

APPENDIX G

COMMENTS AND RESPONSE RECEIVED ON DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL WORK PLAN – FIRST DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Distribution List:

Virginia R. Painter
Deputy Commissioner
WV Dept. of Education & Arts
Division of Culture and History
1900 Kanawha Blvd, East
Charleston, WV 25305-0300

Tom Chapman, Project Leader
U.S. Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
694 Beverly Pike
Elkins, WV 26241

Mike Cummings
US Army Corps of Engineers
Pittsburgh District
100 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-4186

WVDEP
Stephanie R. Timmermeyer
Cabinet Secretary
601- 57th St.
Charleston, WV 25304

WVDOT
Paul A. Mattox, Jr., P.E.
Commissioner,
Division of Highways
Building 5
1900 Kanawha Blvd, East
Charleston, WV 25305

Curtis Taylor, Chief
WV Dept. of Commerce
Division of Natural Resources
Wildlife Resources Section
Capitol Complex, Bldg 3
Room 812
Charleston, WV 25305

District II
Rich Rogers, Wildlife Management
Jim Hedrick, Fisheries Management
1 Depot Street
Romney, WV 26757

Joe Manchin III, Governor
State of West Virginia
Bldg 5, Room 100
1900 Kanawha Blvd
Charleston, WV 25305-0700

Truman Wolfe, Exec. Director
WV State Conservation Agency
1900 Kanawha Blvd, East
Charleston, WV 25305

Paul Wilson
WV Chapter Sierra Club
P.O. Box 4142
Morgantown, WV 26508

W. Neil Gillies, Director
Cacapon Institute
Route 1, Box 328
High View, WV 26808

Margaret Janes, DVM
Potomac Headwaters
Resource Alliance
5640 Howards Lick Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Lyle Bennett
WVDEP
Division of Water and Waste
Management
601 - 57th Street
Charleston, WV 25304

Roger Anderson
WV Dept. of Commerce
Division of Natural Resources
Operations Center, Ward Rd
P.O. Box 67
Elkins, WV 26241

John Forren
Chief, NEPA Compliance Sect
US EPA, Region III
1650 Arch Street, Mc: 3es30
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

William Keplinger, Jr. President
Hardy County Courthouse
204 Washington Street
Moorefield, WV 26836

Bryan Moore,
Executive Director
WV Rivers Coalition
801 N. Randolph Avenue
Elkins, WV 26241

David Rider
US EPA, Region Iii
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

John Wagoner, Chairman
Potomac Valley Conservation District
500 East Main Street
Romney, WV 26757-1836

Frank Jezioro, Director
WV Dept. of Commerce
Division of Natural Resources
Capitol Complex, Bldg 3, Rm 669
Charleston, WV 25305

Danny Bennett, Wildlife Biologist
WV Dept. of Commerce
Division of Natural Resources
Operations Center, Ward Road
P.O. Box 67
Elkins, WV 26241

Karen Sykes
US Forest Service
180 Canfield Street
Morgantown, WV 26505

Gus Douglas, Commissioner
WV Department of Agriculture
Bldg 1, Rm M28, State Capitol
1900 Kanawha Blvd, East
Charleston, WV 25305-0170

James Smalls
George Washington & Jefferson National
Forests
Lee Ranger District
109 Molineu Road
Edinburg, VA 22824

Maureen Hyzer, Supervisor
George Washington & Jefferson National
Forests
5162 Valleypointe Parkway
Roanoke, VA 24019

Office of Federal Activities – A104
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460
US Dept. of Interior
Secretary of the Interior
US Dept. of Interior
Washington, DC 20240

Director
Office of Environmental Project
Review
US Dept. of Interior
Room 2024
Washington, DC 20240

US Dept. of Commerce
Director, Ecology &
Conservation Office
Dept. of Commerce, NOAA
14th & Constitution Ave., NW
Room 6222
Washington, DC 20230

US Dept. of Housing & Urban
Development
Environmental Officer
Wanamker Bldg.
100 Penn Square, East
Philadelphia, PA 19107

US Dept. of Transportation
Coordinator, Water Resources
US Coast Guard G-MPS1
2100 Second Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590

Director
Office of Advocacy & Enterprise
Room 1345, South Bldg.
Washington, DC 20250

Natural Resources Defense
Council, Inc.
1350 New York Ave., NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005

National Wildlife Federation
1412 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Attn: Legislative Rep.

Sierra Club
404 C Street, N
Washington, DC 20002

Potomac Valley Audubon
Society
PO Box 578
Shepherdstown, WV 25443
304-876-1139
Peter Smith, President

Minear & Associates L.C.
100 Capitol St, Suite 703
Charleston, WV 25301

Stephanie & Anthony Slater
406 Gold Dr.
Broadway, VA 22815

Elizabeth Webster
294 Lower Cove Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Mike & Allaina Whetzel
P.O. Box 4
Lost City, WV 26810

Patrick & Joem Webster
824 Lower Cove Run Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

The Walker Residence
2639 SR 259N
Wardensville, WV 26851

Tom Reid
1494 Lower Cove Run Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Don Biller
Lost City, WV 26810

Charles Foltz
1036 Lower Cove Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Delia Foltz
1038 Lower Cove Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Steven Snapp
1162 Lower Cove Run Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812

Mark Tesoriero
Philip Satolli
874 Lower Cove Run
Mathias, WV 26812

Margarite Little
727 Salem St.
Rockton, Illinois 61072

Patsie Polfliet
8485 Necedah Dr
Roscoe, IL 61073

Marilyn and Conrad Christiano
622 Highland Avenue NW
Washington, DC, 20012

Eunice Webster
256 Black Ridge Rd.
Mathias, WV 26812.

Crystal Lake
[mlake1777@earthlink.net]
No mailing address given

Eileen Preston
[ipreston@rochester.rr.com]
No mailing address given

**Individuals listed hereafter will
receive postcard notification
of the availability of the Draft
Plan – EIS:**

Mr. Michell Hicks, Chief
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
Qualla Boundary, P.O. Box 455
Cherokee, NC 28719

Renee Hypes, Division of
Natural Heritage
217 Governor Street, 3rd Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

David Burns
490 Deer Haven
Wardensville, WV 26851

Thomas Cave
100 Manitou Court
Winchester, VA 22603

Steve Dorick
1844 Clovermeadow Dr.
Vienna, VA 22182

Michael E. Dunn
21370 Ashburn Run Place
Ashburn, VA 20147

Bill Fawcett
8645 Koantz Corner Road
Harrisonburg, VA 22802

Dan Hudson
11430 Rosedale Lane
Beltsville, Md 20705

Mr. Russell Townsend
Tribal Historic
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
P.O. Box 455
Cherokee, NC 28719

Steven Krichbaum
412 Carter St.
Staunton, VA 24401

Mr. James E. Loesel, Secretary
Citizens Task Force
2428 Guilford Avenue
Roanoke, VA 24015

Dana Mccarron
6402 Northwoods Hollow
Fulks Run, VA 22830

Matthew Mackay-Smith
Old Dominion Endurance Ride
1038 Carters Line Rd
White Post, VA 22663

Bruce Saunders
2520 Fairlawn Road
Durham, Nc 27705

Shenandoah Trail Riders
792 Boliver Road
Fort Valley, VA 22652

Emma T. Suarez, Esq.
Pacific Legal Foundation
3900 Lennane Drive
Suite 200
Sacramento, Ca 95834

Tammy L. Belinsky
9544 Pine Forest Road
Copper Hill, VA 24079

Robert Whitescarver
84 Hewitt Rd.
Swoope, VA 24479-2208

Dr. Hal Young, Jr.
3816 Vinyard Road
Barboursville, VA 22923

Elizabeth Schelin
Nvtr
1467 Dismal Hollow
Front Royal, VA 22630

Marjorie Fleshman
2703 Dorchester Dr., NW
Roanoke, VA 24012

Ray Ritchie
252 High Street
Timberville, VA 22853

Sarah Francisco
Southern Environmental
Law Center
201 W. Main St.,
Suite 14
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Alan Cabbage
Page County Supervisor
117 South Court Street
Luray, VA 22835

Shenandoah Mountain Bike Club
Thomas Jenkins
375 East Wolfe Street
Harrisonburg, VA 22802

Mr. Floyd Reynolds
329 Miller Road
Edinburg, VA 22824

Appalachian Forest Mgmt Group
C/O Tim Goodbar
6800 Rich Patch Road
Covington, VA 24426

Roger Blalock
466, County Road 349
Logan, Alabama 35098

Larry E. Camp
6320 Musket Ball Dr.
Centreville, VA 22020

U.S. Forest Service
Deerfield Ranger District
148 Parkersburg Tpke
Staunton, VA 24401

Alvin Dove
VA Wildflower Preserv.
P.O. Box 785
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Alvin Estep
Western VA Deer Hunters
15468 Rosebud Lane
Fulks Run, VA 22830

Kenneth Cenger, President
2267 Boliver Rd.
Fort Valley, VA 22652

U.S. Forest Service
James River Ranger District
810-A Madison Avenue
Covington, VA 24426

Jim Keyser
2064 Sulphur Springs Rd
Middletown, VA
22645-3610

Dick Hall
WVDNR
Box 67
Elkins, WV 26241

Sandra P. Long
7546 Smith Creek Road
New Market, VA 22844

John Lawson
President & CEO
Assoc. Public TV Stations
666 Eleventh St, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20001
Molly Grunmeier
610 Old Fort Road
Winchester, VA 22601

Jim Bensman
Heartwood Forest Watch
585 Grove Ave.
Wood River, IL 62095-1615

Southern Appalachian Forest
Coalition, Mark Shelley
46 Haywood St., Suite 323
Asheville, NC 28801-2838

Todd Crowder
P.O. Box 452
Edinburg, VA 22824

David Kocka
P.O. Box 996
Verona, VA 24482

Wild Virginia
P.O. Box 1065
Charlottesville, VA 22902-1065

Mark Zettler
8316 Tobin Road, Unit #12
Annandale, VA 22003-6835

Patrick Sheering
246 Hope Lane
Toms Brook, VA 22660

Ms. Janine Blaeloch
Western Land Exchange
Project
P.O. Box 95545
Seattle, WA 98145

Mr. Mark Donham
Ms. Kristi Hanson
Race/Heartwood
Rr #1 Box 308
Brookport, IL 62910

Ben Prater
Southern Appalachian
Biodiversity Project
191 Merrimon Ave.
Ashville, NC 28801

Valerie Kanavy
874 Burner Lane
Fort Valley, VA 22652

Michael Hollar
108 S. Whissen Street
Edinburg, VA 22824

Mr. Peter Shoenfeld
713 Chesapeake Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Brent Long
902 Woods Chapel Road
New Market, VA 22824

Rich Edwards
222 Campbell St.
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Ed Bachmann
700 Bolinwood Dr.
Apt. 12c
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Chris Boucher
115 Clover Drive
Chesapeake, VA 23320

John Rice
203 N. Leigh Creek Road
Tetonia, ID 83452

Mark Deren
Seven Fountains Rd.
Fort Valley, VA 22652

U.S. Forest Service
Dry River Ranger District
401 Oakwood Drive
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Sarah Faulconer
337 Thompson Street
Strasburg, VA 22657

