

Summary of Written Comments Received During the Scoping Period



Topic	Number of Comments	Comment Summaries
General Comments	22	Twenty-one comments were general and are either generally captured by comments specific to other issue areas addressed in the EIS or do not relate to specific issues to address in the EIS.
		One comment expressed concern that potential impacts could extend beyond the dredging sites and should be examined at a broad landscape scale rather than focusing specifically on each dredging site.
Hydrology	2	Two comments address river hydrology and bank stabilization.
Infrastructure Impacts	9	Five comments expressed concerns for well infrastructure and well field production capacity in relationship to the location of dredge reaches.
		Four comments expressed concerns for potential effects to infrastructure such as road bridges, pipelines, and boat ramps.
Mitigation	4	Four comments expressed a need for mitigation measures to be put in place.
Monitoring	14	Fourteen comments expressed a need for a monitoring plan to be put in place and suggested what that monitoring should entail such as measures for monitoring bed and bank degradation along the Kansas River
Noise Impacts	3	Three comments expressed concerns related to sound emission from dredge equipment operation.
Public Water Supply	5	Three comments expressed concerns that the Proposed Action not be located within one mile of a public water supply intake and apply the same considerations for horizontal collector wells.
		Two comments noted that the Kansas River is an important source of groundwater and drinking water for municipalities and water districts.
Purpose and Need	1	One comment suggested that the EIS include a purpose and need section that addresses a range of alternatives that would satisfy the project purpose.
Recreation	8	Eight comments expressed concern that the Proposed Action would negatively impact the recreational value of the river.
Safety	3	Three comments expressed concern that dredge operations associated with the Proposed Action could pose safety issues for boaters, canoers, and kayakers.
Sediment Transport / Sediment Budget	10	Five comments express concerns for channel morphology dynamics associated with dredging such as sediment transport and bed and bank erosion.
		Five comments expressed a need to develop a sediment budget that would account for sediment transport, erosion, and deposition in the Kansas River.
Species / Habitat Impacts	24	Ten comments express concern for aquatic and riparian habitat loss that could occur along the Kansas River as a result of the Proposed Action.
		Eight comments expressed concern for impacts of the Proposed Action on designated critical habitat and species protected by the Endangered Species Act such as pallid sturgeon, and piping plover.
		Two comments suggested that EIS analysis consider impacts to migratory biota and nesting habitat.
		One comment made suggests for measures to avoid and minimize impacts to listed fish species.
		One comment suggested that potential impacts to the quantity and quality of aquatic habitat be evaluated over the short and long term.
		One comment notes that impacts to aquatic species associated with noise related to dredging may not have been analyzed.
One comment suggests that potential impacts to passage of aquatic organisms be analyzed in the EIS.		

Topic	Number of Comments	Comment Summaries
Alternatives	17	Five comments expressed an opinion in favor of open-pit mining and requested analysis addressing the feasibility of open-pit mining away from the Kansas River.
		Two comments expressed an opinion in favor of the No Action alternative.
		Eight comments suggested items to include in the alternatives analysis, such as a review of varied levels of aggregate mining from the river and for specific river reaches, use of sediments deposited in large reservoirs constructed on tributaries of the Kansas River, off-channel sand mining and locations to obtain substitute materials, and potential impacts from land based processing and transportation.
		Two comments suggested that the range of alternatives analysis include current available data.
Climate Change	1	One comment suggested that analysis of climate change events, such as increased droughts and flooding events, be included in the EIS.
Cumulative Impacts	3	Three comments made suggestions for factors to include in the cumulative effects analysis. Suggestions included issues related to watershed tributaries, aquatic environments, and sediment movement on the formation of sandbars, islands and other shallow water habitat in the Kansas River.
Economic Impacts	8	Two comments suggested that the State of Kansas increase the rate of royalties for dredging operations.
		Six comments suggested factors to include in the economic analysis. Suggestions included issues related to land valuation, economic analysis at a regional scale, market demand for sand and gravel, the relationship between transportation distances and total product costs, and the relationship between dredge operations and recreational and business opportunities on the Kansas River.
Water Quality / Quantity	26	Thirteen comments express concern that dredge operations could reintroduce contaminated sediments into the Kansas River that would affect the quality of public drinking water.
		Ten comments generally suggest that the Proposed Action would result in impacts to water quality.
		Two comments express concerns that the Proposed Action has the potential to impact water tables of surrounding wells.
		One comment requests that dredge operations be restricted based on flow readings obtained from the Kansas River.
Waterbody Bank / Bed integrity	22	Twenty comments express concern that the Proposed Action would increase stream bed degradation associated with bed and bank erosion.
		Two comments expressed concern that impacts to existing infrastructure due to geomorphic changes in the river are exacerbated by dredging.
Total Written Comments	182	