

**DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY**  
**Northwest Regional Office**

March 14, 2001

TO: File

FROM: Charles L. Steele  
Floodplain Management Specialist

SUBJECT: FCAAP 2001-03 #G0200110  
Skagit River CFHMP, Phase 3  
Review of 3/13/02 SOW Change

I reviewed the SOW change provided by Don Dixon to me and Bev Huether on March 13, 2002. The revised SOW is keyed to the Corps of Engineers newly-prepared Project Management Plan, and to an accelerated effort to prepare environmental studies as part of the EIS, and in response to the Department of Ecology's needs relative to Padilla Bay.

Below are task-by-task descriptions of my concerns re the changes vs. the original SOW. These concerns were communicated by telephone to Don Dixon this morning, and he will change the scope as will be noted as a result of our conversation. Clarifications of these concerns and agreements between Don and I are added to each task in italics. The County is on a definitive schedule to assure that they meet our March 31 deadline; this includes completion of the revised SOW by Don by Friday, March 15, legal review by the County next week, and approval by the County Commissioners also next week. The final submittal should be in time for us to make any minor adjustments that may be necessary in time to meet the March 31 deadline.

**FCAAP share.** FCAAP is now 21.3% of Total Project Cost for 2001-2003 (\$350,000 of \$1,643,990). Obviously, this is in line with FCAAP requirements.

**Task 2, Public Involvement.** Costs more than doubled (from \$20,640 to \$50,000), but scope remained the same. Further, PMP Table 6 also shows the \$20,640 figure. The PMP defines this work as Initial & Final Public Meetings, and Public Comments Report – this is different than the SOW in the FCAAP Agreement.

*Don will add text to this task to support the increase in costs and difference in definition with the PMP. This is the only task for which increased funds were requested in the revised SOW.*

**Task 3, Real Estate Studies/Plan.** Costs decrease from \$289,129 to \$50,000; acquire rights of entry only, no appraisals of project land costs (until final alternative is chosen). Were no real estate costs in last year's FCAAP SOW either. County will do annual summary report of real estate studies/plan, rather than final report on 3/31/02 (which they could not have done).

**Task 4, H&H Analyses.** Costs here are down from \$1,878,447 to \$132,000. Final report is changed from 6/30/02 to 6/30/03 (more realistic).

*The major reason for the reduction here is that this category included the Padilla Bay Hydrodynamic modeling work, which is estimated to cost \$1.5 million. It cannot be in this Biennium's SOW for this amount because: (1) the Corps does not have close to this kind of money to commit to the entire modeling work at this time; and (2) the modeling, or aspects of it, are dependent on the results of the sedimentation/geomorphic studies that are not yet underway. The figure of \$132,000 reflects continual modeling the Corps must do to accommodate various changes that are occurring in the project, as described in the PMP (see Table 6, JA, page 28).*

**Task 5, Environmental Design & Mitigation.** Costs are down from \$1,349,837 to \$514,000. The old SOW did not identify any specific studies. The revised SOW is broken down into 9 separate studies, all of which are on the County's "Summary of EIS Studies" from their 1/23/02 State of the River meeting, but none of which are specifically identified in the Corps' PMP. Need to assure coordination between the COE and County. Also need SOWs identified in FCAAP Agreement for these studies (could be based on "Summary of EIS Studies").

- Why is COE Sediment Budget (100K), Geomorphic analysis (100K) and Baseline Conditions (100K) not in the Scope (per the Summary of EIS Studies document)? Is it because COE doesn't have funding for these?
- Is the Baseline Conditions work included in the Fisheries Studies?
- Need task descriptions for Tide Gate Survey, Riprap Studies, By-Pass Water Temperature Studies, Overbank Sedimentation Studies & Saltwater Intrusion Studies. Can be gotten partially from "Summary of EIS Studies."

*Per Don, the PMP does factor these studies in, as identified in Table 6, page 29, line JDN ("All Other Environmental Studies/Documents), which is a \$935,070 item. The Fisheries Study at Section 6.2 of the revised SOW is for \$170,000; this includes three studies from the County's "Summary of EIS Studies" that I picked up at their January 23, 2002 State of the River meeting. The three studies are numbers 4, 5, and 6 of that document, including Fish Loss, Baseline Conditions and Fish Production from Mitigation. Don will clarify this in his changes to the revised SOW. See Task 7 for clarification of the Sediment Budget and Geomorphic Analysis. Also, Don will add textual descriptions for the tasks noted above in the third bullet.*

**Task 6, Evaluation of Mitigation and Restoration Areas.** Changed to this (\$150,000) from Cultural Resources Inventory (\$56,680). Can't do Cultural Inventory until final alternative is chosen. This is good, in that 12 sites will be evaluated for salmon restoration (and will be completed by 9/30/02); but where does it come from? It's not in the "Summary of EIS Studies," nor is it in the PMP.

*Don explained that this evaluation was to have been in the PMP, but was inadvertently left out. He will work with the COE during his review of the PMP to assure it is added to that document.*

**Task 7, Geomorphic Analyses.** Deletes Geotechnical Studies/Analyses (\$113,094), and substitutes Geomorphic Analyses (\$300,000). Description is taken from the PMP, but can't identify where the cost of \$300,000 comes from (not specifically in Table 6 of PMP). Geotechnical studies deletion is based on not knowing final alternative at this time.

*Don explained that the Corps' Geomorphic Study includes their Sediment Budget and Transport analysis, listed in the County's "Summary of EIS Studies." The Corps has just let the first phase of this work out to Pentac for \$161,000 (Padilla Bay sediment routing is part of this contract); upon completion, the second phase of the Geomorphic study will be started (this will cost \$139,000). Don says these studies are in the PMP under Environmental Studies/Report.*

**Task 8, Detailed Engineering & Design.** The old Task 8 was detailed HTRW analyses; this cannot be done till the final alternative is chosen. Task 8 now becomes the old Task 9, Detailed Engineering & Design, and costs are reduced from \$440,366 to \$120,000. But SOW now says only 35% of detailed engineering & design plans will be done by 4/30/03. This shows as 4.12 in the PMP (page 47), but the cost there is \$388,582. Ask Don why the 35% and why the 120K vs. 388K.

*The 35% is the maximum design level the Corps can achieve in a Feasibility Report. When a project is finally underway (a PCA is signed), that authorizes the Corps to do detailed construction drawings (100% design level). Concerning cost reductions, Don had discussions with the Corps re their available funds vs. funds listed in the PMP. The Corps has barely enough funding to assure their 50/50 match with the County (and us); thus, he had to make reductions in several tasks, where he knew funding is not available in amounts originally shown. This kind of reduction is reflected in this task and a few other tasks.*

**Task 9, Interim CFHMP.** Costs decrease from \$250,547 to \$75,000. Interim plan OK, because all depends on final alternative, which won't be known in time to prepare the Final CFHMP. This was Task 11 in the original SOW, but becomes Task 9 because the old Economic Analysis is dropped from the SOW (was \$88,400). Why is the Economic Analysis dropped? It would've provided the B/C for two alternatives. This work is in the PMP at page 43, for \$143,950 (also in Table 6 under JB for same amount).

*County discussions with the Corps' economist (Jim Smith) indicted the Corps has developed baseline conditions for the B/C, but cannot do the complete B/C analysis until a preferred alternative is chosen. This could be up to two more years.*

**Task 10, Project Management.** Same description, but costs decrease from \$250,547 to \$75,000.

