Chapter 7

Regional Coordination and Public Outreach

7. Regional Coordination and Public Outreach

Throughout the Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Migration Feasibility Study (Feasibility Study), the Corps has been diligent about facilitating two-way communication, input, and participation from involved Federal and state agencies, Native American representatives, elected officials, organizations, and the general public. This input is essential for the Corps to present an action alternative that reflects consideration of the wide range of resources and people in the region that would be affected by changes to the operation of the Lower Snake River Project and by changes in salmon and steelhead populations. This section describes activities the Corps has undertaken to involve other agencies and interested parties as they gather information, evaluate options, and develop a plan of action. It specifically addresses regional coordination efforts, the scoping process, the public outreach program, and the Draft FR/EIS public process. A more comprehensive discussion of the public outreach effort associated with the Feasibility Study can be found in Appendix O, Public Outreach Program.

7.1 Regional Coordination

The effects of this study's outcome are expected to be far reaching and involve a variety of entities in the region who are concerned about salmon recovery and effects on other resource areas. Because of this, the Corps has committed to working cooperatively with a variety of groups through a variety of mediums to exchange input and foster understanding. This section describes the Corps' role in those efforts.

7.1.1 Lead and Cooperating Agencies

Because the Corps operates the Lower Snake River Project, they are the lead agency conducting the Feasibility Study and producing the FR/EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in compliance with the 1995 Biological Opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BoR), and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) are cooperating agencies of this study. Each of the cooperating agencies has special expertise regarding some aspect of the study. Representatives of the cooperating agencies worked with the study team and contributed their expertise to the various work groups conducting technical analyses.

7.1.2 Regional Roundtable Workshops

The Corps held a series of seven roundtable workshops around the region to encourage active participation and involvement in the study by public citizens, special interest groups, and communities. Workshops have been conducted in Portland, Oregon; Richland and Clarkston, Washington; and Boise, Idaho. Table 7-1 lists the locations, dates, and number of participants for each regional roundtable workshop. The workshops afforded the opportunity for interested publics to understand and to offer input on specific elements of the study.

Table 7-1. Regional Roundtable Workshops

Town	Date	Meeting Participants
Portland, OR	4/14/97	17
Portland, OR	6/11/97	40
Portland, OR	9/10/97	45
Clarkston, WA	11/12/97	37
Portland, OR	1/21/98	61
Richland, WA	3/18/98	85
Boise, ID	7/15/98	60
Total		**345**

7.1.3 Work Groups

Technical work groups (e.g., the Drawdown Regional Economic Workgroup [DREW] and the Plan for Analyzing and Testing Hypotheses [PATH]) produced some of the analyses conducted for the Feasibility Study. DREW focused most of its efforts on assembling and analyzing economic and social data through the many work teams. Several open focus meetings were held in the region that provided preliminary economic work team evaluations on hydropower, transportation, irrigation, as well as the regional and social analysis. Valuable input received from the stakeholders and public was used by work teams to clarify analysis parameters. PATH consisted of regional fisheries biologists who measured projected salmon and steelhead survival and recovery rates.

Additional work groups of engineers and fisheries biologists designed and tested specific structural changes that could help more salmon and steelhead pass safely through the dams. These work groups are crucial to the Feasibility Study and the Corps' regional coordination effort. Representatives from the Corps; the cooperating agencies; NMFS; USFWS; the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC); Native American tribes; state agencies in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana; academia; and interested organizations contributed their expertise and perspectives to the work groups. The public participated in some work group proceedings, and the Corps provided various work group products to the public via their web site.

7.1.4 Coordination with Other Regional Salmon Recovery Efforts

Throughout the Feasibility Study, the Corps has been working with others in the region to develop and analyze alternative management plans for fish and wildlife resources of the Columbia-Snake River Basin. In terms of an overall improvement in species survival throughout the basin, the Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Migration Feasibility Study is only part of the picture. The Corps has been and will continue to coordinate with other entities by sharing valuable technical information and insights as everyone moves closer towards a common vision on salmon recovery in the region. Some of the entities involved in related actions on the Columbia-Snake River System include the Federal Caucus, the Columbia River Basin Forum, and the Multi-Species Framework.

