

APPENDIX B

Summary Public Scoping Comments

Appendix B

Summary of Comments Received During 2016 Scoping Period

Table of Contents

1	General Comments	1
2	Purpose and Need	1
2.1	Water Demand.....	1
2.2	Water Yield	2
2.3	Support Electric Power Generation	2
2.4	Facilitate Economic Development	3
2.5	Regional Water Source	3
2.6	Recreation	3
2.7	Electricity Conservation.....	4
3	Alternatives	4
3.1	Least Damaging Environmental Alternative.....	4
3.2	Cost of Alternatives.....	4
3.3	Combination of Alternatives	4
3.4	No Action Alternative	4
3.5	Hunter Lake	4
3.6	Sand and Gravel Pit/Sangamon River Valley Well Fields.....	5
3.7	Well Field Alternatives.....	6
3.8	Dredge Lake Springfield.....	6
3.9	Raise Lake Springfield	6
3.10	Put Treated Effluent Back into Lake Springfield	6
3.11	Use Other Existing Reservoirs	6
3.12	Use Water from Other Cities or Water Districts	7
3.13	Existing Water Supply System	7
3.14	Water Conservation	7
4	Resource Areas.....	8
4.1	Land Use	8
4.2	Wetlands and Waters of the United States.....	8
4.3	Surface Water Quality	8
4.4	Groundwater.....	9
4.5	Floodplains	9

Springfield Supplemental Water Supply
Summary of Comments 2016
Appendix B

4.6	Flora and Fauna.....	9
4.7	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	9
4.8	Cultural Resources	10
4.9	Climate Change	10
4.10	Socioeconomic	10
4.11	Mitigation	11

Comment Summary

A summary of the public comments received as part of the scoping process is included below:

1 General Comments

- 1) **Address public scoping meeting comments** – Address concerns and questions raised in comments (*Commenter: USEPA*).
- 2) **Comment summary** – Recommend summarize public and agency comments and include in appendix of draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) (*Commenter: USEPA*).
- 3) **Attach supporting studies to SEIS** – Recommend including supporting studies and references as appendices, where appropriate (*Commenter: USEPA*).

2 Purpose and Need

2.1 Water Demand

- 4) **Demonstrate water need** – Prove need for supplemental water supply (water demand) (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Clark Bullard, Larry Daily, Don Davis, Vinod Gupta, Ron Howell, Bryon Johnsrud, Gary LaForge, Joe McMenamin, Jack Paxton, Prairie Rivers Network, Sheila Walk, Sierra Club, USEPA, irir1322435*).
- 5) **CDM Smith water demand forecast flawed** – Raised issues about methodology and water demand forecast (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 6) **Address intermittency and frequency of water deficit** – Explain intermittency and frequency of water deficit (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 7) **Water usage** – what is current City water usage? (*Commenter: Ann Graffagna*)
- 8) **Actual water demand** - Actual water demand has been flat the last few years so why do we need the project? (*Commenters: Larry Daily, Joseph McMenamin, Sierra Club*)
- 9) **Population and water demand** – smaller population growth requires less demand for water than shown by previous studies (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Larry Daily, Gary LaForge, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Peter Wagner*).
- 10) **Probability of drought** – What is the probability of drought and most probably drought duration and frequency that supplemental water supply designed to meet? (*Commenters: Don Davis, irir1322435*)
- 11) **Partial or complete power plant shutdown** – Explain why partial or complete shutdown of power plants would not meet drought demand need (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Maureen Suhadolls*).
- 12) **Diminishing water demand at power plants** – Consider options to diminish water demand from Dalman Unit 33, including recycling bottom ash sluice water back to power

plant and converting wet fly ash sluicing to dry ash management (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).

- 13) **Reduce demand for potable water** – Stop giving away water to the power plant and other “authorized users” (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 14) **Review draft Purpose and Need** – Provide opportunity for public to review draft purpose and need (*Commenter: Sierra Club*).

2.2 Water Yield

- 15) **Review water yield estimate** – Update water yield estimate and consider if yield numbers are not accurate (e.g., evaporation rates incorrect) (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Larry Daily, USEPA*).
- 16) **Climate change** – Climate change may increase annual rainfall, consider effects of climate change (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Joe McMenemy, Prairie Rivers Network, USEPA*).
- 17) **Regional annual average rainfall** – Provide regional trends in average annual rainfall, air temperature and seasonal rainfall distribution from current climate models (*Commenter: Don Davis*).
- 18) **Forced evaporation** – Consider impacts on forced evaporation estimates if power plant units retire (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 19) **Benefits to water yield from dredging** – Explain why routine maintenance dredging would not increase yield (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 20) **Elevation of Dallman power plant intakes** – Consider whether elevation of power plant intakes can be lowered and what this would do to lake water yield (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).

