

## **Frank Jaeger, District Manager of the Parker Water and Sanitation District Interview**

### **Nancy Green**

So, I want to first understand a little bit about the need in terms of water management in the West, especially Colorado's Front Range, tell me about some of the challenges that we face in terms of providing water for the population?

### **Frank Jaeger**

Now if you look at the general area, not just Parker Water and Sanitation District, but all of the neighboring surrounding communities, we're all tied to Denver Basin Bedrock Groundwater, and what I mean is that the water that we're pumping was trapped in rock formations millions of years ago, and as we pump that water we're actually mining it, so it's being depleted as we speak, as right now, my wells are running pumping water out of that aquifer. Once it's pumped out of the aquifer, it does not return in geologic time, I mean, it took millions of years to get there, it's going to take that again to get back there. So, we're depleting that resource and we need to have a renewable source of water, water that itself on a yearly basis free flowing water in the rivers from precipitation, either from snow pack or from rain. Ok? And we're in that situation and there in the Denver Basin area that I'm concerned with, there are about four hundred thousand people that are being served by bed rock groundwater that is being depleted, so looking for new sources of renewable water is our primary goal, and what I would point out is there aren't a lot of those resources available. In Colorado on this side of the mountain, on the east side of the mountain, there is the Colorado River and there's the Arkansas River, both of them are very highly managed for agriculture, and once that water's put on the land it picks up a lot of pesticides and herbicides that flow back into the river. So if you're going to take water off the Colorado or the South Platte River or the Arkansas, it's going to be full of those different contaminants. In order to treat that for drinking water, you almost have to go to a sterilization process called reverse osmosis. You strip everything out of the water. When you do that there's a real unintended consequence, the byproducts that you strip from the water basically create a superfund site, because you cannot put them back in the river, and where do you store them? They're going to have to be disposed of somehow. What it basically entails is salt, you stripped all of the total dissolved solids out of that water, and you've created a brine, and there's no place to go with a brine, not at the level you would have to for the need for the Front Range of Colorado. There was just a statewide water initiative completed here that that took about three years to develop, it was a study done by the state of Colorado looking at what the needs would be for Colorado over the next fifty years. And that determined that there would be a need for six hundred thousand acre feet of water, potable water, for people to drink and to use in a municipal and industrial fashion. In order to treat that much water, treat all of that, those pesticides, herbicides, out of that water, you would create a new salt flat. This would be the great salt plains, like outside of your hometown, Utah.

So it's not very practical from that standpoint. There are still water rights available in Colorado, in Wyoming, in Utah, that can be treated with conventional treatment to meet the needs of municipal and industrial areas, and what we're doing is we're looking for every available source of water that is clean enough that we can treat it through conventional treatment to deliver it for potable uses.

### **Green**

Why is Green River attractive as a water source?

### **Jaeger**

When you look at the Colorado River, the headwaters of the Colorado had been highly developed to where they've been depleted down to - there are times when there's very little flow left in the stream. You have growth and development going on all along the Colorado River, through the mountains of Colorado, all the way out to the western boundaries of Colorado. So those folks are protecting their interest in the river, there have been decrees on the river for mining, for oil shale development, for municipal uses, and a place that you could actually build a reservoir to capture water off of the river would be very difficult, it'd be almost impossible to permit through the environmental impact statement process to get a permit to build a reservoir on the stream. There aren't any real good sites for that in the first place. Secondly, politically it would be almost impossible to get accomplished, and there are reservoirs already on the stream that could provide water for M&I purposes, M&I being municipal industrial uses. So we are looking for easier softer ways, if you would, so that we impact people the least that we possibly can, and in fact, part of the process of going through developing a water storage reservoir or anything like that of water project, you have to do an investigation that looks at the least damaging alternative. I know about this, because I just finished it on a reservoir that we're building here in Parker and it took us almost four and a half years to finish the environmental impact process just on that issue - on purpose, and need, and coming up with the least damaging alternative. So you, as a water manager you look for what is going to impact the environment the least, what is going to impact dollars the least, what's going to impact the local residents the least. All of those things have to be taken into account before you can ever think about building a project.

