

Hi Ann
Here are notes
from Gordon
for Third
Runway.
He doesn't
think they
are deliberate
Have a nice
day.

Yvonne

Rec'd

7/26/01 AEK

126 1-1602
white

AR 017968

7/17/01 10pm

3rd Party Project Update: ANN K, Ray H, JOHN M,
Kevin F, Terin Sullivan, Kelley Whiting

SMP / Low Flow status:

- Recent submission to Dec 2000 SMP provide a package ^{looking in} ~~meeting~~ meeting K.C. MANUAL STANDARDS,
- Reasonably assured that the proposed measures will work. High level assurance that the retrofit requirement will result in a net benefit to it: improve level of SW man vs pre-project conditions. ^{probably} Better than SW coming off other des. permitted by surrounding cities.
- Need to do a final review to make sure all is now dotted and that inputs on low flow periods are ~~now~~ being incorporated. SW inputs may contribute to, ~~cause~~ low flow problem in ~~certain~~ level of flow catchment. Addition peak flow problem, but POS needs to show how they will address the other end of hydrograph and quantity the level of input to ~~low flow periods~~. Flows during low flow periods - High flow & low flow are 2 most critical parts of the hydrograph affected by SW ~~input~~ - The SMP needs to address ~~both~~ both. - POS in work to adequately address both.
- Recent submitted for POS etc need to go out to all, concern that the records process is jammed up - Ray & Ann will work to hire another staff 1/2 time to make sure that records are disseminated in a more timely manner.
- ~~ATMP~~ - Recent submission is in good, reasonable assurance that it will work w/ ~~some~~ a few additional conditions to insure its functions are addressed.
- Concern about how all all files together are being addressed by joint review.

AR 017969

David Stock, Rebecca, Kim Conant, Bill O'Leary, City Hall
 Andrew Brown, Peter Waring, Rachel Piquet, John Smith, Kristen Mundy
 Mikko Ukonen, Susi, Peter Waring, W. County, Bill O'Leary,
 Mike Nelson

- Dr. Xanth: Focus - SW issue
- ① → with execution could raise for POS proposal
 - Metals history
 - Copper, lead, zinc excel. - 90-2000 designs
 - Not sampling Above + below.
 - Sediments: Lake Tuba data show concentrations of
 - Copper, lead, + zinc.
 - All is sampling start for metals - elevated levels of lead + zinc.
 - No freshwater sink.
 - With the POS do ability to existing outfalls
 - Is the POS really going to do anything to remediate? Not say it is
 - From POS CSMP - they know about it, but no specifics.
 - Cuyahoga is getting into the system.
 - Chronic vs Acute. "

Bill Peterson:

- ① • KC. help get a handle on peak flow issue
- Lingering uncertainties
- Post construction + monitoring: Quite a bit of light room - Need to eliminate the light room
- 3 Areas of uncertainty
 - Scope of the Project
 - What will be built - what are the impacts
 - Low Flow Analysis;

AR 017970

→ Scope of the project:

• PCL was a continued analysis

• E.C. review - construction - Alaska Per-

What happens to the old bridge operation

• I was master of Project Sound.

• Impact of using the two parts

• Fiches of the B. and P. It's

Business today is the long term business

without the Impact of S.W.

• Level II from control is good

• But the SMP is not clear about what they will really do - Not enough assurance - Lack of certainty

Revised SMP id specific man. team to manage

S.W., but lower might need to renegotiate in Alaska for Regional Facilities.

Need to get in place full on-going project team, (Should not be a junior engineer)

can you impact. Do they understand where the line is going. Not giving me info on when the line is going to, and how this is a component of SMP, low flow is a source of impacts. Pelicula Point Creek Channel: will the channel bed water through the summer. It could if out of the feet into the sea say wet, then it will have water - the way is to impact the low level."

Bob O'Brien: "The Des Moines RD facility will not be used to mitigate "peak" dis. include Tred Runway.

Need high level of certainty that the project will not bring up the creek.

Alaska - 1994
Acc. on 10/10/94
about 10/10/94

Smart Legislation Concern that stream will dry up.

Revised P/C: ⁴ Impacts of the POS proposal on the hydrology of the Area

- One issue is ~~the~~ the: Low flow, is that, are no detailed plans on how exactly sw. detent will be used.

Peak Impacts require Peak Section / Mit.

- If 10- Area cap sw. to mit. peak flows is one thing, but if it
The issue of "intent" is the key legal concept. How that is assessed determines the need for a WR permit, protect future use ~~from~~ of water to 401

is intent to be held to mitigate low flow

Amend 7200: 2 major points

- Functional Purpose

- Enhancing bottom & wetland will offset the loss of wetlands

- POS wetland impact is not being fully mit.,

They are using technology to replace wet. functions

- ~~Carbon~~ Site of Organic Carbon - IT is fundamental to

The food chain

- 1-1 to it.

- No scientific evidence for the POS statements about what their mit. will achieve.

- It takes a lot longer to restore functions

→ Mar. Hydrology - Buffer - areas, 50' buffers

will not provide enough of functional area, required to SPTH of Fir Trees.

→ Monitoring of wetlands is not adequate - so how can we know what the situation is like after the undervalued impact

→ Cumulative Impacts: 21% of wetlands will be lost in

- Much more wetland.

- Don't buy the fact that the wetlands can be replaced by streams

- Enhancing website had a significant impact on sales

→ Extremely unusual about many subsequent websites
created within a week.

→ The Auburn site is out of context.

→ More in-balance mitigation !!

Stromt Craig: Ex. of beneficial uses
Megan Nelson: Concerned about loss of in-basin mitigation

Peter Cooney:

- itemy revision K.C. BMPs to mit. SW water they don't work.
- Bio Film. Surface - Mit in Key.
- Grass, S-edge account not that good bacteria
- Oushty of the storage of SW, 10-12/cent.
- Various scenarios include uncertainty.

~~ANAL.~~

~~ANAL.~~ VARIETY of CONTAMINANTS: Will the proposed ~~work~~ change / interrupt / impede natural degradation of cont.

P. of PAVISION ANALYSE, in city, BUT NOT comp. ANALYSE

- Definit
- Need to be on the table: Nature of Cont., what about Solute, Glycote, + METALS.
- What cont. in the perch zone.
- Pole of the underdrain in the embankment. Will it provide a conduit for cont. to be set out into the environment.
- Define the limits of the physical work table.
- Form of "soil" soil.

Other issue: How are all the basic factors being affected by the contaminants.

P. of: Loss of nutrients + nitrogen data points

Engl. All on

AR 017974

Kevin Speck: Common theme - issue of certainty
- Parallel to BMLG
- Tell the PCs to address the issue with greater certainty before the coming year

→ Deal on certain required that come that level II pro-control is implemented

→ Involves work and M11 -

~~Handwritten scribbles and crossed-out text~~

- Modelly Assumptions