

May 14, 2009

Why did NRCS revoke the July 2007 Record of Decision in 2009?

In the memo sent out by NRCS, Kevin Wickey wrote: "In the event we move forward with this project, we will complete appropriate environmental analysis and public involvement, and issue a new decision." In a newspaper article, NRCS reported that it would take several months to do a new draft. Yet, this second draft was completed approximately 6 weeks after the ROD was revoked. Specifically, what new information, new alternatives, and/or new analyses are contained in the 2009 Second Draft EIS that were not included in the 2007 Final EIS? Please provide a comparison of the two documents (e.g., a redline/strikeout version that would show all of the changes between the 2007 Final EIS and the 2009 Second Draft EIS).

What are the sources of funding for this proposed project? If federal stimulus funds are expected to be used, by what date must construction start in order to qualify for the federal stimulus funds? What would constitute start of "construction"?

Why must the project meet both flood control and water supply needs?

I could not find an analysis of what site 16 would be protecting, nor what the other three dams are already protecting. Please include in the final EIS.

When does the public's opinion matter? Isn't it clear from the negative public opinion on the Baker water project and from the lack of people to sign up for public water that citizens in this valley do NOT want public water? Why is it necessary to provide another water source that people do NOT want?

The Army Corp of Engineers was on site in July 2008 to complete the wetland jurisdictional determination. Why is this report not included in the draft EIS? In the draft, you only make reference to "conversations in the field." Please include the report in the final EIS.

Stephanie Slater

Stephanie Slater
406 Gold Dr.
Broadway, WA 22815

- former resident in Lost City
- Current property owner on Lower Cove Road