North Coast Stream Flow Coalition PO Box 4256 Napa, CA 94558 cmalan1earth@gmail.com icarenapa.org



May 27, 2021

Arvin Chi State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Rights P.O. Box 2000 Sacramento, CA 95812 Via email to: arvin.chi@waterboards.ca.gov

Montague Water Conservation District c/o Lisa Faris P.O. Box 247 Montague, CA 96064 Via email to: mwcd@att.net

SUBJECT: Comment on "PETITION FOR TEMPORARY CHANGE INVOLVING THE TRANSFER OF UP TO 500 ACRE-FEET OF WATER FROM MONTAGUE WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT TO THE CITY OF MONTAGUE UNDER PERMIT 2452 (APPLICATION 3544)"

Dear Arvin Chi and Lisa Faris:

The Montague Water Conservation District (MWCD) wants to use the Shasta River channel as a conduit to send poor quality remnant water currently pooled in Dwinnell Reservoir to the City of Montague (City) for drinking water. The City has been advised for years by several organizations and salmon advocates that they should seek water elsewhere because delivering Dwinnell water via the river channel would harm the Shasta River, including ESA and California ESA listed Coho salmon.

There are private wells in the Shasta Valley that have been selling water and which would, we believe, sell water to the City. It appears the proposed project was chosen over other feasible sources of water purely because the cost would be less. Therefore, the proposed project is unnecessary. Lower cost for drinking water is not a good reason to harm Shasta River and its Public Trust Resources.

The proposed project would be a bad idea and, in our view, illegal even if there were not alternative water sources for the City. The remnant water pooled in Dwinnell Reservoir is of poor quality, including high water temperature, high nutrient levels creating excessive Biological Oxygen Demand and un-ionized ammonia which is directly toxic to all life. Also, the Reservoir harbors not one but two

species of toxic algae. Releasing that water into the Shasta River can be reasonably expected to result in the "take" of Coho salmon residing in the River, a violation of the ESA and California ESA. Toxic algae by-products released with the water would also constitute a health risk to those coming in contact with the Shasta River or its water

The City and MWCD could have anticipated this situation and should have begun the process months ago. That would have provided the time necessary to develop an EIR which is necessary before the proposed project can be legally approved because the Proposed Project is likely to have significant negative impacts to the environment.

Because Public Trust Resources, including Coho salmon, would be harmed and because no effective mitigations for that harm are feasible or have been proposed, the SWRCB should deny the petition. If the SWRCB nevertheless does approve the petition, it should require testing of the water to be released into Shasta River prior to release and prohibit release when applicable Shasta River water quality standards would be violated.

A copy of this comment letter is also attached. Please keep us informed of any developments with respect to the Proposed Project and please send a copy of the SWRCB's decision on this petition to Felice Pace via email to Unofelice@gmail.com.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

Felice Pace, Coalition Contractor

Coalition Member Organizations

Community Clean Water Institute; Forest Unlimited; Friends of Del Norte; Friends of the Eel River; Friends of Green Valley Creek, Friends of the Gualala; Friends of the Navarro Watershed; Institute for Conservation Advocacy, Research and Education; Institute for Fisheries Resources; Klamath Forest Alliance; Living Rivers Council, Maacama Watershed Alliance; Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Save Mark West Creek; Sonoma County Water Coalition; Sonoma Ecology Center; Willits Environmental Ctr; Willets/Outlet Creek Watershed Group