

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
1	Adrea Bezdicek	General supporting comments: "I would like to see the Lincoln County Passive Rehydration Project looked into further and possibly put to use." (<i>Additional comment on attached sheet.</i>)	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
2	Jim Bauer	General comment: "With the economic situation the state is in and the federal government as well, why don't they just shut down the deep well irrigators and solve the problem at the source."	Comment noted
3	Clint Campbell	General supporting comments: "I believe that the Odessa aquifer needs to be rehydrated to help farmers keep their crops growing in an ever increasing dry area. The extra water would help create a micro climate that would increase rainfall around the area making the local crops that much more productive which would in turn help the economy."	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
4	Everett and Karen Cole, EKCO Ranchers	Numerous concerns regarding impact to there property: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increased stream flows will cut ranch in half through the Tracy Meadow area; 2) Increased water in creek may lead to regulating cows away from the creek for water quality standards, possibly causing removal of cattle and loss of winter feeding and calving area; 3) Project will cause some ground to be lost for alfalfa production of 2 ton per acre; 4) Upper feed lot may be inundated and not be available for use; 5) Lower feed lot may be lost due to proximity of stream; 6) Water conveyed from Lake Roosevelt may have nonnative plant seeds casing problems with noxious weed laws; 7) New stream flows will bring recreation seekers, thus causing problems with trespassers; 8) Increase of recreational users can bring increase of noxious weed issues from transport on vehicles, equipment, etc.; 9) Increase recreational users would drastically increase probability of range fires; 10) Their driveway to lower ranch would need to be relocated, and a culvert near house would need to be replaced with a bridge or larger culvert; 11) Fencing will be required to keep cattle from stream. 	Comment noted. These concern's will be addressed with the property owner during Feasibility Phase when property owner agreements are developed.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		Everett's have concern that the project may jeopardize their 100 year old ranch operation.	
5	Robert Derkey	General Supporting Comments: "Funding for this study, I feel has an excellent chance for success. That success could revitalize an area that could then continue to contribute to the economic well-being of the state." Other comments supporting geologic viability of project. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
6	Dale Deife, Deife Farms	General supporting comments: "I am writing in support of the Lincoln County Passive Rehydration Project. I live and operate an irrigated farm in the Odessa area. I believe that the Rehydration Project is a great way to recharge the Odessa aquifer." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
7	Mark DeWulf, Brock Carpenter, McGuiire & DeWulf, P.S.	General supporting comment: "I am absolutely in favor of the Passive Rehydration Project. In my experience in dealing with my clients, there is a shortage of water in the area. The geographic area in which this pre-feasibility study was performed is in dire need of water to correct or at least help correct the problem of the declining water table and over allocation of water in the Odessa subarea in general and in the Lake Creek drainage specifically." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
8	Drew Fink	General supporting comment: "I personally would like to see this rehydration project come to pass..., I don't know if this project will solve all our problems for the area, but it would be nice to see water in Pacific Lake again." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
9	Leslie Fink	General supporting comments: "After reading over the information on the website, it is important to continue to look into replenishing the surface and groundwater in the Odessa Sub area. We cannot go back to the "could have, should have" but instead move forward to solutions that will benefit the area farmers, recreation, wildlife, etc.". <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
10	Neil Fink	General supporting comments: "I would like to express my support of the Lincoln County Passive Rehydration Project." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
11	Steven Fink	General supporting comments: "I believe it is in everybody's	Positive supporting comment. No response required.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		best interest to continue with the rehydration plan.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	
12	GWMA	General Supporting comments: “We support the proposed pilot project concept to evaluate the effectiveness of rehydration as proposed in the reports.” - We suggest that watershed small storage and other proposed improvements within the selected watershed could easily enhance the effectiveness of surface storage and passive rehydration potential. - We encourage the State Legislature and the State DOE to favorably consider the request for temporary and potential permanent water rights from the Columbia River. We recognize the Columbia River as the only significant source of water available to address these water issue needs. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
13	Kris Hubbard	We do not want to stand in the way of the Passive Rehydration Project but, the economic loss to our ranch and cost of restructuring would catastrophic, if it ran through our ranch. With this in mind, we would support - piping the water past us, and delivering it into Z Lake, below our ranch.	Comment noted. These concern’s will be addressed with the property owner during Feasibility Phase when property owner agreements are developed.
