN THERE. AND SO THAT'S AVAILABLE.

MEETINGS, AND WERE THERE COMMENTS FROM OTHER MEETINGS AND

DRAFTED? THESE TWO KIND OF A LITTLE BIT TOGETHER.

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 COMMENTS ON THE OTHER MEETINGS. BASICALLY, WE'VE 2 HAD TWO OTHER MEETINGS ON THE PROJECT AND THERE WAS 3 COMMENTS. THOSE ARE PART OF THE RECORD. THEY HAD TO DO DEAL -- MOSTLY DEPENDS ON WHERE YOU WERE. SALINITY ISSUES ON THE DRY LAKE BEDS, HAD TO DEAL WITH THAT ALSO ON THE 5 6 GROUNDWATER ISSUES OF PUTTING WATER IN, TAKING WATER OUT. 7 THAT IS A REASON WHY A LOT OF THE SHORT PRESENTATION DEALT 8 WITH THOSE ISSUES IN PARTICULAR. AND THOSE WILL BE PART OF 9 THE RECORD, AND THEY ARE BEING RECORDED HERE ALSO. 10 ANNOUNCEMENT, LEGAL PAPERS. 11 WE MAILED OUT ROUGHLY 12 TO -- 12 NEWSPAPERS ON 12 THE PROJECT. ONE NEWSPAPER PICKED IT UP, AND THAT WAS THE 13 SAN BERNARDINO SUN, RAN TWO ARTICLES ABOUT WHERE YOU COULD GET THE DOCUMENTS AND THE MEETINGS. 14 15 AS FOR THE LOCAL NEWSPAPER, WHY IT DIDN'T RUN IT, 16 I AM NOT SURE, BUT WE DID -- WE DID SEND OUT TO 12 17 NEWSPAPERS AND -- AND SAN BERNARDING SUN DID PICK IT UP. 18 ALL IN ALL ON THE PROJECT, WE MAILED OUT 19 NOTIFICATION ON THIS MEETING. THESE MEETINGS WERE TO 20 RECEIVE IT TO APPROXIMATELY 750 INDIVIDUALS OR AGENCIES CONCERNING THESE MEETINGS AND WHERE THE DOCUMENTATION IS 21 22 LOCATED AT. 23 TWENTY-ONE: WHO GETS --24 MS. SALENIUS: THE MONEY FOR THE WATER.

MR. REED: -- THE MONEY FOR THE WATER?

	1	OTHER PROJECTS STILL IN TURN
	2	MS. SALENIUS: BEEN STOLEN AND TURNED INTO
	3	THIS PROJECT.
	4	MR. REED: I AM NOT SURE WHAT THIS PROJECT
	5	IS.
	6	WHAT THIS PROGRAM HAS TO DEAL WITH, HAS TO DEAL
	7	WITH VERY DIFFERENT ISSUES SUCH AS STORAGE OF WATER, THE
	8	USE OF STORAGE OF THAT WATER, TAKING THAT STORAGE, STORING
	9	GROUNDWATER BASIN, EXTRACTING THAT WATER, PUTTING IT BACK
	10	IN THE AQUEDUCT.
	11	WHEN WE STORE THE WATER, PUTS IT IN THE GROUND,
	12	THEY OPERATE THAT. WHEN WE HAVE TO HAVE THE WATER
	13	RETURNED, WE PAY CADIZ AND THEY GET THE WATER BACK TO US.
M3-29	14	AS TO THE TRANSFER OF WATER, AGAIN, THE SAME
	15	THING THERE. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS WE PAY CADIZ FOR THE
	16	WATER OF TRANSFER OF WATER THAT'S COMING OUT OF THE
	17	GROUND AND BEING RETURNED TO THE AQUEDUCT ALSO.
	18	RUTH LOPEZ: WHAT ABOUT THE COLORADO RIVER
	19	WATER? YOU DON'T PAY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FEDERAL
	20	GOVERNMENT FOR THAT?
	21	MR. REED: NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF. I AM NOT
	22	POSITIVE ABOUT THAT.
	23	RUTH LOPEZ: IS THAT IN THE DOCUMENT?
	24	WHAT ABOUT THE WATER THAT'S BEING
	25	MS. SALENIUS: WE WILL GET AN ANSWER ON THAT

1 ISSUE FOR YOU AND PUT IT IN THE FINAL. 2 MR. REED: THERE ARE -- THERE ARE OTHER --3 MS. SALENIUS: ALTERNATIVES. 4 MR. REED: -- ALTERNATIVES THAT USE WARD VALLEY. THE ANSWER IS IN THE DOCUMENT. THE DOCUMENT 5 6 SPECIFIES THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, WHICH ALTERNATIVES 7 WE'RE MOVING FORWARD WITH THAT WE'RE ASKING COMMENTS ON. 8 THAT IS THE CADIZ PROJECT, THE CADIZ GROUNDWATER 9 DRY-YEAR PROJECT. 10 WARD VALLEY WAS ONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES 11 EVALUATED. WHAT WE SAID IN THIS DOCUMENT, WE SPECIFIED 12 WHICH ALTERNATIVE THAT WE'RE PROCEEDING WITH, WHICH ALTERNATIVE IS ON THE TABLE FOR CONSIDERATION. 13 14 MS. SALENIUS: OKAY. 15 I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU ALL FOR PARTICIPATING IN 16 l THE MEETING THIS EVENING. 17 I WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT THE PUBLIC COMMENT 18 PERIOD WILL END ON FEBRUARY 23RD, 2000. 19 AND IF YOU WISH TO MAIL IN ANY COMMENTS, AGAIN, 20 WE HAVE THE STAMPED COMMENT CARDS AT THE TABLE. AND WE 21 HAVE UNSTAMPED CARDS THAT HAVE THE MAILING ADDRESSES FOR 22 COMMENTS. 23 COMMENTS WILL BE MAILED TO JACK SAFELY, WHOM I 24 INTRODUCED EARLIER AT METROPOLITAN, AND ALSO JIM WILLIAMS,

B.L.M., IN THE RIVERSIDE OFFICE. HE WILL BE THERE FOR

```
1
    APPOINTMENT FOR RECEIVING COMMENTS FROM THE B.L.M.
 2
                    RUTH LOPEZ: WE HAVE THE ADDRESSES ON THE
 3
    BOARD SO THAT WE CAN --
 4
                    MS. SALENIUS: IF YOU JUST TAKE ONE OF THE
 5
    CARDS, THEY'RE PRINTED RIGHT ON THE CARDS. ANYONE CAN TAKE
 6
    THEM. TAKE EXTRA ONES, GIVE THEM TO YOUR FRIENDS.
 7
                    (THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 8:43 P.M.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF ARIZONA)
3	COUNTY OF MOHAVE)
4	I, LINDA S. LANE, C.C.R., R.P.R., DO HEREBY
5	CERTIFY THAT I TOOK DOWN IN SHORTHAND (STENOTYPE) ALL OF
6	THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER AT THE
7	TIME AND PLACE INDICATED, AND THAT THEREAFTER SAID
8	SHORTHAND NOTES WERE TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPEWRITING AT AND
9	UNDER MY DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION, AND THE FOREGOING
10	TRANSCRIPT CONSTITUTES A FULL, TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF
11	THE PROCEEDINGS HAD, ALL DONE TO THE BEST OF MY SKILL AND
12	ABILITY.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO AFFIXED MY
14	HAND THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2000.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	TIMAS. JANE
25	LINDA S. LANE, C.S.R., R.P.R.  CALIFORNIA C.C.R. #7300