7.2 Public Outreach Program

The Corps has conducted an aggressive outreach effort throughout the Feasibility Study process, in order to both raise awareness and promote involvement. Public interest in the Feasibility Study has been high, and continual communication has been essential because the impacts could be far reaching. The public outreach program began with scoping

meetings in 1995, intensified in 1997 with the implementation of the Public Outreach Plan, and has continued on to this Final FR/EIS release using a variety of public information and public involvement techniques.

7.2.1 Public Outreach Plan

The Public Outreach Plan was developed through a cooperative effort involving study management, technical, and public involvement staff from the Corps; and contractor staff specializing in environmental compliance, communications, social science, and public involvement. The plan is based, in part, on current and recent public outreach efforts conducted for similar types of studies, as well as on the collective knowledge and experience of those responsible for drafting the plan. In addition, the plan reflects insights gained through telephone interviews with individuals from a variety of federal agencies, as well as sources representing state agencies, environmental groups, and river user interests in the Pacific Northwest. Those interviewed were asked what the key issues and concerns for the project are, how people obtain information about salmon and river use matters, who would be interested in the study, and what approaches might work best for communicating with interested parties.

The goal of outreach has been to inform and involve people in the region in the engineering, science, and planning process that would lead to a recommendation on the future operation for fish passage at the Lower Snake River Project. Everyone benefits when the public is informed and involved. Individuals and groups can ensure that their perspective is heard and factored into the decisions made, and the Corps ensures that it has considered all the factors and recommended a plan that has full public involvement. This outreach program supports the Corps, cooperating agencies, and the public in working openly and collaboratively toward a recommendation that can be effectively implemented.

Public outreach efforts for the Feasibility Study have engaged the public in two ways. When the outreach has taken the form of information, those involved have been an audience. When the outreach has taken the form of involvement, those involved have been participants. Groups targeted for outreach efforts include:

- General public
- Stakeholders
- Elected officials
- Native American Tribes (See Appendix Q, Tribal Consultation/Coordination)
- Media
- Academia
- Governments
- Agencies
- Government forums.

Specific public information and public involvement efforts aimed at these groups are described in the next two subsections.

7.2.2 Public Information Techniques

The Corps has worked to raise awareness through a multimedia, multitechnique information campaign. Public information is one-way information, with little or no opportunity for feedback. The purpose of raising awareness is to minimize or eliminate any surprises for decision makers or the public about the decision regarding the future of the lower Snake River. Those interviewed consistently and forcefully said that the Corps' greatest challenge will be making the public aware of the Feasibility Study. Consequently, much of the public outreach effort has been focused on raising awareness about the existence, purpose, and process of the Feasibility Study. Public informational efforts are a necessary foundation for public involvement efforts. The following sections describe the public information techniques the Corps has used.

7.2.2.1 Informational Video

To achieve widespread, consistent information dispersal, the Corps produced a 13½-minute video, *The Path of the Salmon,* that provided the public, user groups, political staffs, agencies, and the internal Corps audience with a factual representation of the study and explained the complexities involved in the recovery of the salmon runs. More than 500 copies of the video in VHS, BETA CAM, and CD-ROM formats have been distributed to an extensive variety of groups, schools, officials, and media.

7.2.2.2 Web Site

A web site page (http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/lsr) was established in 1997 to allow internet users access to detailed information about the Feasibility Study (see Annex A of Appendix O, Public Outreach Program). The web site has proven to be an effective tool for disseminating information to the scientific and educational communities, as well as to stakeholders and the public.

7.2.2.3 Mailing List

The Corps established a mailing list in 1995 to create a network of individuals interested in the study, and all subsequent public outreach activities and informational tools provided opportunities for the public to add their names to the list. The mailing list has steadily increased throughout the study to more than 3,175. The mailing list consists of elected officials, stakeholders, governmental organizations, special interest groups, and interested individuals. The mailing list database has been used to mail out periodic study newsletters and meeting notification cards, as well as for querying specific organizations and contact personnel. Notification of the Draft FR/EIS release and the public meetings was carried out using the mailing list.

7.2.2.4 Newsletter and Brochure

A series of ten newsletters has been produced and sent to the mailing list of parties interested in the Feasibility Study. The newsletters convey study progress and upcoming events to the stakeholders and various interested publics and focus on the issues surrounding the study. Newsletters have been available at public outreach events and have been sent out in response to information requests. Each issue is posted on pages available through the internet at the Corps' web site. The newsletter has proven to be a valuable tool to keep interested individuals throughout the region informed regarding the

study's progress and has also provided an effective means of notification of public meetings on the Feasibility Study.

