

Water Pipeling Comments <nsepipelinecomments@gmail.com>

Fwd: Pipeline opposed

1 message

Launce Rake <greeninvegas@gmail.com>

To: nsepipelinecomments@gmail.com

Thu, Dec 1, 2011 at 1:25 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lang Claypoole < clayhsd@earthlink.net>

Date: Wed, Nov 30, 2011 at 12:14 PM

Subject: Pipeline opposed
To: greeninvegas@gmail.com

Susan Joseph-Taylor:

Has nothing been learned from the destruction of the land in Owens Valley California caused by the water grab by Los Angeles? This area turned from a fertile farming area into desert, sounds like a similar situation to me. The water supply in question will not be replaced annually, so it should be left untouched except by the limited use of local property owners. Respect of the property rights of owners who have been surviving for years should be the main consideration and not the short term use by southern Nevada.

Another solution for lack of long term water should be pursued, and the expense of bringing the water to southern Nevada should be spent in a more logical permanent solution. Trade off the Colorado River water that goes to southern California by financing the construction of desalination plants to replace the supply.

As you can see, I'm against the rural groundwater plan unless it would only be for the annual replaceable supply amount, but I feel the expense would not be warranted for the small supply that normally occurs.

I'm a sportsman that frequents the areas in question and feel that the water depletion that would occur would greatly affect the wildlife in the areas.

Please vote NO to the existing plan.

Lang Claypoole 3863 E. Reno Ave. Las Vegas, Nv.

DEC 0 1 2011

LAS VICAS OFFICE