Tom Hawkins
P.O. Box 601
Dayton, VA 22821

Mr. Michael Kaizar
933 Norfolk St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15217-2855

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Virginia Field Office
6669 Short Lane
Gloucester, VA 23061
Attn: Karen Mayne

Ms. Edith Levine
3731 Kanawha St., NW
Washington, DC 20015

Sherman Bamford
PO Box 3102
Roanoke, VA 24015-1102

Michael & Lisa Ielmini
Box 37
Mathias, WV 26812

Christine Wulf
622 Bolling Ave.
Charlottesville, VA 22902

William E. Schmidt
8525 Bradford Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Ms. Louis Strickler
3877 Winding Way Rd., Sw
Roanoke, VA 24015

Dean Miller
14692 Senedo Rd
Edinburg, VA 22824

U.S. Forest Service
Warm Springs Ranger District
Route 1 Box 30
Hot Springs, VA 24445

Janet Tinkham
360 Kings Drive
Fort Valley, VA 22652

Mr. Russell J. Murphy
213 Chancellor Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23452

Hugh Irwin, Southern
Appalachian Forest Coalition
46 Haywood St., Suite 323
Asheville, NC 28801-2838

Dan Radke
264 Riffey Mtn. Lane
Mathias, WV 26812

Dave Muhly
Rt 2 Box 118
Bland, VA 24315

Mary Ann Wates
936 Gun Barrel Road
White Post, VA 22663

Harold Draper
TVA NEPA Administration
400 West Summit Hill Dr., Wt 8c-K
Knoxville, TN 37902-1499

Mr. Bruce Saunders
2520 Fairlawn Road
Durham, NC 27705

Mr. Jim Tomlin
19625 Charline Manor Road
Olney, Md 20832

Mike Kruse
1420 Early St.
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Responses to Lost River Comments

Portions of the letters that require a response are reproduced here. Letters in their entirety are included in this FEIS in Appendix A.

Hardy County Public Service District letter dated October 11, 2006

Comments noted, no response required.

County Commissioner Correspondence dated October 25, 2006

Comments noted, no response required.

County Commission Correspondence dated October 3, 2006

Comments noted, no response required.

Potomac Valley Conservation District letter dated October 20, 2006

Comments noted, no response required.

Hardy County Rural Development Authority letter dated October 19, 2006

Comments noted, no response required.

United States Environmental Protection Agency letter dated October 24, 2006

Comment: "The stated need for the project is to address flood control and rural water supply. EPA requests that problems associated with flooding be presented specifically for the area that will be protected by the Lower Cove Run Site 16 dam. The position could be substantiated if the yearly cost for flood damage repair for the area protected by Site 16 (12 square mile area?) was tabulated over the past two decades. The table should break down the flood event by year, number of buildings suffering damage and value of losses (with references to the source of the data). The number of homes and businesses where flood damage would be alleviated should be identified.

Table 5 attempts to estimate annual cost of flood damage, but it is unclear what portion of the Lost River Subwatershed is considered and how the costs were derived."

Response: The flood damage reduction benefits cited in this supplement are a result of the combined effects of Sites 4, 10, 16, and 27 and the land treatment measures. All four structures work together to provide the level of protection and reduction in flood damages described in this report and displayed in the tables. Flood damages are based on an average of all the floods, up to a magnitude of a 500 year flood (an event that has a statistical chance of occurring .2% in any given year). The benchmark for NRCS floods is a 1% flood, or 100 year event. The methods used for determining damages are outlined in the references cited in the report. For a

comprehensive picture of the flooding in the Lost River Valley, the original Work Plan and the subsequent supplements as well as this FEIS should be consulted. The average annual damages represent the range of flood damages that occur from very small floods to very large floods on the tributaries and the main stem of Lost River. In some years, the area may experience no flooding while in other years, the area may experience several large floods. To better clarify need and methodology, information has been added to the “Need for Supplement” portion and to the “Investigation and Analysis” section of the FEIS.

Comment: “It is not clear in the document that water quality degradation is a problem in the area that will be protected by the Site 16 dam. Current water quality should be specified and tabulated in the document, and compared to State and national standards, to identify parameters of concern. It would be relevant to show historic water quality, and the improvement achieved by the operation of the new dams that were constructed in the watershed over the last decades (Sites 4, 10, 27). This would be helpful to support that a problem still exists, and to support the efficiency of the type of design proposed to address the parameters of concern.”

Response: Additional water quality data has been added to Appendix D. Also, The Water Quality effects section in the FEIS has been further clarified.

Comment: “It is a concern that the basis of the Site No. 16 is founded on, and relies almost exclusively upon, the study of alternatives performed more than 30 years ago. The Alternatives analysis presented in the Site 16 DEIS refers the reader to the October 1974 report. As such, the alternatives could not have evaluated more recently developed Best Management Practices (BMPs) for stream bank restoration, riparian planting, wetland restoration along floodplains, restoration and preservation of floodplain areas, and storm water and agricultural runoff management. Other options not evaluated in detail in the 1974 document include dry dams, or moving the most flood prone structures away from the floodplain. It would be relevant to a discussion of flood control in a sparsely populated area to evaluate such alternate methods.”

Response: Additional information has been added to the “Alternatives Considered” portion of the FEIS.

Comment: “Though the projection of water temperature change was presented in the original document to range from increases between 5 and 10 degrees F, the current DEIS suggests that temperature of the coldwater stream will not be significantly modified because of construction of a coldwater release in the spillway. It is our understanding that cold water release structures have been built at other dams to maintain flow and thermal regime. It would be appropriate to include the data, or to collect data, to substantiate the claim that downstream temperature will not be impacted by the dam.”

Response: Additional information has been added to the discussion of Water Quality effects regarding water temperature and dissolved oxygen at various depths in existing Lost River impoundments. Temperature and DO data collected at Kimsey Run and Parker Hollow are contained in Appendix D.

Comment: *“An Environmental Impact Statement prepared to satisfy requirements of NEPA needs a section to evaluate the secondary impacts of the proposed action, and cumulative effects, which include any impacts of any development related or unrelated to the action which will impact any of the resources affected by the proposed action. Secondary impacts could include residential or commercial development associated with the proposed water supply system, thermal changes in the stream, fish passage issues, flow conditions during low flow, invasive species. Cumulative impact could include foreseeable effects of construction of Corridor H, or other projects in the subwatershed, on surface and ground water, aquatic or terrestrial habitat, etc.*

The summary of impacts for Tabulation 2 (page 20) appears to misstate acres of permanent inundation.”

Response: Concur. “Cumulative Effects” have been added to the FEIS. Acres of permanent inundation in Tabulation 2 have been further clarified.

Comment: *“It is unclear why the document contends (page 52, tabulation 3) that public support or opposition to the project is outside the scope of the comment process.”*

Response: The FEIS has been corrected.

Comment: *“Potential mitigation plans should be incorporated into the EIS. Mitigation can include the requirements under Section 404, but also what can be done under NEPA to replace impacted resources, reforest, maintain low temperatures in the trout waters, restore or enhance habitat, etc.”*

Response: A “Mitigation Summary” has been added to the FEIS.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources letter dated October 25, 2006

Comment: *“We wish to bring your attention to several statements that we believe are not supported by data. An example is the assertion that trapping of sediment behind the dam is a positive result. To justify this statement, data would need to be presented that excessive sediment is entering the upper reaches of Lower Cove Run. Given the fact that the watershed above the dam is largely forested, it is doubtful that the upper watershed is producing excessive sediment.*

Response: We agree that the upper portion of Lower Cove Run is largely forested. However there continues to be significant residential development occurring in the watershed. Site disturbance associated with home construction and development access roads, farm roads and streambank erosion result in significantly increased sedimentation compared to undisturbed forestland. There are also areas on Lower Cove Run between the National Forest property and the proposed dam site that are severely eroding and contributing large amounts of sediment to the lower reaches of Lower Cove Run. Much of the sediment from these sources would be trapped by the proposed impoundment.”

Comment: *“In addition, the trapping of natural sediment loads behind a dam can be detrimental to channel stability downstream of the impoundment. The phenomenon is referred to as “hungry water.” Flowing water has the capability to transport naturally occurring sediment loads very efficiently so that the net result is a stable channel that is neither aggrading from inefficient sediment transport or degrading. If naturally occurring sediment loads are eliminated, flowing water will remove sediment from the bed and banks down stream of the impoundment. If the channel degrades significantly, it may also become laterally unstable. Grade control and velocity dissipation devices can be constructed below the impoundment to minimize this potential adverse impact.”*

Response: Agreed. The discussion of sediment has been clarified. Grade control and energy dissipation below the outlet of the structure has been included as a measure to minimize the possible effects of discharging sediment-free water from the impoundment.

Comment: *“Another example is the assertion that the project will result in improved water quality. The document does not offer data as to the water quality issues in the watershed. The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection 303(d) program lists the Lost River as impaired due to fecal coliform contamination. We found no evidence that the water supply/flood control project will affect systematic fecal coliform problems. The document does not offer data showing how the reduction in occasional flooding will significantly reduced problems with fecal coliform in a watershed.”*

Response: Additional narrative pertaining to fecal coliform in the Lost River has been added to the Water Quality section. The TMDL developed for Lost River recommends that fecal coliform loads be reduced from pastureland, forestland and cropland. The proposed project would remove an estimated twenty head of livestock from fields adjacent to Lower Cove Run. This reduction contributes to the reduction in fecal coliform loading. In addition, the reduced flood frequencies and magnitudes upon Lost River floodplains used for agriculture will reduce amounts of manure residue and chemical fertilizers that might be transported to the Lost River by flood waters. Since the amounts of nutrients and fecal coliform introduced to the lost River as a result of flooding could not be quantified, no monetary benefits for this effect have been claimed.

Comment: *“The DNR’s primary concern with the revised Dam Site 16 proposal is the removal of recreation as a primary project purpose and diminishing its importance to an “incidental” status. The sponsors assert, without supporting information, that recent improvements to recreation facilities in the area have eliminated the need for recreational facilities on Dam Site 16. With dramatic growth in the area and the projected increase in growth that the project is anticipated to promote, current recreational facilities may not be as adequate as the sponsors assert. The DNR will not oppose the reduction of recreational facilities (i.e. picnic areas and pavilions) on Dam Site 16; however, we are adamantly opposed to “recreation” being classified as an incidental project purpose.”*

Response: In the original plan-EIS prepared in 1974, Site 16 was designated as the only site where recreational facilities and fishing would be provided. Recreational development and fishing were not originally proposed at any of the other four proposed impoundments. Since then, the three completed sites in the Lost River Subwatershed project all have included

incidental fishing and public access components. At the request of project sponsors, developed recreational amenities, including the campground, picnic areas, picnic shelters, system of access roads and parking areas, playground, swimming beach, sanitary facilities and waste water treatment were removed from the Site 16 project proposal. As such, project implementation costs associated with acquiring additional land and constructing these facilities were eliminated. Therefore, recreation was removed as a project purpose. Project costs associated with including incidental fishing recreation are small compared to the developed recreation originally proposed. The removal of recreation as a primary purpose of this project in no way diminishes the importance of fishing as a project benefit.

