Interview with Scott Balcomb

Intro: Today is Tuesday, October the10th, 2006, in Glenwood Springs, Colorado doing an oral history interview for Colorado River Water Users Association and I'm Pam Stevenson doing the interview and Bill Stevenson is our videographer and you are?

A. My name is Scott Balcomb.

Q. When and where were you born?

A. Born in Boulder, Colorado in 1946.

Q. A Colorado native?

A. A Colorado native, my dad was attending law school in Boulder after he got out of the service and I came along.

Q. Were you the oldest of the family?

A. I have an older brother from a marriage my dad had before World War II. I'm the oldest of three kids in our nuclear family.

Q. You were talking about your family going back several generations in Colorado.

A. My granddad was born in Denver, Colorado. My dad was born in New Mexico, kind of interrupted a long line or what could of been a long line of Coloradoans, but New

Mexico is a pretty good place to be born, too.

Q. You know it's just a technical border.

A. Not if you ask Colorado and New Mexico, it isn't (laughs).

Q. I interviewed Stuart Udall who's living in Santa Fe and I asked why he left Arizona and he said he doesn't recognize the border. He likes the Native Americans, he doesn't recognize that border. So it depends on who you talk to.

A. That's true (laughing).

Q. Your grandfather must have come here pretty early to be born here?

A. Yes, my great-granddad was actually born in Nova Scotia and kind of spent his live moving around the west looking for one boom after another. He spent time in San Diego. He was a construction manager, carpenter in Denver. He built some of the old mansions in old downtown Denver that are still there today, including one some lawyer friends of mine are using for an office right now.

Q. That's kind of a fun connection.

A. Yes.

Q. So, what year was your grandfather born?

A. I'd have to go look, something like 1896.

Q. Real pioneers here.

A. Oh yes.

Q. Was your grandfather also a lawyer?

A. No, he was a highway engineer for the New Mexico Department of Highways.

Q. So your father was the first lawyer in the family?

A. As far as we know, yes.

Q. Talk about your growing up years. Did you grow up in Denver?

A. I grew up in Glenwood Springs. After law school my dad moved to Meeker, was the Assistant District Attorney up there. He and the District Attorney then formed a civil practice partnership and we moved to Glenwood Springs when I was approximately five years old. I went all the way through the local school system here. I went to college, Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire for four years. I would like to say one of the things I learned there was that I really like Colorado a lot better than anywhere I found in the east and really couldn't wait to get back. I only applied to see a law school. I was fairly confident I would get in based on the standards of admissions at the time and I did.

Q. Growing up, did you always plan to become a lawyer?

A. No, I never gave it any thought, until I was offered a job as an English teacher when I was a junior at Dartmouth and I realized I'd better get serious about making a living. Didn't feel that I'd be a very good teacher and so I decided to go to law school just kind of on the spur of the moment.

Q. Had you been an English major before that?

A. Yes, I was an English major at Dartmouth.

Q. Without any thought as a career?

A. I liked English because you could do most of the work at the end of the term and take it easy the rest of the time, you know, writing long papers and that kind of thing.

Q. It's interesting how people chose their majors. So when you decided to go to law school that was just kind of a financial choice?

A. Well, I realized that I knew how to drive a truck. I had the equivalent of a CDL driver's license and I had worked several years as a carpenter's apprentice and a carpenter growing up. I didn't feel like either one of those was what I wanted to do long term. I knew I didn't want to be teacher. So I had to be something, so I thought I'd see if I could become a lawyer.

Q. In becoming a lawyer had you thought about specialties or had your dad talked to you about it?

A. No, my dad did not put any pressure on me to become a lawyer at all. When we would go places, sometimes I would accompany him to hearings as a kid, but I never paid much attention. What I was going for was to go fishing afterwards with him or something like that. The courtroom thing was just a boring thing to wait through when I was kid so we could do what we were really planning to do.

Q. So you had spent some time in the courtroom.

A. Yes, but not paying any attention and certainly not with any goal of becoming a lawyer.

Q. So you don't remember any of his cases?

A. Not before I became a lawyer and actually came to work here with my dad.

Q. Was that your plan when you became a lawyer to go into practice with him?

A. No, actually that was the opposite of the plan. At the time that I was anticipating becoming licensed to practice all of the other partners in this law firm were previously employed by District Attorneys of one sort or the other. The thinking was that you got lots of good trial experience in the District Attorney's Office and that it would be best for me to try to find a job somewhere in the state as an Assistant or Deputy District Attorney. The way it turned out this law firm needed to hire someone at the time and they decided to offer me the job just because they didn't want to look for anyone else I think.

Q. That doesn't sound very flattering.

A. Well, I mean they wanted me to get a lot of trial experience. Fortunately we were heavily engaged in civil and water rights litigation at the time and I got lots of trial experience kind of at my dad's elbow. I got to watch some of the best trial attorneys in Colorado who were practicing in the field of water law at work. I think I probably learned a lot more a lot faster than I would have had I done the Deputy District Attorney gig.

Q. Has this firm always specialized in water law?

A. This firm doesn't really specialize in water law at all. In fact, we pride ourselves in being able to represent clients in a wide variety of fields. We do a lot of water law because people for some reason think, as you obviously did, that we specialize, but we don't. It's just that we get lots of opportunities to practice water law. It's a good field of law. When I was a young lawyer, I had my criminal law experiences and my family law experiences. In fact I didn't want to be a water lawyer because dad by then was quite well known at least in the state, and regionally. I thought by gosh I'm not going to be the same as my dad, I'm going to do something different. It didn't take very many criminal or family law cases to convince me that maybe water law was a much more desirable field for a career.

Q. Why is that?

A. Well, family law can be very, very frustrating. Criminal law can be very, very frustrating. You're working with people in their most difficult and stressful times, and often they're

not at their best. Also very few of them can actually afford a lawyer, so financially it's not the best field, unless you're at the very top. Water law on the other hand, you don't own water rights unless you own real estate. As a practical matter, if you own real estate generally speaking, you can afford attorneys. In my way of thinking you have more interesting problems to work with too. Plus when I first started out dad was General Counsel of the Colorado River Water Conservation District. That District was heavily involved in litigation to protect water for Western Colorado, to protect water for Colorado in general. So we got to appear in literally all the regional Federal courts, all of the State courts of record and the United States Supreme Court, even. So it was a real positive and wide ranging experience for a young lawyer.