14	Clark Kagle	General comments supporting the work the GWMA has done and the need to move forward with the feasibility phase of the project. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
15	Matthew Kagele	General supporting comments: “I would like write in support of this project. I do realize that this one project alone will not recharge the aquifers by itself. However, this project could be just what we need to get the ball rolling for the start of other projects to bring water across this sub-area in all of the other channels. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
16	Joanne Keller	General supporting comments: “As a Tax paying Land Owner, you have my sincere support in asking to work to improve the ground water supply to the Odessa Lincoln, Adams County, area.... As advised in the currant publication of the Odessa Record, please accept a resounding affirmative to the request for action to solving this problem. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
17	Alex King	General supporting comment: “ Please start the rehydration process for Lincoln County.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
18	Faye King	General Comment supporting the findings of the report and recommendation to “fast track” this project as soon as possible. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
19	Wes King	General Supporting comment: “Please start the rehydration process. If our ranch loses its water supply it will definitely decrease our tax base and land values.”	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
20	Clinton Knight	General supporting comments: “I am writing to express my support of the Lincoln County Passive Rehydration Project.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
21	Marcella Knight	General supporting comment: “I would like to see this project move forward. I see great potential benefits for community members and visitors.”	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
22	Lincoln County Board of County Commissioners	General Supporting comments: “We support the proposed pilot project concept to evaluate the effectiveness of rehydration as proposed in the reports.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
23	Lincoln County EDC	General supporting comment: “On January 20 th , 2011 the Board of Directors of the Lincoln County Economic Development Council voted unanimously to support moving forward with the Feasibility Study and Pilot Testing Program in 2011.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
24	Mayor Doug Plinski, Town of Odessa	General supporting comments: “ I commend you and your team for the excellent explanations and presentations throughout Lincoln County regarding the Passive Rehydration project. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
25	Robert McKee	General supporting comments	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
26	Keith Nelson	General supporting comments: “Lincoln County Passive Rehydration is a good project. If Passive Rehydration can help this area it is a good use of money spent. This project hopefully will mitigate some of the damage done by irrigation.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
27	Tom Null	General supporting comments	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
28	Odessa Chamber of Commerce	General supporting comments: “ The Odessa Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its members, would like to convey its support for the additional study of the feasibility of rehydrating the Odessa subaquifer. We support moving forward with the feasibility study and with efforts to determine the best way to achieve rehydration of the Lake Creek System.” <i>(Additional</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		<i>comment on attached sheet.)</i>	
29	Darrel Parsons	Numerous comments documenting concerns with the project relative to stream flows through owner's property. Concern flows in creek will have unintended environmental consequences to fish habitat in parts of Lake Creek. Also concerned current marsh lands may be flooded beyond what is useful for waterfowl raising of their young. Increased stream flows may also prevent usage of ranch land on the north side of Lake Creek. Skeptic of project success. Concern's outlined in more detailed in attached sheet.	Comment noted. These concern's will be addressed with the property owner during Feasibility Phase when property owner agreements are developed.
30	Harry & Roylin Price	General supporting comments: "After reading the study and reports it appears to us that rehydration via Lake Creek from Lake Roosevelt is the most likely and practical approach. We are (definitely) in favor of this project and look forward to further updates." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
31	Richard Quirk	General supporting comment: "I am in favor of moving ahead on this project".	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
32	Mayor Sherman Johnson, Town of Reardan	General supporting comments: " As mayor of the Town of Reardan, representing the opinions and concerns of our Town Council, we strongly support the Prefeasibility Report and vigorously support the concept of passive rehydration." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
33	George Rodeck	General comments supporting the project as beneficial to farmers, small business, small community governments, schools, churches, recreation, wildlife and to the economy. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
34	Jerry Schafer	General supporting comments. Also recommends construction of small dams. "This is a project that can do so much for the environment, recreation, wildlife enhancement, and a multitude of positive things much needed." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Comment noted
35	Paul Scheller	General supporting comments: "I am writing to show my support of the Passive Rehydration Project in Lincoln County". <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
36	Dennis Schlimmer	General supporting comments to stop declining aquifers and fill lakes.	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
37	Rodney Schlimmer	General supporting comments: "As a Lincoln county land owner who's property includes part of Goetz and Sullivan Lakes in	Positive supporting comment. No response required.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		what is referred to as Marlin Hollow I want to be counted as one in favor of the rehydration plans currently being discussed. Count me in!"	
