Response to Comments from Debbie MacNeil

MACN-2: This comment appears to be related to allocation of costs to project beneficiaries, which is outside the scope of the DEIS. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4(b)). As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-5, “Potential Project Financing,” an updated cost allocation were included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report. This comment was included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

Water operations at Shasta Dam and Reservoir are described in DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3, “Action Alternatives.” As described, Shasta Dam is operated in conjunction with other CVP facilities and SWP facilities to manage floodwater, storage of surplus winter runoff for irrigation in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys, M&I use, maintenance of navigation flows, protection and conservation of fish in the Sacramento River and Delta, and generation of hydroelectric energy. A series of rules and regulations in the form of flood control requirements, flow requirements, water quality requirements, and water supply commitments governs operations at Shasta Dam. Federal and State laws, regulations, standards, and plans regulating Shasta Dam operations are described in detail in DEIS Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Section 6.2, “Regulatory Framework.”


MACN-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response WASR-1, “Eligibility of the McCloud River as a Federal Wild and Scenic River,” Master Comment Response WASR-6, “Protections of the Lower
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McCloud River as Identified in the California Public Resources Code, Section 5093.542,” and Master Comment Response WASR-8, “Effects to the Eligibility of Rivers for Inclusion in the Federal Wild and Scenic River System.”


MACN-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir,” and Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

33.11.130  David MacNeil

Response to Comments from David MacNeil

MACNE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”


33.11.131 Joan Manning

From: JManning <jmanningsnowcrest.net>
Date: Fri, Aug 2, 2013 at 3:40 PM
Subject: Shasta Dam
To: kchow@usbr.gov

Dear Ms Chow,

MANN-1 I understand there could be about 1420 jobs created in the raising of Shasta Dam. Can you tell me what kind of jobs they would be and how long they might last?

Thank you very much.

Joan Manning

Response to Comments from Joan Manning
MANN-1: Thank you for your comment related to potential employment supported by a Shasta Dam enlargement. Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-2, “Effects on Short-term and Long-term Employment.”
33.11.132 Philip G. Marquis

July 1, 2013

Ms. Katrina Chow
Project Manager
Reclamation, Planning Division
Bureau of Reclamation
2830 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95829-1893

Dear Ms. Chow:

Raising the level of Shasta Lake by increasing the height of the dam certainly represents a potential for more water storage, however, I believe it is beset by several problems that must be addressed.

MARQ-1

1. In the 10 years we have been visiting and living in Shasta County, I can only remember one year when the rainfall was sufficient to almost fully fill the lake. Raising the dam would not alter the weather patterns and thus would not result in any additional water being stored since it does not appear that the rain and runoff is sufficient to presently fill the lake. I would want to see reliable projections that would show the lake will actually rise.

MARQ-2

2. There are many water service agencies in our area around Redding, CA that have varying water rights. This results in water supply guarantees for some that assure 100% of their allocation of water, no matter how much water is stored in the lake. Other agencies may pay the price of unequal allocations by having their allocations more severely curtailed during drought periods. Unless the raising of Shasta Dam insures 100% allocations for all water agencies around Shasta Lake dependent on the water stored in Shasta Lake, there is no point in raising the dam.

MARQ-3

3. Raising Shasta Dam will only intensify the demand for water to be shipped to southern California and the grab for this additional water, whether a raised dam can produce it or not, will intensify. Therefore, if the dam is ultimately raised, there must be a limit on the amount of water that can be sent elsewhere until the needs of the water agencies around Shasta Lake dependent on the water stored in Shasta Lake are first satisfied.

MARQ-4

4. Raising Shasta Dam has many adverse effects upon the land and infrastructure around the dam, and I'm fairly confident that these will be addressed in any plan or by the subsequent lawsuits to be filed such that adverse effects will be fully addressed. Nevertheless, the water rights of the existing water service agencies around Shasta Lake dependent on water stored in Shasta Lake must be written into the plan and subsequent enabling legislation in such a manner as to make the allocations not capable of being challenged by any means.
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5. Raising the level of Shasta Dam will increase the law enforcement requirements of the lake and the costs associated with this increase must be provided for in the plan.

