
**Northern Integrated Supply Project
Environmental Impact Statement**

Scoping Report

Prepared for:

**U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Omaha District, Wyoming Regulatory Office
Cheyenne, Wyoming**

March 2005

Prepared by:

**ERO Resources Corporation
1842 Clarkson Street
Denver, Colorado 80218
(303) 830-1188**

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1.	Proposed Project	1
1.2.	Applicant’s Preferred Alternative	2
2.	Public Scoping Outreach Activities	2
2.1.	Notice of Intent	3
2.2.	Paid Advertisements	3
2.3.	Scoping Announcement	3
2.4.	Web Sites	4
2.5.	Public Scoping Meetings	5
2.6.	U.S. 287 Public Open House Meeting.....	5
3.	Agency Consultation.....	6
3.1.	Agency Scoping Meeting Summary	6
3.2.	Other Agency Consultation.....	7
3.3.	Cooperating Agencies.....	7
4.	Scoping Results.....	8
4.1.	Methods for Comment Collection and Analysis.....	8
4.2.	Source and Subject of Comments Received	8
4.3.	Summary of Scoping Comments by Subject	9
4.3.1.	Purpose and Need	11
4.3.2.	Alternatives	11
4.3.3.	Suggested Alternatives.....	11
4.3.4.	Reasonably Foreseeable Activities	11
4.3.5.	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (Overall Effects).....	14
4.3.6.	Surface Water Quality.....	14
4.3.7.	Surface Water Flow	14
4.3.8.	Water Rights	14
4.3.9.	Sedimentation	15
4.3.10.	Flooding	15
4.3.11.	Channel Stability and Morphology.....	15
4.3.12.	Dam Safety.....	15
4.3.13.	Aquatic Life	15
4.3.14.	Wildlife	15
4.3.15.	Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Wildlife Species and Colorado Species of Concern.....	16
4.3.16.	Vegetation.....	16
4.3.17.	Land Use	16
4.3.18.	Visual Quality	16
4.3.19.	Recreation Resources.....	16
4.3.20.	Socioeconomic Resources	17
4.3.21.	Wetland and Riparian Resources	17

4.3.22. Cultural Resources	17
4.3.23. Air Quality	18
4.3.24. Other Resources	18
4.3.25. Suggested Mitigation	18
4.3.26. Traffic and Transportation	18
4.3.27. Comments about Process	19
4.4. Rationale for Selecting Significant Issues	20
4.5. Significant Issues to be Considered in the EIS Process	20
4.5.1. Significant Issues	21
5. Summary of Future Actions	22

TABLES

Table 1. Publication and dates of paid advertisements	4
Table 2. Public scoping meetings attendance	5
Table 3. Summary of verbal comments and questions from agency scoping meeting.....	7
Table 4. Number of commenters in each major category.....	10
Table 5. Number of comments in each major category.....	10
Table 6. Suggested alternatives.....	12

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Notice of Intent
Appendix B—Paid Advertisements
Appendix C—Scoping Announcement
Appendix D—Material Presented at Scoping Meetings
Appendix E—Invitation Letter to Agency Scoping Meeting
Appendix F—Summary of Number of Commenters for Each Issue
Appendix G—Agency Comments
Appendix H—Public Comments
Appendix I—Material Presented at U.S. 287 Open House

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP or Project), a regional water supply project designed to serve current and future water needs of several towns and communities in Larimer, Weld, and Boulder counties. Scoping is an early and open public process for determining issues to be addressed by the EIS and for identifying alternatives and the significant issues related to a proposed action. This report documents the results of the public scoping phase of the EIS.

Scoping began on August 20, 2004, with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. The notice indicated the Corps' intent to prepare an EIS on the proposed project, briefly discussed the project, and provided dates and times of the scoping meetings. The notice stated that public scoping comments would be most effective if postmarked, sent via facsimile, or e-mailed no later than October 25, 2004 (32 days following the final public scoping meeting). Comments received through November 24 are included in the analysis for this scoping report.

Advertisements announcing public scoping meetings and soliciting participation in the scoping process were published in eighteen local newspapers. The Corps held three public scoping meetings to solicit ideas, issues and concerns about the Project. An agency scoping meeting and preliminary meetings with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also were held.

During scoping, 76 written submissions were received: 19 letters, 8 emails, and 49 comment sheets. From these 76 submissions, 565 substantive comments were gathered. An additional 95 comments were recorded on easel note pads during the public scoping meetings.