2.3 Support Electric Power Generation

- 21) **Support electrical power generation** – (*Commenter: Reggie Davis*)
- 22) **Impact to electric rates if plants shut down due to drought** – (*Commenter: Reggie Davis*)
- 23) **Change if units retired or operations change to meet new requirements** - What would be the impact on water supply if power units are retired or changes in operations occur based on regulatory changes? (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Cyd Ayers, Larry Daily, Don Davis, Joseph McMenemy, Bryon Johnsrud, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Peter Wagner*)
- 24) **Water demand from power plant** - How much water is used to sluice ash to the ash ponds? (*Commenters: Larry Daily, Joseph McMenemy, Bryon Johnsrud, Peter Wagner*)

2.4 Facilitate Economic Development

- 25) **Economic development** – Supplemental water supply needed as an economic development tool (*Commenters: Doug Butler, Robert Wire*).
- 26) **Economic development water need data** – Provide data that existing water resources are a barrier to economic growth and development (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 27) **Lack of adequate water supply harming new business** - Businesses that use significant amounts of water are not coming to Springfield due to concerns about water, these businesses are locating in other areas such as Chatham, that have their own water supply (*Commenters: Gene Seelbach, Jeff Sexton*).

2.5 Regional Water Source

- 28) **Regional expansion as water supplier** – Provide data on future demand estimates when other regional suppliers are increasingly providing water to nearby municipalities (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, . irir1322435*)
- 29) **Regional water source** – seeking to market and export water puts unnecessary pressure on Lake Springfield water supply and could make City more vulnerable to water shortages (*Commenters: Don Cloyd, Peter Wagner*).
- 30) **Water savings if no longer a regional water source** – How much water would be saved by not renewing or vacating regional water contracts (*Commenter: Don Davis*).

2.6 Recreation

- 31) **Recreation** – Support additional fishing, hunting, and hiking opportunities (*Commenters: Julie Hulvey, Troy Williams*).
- 32) **Demonstrate recreation need** – Provide information on recreational need (*Commenters: Clark Bullard, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Ron Howell, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Maureen Suhadolls*).
- 33) **Negative impact on recreation** – Will periodic drawdown harm recreational opportunities? (*Commenter: Julie Hulvey*)
- 34) **Maintain existing recreation** – Lack of funding (City and IDNR) has harmed existing recreational opportunities on Lake Springfield and around the state (*Commenter: Peter Wagner*).
- 35) **Partnership with IDNR** – IDNR will partner with City to maintain Hunter Lake and recreational facilities but IDNR has seen its funding reduced. Demonstrate that IDNR will have capability to maintain Hunter Lake (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).
- 36) **Recreational use data for other area lakes** – provide data on recreational use for nearby lakes (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Prairie Rivers Network*).

2.7 Electricity Conservation

- 37) **Conservation** – Discuss electricity conservation measures being implemented and under consideration that could impact water use (*Commenter: Jack Paxton*).
- 38) **Power plant** – Use the new generator unit more frequently as it uses less water (*Commenter: Bonnie Wright*).

3 Alternatives

3.1 Least Damaging Environmental Alternative

- 39) **Permitting** – Permit application should be evaluated using the least damaging environmental alternative (*Commenters: USEPA, Peter Wagner*).

3.2 Cost of Alternatives

- 40) **Recalculation of costs** – Update cost estimates for alternatives (*Commenters: Larry Daily, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, irir1322435*)
- 41) **Need to factor infrastructure changes into cost estimates** – Infrastructure changes from Hunter Lake include pipeline to transport effluent from three communities to a City wastewater treatment plant and/or new sanitary sewer service to residences along pipeline. Rockies Express natural gas pipeline may need to be shifted (*Commenters: Larry Daily, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club*).

3.3 Combination of Alternatives

- 42) **Combination of alternatives** – Combine alternatives or create a hybrid alternative (*Commenters: Peter Berrini, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Joe McMenamin, Sierra Club, Gene Seelbach, USEPA, Bonnie Wright*).
- 43) **Evaluate appropriate and reasonable alternatives** –Need to consider all appropriate and reasonable alternatives include those previously considered in the FEIS.

3.4 No Action Alternative

- 44) **Evaluate No Action Alternative** – City needs to demonstrate why supplemental water supply alternatives necessary (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).
- 45) **Changes to Springfield Lake operations** - The No Action Alternative should include and discuss operational changes made since 2000 to Lake Springfield, including investigations for and elimination of leaks and areas of supply loss (*Commenters: Larry Daily, USEPA*).

3.5 Hunter Lake

- 46) **Support Hunter Lake** – Generally supportive of this alternative (*Commenters: Doug Butler, Reggie Davis, Jim Dickey, Sue Doubet, Mike Goldasich, Jeff Sexton, Steve Stewart, Frank Tureskis, Dave Varner, Ed Veseling, Troy Williams, Robert Wire*).