### **Green**

And so it sounds like the Green is something that is very viable.

### **Jaeger**

Well, right now we're looking at the Green River, and we're looking at Flaming Gorge Reservoir. Number one reason, there's already a reservoir there, it's already capturing water, it has water that is available under the 1922 compact, Colorado River Compact, that is available for both Colorado and Wyoming. It's built in Utah, it has water backed up in Wyoming, and in order to move water from that reservoir, you would have to come all the way across the state of Wyoming to do that, and deliver water all along the way to the different

municipalities in Wyoming, and then you would take a right hand turn and bring it down into Colorado, one of the main reasons for doing that is the I-80 corridor is already designated a utility corridor in Wyoming. So, you wouldn't be disturbing lands that hadn't already been disturbed, get you away from the EIS process and again least damaging alternative, because you're not tearing up something that hadn't already been disturbed. So we spend an awful lot of time looking at those issues before we ever go anywhere for developing water. We've been fortunate here in the Parker and the Douglas county area over the last - I've been here almost thirty years. We've been able to develop groundwater as our primary source of supply, but we are now seeing that the depletion in those aquifers to where the production in our wells is falling off due to-just from pumping, so we're drawing more and more wells to produce the same amount of water, and it's becoming not only impractical from a dollar standpoint, becoming impossible from a sheer ability to pump the water out of the aquifers.

**Green**

It seems to me that just along the whole Front Range that population growth is a big issue, the fact that there's going to be a lot more people here, are you faced with that too?

**Jaeger**

Well, I moved out here from Michigan, my son had asthma real bad so I had a reasonable reason to move out here, but one of the other reasons that I moved out here is there's three hundred and ten days of sunshine in Colorado, and Michigan tends to be a little bit gray sometimes, ok? And if you look at the economy in Michigan right now, there's even a better reason to have moved away, but people want to be where there's recreational opportunity, where there is sunshine, and the ability to get outside. They want to recreate, they want to be able to live and have their children play outside-all of those things that we all tend to want for our families, ok? And when you look at it from that perspective, they're going to continue to move here. I tell people that if I built a twenty foot high fence around Parker, and said 'no more growth, we're not going to sell another house', it wouldn't save us, because I'm tied to the Denver Basin aquifers, they would go outside the fence and drill a well and suck the water right out from under us. We would still have to go somewhere and get water, it's being depleted whether we're taking it or our neighbors are taking it, it's still being used. So it doesn't leave us much option, we have to be looking, always looking for the long term future, and in the water industry it is imperative that as a water provider you are planning at least a hundred years out in front of yourself, because it takes so long to build projects, and it is labor intensive and cost intensive, there's no way around that.

**Green**

This is a long term project, it's expensive and resource consuming...what's the likelihood of this project even happening?

**Jaeger**

Well, let me answer your question a little bit differently. The likelihood of a project happening is a hundred percent, it has to happen, whether or not it'll be the project that we're talking about of Flaming Gorge, I can't tell you, I don't know that for a fact. I don't have due diligence done to see if the water's available and whether or not we can get through the processes to move water back here, but a project of some form is going to have to import water to this area to meet the needs, because whether we grow or we don't grow, the source of water that we have is being depleted and it will have to be replaced, no way around that. The thing that we're trying to do is to show the folks in Wyoming and in Colorado that we are taking all of their concerns into account, and we're looking at the 1922 compact and preserving the rights that are allocated to those two states. We're not trying to take anybody's water, we're trying to get adjudications, and approvals to utilize that water for the benefit of the two states. Colorado's not trying to take Wyoming's water, Colorado's trying to get Colorado's water. The fact that it has to move across the state of Wyoming says that it can benefit Wyoming too because you can move both parties water in the same pipeline.

**Green**

Explain that to me, if you can, a sort of a layman's explanation of the Colorado River Compact, and the fact that you have certain water rights, and you're just trying to claim your water.

