

From: Pierce, Stephen R NWS </O=ORGANIZATION/OU=USACE NWS SEATTLE, WA/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= LOCAL/CN=PIERCE, STEPHEN R NWS>

Date: 5/14/2001 7:53:49 PM

To: Skjelbreia, Norman K NWS

Subject: RE: Question, and situation with Sterling, Clearlake and Nookachamps
Hi Norm, Flossie is drawing up the **5 levee options** mentioned below. In order for Jim Smith to work on this, he needs the topo with the protected areas outlined. Can you do this? Let's make sure Jim has enough info to come to some sort of conclusion for us. I don't know if real estate is going to ask you for help or not. They might be working with Dave Fox. (the Ace GIS Guy)

Stephen Pierce
Project Manager
206-764-3456

From: Pierce, Stephen R NWS </O=ORGANIZATION/OU=USACE NWS SEATTLE, WA/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= LOCAL/CN=PIERCE, STEPHEN R NWS>

Date: 5/14/2001 7:46:55 PM

To: 'JacquelineVander Veen'

CC: Skjelbreia, Norman K NWS

Subject: Question, and situation with Sterling, Clearlake and Nookachamps

Hi Jackie, well written. I agree that you need to keep people informed and keep things moving. I think a necessary part of this process seems to be people asking questions and raising everyone's awareness.

Question, I need to confirm Sedro Woolley sewage treatment plant location. I was trying to protect it with the Sterling levee extension and someone (Kurt at agency meeting) said I had it in the wrong place.

Sterling levee; two locations, **1st option** is a levee along rail road tracks (per 1979 GDM), where they flood fight all the time. **The 2nd**, the drawn line shown in the design drawings, to protect as many houses as we can. Kunzler says that a Sterling levee would induce flooding in Nookachamps. I don't have any other feed back. Dave and I talked about the flood fight necessary in Sterling during a flood. Per his comments, we need a permanent fix that is part of the complete solution. I'm working with Economics to justify the larger of the two options.

Clearlake levee; this option is a levee along highway 9 to protect as many people as possible. No feed back. I'm working with Economics to justify this option.

Nookachamps levee; two locations, **1st option** is a levee along the Swan road (per 1979 GDM). **The 2nd** along the Francis road. The resource agencies do not like any flood control structures in this area. Kunzler is not happy with me changing things. I think both of these Nookachamps options are dead. I'm working with real estate and legal to see if we have other options with the Nookachamps homes and improvements. Such as easments, house raising or something else.

Stephen Pierce
Project Manager
206-764-3456

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

From: JacquelineVander Veen [mailto:jvanderv@co.skagit.wa.us]

Sent: Friday, May 11, 2001 4:54 PM

To: 'Brendan Brokes'; 'Dan Tonnes'; 'Dave Burdick'; 'Larry Wasserman'; 'LouEllyn Jones'; 'Rodney Sakrison'; 'Valerie Lee'

Cc: 'Pierce, Stephen R NWS'; DaveBrookings; JeffMcGowan; DonDixon; 'Michael R. Scuderi'

Subject: May 22 Working Group Meeting

After discussing the issue of having a May 22 working group meeting, it has been decided to go ahead with the meeting as planned. I initially thought that it would be best to cancel it but there are some very important reasons for gathering the group at this time.

First of all, hats off to you and your hard work. You, in fact, have accomplished a great deal in only two meetings. There is a very good list of considerations that has been compiled. The Working Group needs to have this information to gain a better understanding of the roles that everyone has I know that I and others working on this project have been pushing for a selection of a preferred alternative but that is not the only function of the Working Group. Another function of the Working Group is to have a group of stakeholders that has a shared understanding of the issues in order to fully promote and support the project.

Secondly, the momentum is working in our favor at this time. **Keeping the momentum will assist in achieving our end goal. That goal is to put together a carefully thought out plan to relieve people from catastrophic flood risk and do something fantastic for the salmon recovery effort.**

And third, I think that the meeting will serve to demonstrate that the environmental constituents of the Working Group have indeed been fulfilling their task of moving forward. By postponing the meeting, there could be some misinterpretation that nothing is being accomplished. That is simply not true.

The purpose of the next Working Group meeting will be to share information that the Corps of Engineers has uncovered on other aspects of the study as well as the list of considerations put together during your meetings. Your information will be presented as that, not that there have been concise decisions, but as a demonstration of the complexity of the situation for which everyone needs to respect.

See you on the 22nd.

Regards,

Jackie Vander Veen