38	Steve Schmierer	General supporting comments. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
39	Alan Schorzman, Schorzman Farms JV	General supporting comments: "I am writing in support and stress the utmost urgent need to move forward in a positive direction continuing the feasibility assessment studies of engineering, water availability from the BOR, Ecology, or any other potentially available water rights leading to the ultimate objective of delivering water from Lake Roosevelt into the Crab Creek drainage watershed...." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
40	Mary Schorzman	General supporting comments: "The prefeasibility studies of the rehydration of the Crab Creek drainage has the one of the greatest potentials of beginning the reversing of rehydrating the Crab Creek drainage and the aquifer by filling and keeping full all the lakes and streams between the withdrawal discharge point and including Crab Creek." <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
41	Jay Scrupps Farm	General supporting comments. Discusses the properties dropping well levels. Supports benefit of the project to agriculture and wildlife. Discusses benefits to economy. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
42	Lorus Scrupps	General supporting comments. Discusses his dropping wells and has property in Lake Creek drainage on which a 30 acre lake could be refilled. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
43	Sally Siegel	Discussion of ongoing water shortages in the Odessa area. Discusses family farm issues occurring. Concerned of future growth further impairing water supplies without implementing more of the Columbia basin Irrigation Project. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Comment noted. No action required.
44	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Letter submitted documenting the Tribe's interests and concerns that their rights will be affected if the project progresses. Summarized concerns are the affect of project on Tribe's ancestral fishing and water resources. Specifically: 1) Water Quality – the proposed project has the potential to degrade water quality in portions of the Spokane	Comments noted. Most of these questions will be addressed during the feasibility phase of the project, at which time some consultation with the tribe will be conducted over these concerns.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		<p>Tribe’s jurisdiction. Any future feasibility study must analyze water quality effects within the Spokane and Columbia Rivers.</p> <p>2) Water Quantity – the Tribe holds unquantified water rights for both in stream and out of stream purposes in both the Columbia River and Spokane River with a priority date of 1877. The project has the potential to infringe on the Tribe’s rights and the Tribe is very skeptical of all projects within its jurisdiction that claim there is surplus water available.</p> <p>3) The Columbia River Treaty is currently under review. As the Treaty is changed so will water availability for projects such as this one. It is critically important that any future feasibility study analyze water supply issues beyond what may be available currently.</p> <p>4) Fishery – this proposed project has the potential to affect the Tribe’s fishery and any future feasibility studies must adequately address potential negative effects. Additionally, the Tribe is pursuing the reintroduction of anadromous fish above Grand Coulee and any future projects must ensure that future projects will not infringe on this Tribal goal.</p> <p>5) Pollutants in Lake Roosevelt – Lake Roosevelt contains numerous pollutants including, but not limited to metals, uranium mining waste, and PCBs. Any future study should address the potential effects of utilizing contaminated water in an attempt to refill an aquifer, irrigate and add to stream flows. Furthermore, piping polluted water and introducing it via a point source to another location will likely present a variety of permitting issues.</p> <p>6) Cultural Resources – any projects of this scale will need to address cultural impacts off the Reservation. Additionally, Lake elevations changes due to the project may very well affect the numerous cultural sites along the Rivers and affect the stability of the banks along the Rivers. The routing infrastructure needed for this project will have the potential to affect cultural resources and these concerns will need to be</p>	

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		<p>considered during future studies.</p> <p>7) Economic Interests – The Tribe operates the Two Rivers Resort which includes a houseboat rental operation, a marina, a boat launch, RV camping, an amphitheatre for music events and a small casino. Potential lowering of lake elevations from the proposed project that may affect these operations must be part of any future feasibility study.</p> <p><i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i></p>	
45	Richard Teel	The current proposed 24” pipe line is a fraction of the size needed to do any good. ... I don’t feel just because the money is available this small test project should be done....Make this test a size that will actually rehydrate.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Comment noted
46	Chester Templin	General supporting comment. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
47	Alan Voise	General supporting comment: “ Please keep working on the passive rehydration project to get it completed.” <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
48	James Walter	General supporting comment. Discussion on historical reduction of flow in Coal Creek on property. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Positive supporting comment. No response required.
