

Project Description/ Mitigation Plan RFI 2 - Sent 09/23/2024

RFI #	Information Requested	Type of Information Requested	Reference (if Applicable)	Date Request Sent	Due	Received?	Status	Notes	Applicant Response	Requesting Agency	Recipient of Request
RFI 2-1	The RPDR indicates that a 22 Feb 2022 memo "Airport Levee Wetland Avoidance" remains applicable, and "a stand-alone document supporting the Proposed Project's Airport Levee improvements is appended to the RPDR"--where is the stand-alone document describing the current Airport Levee improvements? The referenced tech memo does not show a complete design; rather it looks at alternatives and suggests "DEIS assumptions regarding footprint can be updated." Where can we find the current design information for this project element?	Construction Details	RPDR 1.1 and Table 1-1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024			Comment added to Project Description Section 2.2.3. and Section 6.	See comment response in Project Description Section 2.2.3.	Ecology	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-2	Text indicates the facility would be "about two miles north of the town of Pe Ell"--based on other information received, we assume this should state approximately one mile south instead, correct?	General	Mitigation Plan Section 2.1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024				Correct	Ecology	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-3	Please clarify whether the second sentence of the Mitigation Plan summary intended to change the project purpose target floods from catastrophic to major, or if the project purpose should remain unchanged from the May 7, 2019 memo to USACE titled "RE: CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN WATER RETENTION FACILITY AND LEVEE IMPROVEMENTS - PROJECT NEED, PURPOSE, AND DESCRIPTION"	General	Mitigation Plan Summary	9/23/2024	10/8/2024			Comment added to Project Description Section 1	The second sentence in the Executive Summary to the Mitigation Plan was intended only to summarize what is in the plan, and should not alter the project purpose. Further characterization about the project purpose was provided on page 3 of the Executive Summary in the Purpose section as well as in Section 2.1.1 of the Revised Project Description Report.	Both	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-4	During non-operational periods, backwatering/ponding upstream of the dam is expected from flow above 12,500 cfs (approximately a 10-year event) at the proposed FRE facility. How does this relate to a trigger event of 38,800 cfs at Grand Mound and to what extent and duration would the impacts be from backwatering?	Modeling Data	Pg. 15 of RMP, Section 2.4	9/23/2024	10/8/2024				The revised design associated with the RPDR indicates that backwater/ponding upstream of the dam is expected from flow above 9,500 cfs (RPDR Appendix D2 Table 2). The applicant is examining modifications to the fish passage conduits that would increase the total flow capacity such that the 2-year flow would pass without impoundment. This would allow the effective flow for sediment transport to pass without impoundment. Ponding of water during non-operational periods will occur more frequently than the trigger event of 38,800 cfs at Grand Mound but will be much shorter in duration, depth, and extent. Specific information regarding the frequency, duration, depth, and extent of ponding during non-operation periods was not available by the requested RFI response date. This data is expected to be available in December 2024.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-5	Are there any areas in the inundation zone that would hold ponded water following an inundation event? If so, where do we anticipate this occurring and approximately how much water is expected to pond and for how long? What resources would be impacted by this residual ponding following an impoundment event? Would the mined quarries hold water?	Operation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024				Natural areas where water is expected to be retained currently hold water following rain events. Ponding is expected to occur on the limited number of benches in the inundation zone. Egress flow pathways could be created as part of the Mitigation to prevent fish stranding. Ponding at permanent roadways will be eliminated by grading roadway ditches and installing culverts to drain back to the river (RPDR Appendix G). Decommissioned roadways would be graded to drain as described in Chapter 6 of the Revised Mitigation Plan. The mined quarry locations are outside the inundation zone. The mined quarries will be restored prior to operation as described in Chapter 6 of the Revised Mitigation Plan.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-6	If FRE Facility operation results in temporary but reoccurring inundation during major or greater floods and the FRE design does not preclude expansion that would incorporate a permanent storage pool, how can <u>compensatory</u> mitigation be achieved in the inundation area?	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024				An expanded facility and permanent storage is not part of this project as described in the 2024 Revised Project Description Report (RPDR).	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-7	The RMP acknowledges that relatively flood-tolerant species (e.g., red cedar, red alder, black cottonwood) to be planted in the inundation zone are not necessarily tolerant of being submerged. Since post first inundation conditions are uncertain in terms of vegetation survivability and changes in landscape due to sloughing or landslides or sedimentation, should pre-concentration planting still occur?	