**Jaeger**

Well, the Colorado River Compact as it was formulated in 1922 divided the river up, the amount of water available on the river between the upper and lower basin states, ok? Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, are the upper basin states, and they have the right to develop a certain amount of the water that is generated on a yearly basis from snow fall and rain fall, ok? And it was determined that the upper basin states had to release seven point five million acre feet of water on a ten year running average. As long as we're doing that then the upper basin states had the right to develop water to their own benefit. We have never released, or not released that seven point five million and there's water available, but it takes – you're going to have to go back and review hydrologic records showing how much water actually has been flowing in the Colorado over that period of time to determine how much water's available for development. And we're simply looking at that from an engineering standpoint as pragmatically as we can to see how much water's available for Wyoming and Colorado in Flaming Gorge Reservoir. When the compact was completed, then the Aspinall units were built in somewhere in the late fifties, mid to late fifties, and they were built on the main stem of the Colorado and on the Green and some of the other - the Gunnison and several other rivers, but they were built with the idea in mind of providing recreation for fisheries and what not - municipal and industrial. Power generation was a huge aspect of the Aspinall units, and they were built with federal dollars, and the Bureau of Reclamation controls those reservoirs, and they control Flaming Gorge. So we're looking at it from the perspective of if we were to

develop Colorado State's entitlement and Wyoming's entitlement would we negatively impact the other uses on that reservoir for recreation and for power generation. We don't believe we will, but that will have to be studied and the only way you get there is you've got to start somewhere, and that's where we're at. We're at the beginning of looking at it from a due diligence standpoint. We have met with all of the water providers in Wyoming trying to get them to the table to join us in this effort. We're looking at a couple of years worth of study that'll, I don't know, for the original due diligence and, I hate to put numbers on the table because somebody will quote it and it'll get chipped into granite, but we believe for the first couple of years we're looking at several hundred thousand dollars just for the due diligence. Now, if you get into a full blown EIS that could run into the millions, I don't have a clue at this point, wouldn't even try to fathom how much it's going to cost, but before you get to that level you've got to make sure that it's worthwhile, that there's the ability to actually develop water, and that's where we're at today. There's no threat to anybody, we're not out there taking water or stealing water, as it were. We're simply trying to look at, is there water available under the compact to be developed that could be moved from Flaming Gorge. That's not the only place we're looking, I mean, Parker has purchased farms out on the South Platte River in order to build the dam that we're building here in Parker, we had to guarantee that any water we took locally off the stream would be replaced for the endangered species in Nebraska. So, we had to buy farms to release the water from the farms back to the river to make up the depletions we're taking here in Parker. If you don't know anything about water, I just lost you.

### **Green**

You didn't, but one thing I do need to clarify, because I don't think most people know, what is an Aspinall unit?

### **Jaeger**

The Aspinall unit was named after Wayne Aspinall the, I don't know if he was senator or congressmen, I'm not sure, but in that day and age, and he put together the legislation to create the development of these now I think there were five different reservoirs that were built specifically for the reasons and intent that I just explained for you. Wayne Aspinall is in the water industry at least in Colorado, is considered a hero from the old days. We wouldn't have gold medal trout streams, they wouldn't be heard of because there wouldn't be any water running down the stream in the middle of the summer, but all the gold medal trout streams in Colorado are directly beneath dams. Water that's being managed and the flows are being managed back into the streams, so it was timely and it was something that needed to be done for the development of the West, you know, and that's what we're talking about it is continued development of the West. And when you look at the benefits of living in the West that I explained earlier, that it's a great place to live, to hunt, to fish, to recreate, to ride bicycles, all of those things that we all like to do are really available here in the West and promoted here in the West so for anybody to say 'well, let's just stop growth', well, that's

kind of silly as far as I'm concerned when we all like the way we live here, don't we? And we'd like to see our grandkids live here. Grandkids, that suggests growth, doesn't it? Whether you import them from Michigan or they're already here it's still growth

**Green**

Do you think about your grandkids when you think about water?