In addition to the newsletters, a color brochure was produced early in the process to present a succinct summary of the scope of the Feasibility Study, the Corps' role in salmon recovery, and the alternative pathways being analyzed. The brochure accompanied the traveling display and all outreach activities so that interested individuals have written material to take with them.

7.2.2.5 Traveling Displays

Two identical portable traveling displays were produced early in the process to present basic study information including the timeline and the three alternative pathways and lower Snake River map. This four-panel foldout display creates a mural for a stand-alone exhibit that has been used in a variety of settings: county fairs, outdoor shows, office building foyers, libraries, meetings, and visitor centers. Over one million people viewed the displays throughout Washington, Idaho, and Oregon (see Annex C in Appendix O, Public Outreach Program).

7.2.2.6 Information Sheets and Information Packets

Information and facts about specific elements of the study were summarized into information sheets after release of the Draft FR/EIS. These two-page documents were designed as handouts and to be placed on the web site to provide a succinct overview of topics of interest. Information sheets on sediment transport, drawdown engineering, recreation/tourism, major system improvements, and community impact assessments were some of the topics included. Information sheets were developed to present the public with an introduction to various elements of the study and to help provide a general understanding of detailed study analyses.

Requests for information about the Feasibility Study have come from a wide variety of sources including students, media, elected officials, stakeholders, and interested citizens. Newsletters, *Salmon Passage Notes*, brochures, newspaper inserts, information sheets, and often copies of *Path of the Salmon* video have been enclosed and sent to interested groups upon request. Media packets have been developed for Media Day and to provide briefing information for visiting officials.

7.2.2.7 Media Coverage

The Walla Walla District Public Affairs Office has coordinated with local, regional, and national press as well as broadcasting networks on Corps news releases and requests for information on the Feasibility Study. In addition to developing news releases to keep the public informed and correct misinformation, coordination with other offices of the Corps and the area elected officials has been a formidable task accomplished by staff in the Public Affairs Office. Public Affairs Office staff and study team members have worked closely with radio stations and television networks to provide personal interviews, talk show guests, and source information on the Feasibility Study.

Through the annual Media Day in the spring of 1998, 1999, and 2000 the Public Affairs Office provided local and regional media opportunities to focus on the Feasibility Study. The media was afforded the opportunity to meet with Corps technical experts, view prototypes of the surface bypass collector and behavioral guidance structure, and

examine the juvenile bypass system and fish transportation barge at Lower Granite Lock and Dam.

7.2.2.8 Newspaper Insert and Advertising

An 8-page, full-color insert was designed and distributed in October and November 1998 in 150,000 copies of community and tribal newspapers throughout the lower Snake River region (see Appendix O, Public Outreach Program for a list of newspapers). The insert included study details about the four lower Snake River dams, the alternative pathways being considered, study milestones, public information meeting schedules, and sources for further information on the study. The inserts produced an immediate reaction in the form of a surge of requests to be added to the mailing list. The study web site page received an increase of several hundred visits after the insert was distributed. The newspaper insert has proved to be an effective, relatively inexpensive method of reaching a large public audience. In addition to the newspaper insert, the Corps has placed advertisements in various regional newspapers when appropriate to announce public meetings and other public outreach efforts.

7.2.3 Public Involvement Techniques

The public outreach program involved interested parties in a public dialog at key points in the Feasibility Study. Public involvement consists of two-way communication between the target audience and the Corps. The involvement techniques described below (i.e., public meetings, community assessment forums, briefings and presentations, tours, and personal communications) have allowed interested parties to provide the Corps with feedback on specific study issues and on the Feasibility Study and the alternative pathways in general (see Annex D to Appendix O, Public Outreach Program). Through these public involvement efforts, formal as well as informal input from the public has provided Corps staff with ongoing and cumulative perspectives that have shaped the overall study.

At each public involvement effort, the Corps identified how feedback would be used. The input was formally reviewed and, where appropriate, has been incorporated into the study. The input has provided the public with an opportunity to influence study scopes and has increased the opportunity for study team members to be exposed to, and to consider, a huge range of public perspectives.