Based on the issues and recommendations identified in the scoping comments, as well as guidance from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), thirteen general categories of significant issues were identified. These issues will be the focus of the EIS:

- Socioeconomic Resources
- Surface Water Flow and Water Quality
- Wildlife
- Fish and Aquatic Life
- Water Rights
- Wetlands and Riparian Resources
- Recreation Resources
- Noise
- Visual Quality
- Air Quality
- Vegetation
- Traffic and Transportation
- Land Use

NORTHERN INTEGRATED SUPPLY PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SCOPING REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP or Project), a regional water supply project designed to serve current and future water needs of 15 towns and communities in Larimer, Weld, and Boulder counties. As currently proposed, the purpose of the Northern Integrated Supply Project is to provide the Project Participants with approximately 40,000 acre-feet of new reliable municipal water supply annually through a regional project coordinated by the District, which will meet a portion of the Participants' current and reasonably projected future additional water supply needs. Because the proposed Project will involve the discharge of dredge and fill material into wetlands or other waters of the U.S, a permit is required under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Corps is the lead Federal agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and will utilize the EIS in rendering a final permit decision. Scoping is an early and open public process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed by the EIS and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. During the public scoping phase of the EIS, the Corps sought input from the public and interested organizations and agencies. This report documents the results of the public scoping phase of the EIS.

1.1. Proposed Project

The proposed Project is a collaborative effort among 15 water providers (Participants) facilitated and coordinated by the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District (District) by and through the Northern Integrated Supply Project Water Activity Enterprise to provide an additional water supply to the Participants through a regional project coordinated by the District. The Project will provide approximately 40,000 acre-feet of new reliable water supply, which will meet a portion of the Participants' estimated

2025 additional water supply needs. The Participants are a group of rapidly growing communities and domestic water districts located throughout the District. The Project would be a non-federal project constructed and owned by the District. The District will be the Applicant requesting a Section 404 Permit from the Corps. While the District would retain ownership and operational responsibility of the Project, the Participants would own a pro-rata contractual right to the Project. This right could take the form of ownership of a portion of the yield, or storage capacity in the Project, or both.

1.2. Applicant's Preferred Alternative

As part of an alternatives evaluation undertaken by the District and Participants, the District and Participants have identified a preferred configuration of the Project (the Applicant's Preferred Alternative). The Applicant's Preferred Alternative includes a proposed Glade Reservoir with a capacity of approximately 175,000 to 180,000 acre-feet. Associated with Glade Reservoir would be a forebay, pump station, and canal upgrade to convey water diverted from the Cache la Poudre River to the proposed reservoir. A pipeline connecting the proposed Glade Reservoir to the existing Horsetooth Reservoir is proposed. Glade Reservoir would inundate a section of U.S. 287 and require the relocation of the highway. Additionally, Glade Reservoir would inundate a section of the North Poudre Supply Canal and a portion of the canal also would need to be rerouted. The proposed Project also would include a proposed Galeton Reservoir with a capacity of about 30,000 acre-feet. Associated with Galeton Reservoir would be a forebay, pump station, and pipeline to deliver water diverted from the South Platte River to Galeton Reservoir. Water exchanges between the Galeton Reservoir and Glade Reservoir diversion locations are proposed.

2. PUBLIC SCOPING OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Public scoping outreach activities included publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register, paid advertisements announcing public scoping meetings, a scoping announcement, and publication of Project information on the District web site and Corps web site. These activities are described in the following sections.

2.1. Notice of Intent

Scoping began on August 20, 2004, with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. The NOI notified the public of the Corps' intent to prepare an EIS, provided Project information and the dates for public scoping meetings, and solicited public comments. The NOI published on August 20 included a typographical error, and an addendum was published on August 27, 2004. The NOI and addendum are included in Appendix A.

The NOI stated that public scoping comments would be most effective if postmarked, sent via facsimile, or e-mailed no later than October 25, 2004 (32 days following the final public scoping meeting). Comments received through November 24 are included in the analysis for this scoping report. No comments were received after November 24. If additional comments are received, they will be considered during EIS preparation.

2.2. Paid Advertisements

Advertisements announcing public scoping meetings and soliciting participation in the scoping process were placed in 18 local monthly, weekly, and daily papers in Larimer, Weld, and Boulder counties, and in the Cheyenne Tribune-Eagle (Appendix B). Table 1 lists the local publications in which advertisements were placed.

2.3. Scoping Announcement

A scoping announcement was distributed that outlined information about NISP, the EIS process, and the public involvement process (Appendix C). In addition, the scoping announcement included times and places of public meetings, a public comment sheet, and contact information for the Corps. The mailing list for the scoping announcement was compiled from a list provided by the District of individuals, organizations, and agencies who had expressed interest in NISP or other past District projects, or who attended public open house meetings conducted by the District in August 2004 to inform the public about NISP. The scoping announcement mailing list also included the mailing list of the Corps' Denver Regulatory Office and federal and state agencies, state and U.S. congressional representatives, cities, counties, and other local representatives, and special

interest groups. On September 9, 2004, about 1,275 scoping announcements were mailed and 198 scoping announcements were emailed.

Table 1. Publication and dates of paid advertisements.