Mitigation Details	VMP	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	A major focus of the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) is to increase flood resilience in plant communities prior to any flood event. The original assumption was that creating a diverse community would help strengthen flood tolerance and reduce landslide potential even if some species do not survive. Details of the plan would include reducing the pre-flood planting lists to shrubby species like willow that are known to reestablish quickly after floods. The post-flood planting lists could then focus on increasing diversity in the plant communities. Planting Year 1 of construction with focus on riparian habitat so there is a minimum of 4 years of growth prior to initial operation. In addition, Adaptive Management Plan established specifically to address uncertainty.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-8	Black cottonwood is currently very limited in the inundation area. As a floodplain species, is there any concern for its success rate given the limited extent of natural floodplain areas in the inundation zone as well as heavy deer and elk browse?	Mitigation Details	VMP	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	See response to RFI 2-7.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-9	Is the RMP claiming that Surface Mine Reclamation of the proposed quarries is mitigation?	Mitigation Details	Pg. 118 of RMP, Section 6.3	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Restoration of construction-related impact is considered one of the steps in avoiding and minimizing mitigation and thus is described in Chapter 6 of the Revised Mitigation Plan (RMP).	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-10	The RMP states that quarry site restoration is provided in Appendix K of the RPDR but a quarry restoration plan is not included in Appendix K.	Mitigation Details	Pg. 118 of RMP, Section 6.3	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Thank you for pointing out this error. While no revisions to the RMP are planned at this time, we will omit this sentence to prevent perpetuation of the error into any future use. A detailed plan for quarry restoration would be provided as part of obtaining permits for operation of the quarries.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-11	The RMP states that "intentional wood placement is also proposed as mitigation for aquatic habitat degradation (see the Fish and Aquatic Species and Habitat Plan, Section 8.1) at five (5) sites within and upstream of the inundation area...". How will the LWD be installed to withstand impacts from inundation events (i.e. anchored, partially buried, other)? Will any dislodged or missing LWD be maintained or replaced following each inundation event, if so how and for how many years (life of the structure or a specific length of time)?	Mitigation Details	Pg. 187 of RMP, Section 8.4	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Please see Attachment 3 (Conceptual Design CAD Plans Mainstem and Tributary Projects) in Appendix J (Basis of Design Report), and individual descriptions in main report for details on proposed anchoring methods for each type of wood structure. The report also notes (see executive summary) that structures may need maintenance/replacement. It is difficult to predict functional lifespan of wood installations. Based on our experience, replacement could be needed as frequently as every 10 years, once every 25 years, or possibly even longer. As described in Section 9, the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan for wood management provides for triggering corrective actions as needed. Anchoring design typically is completed at the next design stage (60%). Right now, this is conceptual and we have a proposed anchoring method but additional design will be needed.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-12	Following a retention event or other high flow events, would any LWD accumulated at the retention facility (previously installed or volunteer material) be removed, reused or disposed of? Would the material be reused and reinstalled onsite to replace dislodged LWD, relocated downstream as free-floating logs for natural downstream distribution and accumulation, reused at alternative restoration sites within the water shed, or disposed of in the uplands. If upland disposal is proposed where would the material be disposed of and how (is burning being considered as a potential disposal option)?	Operation Details	Pg. 18, Section 2.4.6	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Please see the large wood management plan for disposition of wood (Section 8.4 of the RMP). Wood will be reused and no burning will occur. This plan would be further refined during advance stages of the permitting process.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-13	Will a functional analysis of streams, buffers, and upland areas in the FRE Facility footprint and inundation area be completed to inform mitigation requirements? Without such analyses, it is difficult to determine how the mitigation actions summarized in Table 8-1 provide adequate compensation for predicted impacts (particularly for Corps).	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	For determining appropriate mitigation, the Applicant built assessment tools including TOPSIS, Shade-a-lator, and CE-QUAL-W2 models and a wildlife habitat evaluation model all of which predict functional benefits from specific mitigation measures. In addition, the Applicant is anticipating the addition of aquatic habitat and salmon population modeling in 2024 and early 2025 to support ESA and the USACE permitting processes. To the best of our knowledge, there is no single functional assessment tool that is available to accurately predict benefits that would result from synergy across resource specific mitigation plans and occur at a watershed scale. As this project advances through NEPA and SEPA into permit development and the mitigation plan is refined, we anticipate additional refinement to the tools used to assess functional benefits from mitigation.