

203

March 1, 2007

Ms Marianne P. Mazzola  
2741 Cathedral Drive  
St. Louis, MO 63129

Red River Valley Water Supply Project  
Bureau of Reclamation  
P. O. Box 1017  
Bismarck, ND 58802-1017  
Michael J. Ryan, Regional Director

OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED		
MAR 12 2007		
REPLY:	YES	NO
INFO. COPY TO:		
DATE	INITIAL	TO
3/19	MB	Stone Denny
CLASSIFICATION		
PROJECT		
CONTROL NO.		
FOLDER I.D.		

Dear Mr. Michael J. Ryan;

Thank you for requesting my input on the subject the Distribution of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Red River Valley Water Supply Project. GP-4200 ENV-6.00

I believe the five action alternatives, North Dakota In-Basin; Red River Basin; GDU Import to Sheyenne River; GDU Import Pipeline; Missouri River Import to Red River Valley, are all bad ideas. My choice is NO ACTION.

I don't believe the State of North Dakota has substantiated a need for these changes. Scientific studies have rejected the out-of-basin transfer of Missouri River as economically unfeasible and environmentally disastrous. Legally, how will North Dakota's diversion of the Missouri River affect prior rights of other water consumers? It seems to me it will deprive downstream states of water for industry, barge transport, and household needs. I also believe any plan that would interchange waters from one watershed to another has the potential of contamination of pollutants and invasive species. It may destroy cultural and fish resources. It may violate treaties with American Indian Tribes. And, one last question, how does Canada feel about all these proposals?

To sum up, my choice is to reject the five action alternatives, and to CHOOSE THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.

Sincerely Yours, Ms. Marianne P. Mazzola

*Ms. Marianne P. Mazzola*