

Page 3-76, Piping Plover (Threatened), third paragraph - Change first sentence to read “In North Dakota, all Missouri River piping plover critical habitat units consist of”. Piping plovers are the only species in North Dakota that have designated critical habitat.

Page 3-77, Whooping Crane (Endangered), second paragraph - Change the term “whoopers” to whooping cranes to be consistent with the rest of the text and better describe the species.

Page 3-77, Grey wolf (Threatened in Minnesota and Endangered in North Dakota) - On March 12, 2007, the Service removed the grey wolf Western Great Lakes distinct population segment (DPS) from the list of federally threatened and endangered species, except outside of a certain distance from the core population area. In North Dakota, west of a line following the centerline of Highway 83 from the Canadian Border to the shore of Lake Sakakawea then down the Missouri River to the South Dakota State Line, wolves are still endangered. This means that the grey wolf is no longer protected under the ESA in the project area, but is under the authority of the state fish and wildlife resource agencies.

Page 3-78, Dakota Skipper (Candidate), second paragraph, last sentence - Change “In North Dakota, Dakota skippers are in Ransom,.....” to “In North Dakota, Dakota skippers may be found in Ransom,.....”.

Page 4-99, Lake Ashtabula, Fisheries, first paragraph and Tables 4.27 and 4.28 - The definitions of levels for the analysis (low and very low) do not match the definitions used for the tables. The text definition for low is 2-5 feet below target elevation and in the tables, the definition is 1.0 to 5.0 feet below target elevation. The text definition for very low is 6 feet below target elevation to the top of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Pool, and in the tables the definition is 5.0 feet below target elevation to top of Fish and Wildlife Conservation Pool. The definitions for the water levels analyzed should be consistent between the text and the tables.

In Table 4.27, the period analyzed is from 1931 to 2001 (852 months), yet in the table, the only alternative that adds up to 852 months is the No Action. The same thing happens in Table 4.28 which analyzes the drought period from 1931 to 1940 (120 months); only the No Action, Red River Basin, and the GDU Import Pipeline Alternatives add up to 120 months. How is it that the other alternatives do not equal the number of months analyzed?

Page 4-100, Red River Basin Alternative - The text says that this alternative would be very low for 16 months out of the 71-year period of record, but Table 4.27 indicates that there would be 17 months in the very low category. Which is correct?

Page 4-137, Comparison of Alternatives, Risk Reduction in Interbasin Transfer Alternatives, Table 4.58 - The Treatment Failure Risk scores in Table 4.58 do not match the scores that are indicated in Appendix A5 -Comparison of Biota Water Treatment Options, Table A.5.7 Biota Water Treatment Failure Risk Reduction. Table 4.58 lists all treatment options for the GDU Import to Sheyenne River as a score of 3, but Table A.5.7 lists only the Pre-Treatment

with UV & Chlorination option as a score of 3 and the other two options with scores of 4. Table 4.28 indicates a score of 4 for the Pre-Treatment with UV & Chlorination option for both the GDU Import Pipeline and the Missouri River Import to Red River Valley alternatives, but Table A.5.7 shows a score of 3 for that option. If Table A.5.7 in Appendix A.5 is correct, the values for the Treatment Failure Risk and the Total Risk Reduction Scores for the various alternatives are incorrect and should be changed to reflect the correct values.

Page 4-147 - Results, Wetlands, Red River Basin, Table 4.62 - The title for Table 4.62 would indicate that these wetland impacts are all temporary impacts that are the result of pipeline construction, but the preceding text and review of the previous tables would indicate that Table 4.62 adds all temporary impacts to wetlands including those that may result from groundwater pumping (Table 4.61). Change the title for Table 4.62 to make it clear that the table is listing all the temporary consequences or impacts to wetlands from Project alternatives.

Page 4-149 - Grasslands - Native Prairie, Table 4.63 - Table 4.63 would seem to indicate that there is no possibility of impacts to native prairie habitats from the GDU Import to the Sheyenne and the Missouri River Import to Red River Valley alternatives. How can the values for these two alternatives be zero when the values described in Tables 68 and 69 in the Draft EIS are 935 acres of pipeline ROW impacts, and 12 acres of permanent ROW impacts for the GDU Import to the Sheyenne River alternative, and 1,192 acres of pipeline ROW impacts, and 98.9 acres of permanent ROW impacts for the Missouri River Import to Red River Valley alternative? The text on the previous page (4-148 second paragraph from the bottom) states that the data in Table 4.63 shows maximum potential losses of native prairie habitat as these habitats would be avoided where practical. If the native prairie impacts from these two alternatives can be practicably avoided, and therefore result in no impacts, then it should be possible to practicably avoid impact to native prairie habitats for the other alternatives as well.

Page 4-158 - Environmental Mitigation, General, first bullet - If mitigation for fish and wildlife impacts will be acre-for-acre based on ecological equivalency, the SDEIS should provide a definition of ecological equivalency (replacement of the habitat value and function).

Page 4-161 - Environmental Mitigation, Wetlands, second bullet - Delete “when wetlands are moist”. Always avoid placing trench spoil in wetland basins if at all possible. Removing the material after it is stockpiled in the wetland will result in additional impacts to the wetland basin and some of the material may be left in the basin after the trench is back filled.

Page 4-165 - Results, No Action Alternative, Table 4.73 - The acreage figures in Table 4.73 do not match the acreage figures found previously in Table 4.62 (Wetlands), Table 4.64 (Woodlands), and Table 4.68 (Native Prairie). Why are the acres of potential wildlife habitat impacted different from the acres impacted by pipeline construction and aquifer development?

Page 4-166 - Action Alternatives, GDU Import Pipeline Alternative - Change “North Dakota In-Basin” to “GDU Import to Sheyenne River” which has approximately three times less impact than the subject alternative.

Page G.1 -7 - Piping Plover, Table G.1.3, - Change the heading Interior Least Tern in the table to Piping Plover.