Comment: "According to the economic data in the DEIS, recreation (specifically fishing) will annually produce \$872,900 of economic benefit to the region. Flood reduction is reported to annually produce \$584,500. Recreation produces 30 percent of the economic benefit of the project compared to only 20 percent for flood reduction. It is difficult for us to understand how the sponsors can consider 30 percent of the project's economic benefit as "incidental" while flood control, which produces significantly less economic benefit, is still considered a "primary" project purpose."

Response: See response to previous comment.

Comment: "The removal of fishing recreation as a project purpose could allow eliminating public access to the facility with little or no public involvement in the decision. The DNR is planning to commit substantial resources to establish a warmwater fishery in the impoundment. If the project is approved with recreation only considered as an "incidental" benefit, we will reconsider this commitment. Without recreation as a project purpose, we cannot be assured that public fishing will be allowed for the life of the project. Consequently, without the economic benefit of fishing recreation, the project will not meet the required minimum 1:1 benefit to cost."

Response: The NRCS agrees that the loss of incidental fishing would reduce the project benefits and may, in turn, reduce the benefit cost ratio. WVDNR's commitment of resources to establish and maintain fisheries in NRCS constructed impoundments is of great value. Public access and the use of the Site 16 impoundment as a fishery will be insured through the interagency project agreement similar to those existing for Sites 27, 4, and 10.

Comment: "Although the DNR, as stated previously, does not oppose the substantial reduction of non-fishing recreational facilities on the project, the project design must include certain characteristics that will facilitate the projected angler days. These include a boat ramp, parking areas and reasonable access to shoreline. These features should be maintained by the Project sponsors."

Response: NRCS will coordinate with Project Sponsors, including WVDNR, during the design and construction phases to ensure that these features are included.

Comment: "The DEIS did not include any details concerning wetland and stream compensatory mitigation. We will work closely with the Natural Resources Conservation Service and local

sponsors to aid in the determination of appropriate type and location of compensatory mitigation projects for unavoidable impacts.”

Response: A mitigation summary section has been added to address compensatory mitigation. NRCS will work closely with WVDNR and USFWS to develop mitigation plans to address unavoidable wetland and stream impacts.

United States Department of Interior letter of October 18, 2006

Comment: *“The Plan-DEIS does not fully describe impacts the dam will have at the impoundment site and on downstream flow. Information on the following should be provided: magnitude and timing of current and anticipated with-project future streamflow in the reach below the proposed dam site, proposed operating schedule of the dam, and commitments made by the proponents about minimum flow, by season, if appropriate.”*

Response: Flow downstream of the dam during normal operation will equal inflow upstream of the normal pool. Flow downstream of the dam during runoff events will be less than inflow to the pool. The extent of the difference from inflow and outflow will be contingent upon the magnitude of the storm event. Pre-project and with project stream flows and water surface elevations are displayed in Appendix C. The primary discharges from the dam will be through a self-regulating intake riser which will be designed to restrict the flows to an allowable amount and will not have an operating schedule.

Comment: *“We note that the Plan-DEIS supplements a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) written in 1974. The 1974 FEIS described total flow below the proposed dam location as approximately equal to inflow to the impoundment, with the difference equal to loss by evaporation. The original document also stated that flood flows would be stored in flood pools and released with no significant change in volume within 2 to 6 days following the storm (page 7). It is particularly appropriate to revisit the streamflow information because the original document was written 32 years ago and the original purpose of the dam (and potentially its operating and release schedule) has been modified.”*

Response: The nature of the proposed structure has remained the same, with the exception of the riser configuration. The original work plan indicated a two stage riser would be installed; however, this document indicates that a single stage riser would be installed. This change in configuration will not change the operation of the structure during normal flow periods. That being the case, the release rates during flood flows will remain relatively the same. The flood waters will be stored behind the dam and released through the principal spillway up until the 100-year runoff event. If the runoff event exceeds the 100-year event, then the flood waters will begin to exit out of the auxiliary spillway in addition to the principal spillway. During normal flows the inflow into the lake will match the discharge through the principal spillway.

The retarding pool will be emptied in 10 days or less. The primary discharges from the dam will be through self-regulating intake riser which will be designed to restrict the flows to an allowable amount and will not have an operating schedule.

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers letter of October 18, 2006

Comment: *“The Pittsburgh District has the following comments on the DEIS:*

- 1. An individual Department of the Army permit is required for this work*
- 2. A detailed Alternatives Analysis and Avoidance and Minimization narrative commensurate with the impacts to wetlands and other Waters of the United States will be required with your application. The Alternatives Analysis in the DEIS does not meet 404(b)(1) guidelines*
- 3. Direct and Indirect, temporary and permanent downstream impacts must also be considered in your impact calculations.*
- 4. Water delivery structures may also require permitting from this office if they impact wetlands or other Waters of the United States.*
- 5. The Pittsburgh District cautions the project proponent from finalizing design plans and issuing the Final EIS prior to receipt of a Section 404 Clean Water Act Permit as the design may be altered during the application review process.”*

Response: It is NRCS procedure to complete the planning process and produce a Final EIS before applying for a project permit. NRCS acknowledges that permits are required prior to the implementation of the proposed project. Comments 2 through 5 will be addressed during the permitting process.

West Virginia Division of Culture and History Letter of October 2, 2006

Acknowledged, letter superseded by letter of December 6, 2006.

West Virginia Division of Culture and History Letter of December 6, 2006

Acknowledged, letter replaces letter from October 2, 2006.

Emails and letters received from the general public are included in their entirety in this FEIS. Opinions of the writers are acknowledged and, where necessary, a response is provided. Comments were not corrected for grammar or clarity.

Joem Webster email of 10/17/06 10:37 am – Comments noted

Joem Webster email of 10/17/06 10:35 am – Comments noted

Dick Baker email of 10/17/06 10:55 am – Comments noted

Anne Webster email of 10/17/06 9:12 am – Comments noted

Wendy Lane email of 10/18/07 9:57 am – Comments noted

Roger Weidman email of 10/18/06 9:55 am – Comments noted

Valincia Darby email of 10/18/06 4:00 pm – see response to DOI letter

Response to Anthony Slater's email of 10/19/06 8:58 am

Comment: *"Since 1974, the Committee has tried to get the local and elected officials along with cooperating agencies to re-evaluate the 1974 Work Plan for the Lost River Watershed....It is not common practice for any public sector to allow a project or work plan to continue without being updated, reviewed, or checked for feasibility without current studies and alternatives."*

Response: The Lost River Work Plan – Environmental Impact Statement has been supplemented three times (1989, 1991, and 2001) with each supplement consisting of updated costs and benefits, and environmental impacts. Net Benefits of the project have increased since Supplement #3 as a result of decreased costs in the overall project, increased water supply benefits, and a more favorable project interest rate. Changes in the project have resulted in the benefit cost ratio increasing from .80 to 1.0 in Supplement #3 to 1.13 to 1.0 in this Supplement.

Bradley Walker email of 10/19/06 12:29 am – Comments noted

Anthony Slater email of 10/19/06 8:27 am – duplicate of 10/19/06 8:58 email

Response to Elizabeth Webster's email of 10/20/06 1:49 pm

Comment: *"Where is the need for additional dams on Lost River?"*

Response: The need is described in the 2007 FEIS.

Comment: *"Exactly what flood damages would the Lost River Site #16 prevent?"*

Response: Flood damages to property and improvements are reduced by an additional \$126,900 annually as indicated in Tabulation 2.

Comment: *"How is Site 16 at Lost City on Lower Cove Run, a tributary of Lost River, going to protect the town of Mathias?"*

Response: This Supplement does not state that Site 16 will protect the town of Mathias or any other town upstream of Site 16 along Lost River. The supplement does address Site 16 in concert with the other structures in the Lost River work plan.

Comment: *"Where is the data that can be verified to substantiate the NRCS' claim that the Lost River has \$1 million in flood damages annually? Which years had these damages and where did these damages occur? Please identify buildings, etc. by location that were affected by those floods. Also, identify which of these are above or below existing dams. Distinguish those structures that will be protected by Lost City Site 16."*

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: *“Where is the before and after analysis so that a comparison can be made as to the benefit from those dams that have already been constructed?”*

Response: The analysis is displayed in Tabulation 2, Columns 2 and 3

Comment: *“Where does the draft EIS show how much benefit (if any) Kimsey Run has done to lessen flood damages?”*

Response: The effects of Kimsey Run are included in Existing Conditions.

Comment: *“Why are the benefits in the draft EIS calculated for 100 years? Most dams have a life of 50 years.”*

Response: The National Engineering Handbook Section 3 Chapter 8 states the design life of a reservoir is the period required for the reservoir to fulfill its intended purpose. Structures designed by SCS (now NRCS) in the watershed protection and flood prevention programs are usually designed for a life of 50 or 100 years. The SCS-309 form “Reservoir Sediment Design Summary” documents that Site 16 has enough capacity for a 100 year design period. Additionally, footnote to Table 3 of the FEIS states that all Lost River sites store 100 years of submerged sediment accumulation. The benefits and costs are calculated for 100 years because that is the period of time over which these structures are expected to function.

Comment: *“What percentage of the practices to reduce erosion, etc. as written in the 1974 EIS have the NRCS completed? Which have never been addressed? Of those completed which has had the greatest impact on the Lost River? What was the cost of each? What was the financial benefit of each in terms of minimizing water damages to soil and buildings?”*

Response: Refer to Table 1 in the FEIS. As referenced in the 1974 Lost River Subwatershed Work Plan, PL-534 authorized funding for accelerated land treatment as a component of watershed protection within the Lost River Subwatershed, resulting in increased NRCS staffing levels to provide technical assistance to private landowners in the watershed. This assistance has been provided to landowners who became cooperators with the Potomac Valley Conservation District and prepared resource conservation plans to install identified practices. Funding for practice implementation has been provided through various USDA cost-sharing programs.

Total acres of agricultural lands treated to date exceed those identified for treatment in the 1974 Work Plan. Practices installed include, but are not limited to, conservation cropping systems, cover crops, grassed waterways, animal waste storage systems, comprehensive nutrient management, improved pasture management, critical area treatment, fencing, livestock water development (ponds, spring developments, pipelines, troughs), riparian forest buffers, streambank stabilization, and livestock exclusion from forestland and riparian areas.

The application of these conservation measures has improved land cover and hydrologic conditions, resulting in reduced runoff, erosion, and sedimentation from treated areas. The applied conservation practices have also helped limit water quality degradation in the watershed

by reducing nutrient and fecal coliform loading from agricultural sources. Quantitative benefit/cost analysis for individual conservation practices has not been done.

Comment: *“What is the cost of drilling wells for water rather than building another dam at an estimated cost of \$24 million dollars? Where is the comparison of costs for getting water from the river or wells vs impoundments? How can you justify this dam for water supply for such a sparsely populated area?”*

Response: As indicated in the Hardy County Water Resources Study, wells and surface streams are not viable options for public water supply. The report is located at http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/lost_river.html. This document was made available to the public in 2004. Justification for the water supply is included in Appendix E of the FEIS.