I appreciate your taking the time to at least read these concerns and hope to see them included in the issues to be addressed in the full plan.

Thank You

Sincerely,

Philip G. Marquis
11707 Homestead Lane
Redding, CA 96003

Cc: David Coxey
Bella Visa Water District
11368 East Stillwater Way
Redding, CA 96003-9510

Response to Comments from Philip G. Marquis

MARQ-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”


MARQ-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

MARQ-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

MARQ-5: Increased law enforcement needs of an enlarged Shasta Dam are presented in Chapter 22, “Public Services,” Section 22.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”
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33.11.133  Shirley Martin

Public Comment Card

Name: Shirley Martin  Organization: Home owner
Address: 202352 Lakeview Dr, Lake Almanor, CA 96020
Email: doyleshirley@comcast.com

I am very opposed to all proposals to raise the dam. It is too expensive and millions already spent on proposals. The lake is over 100 feet lower than the crest and rarely filled. A higher dam will not create more rain. Fish are being valued over lives of homeowners and businesses. Southern Calif. needs to manage its own water use. I live on a golf course, swimming pool, spa, own dam, consider desalinization plants to process sea water. A spokesperson for “the tunnels” proposal said that at times that project would drain Lake Shasta as it is. This project would take my home as well as my neighbor’s home. We have invested our lives in our homes and property and it should not be taken for such an unreliable project. Too many roads, bridges, railroads, bridges, private property and businesses would be destroyed. VOTE NO!

Response to Comments from Shirley Martin

MART-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

MART-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

MART-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”


MART-5: Although the BDCP is considered for the purposes of qualitatively evaluating potential cumulative impacts of the SLWRI, as mentioned in Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” further speculation on implementation of the BDCP or similar programs is not required by NEPA. However, Reclamation does not agree that the Delta Conveyance tunnels would “drain Shasta Lake.” Delta Conveyance would not control the operations at Shasta Dam and any future operations of Shasta Dam and Reservoir would be consistent with pertinent regulatory requirements, contracts and agreements.
MART-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

33.11.134 Ernest D. Martin

Response to Comments from Ernest D. Martin

MARTI-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
**MARTI-2:** Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”


**MARTI-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

**33.11.135 Corinne Matson**

**Response to Comments from Corinne Matson**

**MATS-1:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General.”

**MATS-2:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”


**MATS-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

MATS-6: The SLWRI poster titled “Major Features Associated with Shasta Enlargement (6.5 feet to 18.5 feet),” used at the September 2013 Public Hearings has been updated to correct the road label. The updated map has been uploaded to Reclamation’s web site. The PowerPoints and posters from the Public Workshops and Hearings are available on the Reclamation website at http://www.usbr.gov/mp/slwri/documents.html.

33.11.136 Rob McDonald

MCDO-1

We don't need to raise the dam, what we need are desalination plants, or my idea cooling towers that pump deep cold salt water up into them, and condense fresh water out of the air. Then pump that water into Shasta Lake to distribute throughout California! Simple, you don't need to raise the dam! Raising the dam is a stupid idea, and some people are willing to do a stupid idea just to bring some jobs to the area!

Response to Comments from Rob McDonald

33.11.137  Michael McLaughlin

Response to Comments from Michael McLaughlin

MCLA-1: These impacts are addressed in Impact BOT-5, “Loss of General Vegetation Habitats” in Chapter 12, “Botanical Resources and Wetlands” and in Impact Wild-13, “Permanent Loss of General Wildlife Habitat,” in Chapter 13, “Wildlife Resources,” of the EIS. In addition, mitigation measures were revised and/or enhanced to include efforts to protect and enhance habitat and associated biological resources.

