



207

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI

JEFFERSON CITY

65102

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899
(573) 751-3321

March 13, 2007

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------|
| OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED | | |
| MAR 15 2007 | | |
| REPLY: | YES | NO |
| INFO. COPY TO: | | |
| DATE | INITIAL | TO |
| | | Signe |
| | | Rick |
| 3/16 | AK | Danny |
| | | FRITZ |
| CLASSIFICATION | | |
| PROJECT | | |
| CONTROL NO. | | |
| FOLDER I.D. | | |

Ms. Signe Snortland
Dakota Areas Office
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
P.O. Box 1017
Bismarck, ND 58502-1017

Re: *Request for 180 day extension to provide comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Red River Valley Water Supply Project*

Dear Ms. Snortland:

As the Missouri Attorney General, I request a 180 day extension for all Missourians to provide comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("SDEIS") for the Red River Valley Water Supply Project. Comments are currently due either March 16 or March 26, 2007, depending on which of the two notices is accurate. Based on the confusion the Bureau has created, the significance and controversial nature of this project, and the breadth of the SDEIS, we request an extension through and including September 24, 2007. In addition, because of the importance of this project to all Missourians, we request that the Bureau schedule a public hearing in Kansas City, Missouri.

As you know, the State of Missouri has monitored this project for some time and has provided comments on prior drafts of the SDEIS. Because the preferred alternative in the SDEIS requires an out-of-basin transfer of water from the Missouri River, a vital natural resource on which millions of Missourians rely, we feel our comments are essential to the review process.

The SDEIS contains substantial new information that was not contained in prior drafts. Many areas newly analyzed directly impact Missouri (e.g., Missouri River water quality) and must be carefully reviewed before comment. A particular area of concern is

Ms. Signe Snortland
March 13, 2007
Page 2

the disclosure that the preferred alternative may have significant impacts on the piping plover and least tern in the Missouri River basin. Over the years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Missouri have spent many millions of dollars to assist in the recovery of these Endangered Species Act protected species. Missouri must have an opportunity to thoroughly investigate these potential impacts – and what they might mean to Missouri River management – before the State can properly comment on the SDEIS.

In addition, many Missourians have complained to my office concerning the short comment period and the Bureau's relative lack of consideration of lower basin viewpoints in this process. I also have heard many people express frustration and confusion over the comment period and the haphazard way in which the Bureau distributed the review documents to us.

Therefore, I respectfully request you grant an extension, through September 24, 2007, and schedule a public hearing in Missouri.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON