From:	Dana
To:	Robert Mecklenburg
Cc:	Mitchell Long; Sue Mecklenburg; Liz Diether-Martin; Lars Gunnarsson; Ken & Alisa Malloch; Rex Gentry; Jack Edwards; Brad Colman; Peter & Teri Barry; Karl Flaccus; Pam MacFetridge; Gordon Gray; Sandy Kilroy; Alisa Malloch; Chris Gerard; Byron Bridges; James Evans; Dana Cogswell
Subject:	Re: Thank you for inviting us to today"s site visit
Date:	Monday, May 11, 2015 10:24:25 PM

Thank you Bob, for extending the invite to us. You summarized the key issues well.

I'd like to share some thoughts on **river location.** After discussing with several homeowners who are directly impacted - including Flaccus, Gerard and Bridges -- I think there is a solution on river location that all SVTMA members can likely agree on.

Based on what I heard Mitch say today, the current conceptual design calls for excavating new channels to the West of the current channel in a few locations:
(1) from RM 1.7 to RM 2.0 (roughly from Flaccus home to Burn Pile Road), the new channel would be a secondary channel. The primary channel would remain where it is today.
(2) from RM 1.3 to 1.5 (roughly from below Chris & Laurie's home to just below Flaccus home), the current proposal would have the new channel replace the current channel, and the current riverbed here would become hardened floodplain.

There was significant reservation from several community members about moving the river to the west on this stretch. As you know, we do not have a riverfront home. However, the stretch of river from 1.3-1.5 (Gerard home to Flaccus home) is a very beautiful stretch of riverbed that we enjoy immensely, and that is enjoyed by many, many homeowners and visitors. It would be a tremendous loss for the community to have that river area turned into dry, hardened floodplain.

The concept I think we can all agree on is the following:
For the stretch between RM 1.3-1.5, leave the main river channel in its current location. Potentially create a *secondary* channel to the West, which would be activated primarily during heavy flows in the spring and fall. This would (a) maintain the aesthetic appeal of the river for those who enjoy it, (b) protect homeowners by creating a safety valve for extra water to flow into, (c) help the fish by stabilizing the current riverbanks from further erosion and having a slower-moving channel for the juveniles.

Today I spoke with Byron & Nancy, Chris Gerard, and Karl Flaccus about this idea. While families had previously expressed different priorities in balancing aesthetics vs. protecting their properties from riverbank erosion, everyone agreed with the idea outline above about river location -- keeping the main channel in its current location, and having a western channel as a secondary channel to divert water flow, especially during high water.

Karl, Chris, Byron, I hope I represented your support on river location fairly. If not, please feel free to add to the discussion

Thank you for your consideration.

Dana Cogswell
47 Gold Creek Lane
206-330-6356

On May 11, 2015, at 8:59 PM, Robert Mecklenburg <bobmeck@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you, Mitch, for inviting us to meet with you, David, and SRFBoard members this morning at Gold Creek. I was impressed with the number of Board members who attended and the commitment of the individuals. As usual, you managed the meeting well, offering a candid and balanced perspective that included your interests as well as others. I was glad to have another opportunity to talk with David.

I wished to capture a few of the thoughts I heard this morning. Comments expressed by individuals do not necessarily reflect the opinion of STVMA but I think they have value as indicators of feelings that are likely shared by others. Here are a few of my recollections:

1. STVMA shares the interest of other stakeholders in restoring perennial flow to Gold Creek, facilitating spawning and improving creek depth to width ratio and habitat.
2. Both STVMA and Board members raised the issue of sequencing: will habitat restoration have utility for bull trout if we do not achieve perennial flow of water in the creek?
3. Have we given due consideration to alternatives to filling Gold Creek Pond? How likely is it that Gold Creek Pond will actually be filled? The low level outlet dam seems worthy of careful discussion as does the idea of short distance excavation to reach water in the creek bed. Neither is a single fix but perhaps a combination of approaches has merit.
4. Can habitat design accommodate both those STVMA members who value proximity to the creek as well as those who do not?
5. Since log jams and rocks provide pools and shelter for aquatic species, and since we do not have sufficient water in the main channel of the creek during spawning season, why are side channels necessary or desirable? Is there sufficient water for both channels to be watered during the dry season?
6. Do we need “manufactured” hardened flood plains? Boulders and logs are materials found naturally in creek beds. Hardened flood plains are not and look distinctly unnatural and unappealing to many persons. What are the alternatives?
7. Will the inclusions in the creek withstand flood conditions?
8. Is the amount of material proposed by NSD for the mile of stream bed more than necessary to improve habitat? My back of the envelope calculation translates the proposal for area of hardened flood plain to a mile of 8-lane highway:

One acre is 43,560 square feet. 11.65 acres is 507,474 square feet. A mile is 5280 feet and 507,474/5250 is a rectangle one mile long and 96 feet wide. A highway lane is 12 feet wide and 96 feet translates to 8 lanes (7.5 lanes if we use 1.1 river miles).

If we also add fifty 40’ x 40’ engineered log jams to the mile of creek bed, this additional area is roughly equivalent to the footprint of 100 SkiTur Valley cabins.

9. Should we not have an EIS for an “Integrated Gold Creek Plan”?

Consideration of these issues will likely move our work together more efficiently and effectively.

Thank you, Mitch.

Bob
copies to Trustees, today’s STVMA attendees and STVMA work group