

175

From: RRVWSPmail RRVWSPmail
To: Elizabeth McPhillips; Micki Weimerskirch
Date: 4/25/2006 11:08:23 AM
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment for RRVWSP EIS

Micki,

Please log in this comment as received on April 12, 2006, and distribute it to the team.

Thanks,

Signe

>>> "Grant Wilson" <esoxgiant@gmail.com> 4/12/2006 4:16:26 PM >>>
To Whom it May Concern:

I submit the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Red River Valley Water Supply Project. My family owns lake property (permanent homes) in northeastern Otter Tail County which sit on top of the Ottertail Outwash Aquifer. I have serious concerns with the Red River Basin Alternative.

In reviewing the Draft EIS, many of the assumptions related to the impact on water quantity are based upon the average data for the period 1931 to 2001. In measuring the impact of drought with the magnitude of the 1930's, the surface water quantity data for the Red River and Sheyenne is noted. *No similar data regarding the impact of drought conditions on ground water supplies is included in the report.* This is serious oversight, as the effects of the additional pressure on ground water resources in the area during drought are not well documented. Soil conditions in the area consist primarily of coarse to fine textured loams and sands. The soils have low water hold capacity. The soil types and textures directly affect the movement and rate of water percolation. Almost all agricultural, residential and industrial water uses in the area are from ground water sources. Surface water is primarily used for recreational purposes and ground water recharge, and there is considerable ground and surface water interaction in the area.

The effects on lake levels as a result of groundwater depletion is contrary to the public good and threatens the rights of riparian land owners and public users. The benefits to the people of the distant Fargo area do not outweigh the burdens upon those of us on the affected aquifer.

I am also very concerned with statements made that comments made during the public hearing by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Schlag on March 23, 2006 will not be entered in the formal record of the EIS. This is not absolutely unacceptable, and is contrary to NEPA, MEPA, and numerous court rulings including Trout Unlimited, Inc. v. Minnesota Department of Agriculture (Minn. Ct. App. 1995). The RGU must include ALL comments made during the comment period, not just the ones submitted in writing labeled "comment".

Based upon the information presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, it appears import of water from the GDU Import to the Sheyenne River alternative is the most effective alternative. An extensive investment has already been made in some of the facilities needed to implement this

alternative. The proposed biota treatment facility would reduce the probability that exotic species would be transported from the Missouri to Red River Basin to acceptable standards.

Sincerely,

Grant L. Wilson
1306 Boardwalk Place
Minneapolis, MN 55411