- 47) **Oppose Hunter Lake** – Generally oppose this alternative (*Commenters: Cyd Ayers, Jimmy Ayers, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Coalition of Concerned Citizens, Larry Dailey, Daisemiin, Don Davis, Ann Graffagna, Vinod Gupta, Ron Howell, Julie Hulvey, Bryan Johnsrud, Anne Logue, Joe McMEnamin, Don Mohler, Pawnee School District, Jack Paxton, Prairie Rivers Network, Gene Seelbach, Sierra Club, Peter Wagner, Sheila Walk, Bonnie Wright, irir1322435*).
- 48) **Depth of proposed lake** - How deep will Hunter Lake be?(*Commenter: Ann Graffagna*)
- 49) **Consider a smaller footprint** – Smaller footprint would have reduced impact on natural resources (*Commenters: Peter Berrini, Larry Daily, USEPA, Village of Pawnee*)
- 50) **Development plans around lake** – Does the City plan to sell land for future home builders? (*Commenter: Julie Hulvey*)
- 51) **Future of Springfield** – Need Hunter Lake to maintain and grow community. It is an investment for the future (*Commenters: Reg Davis, Steve Stewart*).
- 52) **Backup plan for land previously purchased** – If Hunter Lake is not implemented, what is the plan for the land previously acquired? (*Commenter: Dave Verner*).
- 53) **Sewage pipeline impacts** – Discuss impacts of pipeline for sewage treatment from Virden, Pawnee, and Divernon (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).
- 54) **Permanent Pool near Pawnee** – To avoid rotting vegetation, odors and insects, consider putting a permanent pool near Pawnee (*Commenter: Village of Pawnee*).
- 55) **Contamination concern**: Has watershed been studied to make sure no contamination sources upstream of new reservoir (*Commenter: Jimmy Ayers*).
- 56) **Long term dependability** – if regional climate change trends towards desertification, Hunter Lake may not be a dependable supply of water since smaller watershed than Lake Springfield (*Commenter: Don Davis*).
- 57) **Climate change** – impact of Hunter Lake on climate change (*Commenters: Don Davis, USEPA*).

3.6 Sand and Gravel Pit/Sangamon River Valley Well Fields

- 58) **Sand and gravel pits** – Why can't the City use the sand and gravel pits? (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Larry Daily, Daisemiin, Joe McMEnamin, Prairie Rivers Network, Maureen Suhadolls, Bonnie Wright*)
- 59) **Gravel pit studies** – Prior administration thought purchase of gravel pits would solve water supply needs. Discuss this research and reasoning (*Commenters: Gary LaForge, Prairie Rivers Network, Gene Seelbach, Bonnie Wright*)s
- 60) **Gravel pit analysis is outdated and inadequate** – Gravel pits have grown significantly since the analysis (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).

3.7 Well Field Alternatives

- 61) **Consider well field options** – (Commenters: Jimmy Ayers, Joe McMenamin, Don Mohler, Prairie Rivers Network)
- 62) **Water pipeline impacts** – What are the impacts of pipeline construction and pumping water from the various well field alternatives? (Commenters: Jim Dickey, Gary LaForge)
- 63) **Poor water quality** – Water from Sangamon River and wells along the river are of poor quality (Commenter: Jimmy Ayers, Frank Tureskis).
- 64) **Mohomet Aquifer wells** – Consider use of wells in Mohomet Aquifer (Commenters: Larry Daily, Gary LaForge)
- 65) **Havanna Lowlands** – Couldn't Havanna Lowlands provide an almost endless supply of water and its located in a different geographic area (Commenter: Jimmy Ayers).
- 66) **Location of groundwater** – Identify where groundwater is available in area (Commenter: Mike Goldasich).

3.8 Dredge Lake Springfield

- 67) **Dredging beneficial** – Dredging would restore and expand existing resource (Commenters: Peter Berrini, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Joe McMenamin, Don Mohler, Prairie Rivers Network, Sheila Walk, Dave Varner, Peter Wagner, Bonnie Wright, irir1322435).
- 68) **Capacity gained** – Discuss capacity gained by dredging Lake Springfield (Commenters: Don Davis, Ann Graffagna, Bryan Johnsrud).
- 69) **Lack of previous dredging** – Why doesn't the City dredge Lake Springfield periodically so it will not fill up (Commenters: Peter Berrini, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Cloyd, Jim Dickey, Bryon Johnsrud, Prairie Rivers Network).
- 70) **Reduce need for future dredging** – Identify cost for permanent soil erosion prevention practices to reduce need for future dredging (Commenter: Don Davis).

3.9 Raise Lake Springfield

- 71) **Raise Lake Springfield 1 foot** – By raising Lake Springfield and combining with gravel pit, could provide supplemental water supply (Commenter: Larry Daily).

3.10 Put Treated Effluent Back into Lake Springfield

- 72) **Consider use of water recycling of treated effluent** – Discuss advantages and disadvantages of putting treated effluent back into Lake Springfield (Commenters: Don Cloyd, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Joe McMenamin).

3.11 Use Other Existing Reservoirs

- 73) **Clinton Lake** – Address potential to use water from Clinton Lake (Commenters: Jimmy Ayers, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Larry Daily, Prairie Rivers Network).

- 74) **Sangchris Lake** – Sangchris Lake could be a potential supplemental water source (Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Cloyd, Larry Daily, Prairie Rivers Network).
- 75) **Lake Shelbyville** - Plenty of Water in Lake Shelbyville and water can get to Lake Springfield (Commenters: Jimmy Ayers, Larry Daily).

3.12 Use Water from Other Cities or Water Districts

- 76) **Purchase additional water** – Discuss possibilities to purchase water from other cities or water districts (e.g., Chatham) (Commenters: Larry Daily, Mike Goldasich, Gary LaForge, Maureen Suhadolls).

3.13 Existing Water Supply System

- 77) **Continue use of the South Fork of the Sangamon River** – Evaluate continuing existing practices (Commenters: Peter Berrini, Don Davis, Daniel Nelson, Prairie Rivers Network).
- 78) **Volume of water pumped from South Fork** – Discuss how much water was pumped to Lake Springfield from the South Fork historically? (Commenter: Bryon Johnsrud)
- 79) **Operations and maintenance costs** – Identify the operating and maintenance costs for pumping water from the South Fork? (Commenter: Bryon Johnsrud)
- 80) **Use temporary dam on Sangamon River** – Use temporary dam on Sangamon River during drought (Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use).

3.14 Water Conservation

- 81) **Water conservation** – Implementation of water conservation would reduce water demand and could reduce or eliminate the need for the project (Commenters: Peter Berrini, Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Gary LaForge, Anne Logue, Joe McMEnamin, Jack Paxton, Sierra Club, Maureen Suhadolls, Bonnie Wright, irir1322435).
- 82) **Supportive of City Water Conservation Program** – City has done a great job of helping people conserve water (Commenter: Jimmy Ayers).
- 83) **Implement water conservation incentives** – Need to implement water conservation incentives for businesses and homes (Commenters: Joe McMEnamin, Prairie Rivers Network, Bonnie Wright).
- 84) **Water loss** – How much water is lost due to leaks in the water system? What would it cost to repair? (Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Bryon Johnsrud, Prairie Rivers Network)
- 85) **Infrastructure** – An upgrade of existing infrastructure would supply as much water as the city needs (Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network).
- 86) **Inefficient water use equipment** – How many old toilets, faucets, shower heads, dishwashers, clothes washers are being used in Springfield? Does City have data on this issue? (Commenters: Bryon Johnsrud, Prairie Rivers Network)

- 87) **Water restrictions** – Consider implementing water restrictions even when no drought occurring (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Don Davis, Gary LaForge, Joe McMenamin*). Include consideration of water restrictions as part of No Action alternative (*Commenters: USEPA*)
- 88) **Increase rates or seasonal pricing to encourage conservation** – (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Joe McMenamin, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club*)

4 Resource Areas

4.1 Land Use

- 89) **Loss of farmland** – Approximately 60 farms would be displaced by Hunter Lake Alternative and approximately 3,800 acres of farmland taken out of production (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Cyd Ayers, Sierra Club*).
- 90) **Accounting of Hunter Lake area land holdings** – Identify land values, appreciation, rental properties, etc. that would be affected by Hunter Lake (*Commenter: Don Davis*).

4.2 Wetlands and Waters of the United States

- 91) **Stream and wetland impacts** – If Hunter Lake is chosen, analyze impacts to streams and wetlands (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Maureen Suhadolls*).
- 92) **Use updated National Wetlands Inventory data** – National Wetlands Inventory data for Illinois updated in 2010 (*Commenter: Sierra Club*).
- 93) **Stream impacts** – Do not want to change the flow of existing streams (*Commenters: Gene Seelbach, Sierra Club, Sheila Walk*).
- 94) **Benefits of Hunter Lake Alternative** - New wetlands will support waterfowl, deer, pheasant, and quail (*Commenter: Troy Williams*).
- 95) **Mitigation** – Need to develop mitigation plans in coordination with regulatory agencies (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, USEPA*).

4.3 Surface Water Quality

- 96) **Water quality** – Concerns raised regarding meeting water quality standards, such as total suspended solids, dissolved oxygen, and phosphorus if construct Hunter Lake (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, USEPA, Village of Pawnee*).
- 97) **Efforts to reduce phosphorus in Lake Springfield** – Identify initiatives to reduce phosphorus in Lake Springfield and if they are proposed for Hunter Lake (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).

- 98) **Benefit to water quality** – Hunter Lake would improve water quality by reducing runoff from farmed fields and new sewer line could take homes near Lake Springfield off septic systems (*Commenter: Reg Davis*).
- 99) **Watershed management plans** – Discuss watershed management plans (*Commenter: USEPA*).

4.4 Groundwater

- 100) **Groundwater water supply contamination** – Need another water supply as concern groundwater may be contaminated in future from buried pipeline releases and fracking (*Commenters: Sue Doubet, Ed Veseling*).

4.5 Floodplains

- 101) **Water releases** – Concerns about water releases during large rain events. Impacts on downstream levees and farms (*Commenters: Cyd Ayers, Don Mohler, Charles Taylor, USACE*).
- 102) **Lake management** – Requests more information about proposed lake management (*Commenter: Charles Taylor*).
- 103) **Flooding concerns in Pawnee** – The land around Hunter Lake flooded in December 2015 even without the reservoir and Hunter Lake could affect Pawnee schools (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Larry Daily, Pawnee Community Unit School, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Village of Pawnee*).

4.6 Flora and Fauna

- 104) **Harm to plants and animals** – If construct Hunter Lake, project will hurt plants and animals in area from construction and drawdown during droughts (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, Sheila Walk*).
- 105) **Insect breeding ground** – Hunter Lake could support insect breeding grounds in mud flats (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Village of Pawnee*).
- 106) **Benefits from Hunter Lake mitigation** – Hunter Lake could improve habitat in area (*Commenter: Reg Davis*).
- 107) **Mitigation** – City needs to develop mitigation plan for impacts to forest and habitat in coordination with regulatory agencies (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, USEPA*).