49	John Watson	General comments regarding sinking creek. Passive appears to be a good idea but some concern to spend money on Feasibility Studies without having a good idea where the money would come from to complete the project. <i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i>	Comment noted
50	Dean White - LCCD	1) I could not find much supporting text that describes the fracture zone box in Figures 14-15, 17-18 and 20-25 that runs from southeast to northwest in the Lincoln County. This fracture zone box covers the upper reaches of Lake Creek just south of Highway 2 where surface water from Lake Roosevelt would most likely be introduced Lake Creek, should the pilot project for passive rehydration project proceed forward. What if any affect would the fracture zone have on water introduced to the upper reaches of Lake Creek just south of Highway 2? What affect on hydrogeology, if any, does the fracture zone have on the rest of the county to the southeast towards Sprague Lake?	Edits made in report to clarify questions.

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		<p>2) The two Roza dike/vent boxes shown in Figures 14-15, 17-18 and 20-25 that run from southeast to northwest in the Lincoln County have been drawn using inferences from known Roza dikes/vents that have been found to the southeast of Lincoln County, according to the text on page 14. One Roza dike that has been found in the county at Tavares Lake is located on the figures, but this is the only one noted. Is there more information that helps to support the existence of more Roza dikes that are buried underground and that can't be seen? There seems to be a lot of unknowns about where the actual dikes may be located within the two box areas. How does one infer how continuous or discontinuous the Roza dikes may be within the boxes? Is there well information for wells to the NE and to the SW of the Roza dike boxes that indicate that there are vertical Roza dike barriers affecting the hydrogeology of the wells NE and SW of the Roza dike boxes? The presence (or absence) of Roza flow dikes would appear to be very important for infiltrating water into the lower Wanapum and upper Grande Ronde basalts because any vertical Roza dikes would have to cut up through many feet of basalt below the Roza flow in order to have supplied the basalt for the Roza flow, and could act as a barrier to water moving in the basalt interflow zones from northeast to southwest.</p> <p>3) The text on page 14 mentions that Priest Rapids flow dikes are also inferred to be present in the eastern and north central part of Lincoln County, based on projections from known Priest Rapids dikes to the southeast of the county. However, the two dike boxes listed on Figure 14, the structure contour map for the Priest Rapids flow, are listed as being Roza dike boxes, and the location and extent of these dike boxes are identical to the Roza dike boxes listed in other figures. Are there dikes for the Priest Rapids flow located in the same area as the dikes for the Roza flow? Any dikes for the Priest Rapid flow would cut even higher up through to the uppermost layers of basalt in the county.</p> <p>4) It would be helpful to have an additional full size map with aerial photo base and important roads (Redwine Canyon, Welch Creek, Moonshine Canyon, Copenhaver, and Telford roads along with Highway 2) to give the reader a better idea of where</p>	

LINCOLN COUNTY PASSIVE REHYDRATION PREFEASIBILITY REPORT

COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

Comment Number	Comment Submitted By:	Comment	Comment Response
		<p>the 3 proposed pipe routes and the current preferred Lincoln pipe route option would run. The map in Figure 31 is a little small and hard to follow.</p> <p>5.) The caption for Figure 33, Moonshine Canyon route, mentions that the view is looking SOUTH up the canyon. As far as I can tell, the view appears to be to the <u>NORTH, down</u> Moonshine Canyon toward Lake Roosevelt at the top center of the map photo.</p> <p>6) The caption for Figure 34, Welch Creek Road route, mentions that the view is looking SOUTH up the canyon. As far as I can tell, the view appears to be the NORTH, down Welch Creek Canyon toward Lincoln and Lake Roosevelt at the top center of the map photo. I have been doing well level measuring for the WRIA 53 watershed planning unit in both areas covered by Figure 33 and Figure 34 for the past year, and I recognize both views as looking towards the north towards Lake Roosevelt.</p> <p><i>(Additional comment on attached sheet.)</i></p>	