MCLA-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

33.11.138  Randall McNames

Coordination of Dam raising with Shasta County Regs

Randall McNames <mcnaievich@att.net>
Reply-To: Randall McNames <mcnaievich@att.net>
To: "kchow@usbr.gov" <kchow@usbr.gov>
Cc: "marcb@biosearchtech.com" <marcb@biosearchtech.com>, "mcramer@co.shasta.ca.us"

Katrina Chow:

Thanks for being at a couple of the outreach presentations I attended. The most recent one was about a month ago in Lakehead, CA. You asked that comments regarding the Draft EIR be submitted by the end of September. I have a concern about which I don’t have any resolution when I read both the Feasibility Study and the EIR.

My house is located at 20648 Cedar Dr. in Lakehead. My back yard backs up to Forestry land at the edge of the lake. I have determined from the survey that I am above the inundation mark should the dam be raised 18.5 feet. So I believe I will be spared from the relocation process because of the proposed raise in water level.

HOWEVER! I see that Shasta County regulations require that any septic tank leach field must be located at least 200 feet from the edge of a fixed body of water (Shasta Lake) in Shasta County. Your documentation does not mention this fact and the impact it will have on the residents who are above the inundation level, but whose leach lines are still within 200 feet of the proposed new lake level. What will happen to us? Will the houses be red tagged by the county? Will we be grandfathered? I see many residents TODAY in low lying areas that are closer than 200 from the present full water level. How will this issue be addressed?

I think you need to add an explanation in your Real Estate Appendix about how people in my situation will be affected us per Shasta County regulations. Please investigate this matter with appropriate Shasta County personnel, then add it to your report. You might contact Marc Kramer (Marc Kramer [mcramer@co.shasta.ca.us]) at Shasta County for further information.

Thanks,
Randall McNames
20648 Cedar Dr.
Lakehead, CA 96051

Response to Comments from Randall McNames

MCNA-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-11, “Inundation Zone/ Reservoir Buffer.”

MCNA-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response LANDUSE-1, “Relocation of Septic Systems and Leach Fields.”

MCNA-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response LANDUSE-1, “Relocation of Septic Systems and Leach Fields.”
Response to Comments from Melanie McPherson

MCPH-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
Response to Comments from Stefanie Messina

MESS-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”


MESS-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
33.11.141 William Miesse

No DAM raising please

William Miesse <montagne@snowcrest.net> Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 10:05 PM
To: BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov

Dear BOR

Raising the Shasta dam floods sacred land and private land, it's a taking and an insult heaped upon insult -

all because the growers and cities refuse to use conservation skills.

Please no raise dam.

Thanks, Bill Miesse

Mount Shasta

PS Here's a quote from Joaquin Miller in the introduction to his 1881 novel "Shadows of Shasta" which he wrote in response to seeing Indian children in chains being sent to the reservations:

J. M. ShadowsBones.jpg
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spicious fact, that no one who would be remembered in this century should forget. We are making dreadful history, dreadfully fast. How terrible it will all read when the writer and reader of these lines are long since forgotten! Ages may roll by. We may build a city over every dead tribe’s bones. We may bury the last Indian deep as the eternal gulf. But these records will remain, and will rise up in testimony against us to the last day of our race.

J. M.

Response to Comments from William Miesse

MIES-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”


MIES-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

MIES-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
Response to Comments from Herbert W. Mitchell

MITC-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
Response to Comments from Pam Morgan

MORG1-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses,” and Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
Response to Comments from Pam Morgan

MORG2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”
Katrina Chow - Project Manager
US Bureau of Reclamation
Planning Division,
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

September 5, 2013
Comments: Shasta Dam Raise DEIS

Dear Bureau of Reclamation,

Please consider the following comments on the Shasta Dam Raise DEIS.

I am very concerned about the proposal to raise the height of Shasta Dam by 6.5-18.5 feet.

Although your draft feasibility study found such an undertaking would be "technically and environmentally feasible," as well as "economically justified," this project could require more than $1 billion in taxpayer funds and there is significant evidence that runs contrary to your findings.