**Jaeger**

Absolutely I do, I think as a grandparent you think about your grandkids about all issues, about education, which is really something that we're proud of here in Colorado, we have a great educational system here, and you look at those aspects. You look at the quality of life, you look at the ability to have something to eat and drink, and to have a job when they grow up, those are all issues that we look at as grandparents and as parents. I mean, we'd be a little silly having kids if we didn't feel that, wouldn't we? And I look at it, I try to look at it from an overall human aspect of what do I like? What is it that drew me to Colorado? What drew me to Colorado was the climate, my son had asthma to the point where he almost died on us at eighteen months old. We came out here and he immediately got well. All of his allergies cleared up because he wasn't living in that damp climate. Well, there are a million different reasons to move here, you know, and my saying 'no growth' isn't going to change that, there's still going to be people with those same reasons wanting to move to the west, you know? That's the way it is, and it's not a bad way as far as I'm concerned.

**Green**

So we're talking about growth, was John Wesley Powell, right when he said 'the limiting factor in the west would be water'?

**Jaeger**

Well, you know, when you look at the volume of water that's available, what we're talking about is moving water in time. There's plenty of water here but it comes in at inopportune times. It comes on top of a heavy snow fall in the spring or all winter long, and it's gone before you can start growing, I think. Well, the farmers figured that out early on, they started building ditch companies, and they started building small reservoirs so that they could move that water in time - grab it when it was available in the early spring, move it to the summertime so they could irrigate their crops, and we're no different than the municipal industrial industry. We are taking that water and moving it in time so that our people can recreate in it, our people can grow a lawn, they can do all of these different things, but it's a matter of moving water in time.

**Green**

Some people say, especially with the Green, because to a lot of people it's the last quasi wild section of the Colorado River system, mostly because of the way the Yampa runs and also in part because some of the flows cross Flaming

Gorge. Their concern is that projects like the one that you're proposing or conceiving for the future might affect the wild nature of that river.

### **Jaeger**

Wild and scenic is a great term, isn't it? But the reality of it is, the reason we're looking at the reservoirs to take it off an existing reservoir they're still releasing water, and they have to release water downstream because they're generating power off of that reservoir, ok? So the water's going to continue to be released, and if you take a hundred and sixty five thousand acre feet, that's been mentioned, off of three point whatever million acre feet of water, and you do that over an entire year, it's going to be a miniscule affect on the river, miniscule because the same amount of water's being released every year in order to generate that power. Even during the drought they were still releasing six hundred cubic feet per second, specifically to generate power, and that water was going down the river for the gold medal fisheries, they were still being maintained right through the drought, so I'm looking at that from my own perspective. I understand that, ok? And I don't see that it's a major issue, or that it will create any kind of a drawback. I don't live over there so for me to say that is much easier than it is for the guy who lives there, I understand that. It's my responsibility to prove my case that it will be miniscule in nature as to the effect on the river, I understand that too, and it's going to cost a lot of money to prove those issues but that's why we have the system that we have. You have to go through all of the - jump through all of the hoops to prove your case as to what the effect is going to be.

### **Green**

Also, I spoke to a hydrologist, Jack Schmidt from USU, and I said, 'at what point are these projects that are being proposed going to affect the flow of the river?', and he said "well, I can't really answer that because if you take a teaspoon out that's not going to affect it- But at what point is the cumulative effect detrimental to the quality of the river? Is that something that you think about?"

### **Jaeger**

Well, it falls into the realm of the Colorado River Compact, and how much water was proposed to be used for the benefit, remember beneficial use for the states of Wyoming and Colorado, Utah and all the other downstream states. So, under that compact we can't negatively affect it, I don't believe in the long term, because we're limited as to how much will be available, and from that perspective greater minds than I have are going to be working on this issue for a lot of years. You look at the history of the two states involved right now, in the project that we're proposing, neither one of us has developed a lot of water. I mean, Colorado has with the Denver on the mainstem and the upper Colorado, but those of us who are the late comers have not had the opportunity or the need to look at those issues, but I think what we're talking about is managers with the intelligence and the, I think, true agenda to not harm somebody else over their needs. I mean, we clearly understand how important water is to the entire West.

