

COMMENTS ON SPOS'S  
DICK MCCABE

Biota SPOS

Introduction This comment applies to all the sPOS's. In the second paragraph they refer to the Master plan of study. Either that plan has to be updated to reflect the current management of the study by Reclamation or delete this sentence. Ask BR what they are planning on doing.

page 9 first paragraph They have misspelled Cheyenne. They are using the ND name instead of the SD river spelling.

Page 14 second full paragraph. They state they will be identifying the adverse impacts of any interbasin transfer. NEPA requires they evaluate "impact" both adverse and beneficial.

Engineering sPOS No comments

Financial SPOS

Will Warren have a chance to review this?

Page 4 second bullet. Instream flows. Is it a given that those alternatives will have a portion of there costs allocated? Does this mean instream flow rates are definitely going to be included in the alternatives.

Hydrology

P16Hydriky 5 starts by saying "Future water quantity and quality will be modeled for the Red River Basin, as well as for part of the Missouri River Basin. In 5.1 I states that " A separate modeling effort will be done for the Missouri River Basin in cooperation with the COE."

The question is will they do both quantity and quality in the separate modeling effort. They need to state more definitively what they plan on doing on the Missouri River. In the IDT meeting they have discussed a simple modeling approach which needs to be covered in this SPOS

Hydrology 6.2

Is this cumulative effect model the same as what I discussed above?

Needs SPOS

2.2 Is the public scoping discussed here the same as that scoping process which is part of the EIS? If so then delete the reference in 2.2. It is confusing.