

Comment #	Original BLM Comment	Original UDWRe Response	UDWRe March 31, 2017 Response	Additional BLM Comment	BLM Reviewer	UDWRe Updated Response
BLM 704	Last line: This is not the aquatic resources section, so remove this reference to impacts on aquatic resources.	The comment appears to apply to Section 5.3.5.5.4. The suggested edit has been incorporated to that section.	<p>The effects of the No Lake Powell Water Alternative were discussed during the meeting between BLM and UDWRe on March 17, 2017. Based on these discussions we understand that BLM's primary concern is that USGS documents cited in the analysis of changes to urban groundwater recharge appear to contradict the conclusions of the groundwater impact analysis in the environmental report. The impact analysis for the alternative is based on localized recharge of the shallow subsurface soils in the vicinity of the urban irrigation and describes the potential effects of changes to this groundwater resource from the alternative. UDWRe agrees with BLM that these site-specific changes in groundwater conditions are not in total agreement with conditions described in the two USGS reports. We recognize these differences do exist and suggest the cited USGS documents describe groundwater conditions at a different scale than is described in the impact analysis for the alternative as the reason for the differences. In addition to the response below, please refer to attached Narrative Response document for the response to this comment and BLM comment No. 694.</p> <p>The following sentence is added as the first sentence of section 5.3.5.5.4, No Lake Powell Water Alternative, Chapter 5, Exhibit E of the License Application: The effects of the No Lake Powell Water Alternative presented below are localized, anthropomorphic changes imposed in addition to other natural and man-made conditions described in other reports.</p>	I do appreciate the clarification provided here, and discussed at our March meeting. I still question the characterization of impacts being "major" - maybe at this point we should just agree to disagree, and then we can work with FERC on the EIS analysis.	Lorraine Christian	<p>Additional data and analyses demonstrating the projected effects of the No Lake Powell Water Alternative on groundwater resources in the St. George metropolitan area are presented in the response to BLM Comment No. 668 in the Updated Extended Narrative Response to BLM Comments.</p> <p>The text in in the first two sentences of Section 5.3.5.5.4, Chapter 5, Exhibit E of the License Application is revised to read: The No Lake Powell Water Alternative would have no short-term unavoidable adverse effects on groundwater resources. It would have measurable long-term unavoidable adverse effects on groundwater resources in the St. George metropolitan area resulting from eliminating outdoor irrigation with potable water.</p>