Briefly put: raising Shasta Dam would provide a small benefit at a great cost. If plans are approved to raise Shasta Dam by 18.5 feet, which BoR found to be the most economical option, statewide water storage capacity would expand by only 1.5%. The creation of 76,000 acre-feet of firm yield would add less than 0.2% of agricultural and urban water use per year in California.

Dams don't create water – they merely capture rain and snowmelt – and the firm yield reliably produced on an annual basis depends on annual rainfall. The hypothetical firm yield of water produced from the 6.5-foot raise ranges from 20,000 to 72,000 acre-feet. The hypothetical firm yield of the 18.5-foot raise is 71,000-146,000 acre-feet. In comparison, if farmers producing low-value alfalfa were to conserve a mere five percent of the water they consume, it would save nearly one million-acre feet of water. Conservation is a much better alternative.

Another stated objective of raising the dam is to "increase survival of anadromous fish populations in the upper Sacramento River." Ironically, Shasta Dam prevents Chinook salmon from reaching the cold-water streams where these fish naturally breed. Funds would be better spent building a fish ladder around Shasta Dam.

An analysis conducted by Golden Gate Salmon Association and the Natural Resources Defense Council found that the target salmon population put forth by state and federal government is only at 20% of historic populations. Why not...
Response to Comments from Paul Moss


MOSS1-2: The SLWRI DEIS does not include evaluations related to economic feasibility because it is not required under NEPA. Accordingly, the DEIS does not identify a “most economical” alternative. As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-2, “Comments Related to the SLWRI Feasibility Report,” evaluations...
related to economic feasibility were included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report.


MOSS1-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response WASR-1, “Eligibility of the McCloud River as a Federal Wild and Scenic River.”

MOSS1-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses,” and Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MOSS1-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

MOSS1-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

33.11.146  Roxann Mulvey

To: BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov
Cc: winnememwintutribe@gmail.com

Dear Ms. Chow,

As a Park Ranger, Environmental Planner, and a mother, I understand the importance of healthy ecosystems. As a human being I understand that we have lost much in losing our cultures, through immigration, exile, etc. The indigenous cultures have a right, and a responsibility, to practice what they know. I believe they help us all.

We must honor the rights of the native people to practice their cultures on their homeland. And we must take care of the rivers, the salmon, and the earth, for all our sakes and the sakes of our children.

Please do not raise the Shasta Dam.

Thank you,
Roxann Mulvey
PO Box 684
Mariposa, CA 95338
209-742-3834

Response to Comments from Roxann Mulvey

MULV-1: Comment noted.

MULV-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

MULV-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General.”

MULV-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation 2800 Cottage Way, MP–720
Sacramento, California 95825

Re: Public Comments on the SLWRI DEIS

Dear Ms. Chow,

I am writing in regards to the proposed raising of the Shasta Dam in Redding, California. While the motives of raising the dam for increased water reserves is a good reason, I feel we must find other means to secure our water resources which doesn’t necessarily mean increasing our capability to store more water. I believe a better way to ensure a reliable supply of our natural resources is to be more responsible in our consumption. To the common resident of California, little is understood about how their water is delivered to them and where it comes from. I believe that if we took the money that would be spent to expand the dam, and use it in an education campaign to educate California residents about the how water is stored, delivered, and how we are dependent on a natural system that can only support a finite amount of use, we can generate more security for our water resources than simply expanding our water capacity. With this strategy, we strengthen our security through the spread of knowledge.

I must also base my argument against the project on the potential losses of the native tribe of the Winnemem Wintu. If this project goes forward, the last remaining ceremonial lands of the Winnemem Wintu will be flooded, destroyed, and turned to the bare, ugly land that can currently be seen when the lake waters recede.