Q. What were some of the water issues that you were dealing with at that time?

A. Well, one of the things that I think dad is remembered for is that he was the first guy that had the idea that the United States should be subject to the jurisdiction of Colorado Water Courts. He found a legal basis to force the Untied States into the Colorado Water Courts system. It's important because the United States had claimed several water rights prior to that time outside the Colorado Water Courts system, they tried to do it in Federal court, for example. There were also a number of Federal rights primarily reserve water rights that were obviously there like the water rights necessary to accomplish the objectives of the National Forest. But no one had ever tried to adjudicate them, no one had ever tried to quantify them and in a system like Colorado's where you have relative priorities it's important to know what the senior priorities like National Forests really are so that all of the water users that have junior priorities will understand if there is water available for them. Dad really established in three U.S. Supreme Court cases that the principle that the United States should be subject to the jurisdiction of Colorado Water Court.

Q. Was there any specific case or water issue that was involved with that?

A. Well the procedure was that he had caused the United States to be served with process under then a fairly obscure statue which the United States resisted bitterly. When they finally lost after all the appeals it then lead to lots and lots of litigation in all of Colorado's seven divisions establishing the reserve rights of the United States and there are still efforts ongoing today, almost thirty-five years later to get those rights finally established and quantified. But in addition to that dad had done lots and lots of state water adjudications. Represented hundreds of clients, prided himself on the ability to do, like I mentioned earlier, a wide variety of legal problems and today we still do lots of land use in this law firm, lots of transactual real estate work, lots of business related law that doesn't have anything to do with water law.

Q. But water's pretty key up in this area.

A. It's an important thing and it definitely gets me an entree to circles that as living in a small town might otherwise be closed to me.

Q. In what way?

A. Well I don't think there is any secret that most of the lawyers are concentrated in Denver and there's a reason for that. Most of the large corporations are concentrated in Denver. Most of the clients that can afford lots of legal services are concentrated in Denver. So to some extent if you want to be at the cutting edge of the profession you need to at least, if not be in Denver all the time, be in Denver a good part of the time. The nice part about water law practice is that you can office out here in the "hinterland" sort to speak and still be involved in the cutting edge of water law practice.

Q. Do you remember what the first case that you worked on was?

A; There have been hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands of them, I wouldn't remember the first one. But I do remember we lost in the Colorado Supreme Court and I was so sure we'd win as a young lawyer.

Q. What case was that?

A. Well I don't remember the exact case name, I think it involved water rights at the head of the Roaring Fork that were being taken over the Arkansas. One of our jobs representing the River District was to make sure that transmountain diverters didn't get more than their share.

Q. Saying that term; transmountain diverters, just for the future generations listening to this?

A. Well the Colorado River has a large percentage of the water available for use in Colorado as a whole. Early on some of the big districts and municipalities on the Front Range which are the drainages of the Arkansas and the South Platt River looked to the west, built tunnels to come over here and divert water out of the head waters of the Colorado on to the Front Range to supplement the water available naturally out of the Arkansas and the South Platt. Part of the River District's Charter was to try to limit that activity as much as reasonably possible and to preserve water for use in Western Colorado.

Q. So was that what most of your cases with the River District were involved in?

A. No I wouldn't say most of them. There was lots of them, I mean every transmountain diverter got a lot of scrutiny from the River District and from this law office in those days. But we also handled lots of other stuff. I explained the case involving the United States and their water rights. Another time when Lake Powell started to fill, a group of non-governmental organizations sued to enjoin the filling of Lake Power for fear that it would damage Rainbow Bridge and the National Monument around it. We really took the lead in that case defending, assisting the United States, let me put it that way, in defending the right to go ahead and fill Lake Powell. Later a different bunch of "NGOs" filed essentially the same law suit and we were in that case too. There are just lots and lots of issues relating to the availability to develop water in a regional sense.

Q. You said your dad was the General Counsel for the Colorado River Water Conservation District?

A. Right.

Q. How many years?

A. Twenty or more, I don't remember the exact dates. We resigned in 1981 just because there were lots of things going on and we felt that our practice would be better suited to follow other goals.

Q. So since 1981 you haven't represented them at all?

A. We haven't represented the River District at all since '81 until about two years ago when a former General Counsel named Dave Holford came to work for this law firm and he brought back some of the River District work.

Q. So you're back doing some things for them?

A. Well, I'm not personally but the law firm is to a limited extent.

Q. I understand you're the representative on the Upper Colorado River Commission?

A. I'm Colorado's representative to the Upper Colorado River Commission.

Q. Explain to me what that entails?

A. The Commission was created in the Upper Colorado River Compact and basically it consists of an agreement between the four states that share the Colorado River above Lee Ferry, Arizona. Those four states are Colorado Wyoming, Utah and New Mexico. After the Colorado River Compact was negotiated dividing the river between the basins at Lee Ferry then the four Upper Basin states got together and negotiated an agreement to share the river and the Compact basically allocates to each state its negotiated share of the ability to use water in the Upper Basin. It also creates a Commission. The Commission's job primarily is to administer the water between the states when it becomes necessary. By administer, I mean if one state were to overuse in the context of not delivering the required amount of water at Lee Ferry, Arizona then the Commission would have to force the overusing state to cut back. Administration would be very similar to what a State Engineer would do for example, curtailing water use when too much is being used.

Q. Have you ever had to do that?

A. No, fortunately we haven't. Although in the last six or seven year drought cycle, we've had to come to grips with the near term probability that that will happen.

Q. How can you force them? How do you have the power?

A. Well you have the power given to you by the agreement that all states will live to the terms of the agreement. You have the power given by the United States Congress which has ratified the agreement. Essentially the orders of the Commission could be enforced through judicial means if necessary. It would surprise me if it ever became necessary. Although prior to 2000 the idea that a Compact call might have to be made on any given state was considered to be a very remote probability. That we hadn't developed our water up here and the drought beginning in the late '90s or 2000 has convinced us all that maybe we better get more ready than we were before 2000, that that day may not be a far off as we thought it might not be.

Q. Is it just the drought or is it more people using more water?

A. Well there's some incremental additions in water use, there's no question about that but the drought has reminded us that we have to be ready to deal with both increases in use and lowering the supply like a drought.

Q. Is the Colorado representatives . . . are there just four representatives, one from each state?

A. No there is one representative from each state and then there is a Federal representative appointed by the President of the United States.