4.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

- 108) **T&E species** – Identify T&E species that have been found or could potentially be found within the study area of any of the alternatives (*Commenters: IDNR, Sierra Club, USEPA*).

- 109) **New threatened and endangered species listings** – Designations or change in status of species, such as the rusty-patched bumblebee or northern long-eared bat. Expressed concern for other cave dwelling bat species (*Commenters: IDNR, Sierra Club, USEPA*).
- 110) **Illinois Wildlife Action Plan** – Need to consider impact of alternatives on species of concern identified in Illinois Wildlife Action Plan (*Commenter: Sierra Club*).
- 111) **Continued coordination** – Need to having ongoing consultation with federal and state agencies (*Commenter: IDNR*).

4.8 Cultural Resources

- 112) **Native American concerns** – Consultation is appropriate if any prehistoric human remains or artifacts are discovered (*Commenter: Miami Tribe of Oklahoma*).
- 113) **Cultural resources** – Over a hundred archaeological sites need Phase II investigations within footprint of proposed Hunter Lake (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club*).
- 114) **Historic Resources** – Hunter Lake would impact historic resources such as the Pensacola Tavern (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club*).
- 115) **Cemetery impacts** – Need to address impacts to cemeteries (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Sierra Club*).
- 116) **Cost-benefit of historic recreation and tourism** – The City needs to justify lost opportunity of maintaining historic sites (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use*).

4.9 Climate Change

- 117) **Climate change** – Consider impacts on climate change and identify estimated greenhouse gas impacts for each alternative (*Commenter: USEPA*).

4.10 Socioeconomic

- 118) **Effect on utility rates** – Discuss potential rate impacts of different alternatives (*Commenter: Joe McMenamin*).
- 119) **Residential and commercial relocations** – Identify how many residential and business relocations will be necessary for the Hunter Lake Alternative (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Ann Graffagna, Gene Seelbach, Bonnie Wright*).
- 120) **Tax impacts** – Identify lost revenues from residential and business relocations (*Commenters: Don Cloyd, Sierra Club*).
- 121) **Economic impacts** – Discuss impacts to farmers who lease land from City in Hunter Lake area as well as economic losses to crop production (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Cyd Ayers, Gene Seelbach, Bonnie Wright*).
- 122) **Impacts on community services** – Impacts of road closures on police, fire, and ambulance services need to be considered (*Commenter: Sierra Club*).

- 123) **Pawnee sewage rates** – If wastewater piped to Springfield, determine what impacts on sewage rates for Village of Pawnee will occur (*Commenter: Village of Pawnee*).

4.11 Mitigation

- 124) **Mitigation plans** – Need to have detailed mitigation plans (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club, USEPA*).

Appendix B

Summary of Comments Received During 2021 Scoping Period

Table of Contents

1	Purpose and Need	1
1.1	Water Demand.....	1
1.2	Water Yield	2
1.3	Facilitate Economic Development	2
1.4	Recreation	2
1.5	Electricity Conservation.....	3
2	Alternatives	3
2.1	Cost of Alternatives.....	3
2.2	Combination of Alternatives	3
2.3	No Action Alternative	3
2.4	Hunter Lake	3
2.5	Sand and Gravel Pit/Sangamon River Valley Well Fields.....	4
2.6	Dredge Lake Springfield.....	4
2.7	Use Other Existing Reservoirs	5
2.8	Existing Water Supply System	5
2.9	Water Conservation	5
3	Resource Areas.....	6
3.1	Land Use	6
3.2	Surface Water Quality.....	6
3.3	Floodplains	6
3.4	Habitat Alteration	6
3.5	Wildlife	6
3.6	Cultural Resources	7
3.7	Climate Change	7
3.8	Socioeconomic	7
3.9	Cumulative Impact	7
3.10	Mitigation	7
4	Public Outreach.....	8
4.1	Improvement to SEIS.....	8

4.2 Public Input.....8

Comment Summary

A summary of the public comments received as part of the scoping process is included below:

1 Purpose and Need

1.1 Water Demand

- 125) **Water need** – Do not need another water source. (*Commenters: Charles Matheny, Deborah Russell, Mike A Chiles, Kelsie Bentley*).
- 126) **CDM Smith water demand forecast flawed** – Raised issues about methodology and water demand forecast. (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 127) **CDM Smith water demand forecast dated** – Water demand is dated and not reflective of current trends and water usage. (*Commenters: Joe McMEnamin, Sierra Club*).
- 128) **Conservation programs** – What program or provisions for increased efficient or lack of conservation measures. (*Commentor: USPEA*).
- 129) **Address intermittency and frequency of water deficit** – Explain intermittency and frequency of water deficit. (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 130) **Actual water demand** - Actual water demand has been flat the last few years so why do we need the project? (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Network, Ann Graffagna*).
- 131) **Population and water demand** – Smaller population growth requires less demand for water than shown by previous studies. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Sheila Walk, Jim Monahan*).
- 132) **Probability of drought** – Need additional water source, if there is a serious drought water supply would be endangered. (*Commenters: Geoffrey Davis, Rev. Richard A. Van Giesen, Joseph Langfelder, Jennifer Davis, Rich Solomon, Frank A. Tureskis, Reg Davis*).
- 133) **Need for another water source** – Is population growing to need a second lake? (*Commenter: K. Bradbury*).
- 134) **Retired powerplants** – How does water demand change now that Dallman has retired units and Vistra Corporation is planning on retiring units? (*Commenter: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, USEPA, Larry Daily, Coalition of Concerned Citizens, Anne Logue, Will Reynolds, Walt Kruski, Al Pieper, Elise Ransdell*).
- 135) **Need backup source** – Hunter Lake is needed for backup source of water. (*Commenters: Jeff Sexton, Nanci Ridder, Harold Vorreyer, Wynne Coplea, rjm Tell, Paula S. Collins*).
- 136) **Regional annual average rainfall** – Climate in the area seems to be getting wetter. (*Commenter: Lisa Beam*).