7.2.3.1 Scoping Meetings

As part of the NEPA process, the Corps conducted a series of public scoping meetings in the region for the Feasibility Study and its associated FR/EIS in the summer of 1995. The purpose of the scoping period was to invite comments from interested and potentially affected parties regarding potential study content, direction, and process. Comments received from speakers, letters, and comment cards during the scoping process were reviewed throughout the Feasibility Study and helped to shape the study and the FR/EIS. The comments were classified into 10 general categories as follows:

- consider the range of alternatives
- evaluate the juvenile fish transport program
- incorporate related studies

- consider the loss of river services during dam breaching
- determine what other factors could be affecting salmon runs
- evaluate the cost-benefit of dam breaching
- consider the need for a dam breaching test
- coordinate with other agencies
- consider public opinion on alternative(s)
- offer analysis based on sound science.

7.2.3.2 Public Information Meetings

In addition to providing an opportunity for public participation in regional roundtable and work group meetings, the Corps conducted a series of two regional public information meetings in September 1997 and November 1998. The locations, dates, and number of participants from these public information meetings are listed in Table 7-2.

The objectives of these meetings were to:

- inform the public and stakeholders about the feasibility study status
- hear public concerns
- respond to questions
- stimulate public involvement.

Table 7-2. Public Information Meetings, September 1997 and November 1998

Town	Date	Meeting Participants
September 1997		
Boise, ID	9/17/97	45
Lewiston, ID	9/18/97	100
Kennewick, WA	9/23/97	185
Portland, OR	9/25/97	54
September 1997 Subtotal		***384***
November 1998		
Lewiston, ID	11/9/98	300
Richland, WA	11/12/98	300
Portland, OR	11/16/98	140
Boise, ID	11/19/98	85
Spokane, WA	11/23/98	220
November 1998 Subtotal		***1,045***
Total		**1,429**

A total of 1,429 people attended the two series of public information meetings. The meetings featured a general overview presentation, topical presentations, and question-and-answer sessions. Although formal recording of public comments and questions was not taken during the public information meetings, some study team members took notes on issues that were discussed. Issues raised from the September 1997 meetings were

categorized into four broad categories: fish, economics, regional, and study process. The issues identified from the November 1998 meetings were categorized into six broad categories: fish/biological, economic/social, regional concerns, study process, flood control, and engineering. Analysis of the issue categories and distribution has assisted in providing input to specific study technical evaluations, determining public perceptions, and preparing public outreach efforts.

7.2.3.3 Formal Public Meetings

Formal public meetings were conducted after the Draft FR/EIS was distributed for public review. The series of 15 formal meetings around the region (Table 7-3) in cooperation with the Federal Caucus, included presentations on the Draft FR/EIS, John Day Drawdown Study, and the Conservation of Columbia Basin Fish All-H Paper. These regional meetings held in February and March 2000 provided an opportunity for formal public questions and comments. A total of nearly 9,000 participants consisting of stakeholders, special interest groups, elected officials, and individuals from the public presented 1,786 oral and taped comments about the two studies and the Federal Caucus paper. Most meetings consisted of an open house, formal agency presentations, a question and answer session, and a public comment session. Oral and taped comments were limited to 3 minutes in length. At some of the meetings, the attendance was so large that not all those wishing to speak were able to do so; however, written comments were also accepted. In addition to oral and taped comments, the Corps received over 230,000 written comment documents from the public during the comment period. The comment period began December 1999 and extended through April 30, 2000. Written comments were received via mail, e-mail, fax, the Corps' web site, and hand-delivery. For a summary of the oral and written comments received and the responses to these comments, please see Appendix U, Response to Public Comments. Section 7.4 summarizes how public comments were reviewed prior to production of this Final FR/EIS.

Table 7-3. Formal Public Meeting Locations

Date	Location	Attendance
February 3, 2000	Portland, OR[1/]	1,200
February 8, 2000	Spokane, WA[1/]	800
February 10, 2000	Clarkston, WA[1/]	1,800
February 15, 2000	Astoria, WA	200
February 17, 2000	Pasco, WA[1/]	1,200
February 23, 2000	Boise, ID[1/]	1,100
February 29, 2000	Seattle, WA[1/]	550
March 1, 2000	Kalispell, MT	120
March 2, 2000	Missoula, MT	225
March 6, 2000	Ketchikan, AK	72
March 7. 2000	Sitka, AK	130
March 7. 2000	Idaho Falls, ID	520
March 8. 2000	Juneau, AK	151
March 8. 2000	Twin Falls, ID	600
March 9, 2000	Petersburg, AK	91
Total		**8,759**