Q. How often do you meet?

A. When I was recruited for the job it was my understanding that we met about twice a year. That the Commission wasn't a large consumer of time and that it was probably more of a ceremonial position than one that required lots of intense thought and effort on behalf of any of the participants. Bill Owens was elected in 1998 and I was appointed in 1999 and the drought was already going on, although we didn't realize it at the time. By 2000 it was becoming quite apparent that we needed to start looking at new rules and regulations for how to administer the river. The Commission became not a ceremonial position but a real intense experience I think for all of us, myself included. Now we meet, instead of twice a year, whether we need to or not on at least a monthly basis sometimes twice a month, doesn't count conference calls. That doesn't count the time necessary to be knowledgeable and up to speed about every facet of everything that's going on that we need to try to deal with.

Q. It's changed a lot in the last six years?

A. Oh yes.

Q. You're appointed to this?

A. I serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

Q. Is it a term or is it indefinite?

A. Well the Governor can appoint me. The Governor can excuse me at any time. As

a matter of practice as soon as Bill Owens' successor is sworn in I will resign effective upon the appointment of my replacement and give the new governor, who ever he may be in Colorado an opportunity to appoint my successor.

Q. Do you think he'll do that?

A. Well maybe, I mean I don't know. This is a very narrow speciality all things considered and there really aren't a lot of people that would be considered qualified to do it. There'd be some reasonable doubts about my qualifications, for example, in 1999, but I think since then I've learned a lot and feel qualified.

Q. Sounds like it's a part-time job.

A. Well it took at least a third of my active practice hours in 2006 and 2005. So yes it's a big time job right now.

Q. Do you enjoy doing it?

A. I enjoy the challenge of it. I had gotten to the point when I was appointed that. . . I had handled and been primarily responsible with the assistance of young lawyers, maybe by then thousands of State water court adjudications that I was tired of, burnt out, I guess is the right expression. The work on the interstate level is kind of reinvigorated by interests. I find the problems to be very similar, just larger in scope and harder to solve on an Interstate basis. So having done all that State water court solving, I think it helped me a lot to be ready for Interstate problem solving.

Q. What are some of the biggest issues that you're facing?

A. Well there's not enough water in the river for all of the uses. I mean that's the reason people fight over water. If there was enough for everybody like some of the states in the east use to have then there wouldn't be any need for lawyers, kind of a Utopia sort to speak.

Q. Is there any particular state that has more issues?

A. Well from time to time each of us have our own issues and problems. Each state will want to accomplish something. Colorado, for example, has been working for many years on the Animas-LaPlata Project down in the Southwest corner of the state. That represents problems; efforts and solutions to try to keep that . . . get it authorized by the United States Congress and move it forward. Now thank goodness it's under construction and it's not a big problem for me as Colorado's representative. But there are other states that are proposing projects in the very short term. There are problems, I think, that are centered in the Lower Basin where they are using more water than they have available to them on a permanent basis. I think that's a very big problem that we all should be trying to work together to solve.

Q. When you look at the map of the water coming through it seems like Colorado is the source of the water. The water in New Mexico doesn't have very much so I would think their issues are a lot different than Colorado's.

A. Well, New Mexico is in the enviable position of having used most of its allocation by any measure. Colorado has considerable allocation remaining to be used. Wyoming and Utah are in that same position, although perhaps Utah less so. Once a state has used its entire allocation maybe its emphasis will change a little bit. But as I asked

my counterpart in New Mexico the other day "Where will you be if you use all your water?" He said, "We'll still be in the Upper Basin and we'll be helping you guys in Colorado."

Q. Look at the Lower Basin States where do you see the issues there?

A. There are some terrific issues. When Arizona convinced the United States Congress to authorize the Central Arizona Project they agreed at the behest of California to take a junior priority for the water available to that project. The net result is that shortages in the Lower Basin will be borne almost entirely by Arizona. Now that they've got their project built they don't like that agreement very much and I understand why. I mean shortages in deserts are serious things. That puts a lot of stress on the relationships of the states down there and makes for lots of problems.

Q. Of course the growth in population in those states is also creating more need.

A. Well there's no question about that. I mean at least Arizona and California have a considerable amount of agricultural consumption that could be diverted to providing for the new population growth. But Nevada is in a particularly difficult position in that respect they really don't have any agricultural use to speak of and they are the fastest growing municipal area around Las Vegas. They've got a very difficult problem to solve.

Q. And they have a very small allocation.

A. Yes they do, yes they do.

Q. Do you see any movement towards perhaps trying to reallocate the waters down there or some of these Compacts that have been going on for so long being reopened?

A. The problem with reallocation is not that the states that want it reallocated don't need more water. The problem with reallocation is that the states that are called on to give more water don't want to give it up. All three states in the Lower Basin are currently using in excess of their allocation directly or indirectly and it's politically impossible to give up water under those circumstances.

Q. So the only place they could get it would be from the other states?

A. Well not necessarily. I mean I believe that there are opportunities to augment the water supply available to the river. If you pare the problem down to it's most basic when you an inadequate supply of water there are two solutions. One of which is to fight over what's there and the other one is to go find a way to add to the pool to benefit everyone. In my view not nearly enough attention has been devoted to means to add to the pool available to everyone. The economics of water use primarily in these big metro areas like Las Vegas is now getting to the point where augmentation or new supplies could be generated on a reasonably economic basis. I think we, as a group of States involved in the river will be forced to look at that.

Q. Where do you see new supplies coming from?

A. Well I mean a good example is what Nevada is trying to do in Northern Nevada. I know it's controversial but that's an example of a new supply coming in from outside the Colorado River system that could be used essentially in the river system and augment the supply naturally produced by the Colorado. There are a number of other examples, in the Upper Basin we are looking at weather modification, a.k.a., cloud

seeding to provide more dependable snow precip, but even that's not devoid of controversy the high altitude communities that would be snowed upon don't like the idea of increasing their snow removal costs. The communities down wind which would be primarily in Eastern Colorado need to be convinced that if we did that and the headwaters of the Colorado were not robbing the moisture that would naturally come to them. Another example is vegetation management there are those that say the tamarisk invasion is using more water than natural vegetation. I don't think we know that for a fact yet, but there are environmental benefits to controlling tamarisk that transcend merely the water use. There's three examples right there that can be implemented, I think, fairly readily. There are other more long range possibilities that really need to be looked at like desalinization of water and delivery of supplies to water users that are currently receiving Colorado River water or countries in the case of Mexico and moving that water by exchange, that is not releasing it from Lake Mead and making it available there to Nevada and possibly Arizona. Those are big ideas that will require at a minimum all seven states supporting each other and pushing the United States to participate and I think it will be very difficult for an individual state to do that on its own.