We happen to be part of the West, and we're trying to survive ourselves, so in order to survive we have to provide water, we have to develop water. Can we do it willy-nilly and just go out and destroy somebody else's life? No, we can't do that, we understand that, and in the long term there will be a lot of water management issues that will have to take place. I can tell you that, here in the Parker area, through water conservation we've cut our per capita consumption by thirty percent over the last five six years. That's pretty impressive when you think about it, and we're doing everything we can, you know, low flow shower heads and we haven't done any rebates because we're in the middle of kind of a price war here in Parker where people are not happy about the rates they have to pay so we don't have the revenues to do a lot of rebate work. Ultimately that will be a part of our plan, we know that, but conservation is a critical issue, we all look at that, but conservation doesn't create water, it saves water, but it doesn't create water for new growth, that's not what it's about. It's about getting people to be good water managers themselves, and that's what we work toward on a daily basis.

### **Green**

There seems to be this attitude of developing water is fine, but "not in my backyard". What do you say to people who feel that way?

### **Jaeger**

You know, as a child I went to Parochial school so I understand parochialism, and that's really what we're talking about is, protect mine and the heck with everybody else. The reality of it is, with the limited resources that we have in the West, we have to be good water managers, and we have got to figure out how to share, how to treat our water properly, and how not to waste it, and that's everybody's responsibility, not just water managers. It's the guy who's watering his lawn out there, or washing his car, and letting the hose run. It's a responsibility that we all share. I don't know that you'll ever get totally beyond parochialism, that's in our nature, to protect ourselves and to protect what we believe is ours. And if you got water flowing in a river passed you, it is automatically yours, I don't care who you are, you want to be able to put your feet in that water and soak them. You don't want anybody stemming the flow, I understand that, but the reality of it is - if you look at a state, let's just take Colorado for a moment. We have to look at it as an entire state, and not east, west, north or south. What is good for the west slope or the east slope of Colorado, is good for the entire state. A case in point, if this area were not able to develop water and keep our property values up, and keep the revenues coming in, and we failed to pay our debt, our bonded indebtedness, that would affect everybody in the state of Colorado, same would be true in Wyoming or Utah, and no matter where you're at, if one portion of the state defaults on its debt because of parochialism you're going to affect the entire state, and you're going to do it negatively. That's what'll happen, and I think we have to be pragmatic enough to recognize that the other guy's needs are our needs too, there's no way around that one. You can think there is, but there isn't.

**Green**

Do you think that's what's going on when, I was just reading that a county commissioner in Wyoming was saying basically that 'all these people are coming in for our water, and we're going to have a fight on our hands.' And it's almost this notion of, this is our water, you know we need to fight to protect it, is that a western attitude-is that an older attitude?

**Jaeger**

No, I think it's a human attitude, it's a not in my backyard, no growth, all of those things that in a sound bite, sound good. Yeah, no growth, I don't have to worry about there's going to be ten more people out there in my fishing hole, but the reality of it is you're affecting your own property rights when you take that attitude, and are you going to be able to sell your home? Are you going to be able to move to another - a nicer home, are you going to have a job? All of those things have to play into the overall context of what we're talking about here. It's real easy to hold your arms and say, 'boy not in my backyard, don't interrupt my way of life'. The reality of it is, your life is going to be interrupted one way or another, and we're talking about maintaining your lifestyle, and doing nothing is backing up. Your lifestyle is not going to get better if you do nothing.

**Green**

I want to get into the notion of private versus public water. That's one thing that people are talking about with the Million Conservation Group Project is this notion that it's a private entity versus a public entity, and that makes some people uncomfortable.

**Jaeger**

Well you've been in my office, and you can see that I live in a glass house, with all of my offices out there are surrounded by glass. I'm not interested in throwing stones at somebody else's project, but from a public private to standpoint (sigh). The public sector has got to protect the interest of its taxpayers, are we protecting those interests if we agree to sign up with a developer who is primarily concerned with profit margins. I mean, if he's got, if he has investors, they want him to be concerned about his profit margin and how much they're going to make off their investment. In our case, we're trying to keep the cost at a bare minimum, and just pay what it takes to build the project because we answer to our taxpayers, and our responsibility is to try to provide water at the least expensive cost that we possibly can. Are we always successful? I would say no, we're not. Personalities get in the way of all of those - all of the things that happen in a private sector happen in a public sector too. But I think that our motives are - I hate to use terms like altruistic, but they need to be altruistic in the fact that we need to try to keep those costs down. And if we're negotiating with a private sector company who is going to control how - what his profit margin is going to be, from a percentage standpoint or whatever, he's not going to take the best interests of the end user to heart, and that would be my biggest concern,

and it has been my biggest concern because the project that you mention, we'd thought it was a good project when we first started talking to him till we got into negotiations over cost.