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-14	To what extent will the inundation area be commercially logged prior to land conversion away from commercial timberland? If non-Applicant timber harvest is completed before land conversion occurs for the FRE facility, how will the VMP be modified to account for this change in existing conditions prior to construction?	Mitigation Details	VMP	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	We have no knowledge of planning harvest activities by current landowners. As described in the VMP, all areas with recent harvest activity will be prioritized for Early Action. In addition, the VMP planting plan will be adaptively managed and can be revised to address harvest condition at the time of land acquisition. The Applicant has prepared a supplemental Technical Memorandum on management of dead wood to facilitate effective implementation of the VMP.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-15	RMP states "Upstream of the proposed FRE facility and upslope from the temporary pool, the Applicant is proposing enhance 13.3 acres of stream buffer available in the 1,921-acre block of forested timberlands as primary mitigation for the loss of 13.3 acres of stream buffers associated construction of the proposed FRE facility that cannot be minimized by implementation of the VMP nor through restoration of quarry areas." How likely is procurement of those timber lands for mitigation?	Mitigation Details	VMP	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	<p>During very early conversations with Weyerhaeuser the District learned that holding a temporary reservoir could impact Weyerhaeuser operations over a much larger area than the temporary inundation area itself. Due to this potential operational impact, Weyerhaeuser indicated that if the District were to purchase land for the reservoir, it would need to examine purchasing a larger area than just the temporary reservoir itself.</p> <p>The District conducted a TOPSIS analysis to identify areas with the greatest ecological value for mitigating impacts through forest conservation. At the same time, the District's forestry consultant separately reviewed what areas would have the most potential operational impacts to Weyerhaeuser. The District learned that the areas identified by TOPSIS as best for mitigation were closely correlated to the areas where Weyerhaeuser operations would be most impacted if the project were constructed. Therefore, the District included these areas in its proposed 1,921-acre block of forested timberlands to be converted from active forestry management and instead managed with conservation and mitigation as its primary purpose. The District shared the results of this analysis with a designated Weyerhaeuser representative and noted its similarity to Weyerhaeuser's very early projection of what land might be affected.</p> <p>If the project is chosen to move forward as part of the Chehalis Basin Strategy, we the District would need to continue discussions with Weyerhaeuser regarding acquisition of lands for the entire project, including mitigation. It is important to recognize that potential acquisitions will need to consider not just the inundation zone and mitigation sites, but also the impact to Weyerhaeuser's transportation network that access lands not directly impacted by the project. The District is optimistic, based on these earlier discussions, that it can propose an acquisition package that Weyerhaeuser will seriously consider.</p>	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-16	What are the anticipated impacts from pulling water for construction directly from the Chehalis River, from a well drilled to obtain water, or a combination of both sources?	Mitigation Details	Pg. 12 of RMP, Section 2.2.2.5	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Please see follow-up response to RFI 1-29. Water withdrawals from the Chehalis River or from groundwater wells would be subject to permits obtained from state and federal agencies and subject to limitations to maintaining minimum instream flows and groundwater withdrawal requirements to avoid impacts to resources. Those impacts would be determined as part of that permitting process and therefore has not been developed at this time.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-17	Will the 9-foot diameter evacuation conduit allow any downstream fish passage when the fish conduits are closed?	Operation Details	Pg. 17 of RMP, Section 2.4.3	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	The purpose for the 9-foot diameter flood evacuation conduit is to drain the temporary reservoir, it is not being designed to allow downstream fish passage. This conduit is currently proposed to have an energy dissipation valve that would be hazardous to fish. To limit the use of the culvert by fish, the flood evacuation conduit is not designed to open until the WSEL reaches 510-feet, a water depth of 69 feet, a depth where fish are unlikely to sound. This design will continue to be refined upon further discussion with agencies as part of future design phases.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-18	The table lists the quarries as temporary construction but mining aggregate is a permanent impact. Reclamation can occur but restoration cannot.	Construction Details	Pg. 72 of RMP, Table 5.1-1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Under mitigation sequencing (33 CFR Parts 325 & 332, 40 CFR Part 230), restoration comes after avoid and minimize, and before mitigate, and therefore reclamation of quarries was presented under restoration.