Comment: *“Will my emails to you sent on August 8, 2006, be part of the comments section on the final draft? Should I resubmit those to you for inclusion?”*

Response: The comment period for the DEIS was August 25 to October 25, 2006. All comments and questions received during the comment period on the DEIS are included in Final EIS. There was no draft EIS available at the scoping meeting because a draft cannot be produced until **after** the scoping meeting occurs. Comments received during the scoping process have already been addressed in the DEIS.

Ashley Barricks email of 10/20/06 3:25 pm - Comments noted

Response to Elizabeth Webster’s email of 10/20/06 3:58 pm

Comment: *“Please explain how water can be piped from the Lost River area to Wardensville, but the terrain is too steep for water to be piped from Wardensville to Lost River.”*

Response: The FEIS has been corrected.

Comment: *“Isn’t Site 10 adequate for these needs?... Wouldn’t spending approx. \$9 million to use it as a water supply make more sense that [sic] to spend \$24 million and take additional homes and farms?... Have you considered the feasibility of using some everflowing springs as a water source.”*

Response: Lost River Site 10 was constructed to provide flood control and raw water supply source for the Lost River watershed area. There are plans to construct a water treatment plant, water storage facilities, and water transmission lines in the area to provide finished water to local users. The available water at Lost River Site 10 will be adequate to meet the needs of the area over the short term; however, projected needs in the future will exceed the design capacity of Lost River Site 10. Therefore, the sponsors have requested that a water supply component be included with the flood control purpose of Lost River Site 16.

The project sponsors have identified flood control and water supply as purposes for the Lost River watershed project. Lost River Site 16 is identified as providing both of the purposes. In order to provide additional raw water supply to the area, Lost River Site 4 could be modified to include water supply or Lost River Site 16 could be constructed to include water supply. The cost to modify Lost River Site 4 to include water supply is estimated to be approximately \$9 million. The cost to include water supply in Lost River Site 16 is estimated to be approximately \$2 million. Therefore the cost to include water supply in Lost River Site 16 is significantly less than the cost to modify Lost River Site 4 to include water supply.

The total cost of Lost River Site 16 is greater than the cost to modify Lost River Site 4 to include water supply; however, the benefits resulting from the two actions are not the same. Modifying Lost River Site 4 to include water supply and not constructing Lost River Site 16 will not provide additional flood control to the watershed and will not meet the Sponsors' current need for flood control. Thus, a direct comparison of the overall cost of Lost River Site 16 to the cost of modification to Lost River Site 4 does not compare the costs for the same net results.

The feasibility of using springs for public water supply was evaluated in the Hardy County Water Resources report and ruled out due to insufficient yield. The report is available at http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/lost_river.html.

Comment: "... the cost of piping water throughout the entire Lost River Valley is going to be so costly that people may refuse to use public water. Has a study been done to determine if the people who live in the area will pay for water from a public water supply? What is the population requirement to make public water less costly than private wells?"

Response: The Hardy County Public Service District and Hardy County Commission will be responsible for the construction of water treatment plants and distribution systems in the Lost River Valley. The development of public water supply systems is regulated by the WV Public Service Commission. Customer rates and facilities financing are among the many issues that the WVPSC oversees, ensuring that systems are developed that meet the needs and are affordable to customers.

Comment: "Did the writers of this document seriously consider the "No Build, No Action Alternative?"

Response: Yes.

Comment: "Please identify specifically what building and home will be protected by Dam 16... Have you accounted for the damages caused by Howard's Lick, or Fravel's Run, or Mill Gap Run, or the numerous unnamed streams that drain into the Lost River?"

Response: Refer to the "With Project 100 Year Floodplain" maps included in the FEIS Appendix B. Homes, roads, farm buildings, cropland, and all other types of property are shown on the maps. Additional information regarding flood damage calculations has been added to the Investigation and Analysis section of the FEIS. All drainages in the Lost River Watershed are included in the hydrologic and hydraulic study of the watershed.

Comment: *“On page 22, the draft EYES [sic] you state that “55 square miles of drainage area will be controlled”. You contradict that amount on 23 by stating “Site 16 will trap sediment from the 11.8 square miles of drainage area behind this structure.” Why [sic] the huge discrepancy? Why didn’t you translate that amount to a percentage. Isn’t that 8%?”*

Response: The drainage area of Site 16 is 11.8 square miles. The combined drainage area of Site 16 and the structures already completed total 55 square miles. The numbers presented in the paragraph are correct. The drainage area of the watershed is 183 square miles. Site 16 would control 6.4% of the total watershed; however, the total project would control 30% of the total watershed.

Comment: *“Do you have studies to show how much flooding has increased in the past 30 years? the past 10 years? Can you justify that statement with fact based on actual studies?”*

Response: See response to EPA letter of 10/24/07. Changes in watershed conditions, including runoff, floodplain development, bridge modifications, highway construction, and other factors that effect the flooding, were evaluated as part of this Supplemental Work Plan. Mapping, aerial photography, property elevations, stream cross-sections, and all other information needed to assess the current state of flooding were updated as part of this Supplemental Work Plan – FEIS.

Comment: *“Has the water quality of Lower Cove Run been tested periodically. Have these results been published? Has a study been done to determine the possible vegetative impact to the main stream of the Lost River if the water from Lower Cove Run water is deleted from its flow?”*

Response: Water quality samples have been analyzed on Lower Cove Run for a number of years (See data in Appendix D). Most of the time, water will be discharged from the Site 16 outlet structure as a result of water entering the impoundment from upstream. In the event that withdrawals for water supply needs exceed inflow into the impoundment, discharges from Lower Cove Run to the Lost River may be reduced. The cold water release should supplement the discharge from the impoundment and minimize this occurrence. No adverse impacts to vegetation along Lost River is expected.

Mary McGregor email of 10/20/06 5:05 pm – Comments noted

Mary McGregor email of 10/21/06 2:46 am – Comments noted

Marilyn Christiano email of 10/21/06 11:49 am – Comments noted

Cheryl Detamore email of 10/21/06 12:11 pm – Comments noted

Eunice Webster email of 10/22/06 6:00 pm – Comments noted

Roger Simmer email of 10/22/06 6:50 pm – Comments noted

Cheryl Edwards email of 10/22/06 8:25 pm – Comments noted

Connie Wood email of 10/22/06 9:44 pm – Comments noted

Connie Wood email of 10/22/06 9:44 pm – duplicate; Comments noted

Connie Wood email of 10/22/06 9:44 pm – duplicate; Comments noted

Heather Christiano email of 10/23/06 9:48 am – Comments noted

Response to Elizabeth Webster’s email of 10/23/06 4:00 pm

Comment: *“Construction versus modification of existing site? Did you seriously consider using the dam at Kimsey Run as it has been constructed as a water source? On page 15, it states “The cost associated with modifications to Site 4 would be approx. \$9,500,000. This alternative is not the most cost-effective.” You would spend \$24,000,000 to construct a new dam at Site 16, Lost City. Since when is 24 million less than 9.5 million?”*

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: *“What is the basis for your statement on page 17 that states “The lack of dependable water supply will also result in higher fire insurance premiums for homeowners and businesses due to insufficient fire protection. Have you obtained data from the insurance companies to support this claim? Can they not use water from the 3 dams already constructed? Additionally, the PVSCD has helped with the installation of a number of dry hydrants in the Lost River Valley. Do the dams and dry hydrants no [sic] give an adequate supply of water for fire protection?”*

Response: There is tremendous housing growth in the Lost River area, as discussed in Appendix E. While dry hydrants and existing dams can be accessed by fire trucks for water supply and do offer benefits to property owners, these water sources are not as effective as strategically-placed, pressurized fire hydrants that offer a reliable supply of water during fire emergencies. With adequate source water development at Sites 10 and 16, the Hardy County PSD will be able to offer a dependable water supply. The following internet sources support the statements on page 17 regarding the beneficial effects of a dependable water supply relative to fire protection. It should be noted that no monetary benefits were included in Table 6 for the reduction in fire insurance rates.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/fire-hydrant>

<http://ohioline.osu.edu/aex-fact/0424.html>

Comment: *“...it states that “agricultural productivity along the Lost River has been improved with the installation of 3 dams and the land treatment program. Please describe what changes have occurred and specifically where they occurred. I have lived in Lost City since 1972 and have not noticed any dramatic changes to the way the land is used in the Lost River floodplain. The new home [sic] that have been built are on or along the ridges and up the hollows. These new homes do not need protection from the ravaging Lost River.”*

Response: Agricultural productivity is improved due to the reduction in flooding to fences and crop fields in the floodplain. The frequency of flooding has been reduced on floodplain farmlands, resulting in less damage and more dependable yields. Additional information was added to the FEIS regarding this topic. For specific locations, consult the maps in Appendix B. See statements in the *Affected Environment* section of the document regarding floodplain land use. Additional information was added to the *Land Use and Upland Habitat* effects portion of the FEIS to further clarify. We also concur that most new home construction has occurred outside of the Lost River floodplain and therefore, is not subject to flooding and is not included in the flood damage reduction benefits in Table 5.

Comment: *“It further states 416 acres of private land was converted to public uses. Please identify where this conversion has taken place. What public use was realized and is this really an improvement or not?”*

Response: That conversion occurred when land was purchased for Sites 4, 10, and 27. The public use is flood control, watershed protection, water supply, incidental recreation, and other intangible benefits associated with these sites.

Comment: *“On page 42, it states “the implementation of 3 flood prevention structures has reduced the stress and mental anguish associated with the flooding in the watershed. Do you have sworn statements from people who will testify to this claim? What about those who would be impacted if one of these structures were breached or if the rainfall exceeded the holding capacity and the dam overflowed? Did you do a before and after survey to see if people really felt safer before or after construction? What about the mental anguish and stress on the people that opposed these dams?... What about the mental anguish of those who might lose their homes or farms to these projects? ... Did the proponents of these dams consider the wishes of these people? Did you consider the mental anguish and stress of those who do not believe your propaganda and who do not think this project has merit?”*

Response: The FEIS has been corrected.

Response to Elizabeth Webster’s email of 10/23/06 4:49 pm

Comment: *“... It states that it was prepared by Potomac Valley Conservation District, Hardy County Commission and the West Virginia State Conservation Committee. Who specifically from these groups contributed to this document? Please include a list of specific individuals who have helped on the actual writing... How many of the individuals who worked on this draft have intimate knowledge of the Lost River Valley related to flooding during the past 30 years?”*

Response: The list of preparers is included in the document.

Comment: *“There is no data related to actual flood damages in the past 30 years...What specific years where [sic] there floods and which specific years were there drought conditions?...How do you arrive at an average annual flood damage figure in excess of a million dollars?”*

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06. Additional information has been added to the “Investigation and Analysis” section of the FEIS regarding the determination of average annual flood damages.

Comment: *“Did you ever seriously consider the NO BUILD alternative or other alternatives?”*

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Sherry Yurcaba email of 10/23/06 4:57 pm- Comments noted

Joyce McEvoy email of 10/24/06 2:35 am – Comments noted

Joyce McEvoy email of 10/24/06 2:45 am – Comments noted

David McEvoy email of 10/24/06 2:47 am – Comments noted

Dana Pompei email of 10/24/06 12:45 pm – Comments noted

Response to Linda Foltz’s email of 10/24/06 12:57 pm

Comment: *“... The document’s cover page is misleading... Please include a list of specific individuals...Did NCRS personnel write this?... Do these individuals have thorough knowledge of flood-related problems with the Lost River Valley during the last 30 years?”*

Response: See response to E. Webster’s email of 10/23/06.

Comment: *“The document contains no actual flood related data to correlate with “your” annual flood damage cost of over one-million-dollars... Where does this million dollar figure come from?”*

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06 regarding the calculation of flood damages

Comment: *“Is this material presented only to rationalize the construction of additional dams in the Lost River Valley?”*

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Charles Foltz email of 10/24/06 1:00 pm – duplicate of Linda Foltz email of 10/24/06

Mark Tesoriero’s email of 10/24/06 1:06 pm – duplication of Elizabeth Webster’s email of 10/23/06

Response to Wesley Foltz's email of 10/24/06 1:04 pm

Comment: "No flood damage is cited yet there's a million-dollar cost conclusion on page 9. The following facts are excluded from the document: -- zero homes have been lost to flooding in the last 30 years -- no flood related deaths in the last 30 years"

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "The cover page states it was prepared by Potomac Valley Conservation District, Hardy County Commission and the West Virginia State Conservation Committee. However, individuals from these groups have never read the manuscript."

Response: See response to E. Webster's email of 10/23/06

Comment: "The public scoping workshop cited on page 52 hardly meets intent. Landowners were not given copies of the draft EIS before or during the August '06 meeting as promised by the District Conservationist. Therefore, individuals could not comment on the document."

Response: See response to E. Webster's email of 10/20/06

Conrad Christiano email of 10/24/06 4:17 pm – Comments noted

Pat Polfliet email of 10/24/06 9:13 pm – Comments noted

Response to Toni and Dennis Torboli's letter, undated

Comment: "To what purpose other than spending much needed tax dollars we need spent elsewhere in WV is this damn [sic] going to serve????"

Response: Project purposes are stated in the FEIS. They include watershed protection, flood damage reduction, and rural water supply.

Response to Joem Webster letter of 10/09/06

Comment: "The population count includes transients (and probably illegal immigrants)."

Response: Population counts are based on United States Census data and are representative of the population projected to use resources such as water.

Comment: "Then there is the cost of upkeep on all of these dams and the fact that modifications will take more money for the Kimsey Run dam."

Response: The modifications to the Kimsey Run dam were provided in the DEIS as a matter of comparison for the different water supply options. No additional modifications to the Kimsey Run dam will be necessary unless Site 16 isn't built and Kimsey Run becomes the next most likely source for water supply. The upkeep on the existing dams is referred to as Operation and

Maintenance and is included in the costs in Tables 1-6 in the FEIS. Routine mowing, inspection, and monitoring of the sites is the responsibility of the local sponsors.

Response to document entitled “PLEASE READ THE Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Lost River” provided to the WV Conservation Committee and the Potomac Valley Conservation District by local citizens

Comment: “The front cover does say, “Prepared by: Potomac Valley Conservation District...”

Response: Correct, they are an official sponsor of the project and assist in the preparation of the report.

Comment: “According to page 2: The project life is 100 years. I thought most dams have a 50-year life. Was making it 100 years the only way to get the benefit-cost ratio to work?”

Response: See Response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: “According to page 2: No more than 9.6 acres of wetlands will be impacted. According to the USDA-NRCS Web Soil Survey, there are over 30 acres of wetlands in the project area...”

Response: Hydric soils are defined by the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils as soils that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part (top 20 inches). These soils, under natural conditions, are either saturated or inundated long enough during the growing season to support the growth and reproduction of hydrophytic vegetation.

The three essential characteristics of wetlands are hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology (US Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Delineation Manual 1987). Criteria for all three characteristics must be met for areas to be identified as wetlands. Hydric soils without the hydrology (standing water) or hydrophytic vegetation components do not meet the definition of wetlands.

The soil survey does not identify the presence of hydrology or hydrophytic vegetation and therefore, does not indicate the existence of wetlands. Approximately 29.55 acres of hydric soils were identified within the project area. These soils were used as an indicator of potential wetlands in lieu of completing wetlands delineations within the project area. The surface drainage, comprised of a deepened intermittent stream channel, appears to intercept much of the hydrology originating from the hillside seeps on the north side of the project area. Without this hydrology, soils mapped as Melvin silt loam and Dunning silty clay loam lying south of the drainage way cannot be classified as wetlands. This assumption is supported by the cropping history of fields lying between the drainage ditch and Lower Cove Run in the project area.

The hydric soils mapping units lying above (north) of the drainage ditch have greater potential to be wetlands because they have unintercepted hydrology. These potential wetland areas that are at or below the permanent pool area or will be disturbed by the construction of the dam will be

adversely impacted by the project. Wetland areas that are not disturbed by construction activities and are at an elevation higher than the permanent pool will not be adversely impacted according to consultations with the WV DNR and US FWS.

Wetland delineations will be completed prior to the start of construction and wetland mitigation measures will be implemented as a condition of the Corps of Engineers 404 permit, State 401 certification and in consultation with the WV DNR and the US FWS.

Comment: "According to page 2: The Lost River Watershed population estimate is 2600 (That's 21% of Hardy Co. population). Yet in the back of the £15 [sic] (Appendix E Table 4 page 3), water need is based on 49% of the county's housing units."

Response: Correct, current population of the watershed is estimated at 2,600.

The projected water demand was developed through coordination with the Hardy County RDA. The report is based on the best available information at the local level.

Table 4 also shows the percent of the county population in the service area for the proposed public water supply is 42%. Water demand is based on the industry standard of 150 gallons per day per household, thus it is appropriate to use the house count to project demand. The industry standard is an average, taking into consideration houses that use much more water (primary residence) as well as houses that may use much less water (second homes). Additionally, as demographics change and older residents retire, second homes become the primary residence during retirement. This trend is expected to occur in Hardy County, thus many of the second homes will become primary homes.

Comment: "Also, Appendix E Table 2 page 2 shows that the Lost River District population grew 15% from 1990-2000. However, the 2.4 million gallons of water usage per day by 2060 (yes 54 years into the future) is an estimate based on the county's housing growth of 28% from 1990 to 2000 (shown in Appendix E Table 4 page 3)."

Response: Correct. You will note that the housing growth has actually exceeded 28% in the area of study. In fact it is as high as 41%, so the projections are based on a conservative growth rate of 30%. It is entirely possible that demand will exceed the projected need because of the conservative nature of this analysis. Furthermore, the estimate does not account for any large scale industrial or commercial entities that may locate in the watershed. Thus the water usage is very conservative with regard to industrial and commercial projected demand. Refer to the appended Projected Water Supply report for more information on calculation of residential, industrial, and commercial demand.

Comment: "There are many homeowners in the county that are non-residents. So will 2.4 million gallons really be used everyday in the year 2060?"

Response: See response to previous comment.

Comment: "Also, according to Appendix E Table 3 page 2, the water projection is based on

*housing units for the Lost River **and** Capon districts. How will dams in the Lost River District supply water to the Capon District? Is that realistic? If so, who is going to fund that project”*

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

*Comment: “No one in the Lost River District is hooked up to water yet. **Appendix E Table 4** page 3 estimated the water need for the project area in 2000 at over 500,000 gallons per day. The area seems to be doing just fine without a dam source. Can you truly justify the need for another water source?”*

Response: Yes. The justification is documented in the report you are citing.

*Comment: “If so, **did** you **know** that Kimsey **Run** dam could be used as a water supply source?”*

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: “According to the report “Potential Surface Water Supply Sources.” dated February 10, 2005, the WV Conservation Agency, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the Potomac Valley Conservation District (PVCD), and the Hardy County Commission (11CC) [sic] completed a comprehensive water resource assessment for Hardy Co. The Kimsey Run dam was selected as a back-up to the Parker Hollow dam “because it was a reasonable alternative due to its proximate location, it’s huge contributing drainage area, and because a means of withdrawal was included in the final design to facilitate connecting a supply the at the base of the dam to an installed piping configuraiion [sic] equipped with a valve” “The Hardy County Commission advocated including dam site #4 [Kimsey Run dam] as an alternative back-up supply due to the belief that re-allocating the dam’s permanent pool to include a supply component was within their fiscal means.”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: “It is reported in the draft EIS for the Lost River Watershed (page 15), dated August 2006, that: With this site’s [Kimsey Run dam] drainage area, it has potential for incorporating a dedicated water supply.’ It is also reported in the draft US [sic] that modifications would have to be made to the structure. The cost would be approximately \$9.5 million, about 1/3 the cost of building a new dam.”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

*Comment: “Isn’t \$9.5 **million** (page 15) in modifications of an existing structure cheaper **than** \$24 million (blue pages Table 2A) to build another dam?”*

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

*Comment: “The Lower Cove dam would cost over \$24 million. (See **blue** pages Table 2A.) Then, it would take additional money to build the water supply/treatment facility.”*

Response: Yes, it will take additional money to build treatment facilities, regardless of the raw water source.

Comment: "It is reported in the draft ETS [sic] that the Lost River Valley has an average of \$1.2 million in flood damages per year. (See blue pages Table 5.) WHERE are those damages taking place? I cannot find a yearly breakdown of flood damages for the Lost River area."

Response: See response to EPA letter of 10/24/06.

Comment: "After the 1985 flood (in which 10 inches of rain fell), repairs in the Lost River area cost approximately \$400,000. That was 20 years ago. Today, that \$400,000 might be equivalent to SI [sic] million. However, the Lost River Valley does not have a "1985 flood" EVERY YEAR!"

Response: The NRCS Emergency Watershed Protection program expenditure in 1985 was only one of many sources of flood recovery money spent as a result of the 1985 flood. The \$400,000 expenditure by NRCS for Lost River following the 1985 flood was for channel restoration only. This does not include any funds spent by FEMA, WVDOH (for repairs to roads, bridges, etc.), local governments, or by private homeowners, farmers or businesses for repairs, damages or losses to crops, fences or inventories. It also does not include work time lost, detours, business lost due to closures or other interruptions to daily life caused by this flood.

Response to Comment Form from Anthony Slater 9/26/06

Comment: "Where is the streamflow data for Lower Cove Run"

Response: Appendix B of the FEIS

Comment: "What is the Water Quality and Sediment Ratio for Lower Cove Run?"

Response: Water quality information is shown in Appendix D.

Comment: "Is a natural stream ripran [sic] area and nature stream buffers better than a man made structure & channel changes."

Response: Additional information has been added to the Alternatives section of the report. Neither alternative is effective in reducing flooding or meeting the raw water needs.

Comment: "What is the effect of the current 3 dams & their benefits?"

