

Federal Agencies—Regional or Local Levels — FA

Responses to Comments

The table on page 5 provides the list of those commenting in distribution list order, with the page number of the comment document and the first page of the response shown in the table. The responses to the comments follow here.

FA Federal Agencies

FA 01 01

An extended refill was evaluated, but impacts were considered to be too severe, and, therefore, it was not carried forward into detailed studies. See the “Alternatives Considered but Eliminated” section in chapter 2.

FA 01 02

Document was changed. References to “anadromous fish under ESA” have been changed to “Snake River juvenile fall chinook.”

Your suggestion pertaining to survival of Hanford Reach juvenile fall chinook was considered but determined not to be part of the purpose and need of this action.

FA 01 03

The Biological Opinion for the Operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System (NMFS 2001) has been incorporated by reference into this EIS. Additional citations have been added to the T&E section of Chapter 4 to incorporate this additional reference material.

FA 01 04

Power studies have been redone to show monthly impacts. Power rates provided by BPA indicate that August energy cost is less than September energy cost. To assess incremental benefits, it is necessary to compare the Action Alternative to the No Action Alternative. Please see chapter 4, Economics section, Hydropower Resources.

FA 01 05

See response to FA 01 02.

FA 01 06

See response to FA 01 02.

FA 01 07

Changes were made as requested in this comment.

FA 01 08

Document has been corrected.

FA 01 09

Changes were made in the text as suggested.

FA 01 10

Document has been corrected.

FA 01 11

See response to FA 01 02.

FA 01 12

Changes were made in the text.

FA 01 13

The section was rewritten and much of the original text was deleted.

FA 01 14

Changes were made in the text as suggested.

FA 01 15

See response to FA 01 03.

FA 01 16

Changes were made in the text.

FA 01 17

See response to FA 01 03.

FA 02 01

The new tables have been included in the report. See also FA 01 01.

FA 02 02

Removal of warm water from FDR Lake through the use of Banks Lake pumping facilities has been suggested as a means of cooling downstream releases to the Columbia River. This project is not expected to substantially change the potential use of Banks Lake pumping facilities for managing the temperature of Grand Coulee releases to the Columbia River downstream. Modeling tools to evaluate this option are not currently available.

FA 02 03

See response to FA 02 01.

FA 02 04

See text for a revised analysis.

FA 02 05

There are no downstream dams from Banks Lake; all water is utilized in the irrigation system of the Columbia Basin Project. Return flows from the CBP are delayed long enough to be unpredictable from a temperature standpoint in the Columbia River. Even though several water bodies within the CBP have been listed for temperature exceedence, water temperature is not a problem for the irrigators using CBP water. In fact, during certain times of the year, the temperature is an advantage. Releases of water from Banks Lake to the irrigation delivery system does not affect the Columbia River.

FA 03 01

No response required.

FA 04 01

No response required.