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-19	It is confusing to understand the impacts of the current Revised Project Description in Table 6.2-1 when also including a cross walk with the DEIS impacts. The avoidance and minimization measures in Table 6.2-1 also include changes from DEIS as counting towards avoidance and minimization. Suggest the table just evaluate the current Revised Project Description impacts and related avoidance and minimization irrespective of the DEIS.	Mitigation Details	RMP, Table 6.2-1.	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Chapter 6 is about avoiding and minimizing impacts. The District was directed to utilize impacts that were identified in the DEIS when developing the mitigation plan. Further, it was requested by the Ecology and the Corps that the District develop a cross-walk table between the proposed mitigation actions and the impacts that were identified in the DEISs. Following this guidance and request, the table builds off DEIS impacts based on proposed expected changes with the RPDR. The comparison between residual impact after avoidance and minimization is presented in Chapter 8 and in the <u>crosswalk tables that we specifically requested by the agencies.</u>	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-20	In general, Table 6.2-1 includes a lot of redundancy and confusion relating back to DEIS. Suggest streamlining where possible.	Mitigation Details	RMP, Table 6.2-1.	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Please see the response to RFI 2-19.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-21	Conclusions drawn in Appendix F Wildlife Habitat Evaluation appear to be based on the success of the VMP. However, the success of the VMP is uncertain until conditions are better understood following the first inundation event. How was the potential success/sufficiency of the VMP analyzed/determined?	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	<p>A major focus of the Vegetation Management Plan is to increase flood resilience in plant communities prior to any flood event. The original assumption was that creating a diverse community would help strengthen flood tolerance and reduce landslide potential even if some species do not survive. Details of the plan would include reducing the pre-flood planting lists to shrubby species like willow and alder that are known to reestablish quickly after floods. The post-flood planting lists could then focus on increasing diversity in the plant communities.</p> <p>Planting Year 1 of construction with focus on riparian habitat so a minimum of 4 years of growth will be attained prior to initial operation. In addition, Adaptive Management Plan established specifically to address uncertainty. Monitoring and habitat evaluation modeling will be conducted on a routine basis as described in Chapter 9 of the RMP.</p>	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-22	Under the VMP, has climate change been factored into species selection considering those that are not expected to favor well such as western redcedar, or species that require shade such as vine maple in an landscape that will likely be reduced to shrub/sapling and grass/forb dominated habitats?	Mitigation Details	VMP	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Specific response of individual species to climate change has not been addressed in this draft of the VMP. Some of the planting lists could be adjusted to remove species that are already in a known decline in Washington due to climate change. Monitoring of plant growth and survival will be conducted, and the results will be used within the proposed adaptive management approach to refine species and planting goals (Chapter 9 of RMP).	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-23	First paragraph text mentions wetland impacts at the airport levee site, but I do not think that is the case under the Revised Project Description.	Construction Details	Pg. 137, Section 7.4	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	<p>The February 22, 2022 wetland avoidance technical memorandum indicates that the proposed airport levee will stay inside the same footprint as the existing levee, so no wetland impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>Please see reponse to RFI #2-1</p>	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-24	Is it possible to mitigate impacts to spawning gravel sites in the inundation area with reoccurring operations for major or greater floods? Or is this more of a minimization measure?	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Spawning gravel retention projects are intended to mitigate for impacts of inundation by enhancing deposition and retention of gravels during non-operational periods. Operations also are being refined to avoid and minimize impacts to spawning areas.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-25	<p>Section 2.4.2, Pile Driving: Foundation and Fish Flood Passage Facility notes that "impact pile drivers may be used to provide temporary excavation support within the proposed project construction area" and notes that the number and size of piles to be used has yet to be determined and that all pile driving work would be installed "in the dry". This section is included under Section 2.4, Operations and Maintenance Phase but appears to be more relevant to the construction phase.</p> <p>Also, it is the first mention that pile driving may be required as part of project construction. Please confirm that pile driving may be part of project construction. If it could be used, please elaborate on the purpose of these piles, where pile could occur within the site, whether they would be temporary or permanent, and their proximity to the Chehalis River channel. Any impact pile driving proposed would likely contribute to noise impacts on both aquatic and terrestrial species.