[1/] two sessions

7.2.3.4 Community Assessment Forums

More than 1,140 community members throughout the lower Snake River Basin and southern Idaho were involved in a series of 26 interactive community forums (representing 28 communities) dealing with the Feasibility Study from late January to June 1999 (Table 7-4). The communities were selected to represent the variety of current conditions and potential social impacts in different sized agricultural, timber, recreational, and manufacturing based cities and towns with diverse geographic locations. These community forums were not structured like typical information meetings or public hearings; they were individually tailored for each community. Community members worked in groups during 4-hour, structured, interactive workshops aimed at identifying their perceptions of potential social and economic impacts associated with the study alternatives.

Table 7-4. Community Forum Participation

Town	Date	Number of Participants	Number of Public Observers[1/]	Total Attendance
Prescott, WA	1/20/99	51	10	61
Washtucna/Kahlotus, WA	1/26/99	71	124	195
Stanfield, OR	2/8/99	14	9	23
Adams, OR	2/8/99	10	3	13
Umatilla, OR	2/9/99	19	14	33
Burbank, WA	2/11/99	70	22	92
Riggins, ID	2/16/99	26	2	28
Enterprise, OR	2/17/99	23	4	27
Kennewick, WA	2/20/99	19	0	19
Colfax, WA	2/25/99	72	21	93
Pasco, WA	2/27/99	10	13	23
Pomeroy, WA	3/3/99	40	19	59
Weippe, ID	3/4/99	21	5	26
Genesee, ID	3/8/99	37	22	59
Lewiston, ID	3/9/99	33	12	45
Clarkston, WA	3/24/99	36	10	46
Orofino, WA	3/25/99	27	8	35
Salmon, ID	6/14/99	33	0	33
Ashton, ID	6/14/99	13	8	21
Firth, ID	6/15/99	15	21	36
Rupert, ID	6/15/99	21	7	28
Twin Falls, ID	6/16/99	18	18	36
Bliss/Hagerman, ID	6/17/99	21	12	33
Homedale, ID	6/17/99	9	2	11
Boise, ID	6/21/99	49	10	59
Cascade, ID	6/22/99	15	0	15
Total		**773**	**376**	**1,149**

1/ Only members of each specific community were invited to participate in that community's forum; people from other communities were classified as public observers. Public observers were, however, invited to provide written comments.

7.2.3.5 Briefings and Presentations

The Feasibility Study has received considerable attention from elected officials and interested organizations. The study team members have attempted to keep elected officials and their staffs informed about the study and some of its more controversial aspects through briefings and other contacts.

Study team members have also offered presentations and discussion sessions about the Feasibility Study to interested organizations such as special interest groups, stakeholders, service organizations, universities, and professional societies (see Appendix O, Public Outreach Program for a list). The outreach goal has been to meet all speaking requests to provide timely, firsthand, and accurate Feasibility Study information.

7.2.3.6 Tours of Facilities

Tours of the Walla Walla District hydropower facilities, especially Lower Granite Dam, have been carried out throughout the life of the Feasibility Study. Stakeholders, elected officials, special interest groups, governmental representatives, students, and the media have all toured facilities to better understand juvenile salmon passage issues. Tours are an opportunity to explain and to illustrate project improvements, innovative technology, and problem areas, as well as to discuss the feasibility study alternatives and their potential impacts.

7.3 Monitoring Public Outreach Effectiveness

Monitoring public outreach efforts has been accomplished in many ways, ranging from determining web site hits after a news release on meeting schedules to debriefing team members after presentations. Although no formal surveys were conducted to determine outreach effectiveness, there has been continued interest throughout the Feasibility Study expressed through e-mail, telephone and written questions, comments, and requests. Information packets, newsletters, and videos have been mailed out to provide interested individuals and organizations with timely, consistent, and accurate information.

Feasibility Study team members have made every reasonable effort to provide an open and effective public outreach effort. Despite busy work schedules, team members also made every effort to meet all requests for speaking engagements or special meetings.

