John Whipple

From: creda

Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2004 9:30 AM

To: John Whipple

Subject: Fw: Fw: Navajo - San Juan water rights settlement

```
---- Original Message -----
From: "Leslie James - CREDA" <creda@qwest.net>
To: "Rege Leach" <RLeach@uc.usbr.gov>
Cc: "Arlo Allen" <aallen@uc.usbr.gov>; <bparry@uc.usbr.gov>; "Ben Hanley"
<bhanley@ntua.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2004 9:28 AM
Subject: Fw: Fw: Navajo - San Juan water rights settlement
        Thanks for the response. Please consider that the project does NOT
> have to become a CRSP participating project in order to have access to
> project use power. That could be addressed simply through the authorizing
> legislation. Please consider this approach in your discussions with the
> Navajo Nation and State of New Mexico.
> Thanks, Leslie James
> ---- Original Message -----
> From: "Rege Leach" <RLeach@uc.usbr.gov>
> To: <creda@gwest.net>
> Cc: "Arlo Allen" <AALLEN@uc.usbr.gov>; "Brian Parry" <BPARRY@uc.usbr.gov>
> Sent: Monday, December 13, 2004 11:42 AM
> Subject: Re: Fw: Navajo - San Juan water rights settlement
> > Hi Leslie, Just a quick response to your message to let you know we are
> > listening to your concerns and trying to keep abreast to what is in the
> > proposed legislation. The latest draft of the settlement legislation has
> > not been released and we are not part of the negotiation process and
> > therefore don't know just what is stated in the text. I anticipate the
> > settlement document to be considered by the Navajo Tribal Council in
> > December and if accepted the document would go onto the NM Interstate
>> Stream Commission for approval in January. Until then we are just
> > guessing what the document has in it.
> > My understanding is the language relating to Western paying for the
> > power transmission facilities has been taken out. The NGWSP costs,
> > $589,600,000 which was in a prior draft document, does include all power
> > transmission facilities.
> > The NGWSP power demand is 21,000 kw which does fall within the ALP
> > power reserved and not anticipated to be used.
> > We have been discussing the project power supply and overall project
> > operation with NTUA and they have a member on our project steering
> > committee. NTUA plans to be the project facility operator and would be
> > the project power provider unless provided otherwise in authorizing
> > legislation. We also have discussed with PNM their capacity to transmit
> > and provide power to the project and they are interested in working
> > with NTUA.
> > The overall benefits of the project being a participating project in
> > the CRSP other than access to reserved power would be how environmental
> > mitigation costs are handled and providing a definite connection to
> > water from a CRSP project (Navajo Reservoir) to a participating project.
> >
> > When we get a current version of the settlement legislation we will be
> > reviewing the language and give you more information. I hope this
> > helps.
> > Regards,
             Rege
> >
```

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System. For more information please visit http://www.messagelabs.com/email