Newspaper	Publication Type	Dates Published
North Forty News	Monthly	August 1, 2004
Fort Collins Forum	Monthly	August 12, 2004
Fort Lupton Press	Weekly	August 11, 2004
Rocky Mountain Bullhorn	Weekly	August 12, 2004
Erie Review	Weekly	August 11, 2004
Berthoud Weekly Surveyor	Weekly	August 11, 2004
Loveland Reporter-Herald	Daily	August 14,15,16,17, 2004
Fort Collins Coloradoan	Daily	August 14,15,16,17, 2004
Greeley Tribune	Daily	August 14,15,16,17, 2004
Longmont Times-Call	Daily	August 12,15,17,18, 2004
Ft. Lupton Press	Weekly	September 13, 2004
Berthoud Weekly Surveyor	Weekly	September 13, 2004
Erie Review	Weekly	September 13, 2004
Rocky Mountain Bullhorn	Weekly	September 13, 2004
Loveland Reporter-Herald	Daily	Sept 16, 17, 18, 19, 2004
Fort Collins Coloradoan	Daily	Sept 16, 17, 18, 19, 2004
Cheyenne Tribune Eagle	Daily	Sept 16, 17, 18, 19, 2004
Longmont Times-Call	Daily	Sept 16, 17, 18, 19, 2004

2.4. Web Sites

The Corps' Denver Regulatory Office web site (<http://www.nwo.usace.army.mil/html/od-tl/eis-info.htm>), contains information and documents available to the public associated with the formulation of the EIS as well as some Project information. The website will be periodically updated. The District web site contains information on NISP, contact information, documents, maps, and upcoming events (http://www.ncwcd.org/project&features/nisp_main.asp). The web site is updated regularly.

2.5. Public Scoping Meetings

The Corps held three public scoping meetings to solicit ideas, issues and concerns about the proposed Project. Location, date, venue, and time of each public scoping meeting are provided in Table 2.

Each scoping meeting was in an open house format. Attendees signed in at the door and were encouraged to review 10 informational posters (Appendix D), ask questions, and make comments. Representatives from the Corps, the District, ERO Resources and HDR Engineering (both the Corps’ EIS consultants) were present to answer questions. In addition, CDOT representatives were present at the Fort Collins and LaPorte public meetings to respond to questions regarding the proposed reroute of U.S. 287. Comment sheets to encourage written comments were provided at each public meeting. Easel note pads, on which meeting representatives recorded comments, were present at meeting stations. The Fort Collins and LaPorte public meetings included a question and answer session hosted by the Corps. Questions or comments posed during the question and answer sessions were recorded on easels.

The Fort Collins meeting had the largest number of attendees with 62. The La Porte meeting was attended by 45; the Eaton meeting was attended by 9. These counts reflect only those attendees that elected to sign in at the door. A few attendees elected not to sign in.

Table 2. Public scoping meetings attendance.

Location	Date	Venue	Time	Number of Attendees
Eaton	September 20, 2004	Eaton Country Club	6:30 – 9:00 p.m.	9
Fort Collins	September 21, 2004	Fort Collins Lincoln Center	6:30 – 9:00 p.m.	62
La Porte	September 22, 2004	American Legion Post 4	6:30 – 9:00 p.m.	45

2.6. U.S. 287 Public Open House Meeting

A Public Open House meeting is scheduled for March 30, 2005 at 5:00 pm at the American Legion Post 4 in La Porte Colorado. At this public open house meeting the Corps, CDOT, and the District will present several alternatives considered for the

potential U.S. 287 realignment. Materials presented at the U.S. 287 Open House meeting are presented in Appendix I.

3. AGENCY CONSULTATION

3.1. Agency Scoping Meeting Summary

On September 21, 2004, the District hosted an agency scoping meeting from 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Letters were sent to 13 local, state, and federal agencies inviting them to attend the meeting (Appendix E). The format of the agency scoping meeting was an introduction by the Corps followed by a slide show presentation of the Applicant's Preferred Alternative, and a question and comment period facilitated by the Corps. Agency representatives then toured the sites included in the Applicant's Preferred Alternative.

Twenty-two members from various agencies and organizations attended the agency meeting. The following agencies and organizations were represented:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW)
- Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE)/Water Quality Control Division (WQCD)
- Colorado Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP)
- Colorado State Land Board
- Larimer County

Interest was expressed in a range of topics during the comment and question period. The comments and questions are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of verbal comments and questions from agency scoping meeting.

Topic	Agency	Comment
Cumulative Impacts	CDPHE/WQCD	Currently five water projects are proposed on the Cache la Poudre River. Is one entity reviewing all of these projects?
General Comments	CDPHE/WQCD	How is NISP related to the Windy Gap Firing Project (WGFP)?
	CDOW	Is there a chance that there will be additional Participants in NISP?
Purpose and Need	EPA	How are the Participants' future water needs addressed?
		Will conservation be included in the project purpose and need?
Reservoir Sites	CDOW	How much and how often would the water surface elevation in the proposed Glade Reservoir fluctuate?
	EPA	Has slope stability been examined at the proposed Glade Reservoir site?
Water Quality	CDPHE/WQCD	How would water quality in the Cache la Poudre River be affected by mixing with water from the Colorado-Big Thompson project?