</p>	Construction Details	Pg. 17, Section 2.4.2	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	<p>While pile driving is not an expected construction activity at the project site, in the interest of full disclosure, it has been identified as a potential construction method. Final determination of construction methods would be made during final design.</p> <p>No pile driving is planned or expected during Operations or Maintenance. Thank you for noting that pile driving is discussed under Operations and Maintenance in the RMP.</p>	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-26	Section 2.3.1, Access, Mobilization, and Staging mentions that vehicle access would occur across the "RCC cofferdam structures". The use of cofferdams is not mentioned in the RPDR nor are the locations of these structures shown on the associated figures. Cofferdams are mentioned in RPDR, Appendix K, Constructability Report, but there proposed locations are not clearly shown. Is there a drawing that shows the proposed locations of the cofferdams?	Construction Details	Pg. 13, Section 2.3.1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	To clarify, the "cofferdams" mentioned in Appendix K of the RPDR and section 2.3.6 and Table 6.2-1 of the Revised Mitigation Plan (RMP) refer to the sides of the Chehalis River and Crim Creek bypass channels built up high enough so the bypass channels contain a 25-year flood event.	The revised project description has been reconfigured to eliminate the use of cofferdams with the exception of structures that will be used to redirect the Chehalis River and Crim Creek during Phase II of the construction program. Please see Section 6.6 and Appendix D3 of the RPDR and the <i>In-Water Work Steps During Construction</i> technical memorandum dated October 11, 2024 included with the delivery of these RFI responses for additional details.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-27	Section 2.4.1 of the RMP mentions that during low-flow periods, the low-level outlets/fish passage conduits would be managed to concentrate flow through one or more conduits to meet minimum design passage requirements. Has a trigger flow been identified for initiation of this low flow management process?	Operation Details	Pg. 15, Section 2.4.1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	The primary fish passage conduit has a lower inlet than the other fish passage conduits, so low flows will be passively concentrated to the primary conduit thus no low-flow trigger is required.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD	
RFI 2-28	Will the upstream release sites for fish trapped and collected by the FFPF require any modifications (e.g., riparian vegetation clearing for stream access, placement of gravel for truck turnout construction) or installation of infrastructure to support fish release activities?	Operation Details	Pg. 16, Section 2.4.1.1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Specific details regarding truck turnout and stream access will be evaluated during future design phases. Please see Potential FFPF Fish Release Concept and Route Desktop Analysis TM for additional details.	Corps	Matt Dillin, FCZD	
RFI 2-29	Concrete has a high thermal mass with properties similar to brick and stone. It is possible for a large concrete structure to absorb heat from the atmosphere in warm weather, such as summer months, and release it during cooler periods, such as evening, overnight and early morning hours. This is referred to as the 'thermal flywheel' effect or the 'heat island' effect. What analysis has been done to consider concrete (and other facility construction material) thermal absorption and release of heat on the surrounding river and land from the proposed FRE structure itself? Was this considered in the WQ or other project analysis given the size and scale of the facility to be constructed in an otherwise vegetated and undeveloped rural area?	Modeling Data	Mitigation Plan Section 3.4 (and elsewhere)	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	The concrete in contact with the water flowing through the structure will be shaded and will be effectively at the same temperature as the water flowing into the conduit. There might be a slight time lag in temperature difference, but it is expected to be negligible, and the length of stream flowing through the structure will not receive direct solar radiation to boot. Accordingly, the temperature of the water flowing out will be essentially the same as the temperature of the water flowing in.	Ecology	Matt Dillin, FCZD	
RFI 2-30	RPDR Section 15.3.5 says artificial lighting of the fish passage culverts or eliminating the ceiling of the fish passage conduits at the downstream end will be considered. The Mitigation Plan Section 2.2.1.1 says they will be lighted, but we don't see where additional details have been provided. Is this part of the Mitigation Plan or project description?	Facility Details	Mitigation Plan Section 2.2.1.1	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to Project Description Section 3.1.1.3	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.1.3.	Ecology	Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-31	We heard in the mitigation meeting presentations that the 60-foot riparian plantings are intended for shade, but thought we also heard that you intend to use them for wildlife mitigation purposes. Can you clarify what riparian widths are being targeted for specific purposes, and how these tie into mitigation goals and regulatory requirements?	