Q. There is a desalinization plant down by Yuma. Are you familiar with that?

A. Yes.

Q. There's talk at least of restarting it up again and doing some more testing.

A. I think they're going to start it up and operate it at about ten percent of capacity to see what happens, testing. But until recently the economics of desalinization haven't been favorable, but it seems to me that the cost of water and the perception of future need verses lack of supplies makes the economics a much more favorable

determination.

Q. They must have thought it was a viable solution when they invested in building that.

A. Well at the time they built it, as I understand it, because they felt that it would help them comply with the treaty with the Republic of Mexico to deliver water of a minimally good quality. It really wasn't a water supply, I mean in terms of adding to the overall supply to the river feature. It was a water quality matter.

Q. And apparently it didn't work.

A. Well that's true, but if you add to the problems of the Lower Basin the fact that the Upper Basin, in my judgment, is soon to experience probably a sustained energy development demand in the case of oil shale. I know, I know I mean it's another oil shale boom and it will go away people say. Hopefully this country is finally ready to commit itself to some reasonable approximation of energy self sufficiency and that will probably require oil shale development. That's probably going to take several hundred thousand acre feet of additional water out of the river up here that is now being used in the Lower Basin and aggravate the problem of shortage. When the problem of shortage gets acute enough and the price of water get high enough, desalinization doesn't look like a bad idea.

Q. The water that will be used for oil shale, that can't be reused?

A. Oh it will be reused. It will be entirely used up. It won't be allowed to return to the river in all likelihood.

Q. I don't understand too much about that but I hear people talking about it up here.

A. Right. I mean Colorado's Front Range is growing just as fast as some of the communities in the Lower Basin. They've effectively used up most of the supply that's available to them over there out of the Arkansas and South Platt Rivers. There are a number of competing proposals to take more water out of the Colorado River System and deliver it to the Front Range. I think that it's reasonable to assume to some extent that's going to happen. There's another demand on the river that will result in more shortage in the Lower Basin.

Q. Someone suggested to me that they should be looking at bringing Mississippi water over to Colorado.

A. Hey, as far as I'm concerned we ought to look at everything. I know the folks that live along the Mississippi might not like that idea. That's the problem with anything you do in this country there's always impacts. One of the reasons that you need to look at all the options and is try to pick, to implement the project that would have the least collateral damage.

Q. The other things some people said is we need to look more at conservation. We're not using it with water; some are pretty wasteful with their water.

A. I completely agree with that, but I think the most effective means to get conservation is to raise the price. I mean people don't stop driving their cars for theoretical reasons. They stop driving their cars when the price of gas goes up. It may create hardships but it works. The price of water being allowed to raise to the point where desalinization is economically viable will enforce conservation all the way up the scale.

Q. Do you see that happening, the price of water rising?

A. Sure. Oh yes, as the population continues to go up the price of water will continue to go up. Everywhere you see a constrain in the supply you see the price of water skyrocketing. Prices traditionally have been much lower than the true value of water. Now in certain areas, even in Colorado where we have some excess in local areas there is more demand than there is supply and you see prices skyrocket. It's more than the price of gasoline for example.

Q. Another issue that has come up in the last few decades is the Indian Water Rights. I don't know if that impacts Colorado as much as it impacts Arizona. In Arizona it's a really big issue. Tell us a little about that.

A. Colorado has Indian Tribes in the Southwest corner the Southern Utes and the Ute Mountain Utes. One of the benefits of the Animas-LaPlata Project was to assist Colorado in working out an arrangement acceptable to the Tribes on how much water they would get out of the Colorado and their reserve rights. You're probably aware that there's a doctrine of law that says when the United States reserves a Federal enclave they reserve by implication enough water to fulfill the purpose of the enclave so when Congress set aside land for an Indian Reservation they also reserved the water rights to fulfill the purposes. It's not as big an issue because we've agreed with the two Ute Tribes how much water that is in Colorado. In Arizona where they have that large Navajo Reservation there is no settlement. The Navajos and their water counsel, who I know, routinely indicate that they think they're entitled to cause the Compacts to be renegotiated because they as an Independent Nation weren't included in the Compacts, other than whatever water they would get the use of, would have to come out of the State's share. Makes for an interesting consultation, if the provision in the Compact we have is adhered too, than it's really between the water users in

Arizona and the Navajos in Arizona as to how much the Navajos get. But the Navajos I don't think are willing to limit their potential water right to just Arizona's water. I understand their position.

Q. The Navajos are an interesting issue in a lot of ways as a Sovereign Nation.

A. Well that's right and that's the basis of their claim that they weren't included in the Compact and they're entitled to renegotiate it.

Q. Someone suggested sometime they should make them the 51st state. They bigger than a lot of states back east (laughing).

A. That's right and perhaps more populated than a few.

Q. Then we'd have eight states in the Compact but the Hopi's wouldn't like that. They've got their own water issues.

A. That's right.

Q. In Arizona the rights that have been settled with some of the Tribes down there, they are now selling water to developers for housing developments.

A. I'm aware of that. Interesting solutions aren't they.

Q. The tribal chairman of the Gila River told me although the casinos are making them

lots of money right now, in the long term the water rights are going to be much more valuable than the casinos.

A. I wouldn't dispute that. I actually enjoyed playing golf on one of their courses a couple of years ago and more power to them.

Q. How would you describe the "good old days of water politics"?

A. Sure. The "good old days of water politics" on an interstate basis were when there was more water than there was demand. We could all talk about the theoretical problems that would someday come to exist that would have to be solved. Those theoretical problems to a large extent are now actual problems that are demanding solutions. There's still if you look at it on Basin wide basis there's still about as much water on average as there is demand, but as water managers and a system in a country that may require ten or fifteen or twenty years to bring major water projects on line it's incumbent upon us now to be laying the groundwork to provide those water projects ten, fifteen, twenty years into the future. One of the things that we, in Colorado, have been working very insidiously on is trying to convince the Lower Basin that those solutions need to be discussed and identified now and we ought to be putting them on a time track for implementation now, rather than pray for rain, I guess is the other strategy, or snow in the case of Colorado.