Response: This information is displayed in Tabulation 2.

Lost River Committee Counter Summary document, Comments noted

Response to E-Mail Attachment from Stephanie Slater of 10/25/06 1:07 am

Comment: "So, who really prepared this document?" Why were the local sponsors asked to approve a DRAFT EIS prior to the end of the comment period and prior to the final EIS being published? Is it so NRCS can state in the final copy that the local sponsors support the project?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06; See response to A. Slater email of 10/25/06.

Comment: "What is different that will make this dam last twice as long? Was making its life 100 years the only way to get the benefit-cost ratio to work?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "In one year, how did the ratio increase to 1.3 to 1? Could it be because the EIS includes the benefits of water supply but NOT the cost of the water supply facility? Redo the analysis to include those costs. Provide a site by site analysis of benefits and cost.

Response: See response to A. Slater email of 10/19/06

Comment: "Is the 9.6 acres accurate since the wetland delineation has not been completed yet? When will the Army Corps of Engineers or EPA do a JD on the wetlands?"

Response: See response to document titled "PLEASE READ THE Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Lost River" included elsewhere in this section.

Comment: "There seems to be several problems with the water usage estimate... So, will 2.4 million gallons really be used everyday in the year 2060? How will dams in the Lost River District supply water to the Capon District? Who would fund a water system that would transport water to the Capon District? This cost is NOT considered in the benefit-cost analysis?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "... The draft EIS states this is not the most cost effective alternative. Why not? Isn't \$9.5 million (page 15) in modifications of an existing structure cheaper than \$24 million (blue pages Table 2A) to build another dam? Why not use modify Kimsey Run dam to use as a water supply source since it has a larger drainage area and already exists? ... In the draft EIS, it is stated that this cost was NOT considered in the cost-benefit analysis. Why not, since it is one of the primary purposes of the dam?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "Again, the need for water supply is questionable. In March 2004, Ed Kesecker reported that the existing structures would be more than adequate water supply for projected growth. What changed in less than 4 months?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "If there is a great need for water (which there is NOT), consider a water tower... What would be the expense to pipe water to homes in the Lost River Valley, homes that are so spread out? Has a survey been completed to be sure people are willing to hook up to a public water system? What survey has been done or meeting has been held to determine if the public feels there is a need for water"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "Where are those damages taking place? Today, that \$400,000 might be equivalent to \$1 million. However, the Lost River Valley does not have a "1985 flood" EVERY YEAR! What will this dam protect that the other three do not? The Lower Cove dam will only control a drainage area of less than 6.5% of the entire drainage area."

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "If the comments regarding this watershed and project are not addressed in the EIS, when, where, and by whom will they be answered?"

Response: All comments are addressed in the FEIS.

Comment: "Which agencies received notice of the scoping meetings? How and when did they receive the notice? Were agencies contacted for input after these meetings? Were they actually encouraged to provide expert input? If so, which agencies commented and what were the comments?"

Response: The first scoping meeting (technically an early planning meeting) was held on October 26, 2005. Notices were sent out by mail on September 23, 2005 to the WV Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, WV Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, WV Department of Culture and History, WV Conservation Agency, U.S. Forest Service, WV Division of Highways, Potomac Valley Conservation District, WV Rivers Coalition, WV Sierra Club, Potomac Headwaters Alliance, and the Cacapon Institute. Concerns identified at this meeting were addressed in the DEIS and FEIS prepared for the Lost River Site 16 project proposal. Additional consultations were held with several of these entities to discuss threatened and endangered species, habitat evaluations and mitigation, aquatic resources assessments and mitigation, wetlands delineations and mitigation, fishery habitat enhancements, brook trout ecology and life history, and other environmental concerns. Consultations were held with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service, WV Department of Natural Resources, WV Department of Environmental Protection and others. Agencies and non-governmental organizations that were mailed individual notices of the August 1, 2006 project scoping workshop were the WV

Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, WV Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, WV Division of Culture and History, WV Conservation Agency, U.S. Forest Service, Potomac Valley Conservation District, WV Rivers Coalition, WV Sierra Club, Potomac Headwaters Resource Alliance and the Cacapon Institute. No formal comments were received from the above listed entities during or following the August 1, 2006 scoping meeting.

Comment: "The August 1, 2006 scoping meeting was not "widely publicized" as indicated in the draft EIS... I thought it had to be publicized in the local papers at least 30 days in advance. Regarding the second public workshop, I found in one paper that it was advertised as a project in Hampshire County, WV instead of Hardy County, WV. Where was it advertised that the public could comment until October 25?"

Response: The August 1, 2006 scoping meeting was advertised in the Federal Register on July 11, 2006 with the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for the Lost River Watershed. Additionally, the August 1, 2006 meeting was listed in the legal notices for the Notice of Intent published in The Moorefield Examiner, Hampshire Review, Cumberland Times-News and Daily News-Record. Notices of the August 1, 2006 meeting were sent directly to affected landowners on July 10, 2006. Notices and advertisements are to be published at least 15 days before the meeting. The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS, published in the Federal Register on September 8, 2006 and in legal advertisements in the four newspapers listed above, stated that comments were to be received by October 25, 2006. A poster listing comment procedures at the September 26, 2006 informational meeting listed three ways that comments could be submitted and that they were to be received by October 25, 2006.

Comment: "What social impact will this project have on a community that has opposed this whole watershed project from its beginning in the late 1960s? What would the community lose if this project is constructed?"

Response: Social impacts are included in the effects section of the FEIS. Refer to this section and Tabulation 2 for the effects of the "No Action" alternative.

Comment: "How might this project degrade the watershed? What are some of the worst case environmental scenarios that could be caused by this project?"

Response: The impacts of this project on environmental resources in the watershed are described in the effects section of the FEIS.

Comment: "Has a habitat evaluation procedure been completed? If so, which agencies were involved or was it only one NRCS?"

Response: The Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) has not been completed. This work will be completed at such time as personnel may access property to be effected by the proposed project. Information gathered from HEP will be used to define project affects upon indicator species and to develop avoidance, minimization or habitat mitigation measures prior to project

implementation. The HEP analyses will be conducted by NRCS with participation to be requested from WVDNR and the USFWS.

Comment: "How will the project affect wildlife habitat? What will this project do to the trout population since the Lower Cove Run is identified as a trout-reproducing stream (Tier 2.5 stream)?"

Response: The project affects upon terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitats are discussed in the Land Use and Upland Habitat section under Environmental Consequences. A more thorough discussion of brook trout life history and potential impacts has been added to the Aquatic Resources section. Proposed rules associated with the Tier 2.5 Stream Antidegradation classification will allow up to ten percent degradation in water quality. The proposed Site 16 impoundment is not expected to exceed these limits if these rules are promulgated.

Comment: "How can you be sure this will not set precedent for taking of national forest areas for other projects?"

Response: The US Forest Service is a cooperating agency. Forest Service land will not be acquired for the proposed Site 16 project. The 10.1 acres of Forest Service land affected by the project will remain in Forest Service ownership. A special use permit will be issued to allow the use and inundation of Forest Service lands. As no Forest Service land will be taken for the proposed Site 16 project, there will be no precedent established for taking additional Forest Service lands.

Comment: "What effect will this project have on the wetlands?" If the wetlands are recreated/mitigated, how will that affect the environment? Is it true that mitigated wetlands "pump" mercury into streams for the first 10 years of their existence? What effect would mercury contamination have on wildlife and habitats in the area?

Response: See the effects section of the FEIS for impacts to wetlands. NRCS is not aware of any increase in mercury contamination to streams that may result from the construction or enhancement of wetlands that may result from mitigation. The presence of mercury, which may be the result of atmospheric deposition, is not expected to differ between the recommended alternative or the no action alternative.

Comment: "How will the project alter an identified historic site? Has the phase 2 archeological studies been completed on the sites that were recommended?"

Response: The impacts to cultural resources are identified in the effects section. Phase 2 archeological studies will be conducted prior to construction.

Comment: "A thorough analysis of other alternatives has NOT been completed since the early 1970s. Why not? 30 years and 3 dams change things. Why is that information NOT included in the EIS? People are not willing to give up their land at this site. Has this been a consideration when looking at other alternatives? If so, how was this done? Where is the information?"

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "Consider the benefits to cleaning debris out of the streams to reduce minor flooding. Consider a voluntary buy-out of property in the floodplain. Thoroughly investigate the "no action future" alternative.

Response: Additional information has been added to the FEIS Alternatives.

Comment: "Why would acres of wetlands be destroyed if the goal is flood control?"

Response: See discussion of Wetland Restoration Alternative.

Comment: "Regarding the other three constructed sites: How do they currently serve their purposes? They are NOT supplying water to anyone yet. How does that create a need for the fourth? The cost-benefit analysis on those sites has NOT been updated since they have been installed. Why? Provide the information to determine if the other three sites have met the "need" or have the capability of meeting the "need".

Response: See response to A. Slater email of 10/19/06

Comment: "Will the project be in compliance with federal law and regulations? If yes, who checks to be sure that it is? Will the project be in compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act? If yes, who checks to be sure that it is? Will the project be in compliance with all state laws and regulations? If yes, who checks to be sure that it is?"

Response: Yes. Federal and state agencies responsible for issuing each permit will ensure compliance with their permit requirements and associated conditions. Inspectors with the WV Department of Environmental Protection are responsible for enforcing the provisions of state's water quality protection statutes and insuring that erosion and sediment control measures are properly installed.

Comment: "Where will the wetlands be recreated? It is suggested in the same watershed; where would that be in the Lost River Watershed?"

Response: It is expected that wetland mitigation will be accomplished within the proposed Site 16 project area. A Mitigation Summary has been added to the FEIS

Response to Dan Radke E-mail letter of 10/25/06

Comment: "... the benefits of those dams must be removed from your projection to obtain the incremental benefit of the final dam... Financially, I do not see the benefit of building this dam. I suggest that the financial costs of this project be re-examined and that we isolate the true costs and benefits of this single dam."

Response: Refer to Tabulation 2.

Comment: "I understand that recently, the justification of adding a water supply to Eastern Hardy County has become a major reason to move forward with this project. Although I agree the County is growing, and may some day need this water source, this was not the justification made for building this dam."

Response: It is the responsibility of the planning agency to assess current conditions and re-evaluate need. Needs in the watershed have changed from a flood control and intensely developed recreation site to a flood control and water supply site. It is within the scope and authority of Sponsors to request a change in purpose to meet the changing needs of the watershed.

Response to faxed cover letter from Anthony Slater of 10/25/06

Comment: "... who is reading, writing, researching, studying, and checking to make sure this document is correct and project is feasible?"

Response: As part of the Draft EIS review, interested agencies and the public are invited to comment on all aspects of the document. NRCS policy requires the National Water Management Center to review the document for compliance with NEPA and other agency planning guidelines.

Comment: "Would it be cheaper to do floodplain land buy-outs? Why is that not an alternative? Wouldn't that be less than \$24 million?"

Response: Additional information has been added to the Alternatives section of the report regarding floodplain buyouts.