1.2 Water Yield

- 137) **Repairs at lake flood gates** – The City repaired the lake flood gates and no longer draw the lake capacity down in preparation of spring flooding. (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).
- 138) **Evaporation** – Consider impacts on evaporation estimates for Hunter Lake Alternative. (*Commenter: Thomas Denney*).

1.3 Facilitate Economic Development

- 139) **Economic development** – Supplemental water supply needed as an economic development tool. (*Commenter: Rev. Richard A. Van Giesen*).
- 140) **Recreation venue** – Another recreation venue will bring tourist and families to the area. (*Commenters: Rev. Richard A. Van Giesen, Paula S. Collins, Jennifer Davis, Wynne Coplea, Reg Davis*).

1.4 Recreation

- 141) **Recreation** – There is no real need for recreation, there is already existing recreation. (*Commenters: Charles Matheny, Anne Logue, Will Reynolds, Charles Tamminga, Al Pieper*).
- 142) **Recreation study flawed** – Raised issues about methodology, background, sample size, and conclusions made. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 143) **Maintain existing recreation** – Reopen existing recreational opportunities on Lake Springfield and expand to create new recreation opportunities. (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Networks, Brittany Ottino, Carolyn S. Neitzke, Leslie A Dickson, Walt Kruski, Bridget L. Lamont, Deborah Russell, Elise Ransdell, Ronald E Howell, Melissa Eades, Heather Osborn*).
- 144) **Create recreation at other existing sites** – Create river-based recreation at the proposed Hunter Lake site, building boat launch at Riverside Park, and open gravel lakes for public use. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Lisa Beam, Kelsie Bentley*).
- 145) **Recreational use data for other area lakes** – Provide data on recreational use for nearby lakes. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, USEPA*).
- 146) **Non-lake-based recreation** – All forms of recreation are of value (i.e., land-based, river/stream, forest-based recreation). (*Commenters: Sheila Walk, Coalition of Concerned Citizens*).
- 147) **Sangamon River for recreation** – Improve existing recreation at Sangamon River through enhanced public access and funding. (*Commenter: Menard County Trails & Greenways*).
- 148) **Mr. Don Hanrahan's Letter** – I agree with Mr. Don Hanrahan's letter to the editor published in the Illinois Times, regarding recreational justification for a second lake. (*Commenter: Joe McMenamin*).

1.5 Electricity Conservation

- 149) **Energy cost** – CWLP should sell properties purchased for Hunter Lake to lower energy bills. (*Commenter: Ronald E Howell*).
- 150) **Remove coal plants** – Get rid of high polluting coal-generated power plants. (*Commenter Ronald E Howell*)

2 Alternatives

2.1 Cost of Alternatives

- 151) **Costs of alternatives** – Other alternatives are less expensive than Hunter Lake. (*Commenters: Lisa Beam, Carolyn S. Neitzke*)
- 152) **Compare costs** – What is the comparison of alternatives? (*Commenter: Allison Herbst*).
- 153) **City officials and money** – City officials are poor stewards of money; this project has accumulated a cost of 150 million dollars. (*Commenter: Laura R. Whetstone*).
- 154) **Cost** – How is this alternative being paid for? (*Commenter: Charles Matheny*).
- 155) **Ecological cost** – Other alternatives are more ecologically sound and less damaging to landscape. (*Commenters: Charles Tamminga, Ann Graffagna, Doug Wagner*).

2.2 Combination of Alternatives

- 156) **Combination of alternatives** – Combine alternatives or create a hybrid alternative. (*Commenters: USEPA, Doug Wagner*).
- 157) **Evaluate appropriate and reasonable alternatives** – Need to consider all appropriate and reasonable alternatives include those previously considered in the FEIS and those dismissed. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 158) **Combine Lake Springfield and Hunter Lake** – Is there a way Hunter Lake could become a larger part of Lake Springfield to tie both lakes together? (*Commenter: Mike A Chiles*).

2.3 No Action Alternative

- 159) **Changes to Springfield Lake operations** – The No Action Alternative should include and discuss operational changes made since 2000 to Lake Springfield, including investigations for and elimination of leaks and areas of supply loss (*Commenter: USEPA*).