3.2. Other Agency Consultation

Representatives from the Corps and the District met with representatives from: the Service on July 19, 2004; from Reclamation on September 29, 2004; from CDOT and FHWA on August 3, 2004; and from CDOT on September 1, 2004. These meetings were initiated by the Corps and the District to provide agencies with a Project overview and to understand areas of interest and issues the Service, Reclamation, or CDOT, may have regarding the Project. The EPA, CDPHE, Reclamation, and Service submitted scoping letters providing their issues, concerns, and ideas.

3.3. Cooperating Agencies

The Corps submitted a written request to the EPA, Service, BLM, Reclamation, CDOT, FHWA, and Larimer County to participate as cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS for NISP pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.6. In addition, the Corps asked the Western Area Power Administration if it would like to be a cooperating agency; WAPA declined. The Service, EPA, Reclamation, and CDOT agreed to participate as cooperating agencies; the BLM has declined to participate as a cooperating agency, but

will participate as a contributing agency. FHWA has indicated that CDOT involvement will allow for any transportation-related issues to be addressed.

4. SCOPING RESULTS

4.1. Methods for Comment Collection and Analysis

The Corps compiled the scoping comments. Each submission was reviewed carefully and each substantive comment was coded using a four-digit number representing a specific issue. All commenters and comments were recorded in a database. All comments received during the scoping period were coded according to the following major categories:

- Purpose and Need
- Alternatives
- Suggested Alternatives
- Reasonably Foreseeable Activities
- Overall Environmental Impacts
- Surface Water Quality
- Surface Water Flows
- Water Rights
- Sedimentation
- Flooding
- Channel Stability and Morphology
- Dam Safety
- Aquatic Life
- Wildlife
- Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species
- Vegetation
- Land Use
- Visual Quality
- Recreation Resources
- Socioeconomic Resources
- Wetland and Riparian Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Other Resources
- Traffic and Transportation
- Suggestions from Scoping
- Suggested Mitigation
- Comments about Process

4.2. Source and Subject of Comments Received

During scoping, 76 written submissions were received: 19 letters (mailed or faxed), 49 comment sheets (mailed or faxed) and 8 emails. From these 76 submissions, 565 substantive comments were gathered. An additional 95 comments were recorded on the easel note pads during the public scoping meetings. Agency comments are included in Appendix G and public comments are included in Appendix H.

Multiple comments on the same issues by the same commenter were considered only as one comment. For example, if an individual expressed a concern for overall environmental impacts several times throughout their letter, this comment was counted one time. Table 4 summarizes the number of commenters that commented on issues within each of the major categories. The issue most frequently commented on (39 commenters) was the purpose and need for NISP. With 29 commenters, socioeconomic resources were also of great interest. Table 5 lists the number of comments in each of the major categories. The number of comments in each major category (Table 5) may be larger than the number of commenters in each category (Table 4) because one commenter may have commented about more than one aspect of a major category. For example, one commenter may have expressed concern about the economic effects of recreation at the proposed Glade Reservoir and also about the economic effects on the Larimer and Weld Ditch; both of these issues fall within the major category of socioeconomics. Several commenters suggested alternatives for the Project, which are discussed below under *Suggested Alternatives*. Several commenters asked for more information about the EIS process.

4.3. Summary of Scoping Comments by Subject

The general topic of comments and the number received were tracked in a database. Appendix F provides general comments and the number of commenters. Comments for each major category are summarized in the following sections.

Table 4. Number of commenters in each major category.

Major Category	Number of Commenters	Major Category	Number of Commenters
Purpose and Need	39	Alternative development	9
Socioeconomic Resources	29	Noise	8
Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences (Overall effects)	24	Suggested Mitigation	8
Surface Water Flows	23	Visual Quality	8
Suggested Alternatives	20	Air Quality	6
Wildlife	19	Vegetation	5
Other Resources	19	Dam Safety	5
Traffic and Transportation	19	Sedimentation	4
Process	17	Reasonably Foreseeable Activities	3
Surface Water Quality	16	Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species	3
Water Rights	16	Channel stability and morphology	3
Land Use	15	Cultural	2
Recreation Resources	15	Alternatives (Supports a particular Action or No Action Alternative)	2
Wetland and Riparian Resources	14	Flooding	1
Aquatic Life	14		

Table 5. Number of comments in each major category.