Comment: "Annual project benefits lists all the watershed benefits, but the NET Annual Beneficial Effects is only 393,600 per year? Does this mean that by building Site 16 that the annual NET benefits for the project will decrease by 46%? Is that a feasible project when net benefits decreases? Does the assumed needs out way [sic] feasibility reasons?"

Response: Tabulation 2 in the FEIS displays the net beneficial effects. Net benefits are positive. For the investment necessary to build Site 16, there are substantial gains in the water supply benefits, incidental recreation benefits, flood damage reduction benefits, and other categories listed in Tabulation 2. The need for and feasibility of the project are confirmed in the FEIS.

Comment: "Which project discount rate is correct? ($5\frac{1}{8}$ or $5\frac{1}{2}$) Does the analysis years and ration [sic] work like mortgages, the longer the term years, the less you pay per month but pay more over life?"

Response: The project was authorized in 1974 at a project discount rate of $5\frac{1}{2}\%$. Due to a change in purpose, the project had to be re-evaluated using the current water resources discount rate of $5\frac{1}{8}\%$. All calculations in the FEIS use the current water resources discount rate of $5\frac{1}{8}\%$. For informational purposes, both rates are displayed in the Summary, as required by the National Watershed Manual.

Comment: "Why did Ed Kesecker with the WV-NRCS ask the Hardy County Commission and Potomac Valley Conservation District to vote on approving a Draft EIS that is without public and agencies comments that have not been addressed and resolved yet?"

Response: Both the Hardy Co. Commission and the Potomac Valley Conservation District are Local Sponsors for the project who have formally requested that USDA-NRCS proceed with planning and development of the Lost River Watershed Project, including the preparation of the draft supplemental work plan and environmental impact statement needed to pursue completion of Site 16 on Lower Cove. All three Hardy County Commissioners attended the Oct. 4, 2006 meeting of PVCD. At that meeting the Commission and PVCD members were asked to respond to the draft document. The HCC expressed continued support for the project and the DEIS, and presented a letter so stating. The PVCD also voted continued support for the draft document. Both organizations will receive copies of the final supplemental work plan and EIS document, which will include all comments received following issuance of the draft and agency responses to those comments.

Comment: "Does the draft EIS tell any where how many affect [sic] landowners there are? Does the draft EIS say that 11 of the 12 affect [sic] landowners DO NOT SUPPORT this project? Does the draft EIS [sic] how many hundreds signature are on petitions."

Response: The DEIS does not estimate the number of affected landowners. (See response to subsequent comment from A. Slater letter of 10/25/06 regarding "tax maps".) The draft EIS acknowledged local opposition to the project. All public comments were considered in the preparation of this FEIS.

Comment: "Is it cost feasible to lose and mitigate the stated above for \$24 million, rather than keep them natural and not spend a dime?"

Response: Project feasibility is demonstrated throughout the FEIS. Any necessary mitigation is included in the project cost and discussed in the mitigation summary.

Comment: "The 1974 Work Plan has been supplemented three times to add sponsors, change land treatment, and add water supply. According to that the draft EIS has not been fully researched, other alternatives explored, and environmental impacts studied since 1974? Is this correct?"

Response: No, that is incorrect. See response to EPA letter of 10/24/06.

Comment: "Does this mean that all land treatments have been accomplished with the current three dams? There is only 117,200 acres in the entire watershed, is there any studies or documentation that shows/proves the current conservations efforts are doing there [sic] job? Is it feasible that more money needs to be spent on a project that is already protecting 82% of the watershed?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06. As stated, land treatment identified in the 1974 Work plan has been applied, resulting in improved land cover and hydrologic

conditions, and subsequent reduction of runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. However land treatment measures alone do not meet project sponsors' objectives of increased flood protection and public water supply.

Comment: "Do supplements mean full study or revise old work plan? More than 30 years has past, has the work plan been updated to current goals, standard, and changing environment? If so where are those studies in the draft EIS?...Isn't this asking to relook and update? Why does the draft report keep referring back to the 1974 Work Plan then, to see more info on project?"

Response: See response to EPA letter of 10/24/06.

Comment: "Where is the 2004 Hardy County Resources Study? Shouldn't be included in the draft EIS since everything the sponsors want is water supply?"

Response: <http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/hardyCountyWR.pdf>

Comment: "Study and need are used several times on this page, how can the draft EIS justify or prove the need, when words such as trends, predict the future, projected through 2060"? Can the draft EIS can [sic] be justified and feasible when the use of guessing words determines what the sponsors need?"

Response: Refer to the "Need for Supplement" portion of the FEIS.

Comment: "Doesn't the draft EIS indicate that dam Site #4 and Site #10 can be used for water supply?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "Will Site 10 meet the needs when there are not drought periods? Does the County participate in water conservation? Is Site 16 feasible or needed only if there is a drought period? If Site 10 will do 75%, isn't the other dams currently piped to release water or could persons pump water out?"

Response: Refer the Water Supply Report in Appendix E. The safe yield analysis is included in that document. Water conservation measures are generally voluntary and can be implemented any time individuals have a desire to do so. It is impractical for local residents or businesses to haul water to their homes, farms, or businesses.

Comment: "... industrial park proposed for Wardensville area. Who is water be [sic] provided to when there is no structures or no need yet? Aren't these sites all closer and down stream of the all ready [sic] constructed Dam Site #10 flood control/water supply? Shouldn't piping and supplying water with current facilities be first and then accurate numbers for need?"

Response: Information regarding the projected commercial demand is included in Appendix E. Essential infrastructure, such as roads, electric, water, and sewage, must be in place so that businesses will locate in industrial parks.

Comment: "Doesn't this mean that each project is separate, and each should have its own benefit/cost ratio? If you eliminate one of the five sites doesn't that mean that the other four sites have to work better to make up for what the other site would have helped with? Wouldn't that increase the cost of building Site 16 since it would have to make up for not building site 23?"

Response: The watershed project was planned and authorized based on a series of five upstream impoundments and the land treatment work. Due to geologic considerations, Site 23 was eliminated. The other four sites were not increased in size or costs as a result of the elimination of Site 23. Project benefits were re-evaluated based on the total project of 4 sites and the land treatment component.

Comment: "Is there dates and documentation for each scoping meeting that was held? (Such as paid advertisement, ample time to receive and respond, and locations)."

Response: Information regarding the scoping meeting is included in the FEIS in the Consultation and Public Participation section. The scoping meeting was conducted in accordance with NEPA and NRCS guidelines. Also see response to Stephanie Slater questions from 10/25/2006 email.

Comment: "Tabulation 1: These were answered no [sic] why? Is wetlands ecologically critical areas? Essential fish habitat? Zoning and floodplain management in effect? Project is not in a regional water resources planning area? Scenic attributes not effected? All these questions affect a watershed and affect the Lost River- Annual flood damages cost \$1,202,500. Annual Net Benefit is 393,600. What is the ratio? What are you saving?"

Response: Refer to the Scope of Environmental Impact Statement section for information regarding the degree of concern assigned to each resource. The benefit cost ratio is displayed in Table 6.

Comment: "If this is a true statement in the draft EIS, was there need for water supply in the 1974 plans? If everything remains the same nothing has increased such as agriculture runoff, development runoff, and population that all affect a watershed? If this is the case shouldn't the entire watershed work plans, environmental, social, and economic studies all be updated?"

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06 and refer to full text in the Need for Supplement and Affected Environment portions of the FEIS.

Comment: "Is there any where in the draft EIS that states what the current water use is in Hardy County? Is there any place in the draft EIS that tell (sic) what the total capacity of the current water supplies are? Wouldn't these be very useful and base lines for where Hardy County needs are and might be with current water resources? Does the NRCS normally conduct water supply needs for counties? Who is paying the NRCS to study and create these water supply reports?"

Response: http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/lost_river.html. See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: "... shouldn't there be more than eight lines describing alternative flood control measures and their benefits? Has the sponsors and agencies really taken an effort and hard look at alternative? ...Does that mean the alternatives have not been reevaluated since 1974? How many people and times has the public asked for alternatives?"

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "Why are water tanks and wells alternatives along with the current dams?"

Response: The Alternatives section of the FEIS discusses the viability of wells and other raw water sources.

Comment: "What are the gallons per day capacity for each system? What is the total gallons per day these entities currently use? The only potential customer base is in the Baker area? How many people live in Baker? How many businesses? With no current potential customer base, wouldn't Site 10 supply water to Baker? How is Site 16 feasible when it is the furthest away from any current or project need area? Wouldn't piping cost more than [sic] what residents could pay?"

Response: Information concerning the current demands, system capacities, existing and potential customer base, financial considerations, and other information can be found in the 2004 Hardy County Water Resources Report http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/lost_river.htm and other references cited in the FEIS.

Comment: "Is it feasible to get water from one of these sites before you spend \$24 million on Site 16?...What are the current gallons per day usage for Hardy County? Would their current systems plus Site 10 be enough for the potential water needs for Hardy County?"

Response: See response to previous comment.

Comment: "Does this mean that a current Site 4 can meet the sponsor's water supply needs? What is the current volume of water that Site 4 can supply? Site 4 would only cost \$9.5 million to be a dedicated water supply for Hardy County? Is \$9.5 million cheaper than \$24 million?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "Can anyone predict or pin-point a cause of flooding? Is there data to show stream flow and sedimentation rates coming from the Lower Cove Run? Does the Lower Cove Run flood or does Lost River? Could Lower Cove Run have a natural flood basin and wetland to slow down the flow and catch sediments before it [sic] get to the Lost River? Could stream canalization or riprap (stone) be used to create a flow and sedimentation barrier and a natural stream habitat that would be a [sic] less costly?"

Response: Flooding is generally caused by rainfall which results in runoff that exceeds stream channel capacity. All streams, including Lower Cove Run and Lost River, have instances when they flood, with flow extending onto the floodplain adjacent to the streams. Refer to the appendices in the FEIS for stream flow and sedimentation information. Alternatives such as stream channelization (referred to as 'canalization') were considered, but found infeasible. Information has been added to the Alternatives section of the FEIS regarding this alternative.

Comment: "Aquatic resources...When was [sic] they evaluated? 1974? With all the changes in the watershed and implementing dams shouldn't the aquatic resources be updated?"

Response: Aquatic resources in the affected area of each completed site were analyzed in the supplemental documents and information reports prepared prior to construction of those sites. Aquatic resource documentation for Lower Cove Run is contained in the aquatic resources section of this FEIS. Additional benthic invertebrate data and aquatic habitat information will be collected from Lower Cove Run at such time as the property may be accessed by personnel and prior to project construction.

Comment: "It is estimated that 7,456 angler days of recreation annually? How can you get 7456 when there is only 365 day in one year? What is the current angler day's usage for the nine impoundments already in Hardy County? Who pays for stocking? Does this number include natural streams also?"

Response: Angler days were determined using data collected by WVDNR on the number of fishermen using DNR impoundments for fishing activities. An angler day is one fisherman fishing for one day. If ten persons fish during one day, ten angler days would be represented. Angler days reported for Lost River impoundments do not include angler days for fishing in streams. Recreation values were determined from the National Hunting, Fishing and Wildlife Associated Recreation Survey, Water Resources Council Principles and Guidelines, and other references cited in the FEIS. The WV DNR stocks and manages the fisheries at Sites 4, 10, and 27 and will do so at the proposed Site 16.