2.4 Hunter Lake

- 160) **Support Hunter Lake** – Generally supportive of this alternative. (*Commenters: Jeff Sexton, Mary Frances Squires, Roz Stein, Rev. Richard A. Van Giesen, Jennifer Davis, Robert L Wheatley, Rich Solomon, Betty Cawley, Lynn Brown, Nanci Ridder, Brynne Scott, Kathleen Alcorn, Duane Blore Carrell*).

- 161) **Oppose Hunter Lake** – Generally oppose this alternative. (*Commenters: Joe McMenamain, Lisa Beam, Sierra Club, Mary Carey, Sheila Walk Kimberly Riddle, James Butts, Carolyn S. Neitzke, Charles Tamminga, Deborah Russell, Andrew Southwick, Susan Allen, Doug Wagner, Elise Ransdell, Ronald E Howell, Jim Monahan, Heather Osborn, Kelsie Bentley*).
- 162) **Depth of proposed lake** – How deep will Hunter Lake be? What is the acreage of Hunter Lake? Is there a ratio comparing depth to acreage? (*Commenter: Thomas Denney*).
- 163) **Consider a smaller footprint** – Smaller footprint would have reduced impact on natural resources. (*Commenter: USEPA*).
- 164) **Recreation** – Would be a good source for recreation. (*Commenters: Jeff Sexton, Geoffrey Davis, Joseph Langfelder, Rich Solomon, Frank A. Tureskis, Lynn Brown, Naci Ridder*).
- 165) **Water level** – How will Hunter Lake service recreational activity if the water is supplementing Lake Springfield? (*Commenter: Carolyn S. Neitzke*).
- 166) **Water source** – Given the sources of water for the lake it seems it will be a waste rather than a water source or source for recreation. (*Commenters: Anna Graffagna, Susan Allen*).
- 167) **Waste of money** – Hunter Lake is a waste of taxpayer dollars. (*Commenters: d-dog1995, Dylan Runge, Karen Roberts*).
- 168) **Sewage pipeline impacts** – Discuss impacts of pipeline for sewage treatment from Virden, Pawnee, and Divernon. (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).
- 169) **Prevent sediment buildup** – How will the City keep the shallow proposed lake from sediment build up as seen in Lake Springfield? (*Commenter: Mike Budd*).
- 170) **Construction** – Construction would impact quality of life and make roads dangerous and cause excess noise and dust. (*Commenter: Walt Kruski*).
- 171) **Safety** – Hunter Lake would have a High Hazard Dam whose failure could impact both lakes and Springfield’s water source. (*Commenter: Jerald Jacobs*)

2.5 Sand and Gravel Pit/Sangamon River Valley Well Fields

- 172) **Sand and gravel pits** – Why can’t the City use the sand and gravel pits? (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Laura R. Whetstone, Coalition of Concerned Citizens, Al Pieper, Susan Allen, Sandra Lindberg*).

2.6 Dredge Lake Springfield

- 173) **Dredging beneficial** – Dredging would restore and expand existing resource. (*Commenters: James Butts, d-dog1995, Ann Graffagna, Allison Herbst, Heather Osborn*).
- 174) **Future of Lake Springfield without dredging** – What will happen if we do not dredge Lake Springfield (*Commenter: K. Bradbury*).
- 175) **Dredging will allow for recreation** – Degrading will end low summer lake levels allowing for recreational activities such as boating. (*Commenter: Brittany Ottino*).

- 176) **Benefits to water yield from dredging** – Discuss capacity gained by dredging Lake Springfield. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network, Lisa Beam, Dylan Runge, Walt Kruski, Elise Ransdell*).
- 177) **Maintenance of Lake Springfield** – Maintain Lake Springfield to meet water demand and recreation demand. (*Commenters: Mary Carey, Jonathan Ottino, Leslie A Dickson*).

2.7 Use Other Existing Reservoirs

- 178) **Clinton Lake** – Address potential to use water from Clinton Lake. (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).
- 179) **Sangchris Lake** – Sangchris Lake could be a potential supplemental water source and recreation source. (*Commenters: USEPA, Larry Daily, Sandra Lindberg*).
- 180) **Lake Shelbyville** - Plenty of Water in Lake Shelbyville and water can get to Lake Springfield. (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).
- 181) **Purchase Vistra Corporation's land** – Vistra Corporation is retiring operation along Sangamon River Valley, CWLP can purchase this land to meet water needs. (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).

2.8 Existing Water Supply System

- 182) **Sangamon River** – Other resources are available such as aquifers and drawing from Sangamon River. (*Commenter: Jerald Jacobs*).
- 183) **Lick Creek** – There is a creek and wetland west of Route 4 and south of Spaulding Orchard Road. (*Commenter: Brynne Scott*).
- 184) **Use temporary dam on Sangamon River** – Use temporary dam on Sangamon River during drought. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Prairie Rivers Network*).

2.9 Water Conservation

- 185) **Water conservation** – Implementation of water conservation would reduce water demand and could reduce or eliminate the need for the project. (*Commenter: Coalition of Concerned Citizens*).
- 186) **Repair Infrastructure** – Repair infrastructure and enacting water conservation structure would supply as much water as the City needs. (*Commenter: Coalition of Concerned Citizens*).
- 187) **Water restrictions** – City has not tried establishing water conservation measures or restrictions. (*Commenter: Leslie A Dickson*).