Major Category	Number of Comments	Major Category	Number of Comments
Purpose and Need	90	Alternative Development	12
Socioeconomic Resources	71	Suggested Mitigation	10
Suggested Alternatives	68	Visual Quality	10
Surface Water Flows	52	Noise	9
Process	39	Air Quality	8
Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences (Overall effects)	37	Vegetation	8
Traffic and Transportation	32	Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species	5
Wildlife	29	Dam Safety	5
Surface Water Quality	28	Sedimentation	4
Other Resources	27	Reasonably Foreseeable Activities	4
Recreation Resources	26	Channel Stability and Morphology	3
Water Rights	26	Cultural	2
Aquatic Life	20	Alternatives and Alignment Options (Supports a Particular Build or No Action Alternative)	2
Land Use	19	Flooding	1
Wetland and Riparian Resources	17		

4.3.1. Purpose and Need

Although the Corps and the District are preparing a purpose and need statement, a final purpose and need statement was not available during scoping. The information presented at the scoping meetings indicated the Project was needed to provide future water supplies to the Participants. Numerous commenters asked for clarification about the Project purpose and need. Several commenters expressed disagreement about the purpose or need for the Project, or questioned whether the Project would meet the regional need. Other commenters voiced agreement for the Project. Other general comments addressed future water supply demands, and issues related to the need for storage and conveyance contracts, and issues related to water exchanges.

4.3.2. Alternatives

At the scoping meetings, only the Applicant's Preferred Alternative had been developed; therefore, there were few comments on alternatives. Two commenters were in favor of the No Action alternative (yet to be developed). Some general comments about alternative development were received. Three commenters requested an alternatives analysis.

4.3.3. Suggested Alternatives

Many commenters suggested alternatives to the Project in general, or certain aspects such as storage, reservoir locations, or other aspects of the Applicants' Preferred Alternative (Table 6). Suggested alternatives included conservation, conversion of agricultural water uses to municipal and industrial (M&I) uses, dry-year leasing, dredging existing reservoirs, developing gravel pit storage, and investigating the use of Seaman Reservoir or the proposed Halligan Reservoir.

4.3.4. Reasonably Foreseeable Activities

Few comments about reasonably foreseeable activities were received. Most comments about reasonably foreseeable activities were about cumulative impacts from other water projects in northeastern Colorado. Concerns were expressed about cumulative effects on the environment, wildlife, surface water quality, surface water flows, aquatic life, and socioeconomics.

Table 6. Suggested alternatives.

Suggested Alternative	Summary of Comments*	
ALTERNATIVES FOR PROJECT	New developments will be built in areas currently used for farming. Use water rights from impacted agricultural lands to support growth.	Because a large percentage of land projected to be developed is on or immediately adjacent to irrigated farmland, there is potential for future supply to be met through such arrangements [as dry year leasing].
	The operation of the C-BT** system should be re-evaluated to reflect its new function of delivering predominantly M&I water instead of supplemental agricultural irrigation water, and to determine if it could meet a portion of the forecast demand for the Participants.	Irrigation water from retired farm land could meet a portion of the future M&I demand for the Participants.
	A more regional approach, involving more entities in Northeastern Colorado.	Combine all projects on the North Fork into one project.
	Why is the project better for the environment than converting water used for agricultural uses to M&I?	Glade and Galeton Reservoirs should be analyzed for possibly incorporating hydroelectric generating capacity, thus decreasing the environmental impact for electrical generation.
	Dry-year leasing.	
CONSERVATION ALTERNATIVES	Tiered water rates	Consider water conservation as an alternative to NISP.
	Water meter installations	Obtain the firm yield of NISP partly or fully through conservation of municipal and industrial water.
	Restricted outdoor watering	The amount of water available from future M&I water conservation should be determined as an alternative to NISP.
	Trickle irrigation, polymer gels, low water crops	Water efficient appliances.
	Moisture monitors	Compare the relative impact of removing about 40,000 af of pristine water from the South Platte Basin with the option of conserving agricultural water.
	Each alternative should incorporate sustainable water management.	A specific alternative that meets the need or shortage through sustainable water management or conservation of current resource, rather than construction of added storage facilities.
	The relationship between small capacity elements, non-structural options, conservation, and project phasing.	

NORTHERN INTEGRATED SUPPLY PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SCOPING REPORT

Suggested Alternative	Summary of Comments*	
ALTERNATIVES TO STORAGE	Seaman/Halligan should be alternatives for NISP.	Present a real alternative to a major dam
	Develop gravel pit storage.	The expansion of existing reservoirs such as Halligan and Seaman, combined with gravel pit storage and/or dredging of plains reservoirs, may produce the same or greater firm yield as NISP.
	Present an alternative to a major dam.	Dredge out the current reservoirs that are supporting the water systems now.
	Present non-structural options.	A reservoir site farther north and/or west would be less disruptive.
	Enlarging, dredging and renovating mountain dams	
ALTERNATIVES TO PIPELINE ALIGNMENTS	Please consider a Poudre River restoration alternative, which would outline measures to improve water quality and ecological conditions in the lower Poudre River. Such measures could include, among other options, reduction or re-timing of irrigation diversions	Use the Cache la Poudre River as a means to deliver water, rather than pipelines.
	Consider other alternatives to the proposed pipeline from the proposed Glade Reservoir to C-BT facilities and contracts for water conveyance.	
OTHER ALTERNATIVES	Could residents on wells near Glade Reservoir be supplied by taps from Glade Reservoir?	Design project with contingency plans to handle the “worst case scenario.”
ALTERNATIVE U.S. 287 REALIGNMENTS	Take U.S. 287 across Owl Canyon to I-25.	Connect the rerouted U.S. 287 1 mile north of the Bonner Peak Estates main access entry rather than one mile south of the entry.
	The EIS should consider possible bypass options including Owl Canyon Road and potential roadways further north.	Develop a bypass of U.S. 287 well north of Fort Collins/LaPorte.
	Consider rejoining the rerouted U.S. 287 to the Owl Canyon Road instead of over the hogback.	Consider upgrading U.S. 287 to an Interstate.
	Consider County Road 23.	