Q. Do you think the states tend to look at their state issues and not look at the whole region? Is that part of the problem?

A. Sure. I mean I serve the Governor. The Governor has to be elected every four years in Colorado. He needs to appeal to the electorate, the people that for vote for him are interested in the State issues in Colorado and to the extent they're interested in

interstate issues is primarily to not let those rascals from other states get any of "our" water. By necessity the debate in Colorado is always constrained by politics. One of the things that I've tried to work hard on is to transcend the politics and keep plowing ahead with a strategy that's good for Colorado irrespective of whether we have a Republican or Democratic Governor.

Q. You mean water is a way.

A. That's right, that's right.

Q. As we started out talking the water system, the whole river system provides water to the west, those state lines are pretty artificial to draw on.

A. They may be artificial but they're awfully important if you're serving the Governor of one of those artificially drawn states.

Q. Looking back at . . . what projects or legal developments do you think have been most important in Colorado's water becoming the way the water system is today?

A. If you're talking on the interstate basis which is what, I assume the User's Organization would be interested in, it's the construction of the big mainstem reservoirs and power plants and Mead and Powell. They really changed how the river is used and administered. They really made it possible to have lots of development. They really made it possible to rely on the average yield of the river as opposed to the dry year yield, which is a big deal. Beyond that, I mean everything else is secondary. My predecessor Jim Lockhead worked very hard, for example, on getting California to cut its usage back from about 5.2 million to about 4.4. That's a big deal. It's a big

accomplishment for Jim.

Q. It's a big cut back.

A. Yeah, but I mean even that pales beside the mainstem reservoir construction.

Q. Of course there was Hoover Dam before. . . (45:13)

A. That's right Lake Mead is formed by Hoover Dam.

Q. What about any other big developments in Colorado?

A. Well I think when the Colorado Supreme Court established the principle that water could be appropriated in a basin for use in another basin that's big deal. Because it opened the door to transmountain diversions out of the Colorado over to the Front Range which comprise a large volume of water that's used in Colorado out of the Colorado River. There's no doubt that the **Curacana (45:57)** Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project on the Gunnison is a big deal. But we are still really not using all that water in Colorado today.

Q. Is there areas of western water history or milestones in western water that you think played a big part in this whole system?

A. The Compact of '22 was a big first step. Ironically enough like any short agreement that's vague enough to get the agreements of seven states there are some areas in there that are rife for interpretation. That is interpreted very differently by some of the

Lower Basin and Upper Basin States and the Compact still forms the bases of the Lower Basin's legal positions and the Upper Basin's legal positions. That's still probably in a non-construction sense the milestone event on the Colorado River. The Upper Basin Compact that we talked about before is another similar milestone. The Supreme Court decision that allocated the lower river between the three states down there is another big milestone. I believe the California 4.4 agreement was a huge milestone. We're trying very hard to work towards yet another what I would characterize as a potentially milestone event if we can secure an agreement that all seven states can support bringing new water supplies in to alleviate shortages as opposed to fighting over who has to bear the shortage. That would be a big deal at least for the foreseeable future.

Q. I think it's kind of amazing that in 1922 that these seven states were working out a Compact when there were very few people here, comparatively.

A. That's true but the people with foresight knew the West was going to grow. The whole attitude at the time was pro growth. And once you've been out here you realize that there are some nice things to recommend. I mean you're from Arizona; this is time of the year when people flock to Arizona for good reason. Every year that goes by and every year the snow comes I think about it myself, although I don't want to admit it to my friends in the Arizona Department of Water Resources.

Q. You can visit.

A. Thank you, thank you.

Q. We'll come up here in July (laughing). How did you see the Western water issues change during your career?

A. I don't think that the river issues, the interstate issues changed at all. When dad was General Counsel for the River District and we were involved on the interstate issues the problems were essentially the same problems we have day. Only then they were theoretical because there was enough water. Now they're actual thanks to the drought and the growth and demand and the need to anticipate where we're going to be in fifteen or twenty years. I would say the only difference between the issues then and now is that the states have made serious efforts at working together to solve these problems in the last few years. Whether those efforts will come to fruition or whether we'll breakdown because of internal state politics. It's hard to tell. It's hard to work on these things during a drought because there is lots of public scrutiny for everything that goes on in each one of our seven states because of the drought. If times were flush no one would care and of course we wouldn't work so hard either.

Q. It wouldn't be so difficult.

A. Right.

Q. What direction do you see the water issues taking in the near future?

A. I believe and I work very hard to try to implement that the seven states will need to work together to augment the supply to alleviate shortage. I don't believe that all seven states are as committed to that principle as Colorado and I are today, because it's hard to get away from eighty years of positioning and legal theory initiated by the provisions of the '22 Compact. Sooner or later everybody's going to realize that only true way to take the risk of shortage out of the equation is to provide more water.

Q. That sounds like another big water project and some people say that we've seen the end of the big water projects.

A. Oh my, it's hard to believe that that's true. You tell the folks in Southern Nevada that we've seen the end. I think they would be very put our to hear that. They need another big project and perhaps one after that.

Q. What would you suggest?

A. I think that the long term real solution will be saline in Mexico, delivering desalinized water to Tijuana, Mexicali and perhaps some extent to Morales Dam. Retaining water in Lake Mead for the benefit of whoever pays for that project. I mean it's a big time deal. It's going to require a new power plant. It's going to require a desalinization plant. It's going to be very expensive.

Q. Desalinating the ocean water. . .

A. Yes, diverting water in the gulf of Southern California and desalinating it. I know there are environment issues associated with these projects, but we just got to find solutions because people aren't going to quit moving to the desert.

Q. Of course that becomes an international issue, where do you put this plant and who runs it?

A. That's right. There's no question that what we're going to have to create a working relationship with Mexico that's better than our working relationship has been in recent years.

Q. Do you think that the long time Doctrine about first in time, first in right, do you think those are going to survive through this whole period of drought and growth?

A. Sure. When you ask a question like that you got to remember you're talking to a guy that spent thirty-four years working in the system and he believes that his career is characterized, mine, by being able to find solutions working within that system. If you threw first in time and first in right out then you would have to replace it with something. Replacing it with something is problematic because no one has a system that works any better. There are lots of people that talk about state run allocation system, but we all know how efficient state run things are. I mean there are lots of examples of it. In Colorado I think that the water allocation system is actually extremely efficient. Our system doesn't reward waste, doesn't allow waste to continue. If you're wasting water sooner or later you're going to become the focal point of those who need the water and they'll stop you from wasting it. There are numerous example of it in Colorado. We're now starting to bring that kind of attention and pressure to bear on some of the wasteful practices in the Lower Basin that have been allowed to go on for tens of years because there's been enough water. When there's plenty of water you don't have to worry so much about it, but now there is not enough.

