

From: JacquelineVander Veen  
</O=SKAGIT/OU=ADMIN/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JVANDERVEEN>  
Date: 4/20/2001 11:49:04 PM  
To: DaveBrookings  
Subject: FW: Working Group Meeting

Dave,

I'm a little frustrated. We have had four working group meetings total. NMFS came once . USF&WS came three times, and SSC came twice. WDFW hasn't missed any. Scuderi missed once. I am guessing that the next meeting only WDFW will be in attendance. I can't help it if they are feeling left out. We give plenty of advanced notice. I am also concerned that no one in the environmental arena has any incentive to be economically responsible. I won't be able to get to that environmental tech meeting until probably as late as 11:30. I haven't heard whether Jeff is able to attend or not. What are You doing on May 4 at 10:00? Going to Seattle? Or perhaps we don't have to worry about them just yet? Maybe we let them have a brain storming session before we ask them to take the logical approach? What's your take on this message from Scuderi?

JVV

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

From: Scuderi, Michael R NWS [mailto:Michael.R.Scuderi@NWS02.usace.army.mil]  
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2001 4:26 PM  
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"