7.4 Public Comment Process

The public comment period on the Draft FR/EIS began December 17, 1999, with the release of the FR/EIS and associated documents. The Corps announced the availability of the documents, announced the beginning of the comment period, and informed the public how to make comments on the FR/EIS in the following ways: 1) as required by NEPA, a notice of availability was published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Federal Register dated January 14, 2000; 2) the summary document, which was mailed out to 2,500 interested parties on the Corps' mailing list and made available by request, described the public comment period; 3) Newsletter No. 8, mailed in January 2000 to the Corps' mailing list, contained information on the public comment period; 4) an information paper was distributed to media contacts throughout the region in January 2000; 5) the Corps website (http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/lsr/) announced and explained the comment period and provided copies of the documents; and 6) the public was encouraged to provide comments at the series of 15 public meetings held in February and March.

Although the comment period was originally set to end on March 31, 2000, the Corps extended the deadline to April 30, 2000 in response to the high volume of interest and comments. Written public comments were received in a variety of forms, but most were mailed, faxed, or e-mailed. In all, the Corps received over 230,000 written comment documents. Examples of the original comment documents can be accessed at the Corps' Feasibility Study web site at http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/lsr/. A more comprehensive discussion of the public comment process associated with the Feasibility Study can be found in Appendix U, Response to Public Comments.

7.4.1 Processing the Comment Documents

All public comment documents received as a result of the public meetings, the FR/EIS, or the All-H Process were given a unique identification number and entered into a computer database. The Corps set up record retention and management files for all the comment documents.

Of the roughly 230,000 comment documents received, more than 90 percent were form letters, petitions, cards, faxes, or e-mails.

7.4.2 Evaluating the Comment Documents

It was the Corps' goal to ensure that each comment document was evaluated so issues of concern could be identified and addressed by technical experts. Form letters, petitions, cards, faxes, and e-mails were identified and grouped. The issues contained in each of these form comment documents were evaluated and incorporated into the issues and responses presented in Sections 4 and 5. The remaining unique comment documents were processed as summarized in the following sections. See Appendix U, Response to Public Comments, for a more detailed description of this very involved process.

7.4.2.1 Identifying and Categorizing Comments

Each unique comment document was reviewed by a trained member of the comment coding team and categorized in one of six categories: Federal Agency, State/Local Agency, Tribal Representative, Organization, Individual—Detailed, and Individual. To be placed in one of the first four categories, the document had to be received from an official representative of the agency/tribe/organization. Letters from individual members, etc., were not necessarily included in this category. Letters coded Individual—Detailed were from individuals with a specific expertise/training in a technical field who have provided their professional opinion in the form of specific comments on an aspect of the FR/EIS analysis. The Individual category was used to categorize comment documents from the general public.

Once the comment document was categorized, the coder determined whether or not it included Non-Lower Snake River comments. The comment documents that did not include lower Snake River comments were considered to be outside the scope of the FR/EIS and were coded Non-LSR.

The next step in the process was for the comment coder to read each comment document in its entirety, identify individual comments within the document, and assign a comment keyword. To be delineated as a comment and marked with a specific keyword the material had to be detailed and refer (directly or indirectly) to analysis, inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and/or omissions from the FR/EIS, associated documents, or associated

studies. If no detailed material was identified, the document received the comment code Non-specific. The majority of comment documents received this code. Although these documents did not provide specific feedback on the FR/EIS text or related analyses, coders did identify common themes, issues, questions, and concerns (along with those expressed in the form documents) to develop the General Issues and Responses provided in Section 4 of Appendix U, Response to Public Comments. Coded comments were sorted by keyword and forwarded, along with the corresponding marked letters, to the appropriate technical specialists for review and response to comments.

7.4.2.2 Responding to Comments

Appropriate technical specialists in each resource area represented in the FR/EIS (usually the authors of the FR/EIS sections and/or appendices) reviewed the general concerns raised in non-specific comment documents, form documents, and transcripts. They also reviewed each letter containing detailed comments coded for their resource areas, as well as issues identified in the public meeting transcripts. Because of the high volume of comments coded, the Corps opted to consolidate comments into issue statements. As all the material in their resource area was reviewed, technical specialists identified the issues raised in each comment, making sure each comment was rolled into an issue statement for the appropriate resource area. Once the issue statements were developed, technical specialists reviewed each issue statement and developed a response for each. Sections 4 and 5 in Appendix U, Response to Public Comments, detail these results and responses to the comment documents. Section 4 contains the more general issues raised primarily in non-specific comment documents, form documents, and transcripts; and Section 5 contains issues more specific to the FR/EIS.