The stories of the disenfranchised are seldom heard, let alone considered, and the Native Americans of Northern California have a long painful history of being marginalized and ignored. The natives tribe of the McCloud river and its neighboring watersheds have already experienced great loss when the dam was first build. They lost homes, ceremonial lands, and burial grounds where their mothers and fathers rested in the ground were desecrated and flooded for the sake of maintaining the proverbial cornucopia that was California’s abundant farming resources. Today, we again look to further our dept to the ecosystem services of California, to get more water from these systems that are not naturally prepared to deliver to us, and again we do it while letting our fellow residence suffer anonymously and quietly. When these ceremonial grounds used by the Winnemem Wintu are destroyed, the Winnemem Wintu will not just lose more land. Once again, they will lose a tangible element of their history, they...
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Response to Comments from David Murphy


MURP-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

MURP-3: Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6, “Areas of Controversy,” of the DEIS acknowledges that Native American concerns and cultural resources remain an area of controversy. The U.S. Congress will use this Final EIS, the related Final Feasibility Report, and supporting information, as well as any additional information they believe appropriate, to determine the public interest in the project, and the form scope of project authorization (if any). As this Final EIS chapter includes public and agency comments received on the DEIS, and responses to each of these comments, these decision makers will have a full characterization of the public interests.

As stated in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.1.1, “Project Purpose and Objectives” of the Final EIS, the Project purpose is to improve operational flexibility of the Delta watershed system to meet specified primary and secondary project objectives including increasing survival of anadromous fish populations in the Sacramento River and increasing...
water supply and water supply reliability for agricultural, M&I, and environmental purposes, to help meet current and future water demands (primary objectives); and to conserve, restore and enhance ecosystem resources in the Shasta Lake area and the upper Sacramento River, reduce flood damage downstream, develop additional hydropower generation capabilities at Shasta Dam, maintain and increase recreation opportunities at Shasta Lake and maintain or improve water quality conditions downstream (secondary objectives). The DEIS examines the full range of impacts on the human environment of five action alternatives and a no action alternative.

Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” identifies impacts from inundation of Traditional Cultural Properties and Sacred Land Filings, which include Winnemem Wintu places of traditional, ceremonial, and sacred uses. See “Impact Culture-2” in Section 14.3.4, “Mitigation Measures,” for “CP1,” “CP2,” “CP3,” “CP4,” and “CP5,” are identified as significant and unavoidable, with no feasible mitigation identified.

Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-15, “National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultations.”

**MURP-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources,” and Master Comment Response CR-5, “Environmental Justice.”

Response to Comments from Dan Bacher on Behalf of Northern California Anglers Association

NCAP-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”
Response to Comments from Jeff Nelson

NELS-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

NELS-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”
33.11.150 Marc Newman

To whom it may concern,

I oppose this project as it will obliterate sacred grounds of local natives, and I know bureaucrats look at Native people with disdain but let's look at some obvious truths... These are indigenous people to this land and have been forced from there lands, hunting grounds, sacred burial grounds, and the grounds for their religious ceremonies. I firmly believe this sort of action needs to stop!!!

Marc Newman
Shasta Lake Ca.

Response to Comments from Marc Newman

Please do not raise Shasta Dam

John Nishio <jnnishio@gmail.com>  
Fri, Sep 27, 2013 at 1:07 PM

To: BOR-MPR-SLWR1@usbr.gov

Katrina Chow  
Project Manager  
Reclamation, Planning Division  
2800 Cottage Way  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

Dear Ms. Chow:

Please do not recommend that we raise Shasta Dam.

The amount of water that will be available from raising the dam is insignificant compared to our overall usage. Simple conservation will readily make up for the maximal amount that might be stored on a wet year.

The damage to Native American land is too great to proceed with raising the dam. The Winnemem Wintu lost much of their sacred land when the original reservoir flooded lands behind the existing Shasta Dam. Today, the Winnemem Wintu fight for access of the non-flooded areas, and the US Government, USFS in particular, has been harassing the tribe for attempting to conduct ceremonies on their land.

We cannot allow such treatment of a tribe.
Response to Comments from John Nishio


NISH-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

John N. Nishio, Ph.D., President
+1 530.588.0795
nishio@sol-dance.com
**NISH-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

**NISH-5:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”