

Vince Panesko

I own the property upon which the proposed dam is currently sited; I grew up working on this property for the past 87 years. I understand the immediate environment better than anyone who contributed to writing the EIS. The people writing the draft EIS appear to be unfamiliar with the area and are not able to produce a comprehensive environmental impact. I am here to help you. Page S-1 of the summary states that this draft EIS "Identified probable significant adverse impacts from the proposed project." That is a false statement. The EIS is lacking impacts due to the author's lack of familiarity with the dam site. The EIS must address the REAL impacts.

Appendix 1, Page 35, Section 3.2.3 TOWN OF PE ELL WATER SUPPL SYSTEM states that the dam "may" require the relocation of the Pe Ell water line, and that possible impacts will be discussed in the future. That is a false statement because construction of the dam WILL permanently block the only road to the Pe Ell reservoir and intake (which crosses my property). And will permanently rip out a half mile of water line along side the bottom of the dam and another 2-3 miles of water line which would be inundated by the dam reservoir. The water line piping was not designed to be under 200 feet of water.

The draft EIS must be revised to state that a major environmental impact will be the removal of the road and water line connecting the Pe Ell intake with the Pe Ell Water treatment plant. The environmental impacts of the following projects must be included in this EIS as Mitigation option 1: (1) building a new road to the Pe Ell intake, (2) building a new water line from the intake to the Pe Ell water treatment plant (3) installing a pumping station at the Pe Ell intake and (4) running an electrical line to the new pumping station. If you do not address these environmental impacts, this draft EIS is a fraud.

Whereas the draft EIS suggests the Pe Ell water intake on Lester Creek may have to be relocated (mitigation, option 2). The environmental impacts of that relocation (possibly to Rock Creek on the west) must be addressed now for two reasons:

1. The reservoir of the proposed dam comes within a few feet of the Pe Ell intake putting the intake at risk. If the model is slightly incorrect or there is a disturbance in the large reservoir, the Pe Ell intake would be washed out.
2. The larger problem is that your own landslide studies revealed an active landslide south of the Pe Ell intake which is slowly sliding into the Pe Ell drinking water reservoir. Your own document states that Lester Creek is under-cutting that landslide and provides a photo showing a layer of brush handing over the creek with the underlying soil washed out. Your current staff has no knowledge of this and the FCZD has the same problem with new staff being clueless of the Pe Ell area.

The environmental impact which your staff has entirely missed is that the elevation of the reservoir into Lester Creek up to the Pe Ell dam will be saturating the soil on the adjacent hills with active landslides. Saturating those active landslides will accelerate the sliding and put the Pe Ell intake at great risk. A landslide would leave Pe Ell without water for 1 to 2 years while a new water intake is built in the watershed to the west (Rock Creek) or the watershed to the east (Stowe Creek).

The draft EIS should be making it very clear that no dam can be built until Pe Ell gets a new water system. The cost could be 10 to 20 million, maybe more. Those costs are not currently in the cost of

the dam, but should be.

The draft EIS should make it crystal clear that it will take a couple of years to build a new water system for the town of Pe Ell. The Flood Authority has known about this problem for over 10 years and had DONE NOTHING towards mitigation. And the FCZD has continued kicking the can down the road without developing a solid plan for mitigation, costs and schedule. There is no excuse for this lack of planning.

3. The current Pe Ell water treatment plant is located so close to the proposed dam that it might have to be replaced. If Rock Creek is the new source of Pe Ell water, it makes sense for the new water treatment plant to be west of Pe Ell.

Another factor which your contractor staff has entirely missed is that the road past the current Pe Ell water treatment plant consists of a series of narrow, blind, hairpin curves which are not appropriate for hundreds of construction vehicles to be going back and forth all day. Anybody can see that, but since most EIS authors have never been there, they have no idea.

It should be obvious that a new road to the dam site is required, but that is for a later comment.

The fence protecting pools of water inside the treatment plant sticks out into a blind curve on the road. When I drive downhill in my truck, I try to maintain at least 12 inches of clearance from that fence and hope nobody is coming uphill. It is a wonder that fence has not been knocked back into the pools of water. This is another environmental risk of the proposed dam which nobody, nowhere has addressed.

My main point is that the Pe Ell water treatment plant will be so close to dam construction activities that it may have to be removed. And re-location would be part of the entire rebuilding of the Pe Ell water system.....which has to happen before one shovel of dirt is removed from the dam site.