That's when I started talking to other public entities and they did-couldn't go there either. I mean, what public entity could sign away its fiduciary responsibility? You simply cannot do that. I mean, I can see areas where we could end up in jail if we signed away our fiduciary responsibility. I'm not willing to go to jail for anybody. I can't manufacture water, and I can't manufacture money, or won't manufacture money.

### **Green**

It also brings up an interesting point to me, because there have been private interests that have developed water before. Are we at the point now in the west where water is such a commodity, it's so lucrative now that, it really is something where private interests are saying "I can make a profit." Is that a new phenomenon or something that's always existed?

### **Jaeger**

Yes, you're right, that there is that attitude out there that water is valuable, therefore we ought to be able to invest in it, we ought to be able to make a profit off of it. That's been going on for some time, there are always water brokers, I can't tell you how many times I've had this same water right put on my desk by a different...I want to be careful with my terminology here, but by a different promoter. I mean, it happens all the time, and when I first started here there were water rights available on Cherry Creek, and I had some really, really poor water rights brought to me and touted as the best thing in the world, and I didn't buy them from any of the five different entrepreneurs who bought it to me. Sure, there's that and maybe they can put some deals together because we have to be relatively transparent, and there's a term I don't particularly care for, but we have to be transparent, and we have to put everything out on the table so that when we're negotiating it's a little tougher on the privates or the public sector to negotiate, because you can't do it behind closed doors when you would like to, you know? And that makes it competitive by its very nature.

### **Green**

You were saying that basically water is a slow process, tell me about how slow water is, and in fact that it took you twenty five years to get this dam built. Explain that.

### **Jaeger**

Well, first of all, you're dealing with public funds, with the public's funds, and you can't just run out and cut deals willy-nilly, you have to have, you have to be able to prove to the constituency that what you're doing is a good idea. And beyond that just permitting a process or project, going through the federal process especially, is time consuming, and what're you going to do? If you're Parker,

forty five thousand people, are you going to file a lawsuit against the federal government and hope to win that lawsuit? They're spending your money against you, you don't stand a chance, so yeah it's time consuming because you have to dot all i's and cross all the t's. You know, I can recall I was living in Ohio at the time, when the Cuyahoga River caught fire, and that was prior to the institution of the EPA. Now if you saw the Cuyahoga River in 1960 through '66, you understood there was a real need to do something about it. So the EPA was empowered, and they did a wonderful job of a cleaning up the Cuyahoga River and the Lake Erie for that matter. So they gained power and now it's becoming a bureaucracy that's really difficult to work your way through because they have dictatorial power basically, and defining the hoops that you have to jump through is difficult enough, or having them define - giving you a final definition of which hoop you're going to jump through next, is really difficult. But it's doable, it is doable, and we've proven that here by getting the permit for Rueter-Hess, it's the first project or reservoir on a stream permit in the state of Colorado, since the clean water act was envisioned thirty years ago. There have been other reservoirs built but they haven't been on a live stream. So, it took some real soul searching and hard work to get to the point that we did. Now we bought a site to built Rueter-Hess and we did that, we justified it because we bought over two thousand acres and underlying that two thousand acres there were almost three thousand acre feet of water. So if we'd never built a reservoir we could at least develop the water out from under it, but we were tenacious enough to stick to it, it took twenty five years to get it done. And I can't blame that all on the on the government process, but a good portion of it was.

### **Green**

So in reality, if the project on the Green actually could go through, if everything passed, how long would it take?

### **Jaeger**

I think a project of the nature that we're talking about could take upwards of twenty years. Will it take that long? I don't know. Part of the problem is getting all the partners to the table to sign the documents to say 'yeah we're a party to this,' because you may have to prove purpose and need, and that means you got to prove how many homes you have, how many you're going to have, how much water each one's going to use, and that'll be a collection process with multiple different municipalities, and that'll take time, lot of time.