3 Resource Areas

3.1 Land Use

188) **Return land** – Return land city has for Hunter Lake. (*Commenters: d-dog1995, Dylan Runge*).

3.2 Surface Water Quality

189) **Water quality** – Concerns raised regarding meeting water quality standards if Hunter Lake is constructed. (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Network, Sandra Lindberg*).

190) **Water quality of Lake Springfield** – Identify initiatives to meet water quality standards in Lake Springfield and showcase how water quality will be maintained at proposed Hunter Lake. (*Commenters: Prairie Rivers Network, Leslie A Dickson*).

191) **Recreation and water quality** – Unusual for drinking water reservoir to be used for recreation use, what are the potential for water quality degradation and associated costs? (*Commenter: Kelsie Bentley*).

192) **Watershed management plans** – Discuss watershed management plans (*Commenter: USEPA*).

3.3 Floodplains

193) **Flooding during construction** – Hunter Lake would flood the landscape and surrounding habitats. (*Commenters: Leslie A Dickson, Walt Kruski, Elise Ransdell, Sandra Lindberg*).

194) **Flooding concerns in Pawnee** – Hunter Lake could affect Village of Pawnee. (*Commenters: Kelsie Bentley, Sandra Lindberg*).

3.4 Habitat Alteration

195) **Dams** – Building dams are a thing of the past and being removed for environmental reasons. (*Commenter: Sierra Club*).

196) **Use site to enrich natural areas** – Hunter Lake site should be used to preserve forests and can be used as publicly accessible natural area. (*Commenters: Al Pieper, Will Reynolds*).

197) **Develop conservation lands** – Hunter Lake will submerge forests; therefore marsh, swamp, and prairie habitats need to be provided around the lake. (*Commenter: H. David Bohlen*).

3.5 Wildlife

198) **Harm to plants and animals** – If constructed Hunter Lake, project will hurt plants and animals in area from construction and drawdown during droughts. (*Commenters: Lisa Beam, Sheila Walk, Kimberly Riddle, Laura R. Whetstone, H. David Bohlen, Carolyn S. Neitzke, Ann Graffagna, Susan Allen*).

- 199) **Hunter Lake provide habitat** – Provide additional habitat for fish and wildlife.
(*Commenter: Frank A. Tureskis*).
- 200) **Conservation plan** – Has there been conservation studies on wildlife currently living on the Hunter Lake Site? (*Commenter: K. Bradbury*).
- 201) **Lost wildlife** – Too much wildlife will be lost (*Commenter: Dylan Runge*).

3.6 Cultural Resources

- 202) **Native American concerns** – Consultation is appropriate if any prehistoric human remains, or artifacts are discovered. (*Commenter: Miami Tribe of Oklahoma*).
- 203) **Historic resources** – Hunter Lake would impact historic resources such as the Pensacola Tavern. (*Commenters: Leslie A Dickson, Charles Tamminga, Al Pieper, Ann Graffagna, Sandra Lindberg*).
- 204) **Cemetery impacts** – Hunter Lake would destroy historic Joe Brunk Cemetery.
(*Commenter: Lisa Beam*).

3.7 Climate Change

- 205) **Climate change** – Consider impacts on climate change and identify estimated greenhouse gas impacts for each alternative. (*Commenters: USEPA, Coalition of Concerned Citizens*).

3.8 Socioeconomic

- 206) **Effect on utility rates** – Impacts of increasing water/sewer rates should be considered in CDM modeling. (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 207) **Residential and commercial relocations** – Project will dislocate landowners.
(*Commenter: Charles Tamminga*)
- 208) **Other infrastructure needs** – Money would be better spent funding other municipal needs. (*Commenters: Joe McMenamin, Sierra Club, Kimberly Riddle, Walt Kruski, Elise Ransdell*)

3.9 Cumulative Impact

- 209) **Long-term impacts** – Long terms impacts do not seem to be considered in plans.
(*Commenter: Kelsie Bentley*).

3.10 Mitigation

- 210) **Mitigation plans** – Need to have detailed mitigation plans and cost of all alternatives and associated environmental impacts. (*Commenter: USEPA*).

4 Public Outreach

4.1 Improvement to SEIS

- 211) **Comment summary** – Recommend summarize public and agency comments and include in appendix of draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. (SEIS) (*Commenter: USEPA*).
- 212) **Verify all sources in SEIS** – Request that USACE critically review source documents and analyses. (*Commenter: Prairie Rivers Network*).
- 213) **Attach supporting studies to SEIS** – Recommend including supporting studies and references as appendices, where appropriate. (*Commenter: USEPA*).
- 214) **2016 Scoping meeting** – Address Concerns and questions raised in 2016 Scoping Meeting Summary Memorandum. (*Commenter: USEPA*).

4.2 Public Input

- 215) **Request public hearing** – Changes to the purpose and need of the SEIS require new public hearing. (*Commenters: Sierra Club, Larry Daily*).
- 216) **Longer public notice period** – Request longer public notice period to allow all parties to prepare comments. (*Commenters: Citizens for Sensible Water Use, Bridget L. Lamont, Walt Kruski*).
- 217) **Public notice lacking information** – Public notice does not address prior issues raised during 2016 scoping. (*Commenter: Larry Daily*).