

From: Scuderi, Michael R NWS </O=ORGANIZATION/OU=USACE NWS SEATTLE, WA/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LOCAL/CN=SCUDERI, MICHAEL R NWS>
Date: 4/24/2001 4:22:25 PM
To: Scuderi, Michael R NWS; 'JacquelineVander Veen'; Pierce, Stephen R NWS; 'Valerie Lee'
CC: 'Larry Wasserman'; 'Lou Ellyn Jones'; 'Dan Tonnes'; 'Brendan Brokes'; 'Burdick, David'; 'jeffmc@co.skagit.wa.us'; Ziminske, Mark T NWS; Brunner, Kenneth R NWS
Subject: RE: Working Group Meeting

Sorry this followup is a day late (was out on Monday).

One other very important point I left off the list on Friday relates to ESA species. While we potentially are improving chinook habitat we still have to deal with bull trout. The Skagit has the healthiest population of bull trout in Puget Sound and FWS is quite concerned with any disruptions to that population. That doesn't mean that the planned project will impact bull trout. WE just have to have sufficient documentation of effects. Ken Brunner, our ESA coordinator had a similar reaction concerning bull trout when I talked to him. **This issue must be addressed.**

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Scuderi, Michael R NWS
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 04:26
To: 'JacquelineVander Veen'; Pierce, Stephen R NWS; Scuderi, Michael R NWS; 'Valerie Lee'
Cc: 'Larry Wasserman'; 'Lou Ellyn Jones'; Dan Tonnes; 'Brendan Brokes'; 'Burdick, David'; 'jeffmc@co.skagit.wa.us'
Subject: RE: Working Group Meeting

Jackie and Valerie,

I have been busy talking to NMFS, SSC, and FWS and I have heard a lot. Jeff Dillon and I are scheduled to meet with NMFS, FWS and SSC on Friday, May 4th at 1000 at Seattle District. Ecology cannot make it but the invitation is still out to WDFW and Jeff McGowan. We will be talking about the alternatives and starting the process (I think this is the fourth time) of identifying how to evaluate the alternatives.

There is a general disappointment that the environmental component will not be represented at the next working group meeting and participation has been spotty at past meetings. This needs to be fixed if a real preferred alternative is to be arrived at. Here's a rundown of some of the other comments I have heard from FWS and SSC (NMFS still needs to get up to speed on the alternatives):

1. A clarification should be made on the environmental impacts matrix that **Dry Slough, Britt Slough and Hart Slough are only possible options for opening up sloughs. We need to point out that no decisions have been made on any sloughs and nothing is a done deal. Apparently, by mentioning these sloughs we might have caused some undue distress with property owners.**

2. We all know this but I want to put it in writing. Before we can really settle on a preferred alternative we need to know the full extent of the environmental costs. Once those costs come up it might make a preferred alternative not necessarily look as good. the meeting on the 4th will be the first step in that direction.

3. The indirect impacts to the floodplain are an issue that still needs to be addressed. The agencies don't even agree on this one.

4. With respect to not removing the toe rock on the river in setback areas, that is receiving an unequivocal negative response. The Corps will be meeting on Monday to discuss this issue.

5. The salt water intrusion issue needs some type of modeling effort to document the extent of the problem. Placing a gate at the downstream end of the project even if it is a barn door gate might negate a lot of the environmental benefits of the diversion.

6. Dr. Thom should have a summary of the Padilla Bay meeting ready for me on Monday.

7. Stephen and I will work on the environmental timeline on Monday.

Mike

Michael R. Scuderi
Seattle District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 3755
Seattle, WA 98124-2255
(206)764-7205
FAX (206)764-4470
michael.r.scuderi@usace.army.mil <mailto:michael.r.scuderi@usace.army.mil>

"To Serve Man"

-----Original Message-----

From: JacquelineVander Veen [mailto:jvanderv@co.skagit.wa.us]
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2001 03:32
To: 'Pierce, Stephen R NWS'; 'Michael R. Scuderi'
Cc: DaveBrookings; DonDixon
Subject: Working Group Meeting

Greetings:

Dave Brookings, Don Dixon (new surface water manager), Valerie Lee, and I met today to discuss the logistics for the Working Group meeting that is scheduled for April 26. During the meeting, we decided to make some changes to the agenda. The changes are slight but you need to be aware of them.

One of the primary objectives for the meeting is to emphasize that we are coming down to the line on recommending a preferred alternative. Given that, Dave requested that Val move the "Timeline for Decisions" that was listed last on the agenda up to just after we hear from the Commissioner. We want to make the point that we will only have two, (maybe three meetings at the most) left before the end of June. (Recall, our goal for the working group was to reach a consensus by the end of June.)

To facilitate this line of thinking, Dave also suggested that we change the "Update on Environmental Studies and Analyses" to "Timeline for

Environmental Studies and Analyses". We thought it helpful for the Working Group participants to understand that even though we have come to consensus on a preferred alternative, that the alternative will need to be studied in order to make correct assessments on the impact that the alternative might have on the environment. At least, that is where I see this going.

So, Michael, can you take an hour or so and sit down with Stephen to let him know how you see this all fitting together as far as the timeline for getting the results from the environmental studies is concerned? This does not have to be detailed - just provide the big picture. I still would like for Stephen to go through the environmental matrix in addition to talking about the timeline.

Please don't hesitate to call me if you have questions about these changes. Also, I saw the changes that Environment International made to the matrix and I think they did a good job. I also got a great hand out from Jim Smith. These things will be sent out hopefully today.

Oh yes, Michael, any word from Dr. Thom?

Thank you.

Jackie Vander Veen