

173

**From:** RRWSPmail RRWSPmail  
**To:** Elizabeth McPhillips; Micki Weimerskirch  
**Date:** 4/25/2006 11:19:36 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Public Comment for RRWSP EIS

Micki,

Please log in as received on April 15 and distribute to the team.

Thanks,

Signe

>>> "Jerry & Shirlee Maertens" <maertens@paulbunyan.net> 4/15/2006 9:47:28 PM >>>

After wading through the 350 page draft EIS and attempting to get through many of the supporting documents, The Mississippi Headwaters Audubon Society located in North Central Minnesota would like to provide the following input and comments concerning the Red River Valley Water Supply Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

First of all we note that this project is to supply the municipal, rural, and industrial (MR&I) needs for the Red River Valley. Supplying and/or planning for municipal and rural water for the populous under drought or extreme drought conditions is one thing but providing water for existing and new industries some of which have extremely high water consumptions is highly questionable. On page 5 of the draft EIS we note that park and golf course irrigation is a part of the municipal water demand. Many of us have a major problem using water for this purpose under normal circumstances let alone continuing the use under drought conditions. Although many of us look at water as part of the "commons," this document appears to be an attempt for an early-on water grab.

We do not support the transfer of water from one watershed to another for any reason (even if it is "treated"); thus we do not support the Garrison Diversion Unit alternatives listed in this draft EIS.

Of the three in-basin alternatives (North Dakota, Red River, and Lake of the Woods), the North Dakota and Red River should be considered over the Lake of the Woods alternative.

Some of our concerns that appear in a number of alternatives are:

Surface waters (reservoirs, impoundments, etc)

a.. Water elevation of conservation pools in multiple use reservoirs, impoundments, or lakes, under drought conditions, will probably already have lower water elevations than recommended for the conservation pool and should not be further stressed by drawing additional water out for other uses, including in stream flow maintenance.

#### In stream flows

a.. In stream flow maintenance should not be maintained at the expense of further reducing conservation pool elevations creating further stress on the pools

#### Low head dams

a.. Although eliminated from the above options, low head dams do appear in several rejected options and mentioned in several places within the proposed EIS. The ecological sound option is the removal of these dams not the placement of more dams. A recent study showed the removal of the lowhead dam on the Red Lake River in Crookston provided fish access to an addition 75 miles of the Red Lake River.

#### Aquifers

a.. The taking of ground water to meet the needs under drought conditions should be further studied and closely examined. To purchase farming irrigation quotas to supply industry is highly questionable.

In summary, we have a problem with 50 year drought predictions, assuring new and expanded industrial facilities a "sure" water source in a drought situation, and assuring emergency municipal/rural supplies other than the daily needs of the population. We believe that the calculations for MR & I be separated into two separate categories MR and I. In addition the MR should be calculated for the basic needs. We are also opposed to the Garrison Diversion Unit Alternatives and would prefer consideration of the North Dakota and/or Red River Basin alternatives without any low-head dams in the Red or Sheyenne Rivers.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Gerald H. Maertens

Issues Chairman

Mississippi Headwaters Audubon Society

885 Bootleg Lake Road SW

Bemidji MN 56601

218.751.3793