

From: Howe, David L (DFW) <David.Howe@dfw.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 6:26 PM
To: Uber, Alex H (DFW) <Alex.Uber@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgefield pits memo

A couple thoughts to pass along.

- Alternative 2 has the additional risk of not being accepted by Storedahl because of a perception of increased flood risk. There may be some political risk with this alternative. Alternative 3 could benefit from the perception of reduced flood risk to the northern berm protecting the Storedahl operation. There would need to be more work here to ensure this doesn't happen.
- If cost is a potential constraint for Alternative 3, what about a *partial* re-grade using available materials. For example, what if we can decrease the fill timeframe for the ponds from 60 years to 20?
- Alternative 3A involves leaving ponds 8 and 9 to maintain cold water refugia. How does this affect long-term gravel recruitment downstream? While I can see the benefit of maintaining cold water inputs, if it comes at a cost of extending the duration of time for downstream reaches to regain their historic spawning potential due to lack of gravel recruitment, I'm not sure that's an acceptable trade off. Seems like we need more information here.