### **Green**

You addressed this earlier, but I wanted to follow up, it seems like you don't have a lot of options in terms of places you can look to get water at this point, it seems like a lot of sources have been plumbed.

### **Jaeger**

Well, there are so many unintended consequences on everything you look at, that it makes it really problematic. The biggest problem you have is there is

water available if you were to dry up agriculture on the South Platte River and on the Arkansas River, but that water is so polluted to the point of the cost of treatment and disposal of the byproducts that it makes it almost impossible. I mean, if all I had to worry about was the forty five thousand homes I've got here in Parker, yeah, the project would probably be built that you could maybe pencil out somehow. The individual costs would be very high but you could get it done, but for the amount of water necessary for the proposed growth and development for the Front Range of Colorado, it's totally impractical of trying to treat that much water, and try to dispose of the byproducts. So, you almost have to look at where is some relatively clean water that you can treat conventionally, and there's not a lot of that available, it's why we're looking at the Green and why we're looking at the Yampa, and why we're looking at the Gunnison, and there's a political fight on every one of those rivers. It isn't limited to the Green River, it's limited to every one of the rivers.

The Green, the Yampa, the Gunnison, any one of them. If you go over, if you go over to Gunnison you start talking about developing water they'll literally shoot you over there. (laughter) I've had more than my share of arguments with the legislator who happens to be the head of the agricultural committee for the House of Representatives here in Colorado, and if you think you're going to move water out of her backyard, hmm that's a long uphill battle.

**Green**

So, in a way it seems like the Green and the Yampa, for this region, are pretty much the rivers of last resort. Are they the last rivers?

**Jaeger**

No, they're not the last rivers because you do have the Gunnison and given time and need and all of those other issues building to a bursting point, I suppose you could develop some of that other water, but and I wouldn't call the Green or the Yampa low hanging fruit. If there's low hanging fruit I suppose it's the South Platte River where you can buy farm rights, and fight the issue on treatment, but there's no easy projects out there, I don't care where they come from. I would just caution people to understand that when you're talking about developing water, especially from a municipal industrial standpoint, you're looking at what benefits your entire state, it isn't just one portion of the state or one small faction. You have to look at what the ultimate effect is on the entire state.

**Green**

So when you think of river use, do you view the rivers as there, in a way, to serve municipalities?

**Jaeger**

Well, we don't have a choice but to develop water. We do not have a choice, have to continue, have to keep moving down that road of developing a resource for our constituency, and the fact that we're in Colorado and we're going to grow

whether we individual municipalities or not want to do that is beside the point, it's going to happen, it's happening to us on a daily basis.

**Green**

When you look at the Green-when you look at a river, everyone relates in a different way, so if you were standing at the banks of something like the Green, what would you see? What would your relationship be to that river? What do you see when you look at the Green?

**Jaeger**

I see a use, many uses, and if I'm standing on the Green I've got a fishing pole in my hand. I'll be honest with you, I'm not if I'm hunting, , the water's necessary for the prey I'm hunting, , and as a municipal provider it's necessary for the economic health of my community. If I live on the river, I'd like to preserve it and not see it change much. I clearly understand where they're coming from, but I would point out to you that that river changed significantly when that Aspinall unit was built and that reservoir was built. On that stream, on the Green it totally changed the regime of that stream, totally. Now, what we're talking about now is taking a small portion of that already developed resource and utilizing it for municipal industrial use which was part of the intent of the original project in the first place. That's what it was intended to do. We're simply trying to maximize the use, that's what we're looking at.

**Green**

Is there anything you want to add? Is there anything that viewers watching this show should be considering as they think about the issues of water use on the Green?

**Jaeger**

Well I think, if I were to add anything, is to remember that we're all humans trying to survive in a pretty cruel world today. And in order to do that, in order to survive and do it in a manner that we're used to, it's going to require sharing, change a little bit, oh god there's a word for you, huh? Change and recognizing that the other guy's got just as much right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as you have. Now I sound like a preacher, so I'll stop.

**Green**

Thanks