Q. What are some of the wasteful practices that you see?

A One of the practices I think that's resulted in what I would characterize as waste is the pattern of the Bureau of Reclamation of releasing water at Hoover Dam that has to travel, I think, three days to Imperial Dam to be diverted into the Imperial Valley. Often during those three days a precipitation event might occur in the valley that changes the water orders and there's no need for all the water that was released three days before. So that water is then bypassed at Imperial Dam and runs on in to Mexico.

Hopefully the Mexicans are making good use of it. It's an example of a system the administration of which could be much better. Prior to the drought it was fairly loose and after the drought became critical the Bureau tightened that up considerably, but there's still some administrative waste, called inadvertent deliveries. They don't call them waste, I don't blame them. Big systems have opportunities for conservation like that.

Q. One of the other things that seems to have come up in the last few decades that wasn't talked about in 1922 is the recreational use of water and the environmental issues. How have you seen that change?

A. I think starting with the environmental use that it's just another use. That states need to make decisions how about how uses will be conducted within their state and use for environmental purposes is no different than a use for domestic, or a use for agricultural or a use for industrial. Those are decisions that need to be made by a state's allocation system. As the economy or rewards, what uses that would ordinarily called environmental then you're going to see more and more of that. When the system began there wasn't any need to be that concerned about it and few were. Now there's more concern, more use and more conversion of water from traditional or non-use to environmental. I don't see it as a "C" change myself, same deal with recreation really.

Q. Recreational, that's something I hadn't heard much about until came to Colorado. It didn't seem to be an issue in Arizona.

A. It's a big deal in Colorado, no doubt about it. And it's just like I said another use. There aren't any super uses. All the uses are competing against with one another and the system that seems to work the best day in and day out is the one based on the value of the water for that use. I mean a hundred years ago the highest use was

agricultural because that was the only profitable bases, that's changed. Agricultural may be, some of my farmer friends will not like to hear me say this, not really the most intensive economic use of the water any more. So it's starting to shift, shifting to municipal to domestic, shifting to recreation, shifting to environmental. It's all being driven by economics.

Q. How could Colorado fairly allocate its remaining allotment under the Colorado River Compact of 1922?

A. There's an easy answer to it, it's called first in time, first in right. Follow the same principles we've been following and the water will be allocated between all the competing uses based on essentially in the long term on what's the economic purpose for water to be used for. As I indicated a minute ago, recreation and environmental uses are involving into an economically competitive use for water. I think that's going to continue. I believe the Colorado system works and is working. We have a state wide water plan that has all the vitality of a, for example, a free market economy. You can't tell for sure what product is going to made where and when, but you know that it will happen. You can't predict who the successful entrepreneurs are going to be, because you don't know what's going to happen in the twenty years. But that's why the system works because it allows new uses to evolve into being. I think there are those out there that would like to see water reserve for environmental purposes by government fiat. I think that would be a huge mistake in the long run because the government's not an efficient allocator of resources. Maybe it would make the people that think they are in a hurry happy, but in the long run it won't make them happy because if the environmental use is truly an economically viable use and I believe it is, then it will involve into its own very important use. I think it's happening all around us. We see lots of developments in Colorado to that effect. It's really not the poor step-child of water uses that it was thirty-five or forty years ago.

Q. What about all these local basin panels that are discussing water now? What's happening with those?

A. I don't know and I don't participate in them. I view my responsibility as to the entire state and all present and future water users in the Colorado River System in Colorado and it doesn't seem to me that it would be wise for me participate in an exercise to differentiate between basins or between users; that would tend to undermine my ability to speak for all the users in Colorado whether they're transmountain diverters or whether they're in basin farmers, or environmental users. I mean my career has been spent largely representing developers. I'm sure they're "NGOs" that would be very nervous about me speaking for them, in fact, I'm trying to like I indicated, it's a use. One of the really fun, but interesting moments early in my appointment as the Upper Colorado River Commissioner came when I ran in to an old friend of mine Ed Pacorny that works for the Denver Board of Water Commissioners. Ed's been around for years and remembers when I was a young lawyer working with my dad. We tried to do everything we could to limit Denver's ability to get water. I told Ed this is really a strange for me working on your side for a change. He said "If you think it's strange for you think how we feel." I've tried to remember that ever since and take it to heart and not be involved in the roundtables or anything remotely approaching it. The other reason is political. I work for Russell George, the head of Department of Natural Resources. Russell's heavily involved in that process. I don't want to inadvertently play a part of anything that might run counter to what Russell's trying to accomplish. The real reason is I just don't think that the job I've got keeps me from getting involved in that one.

Q. Do you think that whole roundtable process is going to be productive? Some people said if nothing else it will educate a few people about water.

A. I'll put it another way. I plead the 5th.

Q. That's sounds like a lawyer speaking (all laughing). So many times I hear roundtables, I just think of a lot of people talking, a lot of people meeting, a lot of reports being written, and nobody ever reading them.

A. There is some tendency to that in the water arena but on the other hand, one thing I have learned about any kind of a process is that you need new blood from time to time. New people bring new enthusiasm and new ideas to problems that often are critical for the solutions to be found and implemented. I'd like to think that I'm an awfully experienced and capable problem solver. But I may not have the answers that it takes to bring these seven states together under one critical mass to solve problems that may be the next commissioner or governor's representative. I don't know. I'll work at it as long as the governor gives me, who ever the governor may be. Then at some point when it seems to me that my energy is flagging, I'm going to turn it over to someone that will re-energize Colorado's role in the process.

Q. The reopening of the Compact of 1922, would Colorado be advocating to reopen that Compact? Is somebody trying to reopen it?

