

Susan Ballinger

I support the "no action" alternative for 2 reasons, as described in the EIS documents:

1. *Lomatium laevigatum* (smooth desert parsley) is a state-listed threatened plant species in Washington, and construction would result in direct mortality of this species.

2. As described in the EIS, "Five archaeological sites would be adversely affected by ground disturbance. These sites are NRHPeligible for their association with traditional use and practices, and one of the sites is also significant for its scientific data potential. This means that important questions about human history can only be answered by the physical materials at the site. The sites, and the Columbia Hills Archaeological District, would be disturbed by construction, which constitutes a significant adverse impact. Ground disturbance would also occur in areas where no archaeological sites have been identified during recent surveys, but there is still a potential for previously unrecorded sites to be identified during construction. " And, "Operation of the proposed project would also mean that the archaeological sites in the reservoir areas willbe inaccessible or would have been previously destroyed by construction. This inaccessibility of remaining sites constitutes a significant adverse impact."