*Suggested alternatives are paraphrased; some may reflect several comments received.

**C-BT = Colorado-Big Thompson project.

4.3.5. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (Overall Effects)

General comments about the Project's environmental impact were included in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (Overall Effects) category. Comments regarding overall environmental impacts included direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the Cache la Poudre River, the South Platte River, and the Platte River, and the environment in general. In addition, commenters expressed interest in potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed U.S. 287 realignment.

4.3.6. Surface Water Quality

Interest was expressed in the direct and cumulative impacts on water quality of the Cache la Poudre River and the South Platte River. Several commenters were concerned about the potential for reduced water quality to affect fish and other aquatic species. Some questions were raised about mixing water from the Colorado-Big Thompson (C-BT) project with water in the Cache la Poudre River. Additional analysis was requested on water quality.

4.3.7. Surface Water Flow

Surface water flow was of interest to many commenters. Of primary interest was the amount of flow in the Cache la Poudre River and the potential effect on fish and other aquatic species, riparian habitats, and recreation. There was concern that flow below certain levels in the Cache la Poudre would adversely affect deliveries to the Larimer and Weld Ditch. Commenters also were interested in potential changes in surface flow in the South Platte River and the potential for impacts to aesthetics. Concern was also expressed about the cumulative effects on surface water flow in the Cache la Poudre and South Platte Rivers.

4.3.8. Water Rights

Many commenters wanted to know what effect the Project might have on water rights such as ditch deliveries, and the possible loss of agricultural water rights. Several commenters suggested that as agricultural land likely would be converted to residential

uses as a result of growth, the water rights associated with the agricultural land would make water available to serve new residents.

4.3.9. Sedimentation

A few commenters were concerned about sedimentation. Comments were expressed regarding sedimentation in Glade Reservoir, in the Cache la Poudre River, and general comments about sedimentation.

4.3.10. Flooding

Flooding apparently was not important to commenters. Only one comment was received with regard to flooding.

4.3.11. Channel Stability and Morphology

Few comments were received about general channel stability and morphology. Comments about channel stability and morphology generally were regarding the Cache la Poudre River.

4.3.12. Dam Safety

The safety of the proposed Glade Reservoir dam was a concern to five commenters. Most concerns focused on the geology and stability of the proposed Glade Reservoir site. Dam security also was a concern.

4.3.13. Aquatic Life

Commenters were interested in the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on fish and other aquatic life in the Cache la Poudre and South Platte Rivers. The effects of decreased flows, decreased water quality, and increased temperatures were raised as potential issues.

4.3.14. Wildlife

Concerns were expressed about direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on wildlife, including potential adverse effects of reduced water flows in the Cache la Poudre and South Platte River on wildlife habitat and the effect of Glade Reservoir on wildlife

movement corridors. Some commenters were also concerned about the impact of the Project on migratory birds.

4.3.15. Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Wildlife Species and Colorado Species of Concern

One commenter noted the presence of Preble's meadow jumping mouse near the Glade Reservoir site and one commenter was concerned about the general effects on threatened or endangered species. Concerns also were expressed about the potential effect of reduced flows on threatened or endangered species in the Platte River.

4.3.16. Vegetation

General concern was expressed about impacts on vegetation resources, revegetation and reclamation, and weed control that may be affected by the Project.

4.3.17. Land Use

Comments about land use pertain to changes in land use and effects on private property. In particular, several commenters were interested in potential changes from agricultural to residential land uses. Several commenters expressed concerns about changes in land use that could result from population and economic growth in northeastern Colorado. Also, several commenters were concerned about changes in land use either around the proposed Glade Reservoir or the existing and proposed U.S. 287 alignments.

4.3.18. Visual Quality

Impacts on the aesthetic value of the Cache la Poudre River from reduced flow were a of interest. In addition, commenters were concerned about the aesthetics of the proposed U.S. 287 realignment and the Glade Reservoir.

4.3.19. Recreation Resources

Commenters expressed concern about impacts to recreation on the Cache la Poudre River. Comments included potential effects on fishing, hiking, boating, and general recreation along the Cache la Poudre River corridor. Several commenters were interested in recreation at the proposed Glade Reservoir. Several commenters asked what types of

recreation are proposed at Glade Reservoir, and a few suggested either no recreation be allowed, no fishing be allowed, or no motorized vehicles (cars or boats) be allowed. One commenter requested recreation not be allowed at the northern end of the proposed reservoir, and one commenter expressed concern that recreation at Glade Reservoir could lead to trespassing on nearby private property.

