

IE Interested Entities and Individuals

IE 01 01

Comment noted.

IE 02 01

Comment noted.

IE 03 01

See response to CO 01 01. See also responses to CO 01 02 and SL 05 02.

IE 04 01

Information has been added to describe the fish barrier net at the end of the Fish sections in chapters 3 and 4. The boat docks will be modified under mitigation for recreation and access would be available.

IE 05 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 05 02

See response to CO 01 01.

IE 05 03

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 05 04

Comment noted.

IE 06 01

Comment noted.

IE 07 01

Comment noted.

IE 08 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to SL 05 02.

IE 08 02

The deadline for comments on the DEIS was extended until April 11, 2003.

IE 09 01

Comment noted.

IE 10 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to CO 02 01.

IE 11 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 11 02

See response to SL 05 02.

IE 11 03

See response to ID 02 02.

IE 12 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 13 01

See response to CO 01 01. See also response to CO 01 02.

IE 14 01

See responses to CO 01 01 and CO 01 02.

IE 15 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 15 02

Loss of recreational opportunity is addressed in Chapter 4, Economics, Regional/Local Economy, under Recreation Days and in Chapter 4, Recreation, under Recreation Visits.

IE 15 03

See response to ID 02 02.

IE 15 04

See response to SL 05 02.

IE 15 05

The deadline for comments on the DEIS was extended until April 11, 2003.

IE 16 01

Comment noted.

IE 17 01

Comment noted.

IE 18 01

Comment noted.

IE 19 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to CO 02 01.

IE 20 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 20 02

See responses to CO 01 02 and ID 02 02.

IE 21 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 22 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 23 01

Comment noted.

IE 24 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 25 01

Comment noted.

IE 26 01

Comment noted. See also response to CO 01 02.

IE 27 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to SL 05 02.

IE 28 01

Comment noted.

IE 28 02

See response to ID 05 02.

IE 28 03

See response to CO 01 01.

IE 28 04

See responses to:

- 1. SL 03 05
- 2. CO 01 02
- 3. Table 4-13
- 4. ID 02 22
- 5. Comment noted.
- 6. Comment noted.

IE 29 01

Comment noted.

IE 30 01

See responses to CO 02 01 and CO 01 02.

IE 31 01

Comment noted.

IE 32 01

Comment noted.

IE 33 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 34 01

Comment noted.

IE 35 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 36 01

Comment noted.

IE 37 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 38 01

Comment noted.

IE 38 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 39 01

See response to CO 01 01. Estimates of total numbers of returning adult salmon as a result of this Action Alternative have not been determined. See also ID 02 06.

IE 39 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 39 03

Loss in generation for both the PUDs and the FCRPS is due to spill requirements during draft. During the migration, the mainstem projects are required to spill a certain percentage of their flow. During September through November when Banks Lake is refilling, there is no spill requirement on the mainstem. The loss in

generation is due to this difference in additional power generated during draft, and generation lost during refill. Estimated costs range from \$966,871 for the FCRPS and up to \$451,700 for the Mid Columbia Projects.

IE 39 04

See response to CO 02 01. Also, refer to Grand Coulee Project Hydroelectric Authority, table 4-13, page 102.

IE 39 05

This question is impossible to answer, and definitions of words are open to individual interpretation.

IE 39 06

See response to IE 39 01.

IE 40 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 41 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 42 01

Comment noted.

IE 43 01

See response to CO 01 01. See also response to CO 01 02.

IE 44 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to SL 05 02

IE 45 01

Comment noted.

IE 46 01

Comment noted.

IE 47 01

Comment noted.

IE 48 01

Comment noted.

IE 49 01

Comment noted.

IE 50 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 51 01

Comment noted.

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 51 02

See response to SL 03 05.

IE 52 01

Comment noted.

IE 53 01

Comment noted.

IE 54 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 55 01

Comment noted.

IE 56 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 57 01

Comment noted. See also response to CO 01 02.

IE 58 01

Comment noted.

IE 59 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 60 01

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 60 02

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 60 03

Comment noted.

IE 61 01

Comment noted.

IE 62 01

Comment noted.

IE 63 01

See responses to CO 01 02 and CO 02 01.

IE 64 01

Comment noted.

IE 64 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 65 01

Comment noted.

IE 65 02

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 65 03

Comment noted.

IE 66 01

Comment noted.

IE 67 01

Comment noted.

IE 68 01

See document changes in the vegetation, fish, and wildlife sections in Chapters 3 and 4.

IE 68 02

See document changes in Chapters 3 and 4 on fish.

IE 68 03

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 68 04

See response to CO 01 01.

IE 69 01

Comment noted.

IE 70 01

See response to ID 02 02.

IE 71 01

Comment noted.

IE 72 01

Comment noted.

IE 72 02

See response to ID 05 02. Also, Reclamation provided public notice of the hearings in local newspapers through press releases and provided a website for additional information.

IE 73 01

Comment noted.

IE 74 01

Comment noted.

IE 75 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to ID 02 02 and SL 05 02.

IE 76 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 76 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 76 03

Comment noted.

IE 77 01

Comment noted.

IE 78 01

Comment noted.

IE 78 02

Review and discussion of other causes of salmon jeopardy is outside the scope of this document.

IE 78 03

See response to SL 07 29.

IE 78 04

See response to CO 01 01.

IE 79 01

Comment noted.

IE 79 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 80 01

Comment noted.

IE 81 01

Comment noted.

IE 82 01

See response to CO 01 02. See also response to CO 02 01.

IE 83 01

See response to SL 05 02. See also response to CO 01 02.

IE 84 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 85 01

Comment noted.

IE 86 01

See response to CO 01 02. Sun Banks' location makes it vulnerable to boat docks being out of water in a drawdown. As the need for future drawdowns of various depths had been anticipated, Reclamation encouraged the Sun Banks Resort to find a different location on which to build.

IE 86 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 86 03

A September drawdown does not meet the need for enhanced flows during the month of August. Reclamation has committed to mitigating impact to recreation by modifying existing recreation facilities on public lands to allow their use during times of lower water.

See also response to ID 02 02.

IE 87 01

Comment noted.

IE 88 01

Comment noted

IE 88 02

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 88 03

Comment noted.

IE 89 01

Comment noted.

IE 90 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 90 02

See response to SL 05 02.

IE 91 01

Comment noted.

IE 92 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 93 01

Comment noted.

IE 94 01

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 95 01

Comment noted.

IE 95 02

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 95 03

Comment noted.

IE 96 01

Comment noted.

IE 96 02

See responses to CO 01 01 and SL 03 05.

IE 96 03

As stated in response ID 02 02, the purpose of this EIS is to evaluate the impacts of a drawdown to the resources of Banks Lake, not to evaluate other potential sources of water. If there is a reasonable expectation of not being able to refill

during early September, then the drawdown would not take place during that year. The Action Alternative proposes refill to elevation 1570 feet by September 22.

IE 97 01

See response to CO 01 02 and CO 01 01.

IE 98 01

See response to CO 01 01 and SL 03 05.

IE 98 02

See response to CO 01 02.

IE 98 03

See response to CO 02 01.

IE 99 01

Comment noted.