

From: Elizabeth Webster [ewebster@access.k12.wv.us]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2009 1:17 PM
To: O Donnell, Bill - Morgantown, WV
Subject: Lost River Comments
RE: EIS for Lost River Site #16 published April 2009

Concerns and questions related to your published document of April 2009:

1) NEED FOR THIS DAM? The fundamental question that you need to answer is this: *Is there enough flood damage to warrant the expenditure of millions of additional tax dollars?*

2) NEW PROJECT?: *Do you have authorization by Congress for this "new" project?*
It should be considered a "new" project because what was a five dam watershed initiative has now become a 4 dam project.

You have drastically changed the original plan for the Lost River Subwatershed that was approved by Congress in the early 1970's by deciding that you will not build Site #23 --Cullers Run. This changes everything and should invalidate most of the statistics that you copied from the 1974 EIS into your 2007 EIS and subsequently into the 2009 EIS. You decided to eliminate a structure which was intended to reduce the flooding of Mathias. By eliminating that structure, you have dramatically reduced the benefits planned for the homes, churches, and business located along the Lost River at Mathias and the area downstream, yet no mention is made of any revision of the original plan. You try to use the statistics for all 5 dams to show the benefits, but you no longer have 5 dams in your plans. It is a new plan with only 4 structures and the benefits derived should reflect the loss of protection that was attributed to Cullers Run.

Where in the 2009 EIS can I find a list of homes or businesses that Site 16 will protect? Pictures? What property has been lost in the past 35 years due to flooding?

3) ERRORS in 2009 EIS: One of the most blatant errors in the 2009 EIS was pointed out by the hydrologist at the Mathias-Baker Fire Hall on May 14, 2009. He claimed that site 16 dam would hold 26 inches of rainfall. He told us the information in the 2009 EIS was copied from the 2007 EIS. Which means that the 2007 EIS is incorrect. If you check TABLE 3 - STRUCTURAL DATA in the back of the 1974 Work Plan, (bottom of the page) you will find that Site 16 has a Capacity Equivalents(Total) of 5.38 inches; 0.34 inches is Sediment Volume; 4.22 inches are Retarding volume and 0.82 was Recreation Volume for a Total of 5.38 inches. NOTE: 5.38 inches NOT 26 inches. *If you based your benefits on this structure retarding 26 inches of rainfall, you need to recalculate. And where are the calculations to show the difference between how much rainfall a dry dam would hold as compared with a dam that is used for water supply and thus is full or nearly full of water?*

Isn't it a misnomer to call this a flood retarding dam when its main function will be as a reservoir for water supply?

Elizabeth A. Webster
294 Lower Cove Run Road

Mathias, WV 26812