4.3.20. Socioeconomic Resources

Socioeconomic resources were of interest to many commenters. Commenters expressed concern about the overall direct, indirect, and cumulative socioeconomic impacts of the Project as well as the impacts on rural areas and small towns that may bear either the cost or the direct impacts of the Project, but not benefit from the Project. Several commenters expressed concern about the Participants' ability to fund NISP. Many were concerned about growth projections and the Participants' ability to fund NISP if the projected growth does not occur. Concern was expressed about the possible socioeconomic effects of population growth, and the possibility that NISP could cause or accelerate such growth. Comments were received regarding the potential effects on property values, especially along or near the proposed U.S. 287 realignment. There was concern about adequate compensation for landowners affected by any part of the Project. Concern was expressed for the cost of construction, operation and maintenance, water treatment by both the Participants and downstream users, and mitigation. Commenters questioned whether overall quality of life could change.

4.3.21. Wetland and Riparian Resources

Several commenters expressed concern about the potential for the Project to affect wetland and riparian resources during construction and from changes in stream flows. Commenters expressed concern about the habitat provided by riparian and wetland resources, and about the aesthetics provided by riparian and wetland resources.

4.3.22. Cultural Resources

Two commenters expressed interest in the potential effects of the proposed Glade Reservoir on cultural resources.

4.3.23. Air Quality

Issues were raised about impacts to air quality during construction, from the proposed U.S. 287 realignment, from Project operations and from future population growth. Issues were raised about the effect of the Glade pump station on air quality.

4.3.24. Other Resources

Commenters expressed concerns about ground water resources such as wells and springs near the proposed Glade Reservoir, and about the geology at the proposed Glade Reservoir site, especially with regard to seepage from the reservoir. Some commenters inquired about the power source for the proposed Glade Reservoir pump station, and about general effects of construction.

Although not identified as significant issues during scoping, the Corps will address other resource issues through compliance with statutory requirements, such as the Endangered Species Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.

4.3.25. Suggested Mitigation

Several mitigation measures were suggested including mitigating visual and noise impacts along the U.S. 287 realignment by constructing berms or planting trees or shrubs. One commenter suggested mitigating the construction of the proposed Glade Reservoir by placing a perpetual conservation easement on a foothills parcel of similar size. One commenter suggested creating a concrete step design spillway, similar to the spillway at Seamen Reservoir, to mitigate for visual impacts at the proposed Glade Reservoir. One commenter suggested revegetating disturbances resulting from construction with only native seed. One commenter suggested that the mitigation could include ensuring that the proposed realignment of U.S. 287 is safer than the existing highway, possibly by widening U.S. 287 to 4 lanes.

4.3.26. Traffic and Transportation

Several commenters were interested in traffic and transportation related issues such as access to private and public property along the relocated U.S. 287 and about the safety of U.S. 287. Commenters expressed concern about changes in traffic patterns associated

with possible recreation at Glade Reservoir and the ways in which changes in traffic patterns could affect communities near the existing and proposed U.S. 287 alignment. Some commenters were interested in the effects that the proposed realignment of U.S. 287 could have on environmental factors such as wildlife, vegetation noise, visual quality, water quality, and the environment in general. Specific concerns about the potential effect that the proposed U.S. 287 realignment may have on various environmental factors were included under the specific environmental category about which the commenter was interested (e.g. wildlife, noise, or visual quality).

4.3.27. Comments about Process

Several comments made about the EIS process were related to the methods of analysis of effects on various resources. For example, several commenters were interested in the methods and assumptions of hydrologic modeling, items of interest included selection of stream reaches for modeling, verification that historical data is representative of current conditions, analysis of hydrologic conditions in wet, average, and dry year, questions as to whether using monthly mean data is sufficient for analysis, assessments of risk of water supply shortages, and assumptions about supply-site potentials. One commenter asked that potential indirect effects of the Project on wetland and other natural resources spatially removed from the Project be examined.

Comments made about the EIS process included a suggestion that the 404(b)(1) guidelines be incorporated into the EIS process, and that the Corps investigate a reasonable range of alternatives. Some commenters asked that the maps of the area around Glade Reservoir include county roads for reference. One commenter asked that mitigation be explicitly described under each alternative, and one requested that each alternative include sustainable water management. Some commenters wanted to know how the EIS would address land use values and development for the proposed U.S. 287 realignment.

Some entities noted specific items regarding the EIS process. For example, one commenter noted that applications for the dam, associated facilities, and proposed U.S. 287 relocation must be submitted to local governments. Some commenters expressed

interest in how NISP and C-BT were related, and whether NISP would cause a change in C-BT operations.