Mitigation Details	Appendix G to Mitigation Plan	9/23/2024	10/8/2024		As presented in Table 8-1 and Appendix C (Mitigation Impact Crosswalk Table), the primary mitigation measures to offset wildlife and habitat impacts and were quantified as such are habitat enhancements in the Forest Conversion area and wetland and buffer enhancements at RM 87.6-89.3. In Appendix F, Wildlife Habitat Evaluation, modeling results showed that the riparian expansion along Bunker Creek also would generate increased habitat value for wildlife and asserts that riparian enhancements along the mainstem Chehalis River should produce similar benefits. These riparian enhancement measures were not quantified as wildlife mitigation needed to offset impacts, instead they would contribute to wildlife mitigation benefits by increasing ecological functional value above the current degraded condition. In this way, they demonstrate additional synergistic functional benefits that will occur with the proposed watershed approach to mitigation.	Ecology	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-32	Does the RMP also describe mitigation measures for impacts to the built environment?	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Intro Section by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 1		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-33	Can you please confirm or provide the details called out in this paragraph?	Facility Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 2.2.2 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 2.2.2		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-34	Can you provide the reasoning for this. What is the recommendation based on? Is the sediment trap function desirable?	Facility Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.1.3 by Agencies under Conduit Stilling Basin	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.1.3.2		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-35	Is it possible that such flows wouldn't occur frequently enough, requiring sediment to be manually removed from the stilling basin. If so, how would that be accomplished?	Operation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.1.4 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.1.4.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-36	Can you confirm the recreation elements are intended as compensatory mitigation and not part of the project?	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.2 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.2.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-37	Would there be any potable water or sanitary sewer/septic systems needed for the FRE facility? Any restrooms or utility sinks needed in the FFPF sorting building or is it assumed that portable toilets would be used?	Operation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.3 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.3.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-38	Please confirm whether the service road and replacement bridge mentioned in the RPDR is FR 1000	Road Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.3 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.3. See inserted .jpeg for location clarification		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-39	What is the plan for fuel storage for this generator? Underground or aboveground storage tank? Mobile tank? If so, how large and what kind of safety and spill containment measures would be implemented?	Operation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.1.3.1 by Agencies	See comment response in Project Description section 3.1.3.1.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-40	Can you confirm updated description of trash rack is accurate?	Facility Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 3.3.3 by Agencies	See comment response and proposed track changes revisions in Project Description section 3.3.3.		Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-41	The intent of a compensatory mitigation plan is to replace the ecological functions that would be lost if a proposed project is implemented. Using the language in the following sentence, a compensatory mitigation plan for this project would focus on replacing the lost ecological functions associated with higher riverine water temperatures and reduced cover and complexity of aquatic and terrestrial (riparian) habitat, including large wood.	Mitigation Details		9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comments added to RPD Section 5 Intro (Mitigation Plan) by Agencies	See comment response and proposed track changes revisions in Project Description Section 5.		Matt Dillin, FCZD

RFI 2-42	While mitigation ratios are an easy – if often inaccurate – way to assess and measure compensatory mitigation, in the end, a project simply needs to replace the measure of aquatic ecosystem functioning that would be lost as a result of its implementation. If prescribed mitigation ratios happen to approximate the ~1:1 functional replacement ratio, that's great, but for a given project, functional assessment should normally take precedence over the application of generic mitigation ratios.	Mitigation Details	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comments added to RPD Section 5.2.1 by Agencies	See comment response and proposed track changes revisions in Project Description Section 5.2.1	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-43	As written, this sentence says the mitigation includes expanding protection for currently degraded riparian conditions. Isn't the mitigation design to improve, not just protect, aquatic habitat? Perhaps this second mitigation component should be in its own sentence.	Mitigation Details	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 5.2.2.4 by Agencies	See comment response and proposed track changes in Project Description Section 5.2.2.4.	Matt Dillin, FCZD
RFI 2-44	Request to add any additional references for RPD, as applicable	General	9/23/2024	10/8/2024	Comment added to RPD Section 7 by Agencies	See comment response and proposed track changes revisions in Project Description section 7.	Matt Dillin, FCZD