A. Those are part of the theoretical discussions that have gone on for years about the Compact and what it means and the basis for law suits and was it fair or not fair. In my view it would be exceedingly foolish for Colorado to participate in anything that resembles reopening or renegotiating the Compact. It's provided us protection to an extent for many years. It continues to provide us protection. I think our energies are a lot devoted to trying to put wet water to water use that needs water, rather than try to reopen the Compact to renegotiate, obviously in our case we wouldn't want to provide more water to the Lower Basin would we. So why should we be trying to renegotiate

the Compact with the Lower Basin when they need more water, that would be silly. Reopening the Compact would be suicide for Colorado. But all that aside it would take years, enormous amounts of energy, probably lead to no clear result because agreements between states are similar to agreements between nations they're inherently vague or you don't get a deal. In the final analysis we don't have enough time to solve the problems of putting wet water to solutions. Now, we need to get to work on those things that can be done and implement them. I mean fighting is just counter productive in my view.

Q. Just a . . .on the lawyers? **(Tape 2 8:26)**

A. The other problem is you put the decision making in the hands of someone who is inherently not very well suited to make technical decisions, a judge. Some of my best friends are judges. I have immense respect for them, necessary for someone in my position. But the reality of the judicial process is that often judges are called upon to make decisions that they don't get enough information in the course of a trial to make a good decision. They're trained as lawyers. They're not trained as engineers or all of the things that you need to be to make sound decisions in water allocation systems. I mean we're the ones; we that operate the river are the ones with the background and training to do that. It would be just a darn shame in my idea if we're unable to find a way to implement those solutions by agreement. The fallback's turn it over to somebody that will decide. One good thing about judges, you get a decision and you rarely like it.

Q. Both sides aren't going to like it.

A. No, both sides probably won't like it. That's the other irony of judging is that trying to do a good job of judging often means that nobody likes the out come. That's not

what we want here.

Q. Looking back over all the different issues you've been involved in, what accomplishments related to Colorado water issues are you proudest of?

A. I came in on time to implement Mr. Lockheed's California 4.4 agreement. I didn't screw it up, I guess that's one thing I could say (laughing). I think over thirty-four years I've consistently provided a wide range of clients with good advice, mainly on instate issues. I think that my reputation interstate is of someone that will say what needs to be said, even if sometimes it's unpopular and that suits me fine. And it remains to be seen whether we'll actually get any movement on a seven states agreement that actually provides more water to the system.

Q. Are you actively working on that right now?

A. Oh, yeah. We're actively working on it. The state signed a letter to the Secretary of Interior saying we thought we could get there. This was back in February, but since then we haven't managed to make any progress at all and in some respects it backslid an alarming amount.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Let's stay that we don't see the states of the Lower Basin lining up to implement the agreement the way they need to.

Q. Who in those states would be responsible for implementing . . . Department of Water

Resources in Arizona?

A. Arizona, DWR would be a primary in Arizona, Southern Nevada Water Authority in Nevada. California would be the Colorado River Board of California, I think, although each state has multiple layers of organizations.

Q. I was wondering who would be doing this?

A. Why that's why it's so hard is that I mean you deal with "water leaders" but each one of those people have organizations they have to answer to and each organization has constituencies they have to answer to. It's extremely difficult to come to a meeting and then go home and say well we thought it was important to go along with Colorado for a number of reasons and the answer could easily be well you're fired and we'll get someone that won't go along with Colorado. How do make an agreement in that atmosphere? It's very tough. It takes a long time. It takes a lot of education not only amongst ourselves that we want to get there but then there's a component of going back home and educating our constituency that's it's desirable to get there from their point of view as well. That's a long, long difficult process.

Q. Then you throw Mexico in to the mix, too.

A. That's true, but one good thing about shortage is it forces people to focus on real problems and they quit posturing and quit talking about theoretical legal problems or at least they should. If they're ever going to, shortage will force them to.

Q. Do you see the drought ending? Some people are saying that the drought is almost over.

A. Ha, ha, ha. When this thing got rolling one of the things that we collectively, in working with the Bureau of Reclamation, did was invest a lot of our time and attention and resources in that very question. I mean, when will this drought be over? When can we go back to business as usual where we have enough water and we don't have to fight? I think for my money what I learned is that we were probably just as well off examining the entrails of goats to figure out what's going to happen next year. The weather forecasters haven't got a handle on it yet. It's too big and complex a system to generate reliable answers. So that forces us in the business of trying to plan water policy for the future to plan for the worse. That's all you can do is plan for a shortage and do what you can to alleviate the shortage. If it turns out that the shortage doesn't materialize hopefully you've planned for that by not spending too much money but by being ready to spend the money if you need to, to build a project for example.

Q. Some people say that the drought's tied into the whole global warming and nobody can agree about that.

A. Well, like I said the only thing that makes sense to me is trying to make a plan that protects Colorado if global warming is a reality. Rather than me having an opinion, that would be no more valid than looking at the entrails of goats, as I said. I'd rather have a plan that protects Colorado, that allows us to, and we're working on this instate, I mean one of the things that became apparent to me as Commissioner was that we didn't have a plan to administer a state line call. I came back and reported this to Russell and to the State Engineer and now there's a definite move afoot to be able and ready when the time comes to administer. That could entail something as serious as cutting off all water rights junior to1922. We need the plan so that people that are providing municipal water have time to be able to meet the plan. It's important that we do it now so if there is a call ten years from now the community of Glenwood Springs has a water supply and has made a plan to deal with that eventuality and every other

community and every other water user to the extent they have the means to do it.

Q. At least you have a river running past Glenwood Springs, that's a good thing that you're actually are on the river.

A. That's true except a lot of that water is devoted to other users.

Q. Look at California and Arizona; they're pumping that water hundreds of miles.

A. Think about a hundred years ago, I mean in the context of a society, a hundred years is a blink of an eye. A hundred years ago the concept of pumping that water hundreds of miles was crazy. It was a "Flash Gordon" type of a deal. That's why I don't think desalinization in Mexico is crazy. I think it is an inevitable thing that we'll all have to implement together. Maybe I've got the wrong exact project, maybe it will be something that I don't even know about. We've got to create an attitude and an approach to business between the seven states that can get together enough and agree on the desirability of doing that. If we have opportunities and we fail to implement them because of lack of trust or lack of vision, we failed.

Q. I know Arizona is taking some of the Colorado River water and pumping it down to replenish the groundwater. That sounds like a crazy idea, too.

A. I've had dialogue with my friends from Arizona that made it clear that I thought when Lake Mead got to a certain point that maybe that wasn't the best idea. They roundly told me to go jump in a lake. So I'm not going to comment on how other states have devised their systems and Arizona in particular knows that they have to be able to take shortages that other states won't have to take. So they're devising a system to try

be able to get by. At the current time it's hard to tell whether Arizona really wants to implement the solution that I think is out there which is big scale desalinization. We haven't observed any commitment from Arizona that they are ready to go there, until they do the water supply in Arizona is going to be at risk. If they want to risk something that important who am I to tell them they're wrong.