4.4. Rationale for Selecting Significant Issues

The Corps considered every comment received during the public scoping process. These comments were grouped into relevant categories for consideration. Based on guidance from NEPA, significant issues were determined. An “issue” is a point of discussion, debate, or dispute about environmental effects, or about aspects of the Project that could cause environmental effects. NEPA regulations require that lead agencies (the Corps in the case of NISP) determine “the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the environmental impact statement” and to “identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues that are not significant” (40 CFR 1501.7). The process of identifying significant issues is called scoping. The overall purpose of scoping is to focus the detailed environmental review on those issues that are relevant to the proposal and decision to be made. Significant issues are those with environmental effects that warrant resolution either through development of alternatives that reduce effects while achieving the proposed Project’s purpose and need, through application of mitigation measures, or both.

4.5. Significant Issues to be Considered in the EIS Process

Based on the issues and recommendations identified in the scoping comments, as well as guidance from NEPA, the following significant general categories of issues will be the focus of the EIS:

1. Socioeconomic Resources
2. Surface Water Flow and Water Quality
3. Wildlife
4. Fish and Aquatic Life
5. Water Rights
6. Wetlands and Riparian Resources
7. Recreation Resources
8. Noise
9. Visual Quality
10. Air Quality
11. Vegetation

12. Traffic and Transportation

13. Land Use

4.5.1. Significant Issues

The EIS will disclose potential effects on all resources. The scoping process identified several significant issues, however, which will be the emphasis of the EIS.

Socioeconomic Resources. NISP may affect the economies and social conditions of Larimer, Weld, and Boulder counties, and individual communities and groups within these counties.

Surface Water Flow and Surface Water Quality. Surface water flow and surface water quality in the Cache la Poudre and South Platte rivers may change as a result of the proposed Project.

Wildlife. Project facility construction and changes in surface water flow may affect wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Fish and Other Aquatic Life. Project facility construction and changes in surface water flow and water quality may affect fish and other aquatic life.

Water Rights. Project operation will require the District to have adequate water rights. The Project may affect other water right holders and users.

Wetlands and Riparian Resources. Project facility construction and operations, and changes in surface water flows may affect riparian resources, wetlands, and other waters of the U.S.

Recreation Resources. Changes in the flow of Poudre River may affect recreational opportunities along the river. The proposed reservoirs may provide increased recreational opportunities. Recreation at the proposed reservoirs may affect property owners in the vicinity of the reservoirs.

Noise. Noise levels may be affected by Project construction and operation.

Visual Quality. Visual quality may be affected by Project construction and operation.

Air Quality. Air quality may be affected by Project construction and operation.

Vegetation. Changes in flow in the Cache la Poudre River, the South Platte River, and ditches and canals could affect riparian and wetland vegetation. Vegetation may be disturbed by Project construction and operation.

Traffic and Transportation. Construction of a reservoir and realignment of U.S. 287 could change traffic levels and patterns on U.S. 287. Changes to the U.S. 287 realignment could affect the public and private properties served by U.S. 287. Traffic could also be affected during construction of facilities associated with the project.

Land Use. Reservoir construction will affect land use in the immediate area of the facilities. Land uses in northeastern Colorado are continually changing. In the future, agricultural uses may change to residential, commercial, or industrial uses. Infrastructure such as roads and water supplies will change in response to changes in land use. The potential U.S. 287 realignment and proposed Glade Reservoir construction may have an effect on land use patterns in the immediate area of the facilities.

5. SUMMARY OF FUTURE ACTIONS

The information gathered during the scoping process will assist the Corps in the focusing the EIS analysis and developing alternatives for the EIS. Although the scoping period has ended, public meetings are planned after the alternatives have been developed for the potential U.S. 287 realignment. Public hearings also will be held after issuing the Draft EIS. The time, date, and location of future opportunities for comment will be mailed to those on the mailing list and posted on the District's and Corps' web sites. The Corps welcomes all comments anytime during the EIS process. For information and updates about the planning process, please visit the Corps web site (<http://www.nwo.usace.army.mil/html/od-tl/eis-info.htm>) or the Project web site at (http://www.ncwcd.org/project&features/nisp_main.asp). Periodic newsletters providing updates on the NISP EIS will be sent to those on the mailing list and will be posted on both web sites. Anyone interested may request a copy of the newsletters. It is anticipated that one newsletter will summarize the proposed alternatives for the U.S. 287 realignment, one newsletter will inform the public and agencies of the alternatives to be considered in the EIS, one newsletter will inform the public and agencies of issuance of

the DEIS, and public hearings related to the DEIS, and one newsletter will inform the public and agencies about the FEIS and issuance of the Record of Decision

To obtain a copy of the Scoping Report, visit the web site (<http://www.nwo.usace.army.mil/html/od-tl/eis-info.htm>). For a hard copy of the Scoping Report or for questions about the Project or the EIS process, please contact:

Mr. Chandler Peter
Wyoming Regulatory Office
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
2232 Dell Range Boulevard, Suite 210
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009-4942
Phone: 307-722-2300
Facsimile: 307-722-2920
E-mail: chandler.j.peter@usace.army.mil