Comment: "Has archeology surveys been done on the Phase II locations? Has [sic] Phase I surveys been done on the spillway site since the original plans have been altered?"

Response: Refer to the Historic, Scientific, and Cultural Resources effects section of the FEIS for information on the Phase I and Phase II surveys. The Phase II surveys will be completed prior to construction.

Comment: "How will you replace this invaluable resource [prime or important farmland] on the Lower Cove Run when 75% is already forest?"

Response: The conversion of farmland and forest land to a lake environment is acknowledged in the FEIS.

Comment: "Wetlands... Does that mean that out of 220.7 acres, 5% are wetlands? What is the cost of mitigation and where can you put them?"

Response: A Mitigation Summary has been added to the FEIS.

Comment: "Would these areas of study be important to study and have recent documentation in a draft EIS to be evaluated by others before a final draft: adverse effects, short/long term impacts, irreversible/irretrievable resources, land conflicts, risk & uncertainty, rationale for recommended alternatives be considered? Would these be costs or benefits?...Why are none of their comments or concerns distributed or printed in the draft EIS?"

Response: Additional information has been added to the FEIS as a result of comments on the Draft EIS.

Comment: "Consideration of water supply – 8 questions? Is that an open ended question, does that mean alternatives, need or can current sources be used?"

Response: Additional information has been added to the FEIS regarding need and justification for adding raw water supply as a purpose to Site 16.

Comment: "Benefit cost analysis – 8 questions? Is Site 16 feasible when the total watershed NET benefits are reduced by 46%?"

Response: Yes, Site 16 is feasible.

Comment: "Effectiveness of existing dams – 7 questions? Where in the draft EIS is this question answered and where are the studies to support them?"

Response: Tabulation 2 and Tables 1-6 in the FEIS provided information regarding the effectiveness of the existing dams and the proposed Site 16.

Comment: "Wetlands – 7 questions? How valuable are natural wetlands? What is the cost of mitigating them? Where do you locate additional land for wetland use?"

Response: A Mitigation Summary has been added to the FEIS. Onsite wetland mitigation for other recent NRCS projects has cost approximately \$2,500 per acre.

Comment: "Why are the previous comments not in the draft EIS? Who has all of them? Does each agency or sponsor turn them in to one location so that they can be compiled and responded to by the final EIS?"

Response: See response to S. Slater email of 10/25/06

Comment: "Was the cost estimate at 2006 or later rates? Would you not want to estimate or use projected for the future cost, since the project will not be done in 2006?"

Response: Costs and benefits are analyzed at 2006 prices in accordance with NRCS policy. Discount rates for water resources projects are issued annually by the Water Resource Council.

Comment: "When is the last time the tax maps were updated? What years \$\$ numbers were use to estimate? How many landowners are affected? How many will lose everything? Has anyone approached landowners to get a current appraisal or to tell them what their property is worth?"

Response: The Hardy County tax maps are updated annually. Land rights cost estimates for Lost River site 16 were updated in March 2006. At that time there were 231 acres of proposed fee take acquisition involving ten parcels, and 44 acres of permanent easement involving two additional parcels. Of the twelve effected parcels, four would be taken in their entirety. There were a total of three residences (two houses and one mobile home) whose occupants would have to be relocated as a result of the proposed acquisition.

Landowners have not been approached regarding specific property values. Upon authorization for construction of the project, local sponsors will advertise for bids and engage a certified land surveyor to survey portions of properties to be taken, and a certified real estate appraiser and review appraiser to determine current market value of the surveyed properties, as well as any quantifiable damage or benefit to the residue. That certified appraised value is the basis of the sponsor's offer for settlement, plus any eligible reimbursements associated with residence and/or business relocation resulting from property acquisition for the project, as mandated by provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as Amended.

Comment: "Literature cited that is outdated...In the day and age of computers, GIS, satellite mapping, new sampling methods some of the literature is outdated. Can new web soil surveys and digital technology be used?"

Response: Yes, aerial photography and updated mapping were obtained for this FEIS.

Comment: "Residential demand, what is that based on actual households (WV residents) or housing units? Do cabins count as units? Weekend homes?"

Response: Information contained in Appendix E describes the basis for the projected residential water demand. The demand is based on total housing units. Housing growth is projected from current trends for new construction in the area. Housing growth does not distinguish between WV residents and non-residents or whether they are primary or second-home residences.

Comment: "Table 1 shows the housing unit growth, not the population or household growth; wouldn't the numbers be estimated to [sic] high by using these numbers? Why don't you use households since they are the everyday users?"

Response: The information presented in Appendix E represents the best estimate of future water demands. This information has been developed in consultation with the Hardy County PSD and the Hardy County Commission. There is no compelling reason to use households rather than housing units.

Comment: “Why is the Capon District used? This table is compromised because there are three different localities being used, is that done any [sic] where else in the draft EIS? ...If 85% have water what is the current daily usage? Would you need Site 16 if you only have to supply 15% more of the population? Why couldn’t another dam site (4 or 10) be more than enough water supply to meet the projected need? Why and how can it be feasibly [sic] to have one dedicated water supply to feed the whole county?”

Response: Refer to the Water Supply Report in Appendix E.

Comment: “Table 4 – Projected residential need through Year 2060. Why is there no base line – What is the current daily water usage for Hardy County? Shouldn’t that number be the basis along with the capacity of the current water systems? Is the current usage numbers needed to project the need for water supply for Hardy County? Where is the number in the draft EIS?”

Response: Please see the following link for that document:
<http://www.wv.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/lost/hardyCountyWR.pdf>.

Comment: “Why is water supply needs determined by the sponsors with the assistance from the NRCS and not a private third party that is bias?”

Response: The Hardy County PSD and Hardy County Commission are most familiar with the water supply needs in Hardy County.

Stanley Wilkins letter of 10/23/06 – Comments noted

Connie Wood letter of 10/23/06 – Comments noted

Rebecca Strawderman comment form of 10/23/06 – Comments noted

Heather McClure comment form of 10/22/06 – Comments noted

Odessell Sherman comment form of 10/19/06 – Comments noted

Frank Rosso comment form of 10/21/06 – Comments noted

Norman Ashby letter of 10/21/06 – Comments noted

Darryl Ashby letter of 10/21/06 – Comments noted

Connie Wood letter of 10/23/06 – duplicate of email; Comments noted

Response to Robert See, Jr. letter sent as an attachment to Crystal Lake's email of 10/25/06 9:22 am

Comment: "Please explain how water can be piped from the Lost River area to Wardensville, but the terrain is too steep for water to be piped from Wardensville to Lost River."

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: "Isn't Site 10 adequate for these needs? ... Wouldn't spending approx. \$9 million to use it as a water supply make more sense than to spend \$24 million and take additional homes and farms?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: "Have you considered the feasibility of using some overflowing springs as a water source?"

Response: The FEIS includes an alternative analysis of springs.

Comment: "Has a study been done to determine if the people who live in the area will pay for water from a public water supply? What is the population requirement to make public water less costly than private wells?"

Response: The Hardy County PSD, which is responsible for public water service in Hardy County, has endorsed the FEIS. Issues related to number of customers, customer affordability, etc. will be determined by the Hardy County PSD, with oversight from the WV Public Service Commission. There is no known 'population requirement'.

Comment: "Did the writers of this document seriously consider the No Build, No Action Alternative?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: "Please identify specifically what building and home will be protected by Dam 16."

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "Have you accounted for the damages caused by Howard's Lick, or Fravel's Run, or Mill Gap Run, or the numerous unnamed streams that drain into the Lost River?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: "On page 22, the draft EYES [sic] you state that "55 square miles of drainage area will be controlled". You contradict that amount on 23 by stating "Site 16 will trap sediment

from the 11.8 square miles of drainage area behind this structure”. Why the huge discrepancy? Why didn’t you translate that amount to a percentage. Isn’t that 8%?”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Comment: “Do you have studies to show how much flooding has increased in the past 30 years? The past 10 years? Can you justify that statement with fact based on actual studies?”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: “Has the water quality of Lower Cove Run been tested periodically? Have these results been published? Has a study been done to determine the possible vegetative impact to the main stream of the Lost River if the water from Lower Cove Run water is deleted from its flow?”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.

Crystal Lake email of 10/25/06 9:26 am – Comments noted

Crystal Lake email of 10/25/06 9:24 am – Comments noted

Response to E-mail Attachment from Crystal Lake of 10/25/06 9:22 am

Comment: “Construction versus modification of existing site? Did you seriously consider using the dam at Kimsey Run as it has been constructed as a water source? On page 15, it states the cost associated with modifications to Site 4 would be approximately \$9,500,000. This alternative is not the most cost-effective. You would spend \$24,000,000 to construct a new dam at Site 16, Lost City. Since when is 24 million less than 9.5 million?”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06

Comment: “What is the basis for your statement on page 17 that states the I [sic] lack of a dependable water supply will also result in higher fire insurance premiums for homeowners and businesses due to insufficient fire protection? Have you obtained data from the insurance companies to support this claim? Are you implying that the fire companies would not have water to fight fires without the construction of Site 16 at Lost City? Can they not use water from the 3 dams already constructed? Additionally, the PVSCD has helped with the installation of a number of dry hydrants in the Lost River Valley. Do the dams and dry hydrants give adequate supply of water for fire protection?”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06

Comment: “Please describe what changes have occurred and specifically where they occurred.”

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06

Comment: "Please identify where this conversion has taken place. What public use was realized and is this really an improvement or not?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06

Comment: "Do you have sworn statements from people who will testify to this claim? What about those who would be impacted if one of these structures breached or if the rainfall exceeded the holding capacity and the dam overflowed? Did you do a before and after survey to see if people really felt safer before or after construction? What about the mental anguish and stress on the people that opposed these dams? ... What about the mental anguish of those who might lose their homes or farms to these projects? ... Did the proponents of these dams consider the wishes of these people? Did you consider the mental anguish and stress of those who do not believe your propaganda and who do not think this project has merit?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06

Mrs. Abner Moore email of 10/27/06 4:37 pm – Comments noted

Rolfe Ashby letter of 10/21/06 – Comments noted

R. Edward Ashby, Jr. letter of 10/21/06 – Comments noted

C. Taylor letter of 10/29/06 – Comments noted

Response to E-mail Attachment from Bessie See of 10/25/06 9:24 am

Comment: "Who specifically from these groups contributed to this document? Please include a list of specific individuals who have helped on the actual writing... How many of the individuals who worked on this draft have intimate knowledge of the Lost River Valley related to flooding during the past 30 years?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/23/06

Comment: "What specific years where [sic] there floods and which specific years where [sic] there drought conditions? ... How do you arrive at an average annual flood damage figure in excess of a million dollars?"

Response: See response to EPA letter dated 10/24/06.

Comment: "Did you ever seriously consider the NO BUILD alternative or other alternatives?"

Response: See response to E. Webster email of 10/20/06.