Q. They've been pumping it down there as another storage way. . . but no ones quite sure where it's going.

A. Well that's true, but I mean, if Arizona's losing it, maybe I would chose to handle it a little bit differently but I'm not privy to all the political pressures and problems that exist in Arizona. I'm privy to some of them, I know about them, but I'm not subject to them, I guess is the right way to put it. So it's hard for me to be critical of what they're doing. What concerns me is that that's a short term solution to a short term foreseeable shortage and Arizona needs to be in the business of looking farther down the road. We all do.

Q. What do think looking back that you would have done differently in your water career?

A. I should have gone into criminal law or family law. It's easier (laughing).

Q. Personal liability. . .

A. The good thing about this river job is that no one will know if I screwed up until I'm long gone. So it won't bother me then (laughing)

Q. What's been the greatest surprise for you regarding Colorado and water issues?

A. Yes, after all the years that I heard that Colorado's system of prior appropriation was a dinosaur what I think I've learned is that we've got by far the most efficient system that works better than. . . I mean the criticism for years has been we have ninety percent of all the water lawyers in the Western United States, but we also have a system that I think solves problems faster and more efficiently and I don't think that's an accident. Not the lawyers are critical for problem solving but that's largely what law has become seeking solutions to problems. And if you can't solve them any other way toss them to a judge who will decide. Having witnessed the systems that the other seven basin states have employed, having witnessed how their water allocation works, I'm proud of Colorado's system. I think it's a notch above. I think that system is producing the kind of trained people experienced in problem solving that are going to be needed throughout the basin.

Q. What do you see as the problems relating to Colorado's water resources? What do you think are the most critical ones today?

A. I think Colorado's system is solving those problems and we don't have critical problems. I mean we have problems and they arise and we find solutions, either market based solutions or other solutions. Where there is a shortage of water the price goes up. The water winds up there we solve the problem. I mean that's what I really like about Colorado dynamic water plan, if you want to call it that, is that we don't have critical problems. I guess you could envision a problem and say well so there are places there should be more water flowing in steams, maybe so, but it's not a critical problem. To my way of thinking a critical problem is somewhere where somebody needs a drink of water and can't get it. And that's not happening anywhere in Colorado that I know of.

Q. What do you see as future challenges?

A. In Colorado or. . .

Q. Oh, let's talk about the state first, Colorado and then the region.

A. I think the future challenges are that we need to make sure we have the courage of our convictions here that more guys and ladies that are involved in Colorado solving have to come to the realization that our system is really very, very capable and efficient. And we ought to be proud of it instead of making excuses for it because it is working.

In a regional or multi-state sense I think that the problem is, as we've already touched on, we're on the edge of an era of permanent shortages. In order to meet those shortages we're going to have to have a new era of working between the states, a trusting relationship that implements big projects that are too big for individual states. We're not there yet by any means. If we don't get there then we'll dissolve into an era of maybe twenty years of bitter and divisive litigation that may take fifty years to overcome and lots of severe shortages.

Q. And no big projects because nobody can agree on them.

A. That's right. It takes agreement and teamwork to get big things done and we're not there yet.

Q. It seems like in the 1900's that we were doing more . . . that's when the Bureau of

Reclamation started big projects. It almost looked more futurist then?

A. No, it was because a big project didn't automatically work to the detriment of someone else except in the case of Hoover Dam. I mean the Upper Basin States didn't like to see Hoover Dam and it didn't happen until a Compact was negotiated. They didn't want to see Hoover Dam diverting all the water in the Lower Basins to uses before we were using water ourselves. Other than that there haven't really been to many instances where a big project was opposed by anyone because there was enough water for everyone. Now we're in the position where new water projects in the Upper Basin are going to make new depletions. That water won't run down the river and solve the overuse issue in the Lower Basin. So we're now for the first time, I think, on average over the period of record in the river competing for the actual use of the water in a real time context and that's changed. That's very different than it was.

Q. In talking to John Fetcher of Steamboat Springs he talked about one of the reservoirs that he was involved with in building earlier went fairly smoothly, got permits, built it. But the more recent ones he spent, and he is still at ninety-four working to fill out the forms required for environmental and different energy department forms and complying with all the government regulations that weren't there forty years ago.

A. Well it's harder to develop a consensus. No question about it.

Q Even once you decide to build something he was talking . . . and once it's built he still has to do a lot more paperwork and filling out forms than he use to.

A. But that's largely due to the fact it's harder to develop a consensus on what needs to be done. Water is always going to have a large political component to it. It just requires more commitment on the part of the people that see the need for the project.

Q. If the environmental groups had gotten more powerful earlier some people say Glen Canyon Dam would never be built today.

A. Well, they're wrong. I mean the proof of that is Glen Canyon Dam basically kept the states in the upper division from having to face the real possibility of a state line call in the last five years and still represents a major bulwark against if this drought were to continue five or six or forbid ten more years. Without Lake Powell we'd be in serious trouble, I mean, there would be cities without a water supply.

Q. There are still people trying to get rid of that dam. Do you think they have any chance?

A. They're just silly. Unfortunately I mean if those people think that cutting off the city of Denver's water supply is good for the environmental movement they got a lot to learn.

Q. What advice do you have for people that are operating Water Resources today?

A. Look for solutions. Don't be afraid. Don't be constrained by old thinking. Look to the future and let the future happen, just be ready for it. Too many people can't see beyond tonight at five o'clock. That's the most amazing thing to me.

Q. When you're talking future then how far in the future do you look?

A. Why I try to look tonight at five o'clock, next week, next year, five, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years. I mean obviously the farther you look the more iffy it is, but you also have to be open to the idea that things are going to be different. If you're not open

to change, generally speaking, you just get left behind.

Q. I think I've covered most of the questions I have here. Is there anything you want to talk about that I didn't asked you?

A. No, my role is summed up by the story I told you about the Denver Water Board guy. I've learned to be careful about representing the whole state and not individual basins or users. It's been a lot of fun, I mean in one sense, very challenging, still not over.

Q. Well, these are big issues you are dealing with. This is the future of the whole west.

A Well, you're the living proof of that. No one would be bothering me about stuff like this if somebody didn't think that (laughing).

- - - End of Interview - - -