

VEAL EXHIBIT 76

From: Costello, Casey D (DFW) [Casey.Costello@dfw.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 10:23 AM
To: Tom W. Hardy
Cc: Reinbold, Stewart G (DFW)
Subject: RE: Stream Questions
Good Morning Tom,

Please send an address or coordinates for those two locations when you get a chance. The first step I take in assessing fish presence is to cross reference the location with WDFW's Salmonscape, WDFW's PHS, WDFW's Fish Passage (FPDSI), and DNR's Forest Practices Mapping Tool. I've outlined the situation below both in the general, WAC based, point of view and for the two specific locations. Please note I am more than happy to do field based assessments for situations such as these.

Generally, WDFW will consider any watercourse with a defined bed and bank as a regulated watercourse. Fish presence is presumed according to WAC 222-16-031. Specifically, section 3(b)(i)(A)(B) which states –

(i) Waters having any of the following characteristics are presumed to have fish use:

(A) Stream segments having a defined channel of 2 feet or greater within the bankfull width in Western Washington; or 3 feet or greater in width in Eastern Washington; and having a gradient of 16 percent or less;

(B) Stream segments having a defined channel of 2 feet or greater within the bankfull width in Western Washington; or 3 feet or greater within the bankfull width in Eastern Washington, and having a gradient greater than 16 percent and less than or equal to 20 percent, and having greater than 50 acres in contributing basin size in Western Washington or greater than 175 acres contributing basin size in Eastern Washington, based on hydrographic boundaries

For Unnamed Trib 1 and based on your description, WDFW would consider this a fish bearing watercourse. The gradient is 5% and the BFW is 2.5. If there are barriers downstream this could potentially change the classification to non-fish but only if those barriers are natural (e.g. natural waterfalls or a sustained gradient of 20% or greater). In water type classifications WDFW must assume that at some point all downstream, man-made barriers to fish passage will be corrected.

For unnamed Trib 2 while I agree an 8 % slope is steep for that area it is not over 16% cut-off (16% in this case because of the contributing basin size). I also understand that the majority of the water in this system is stormwater. However, since some portion of the watercourse is derived from natural sources (i.e. rainwater, groundwater, sub-surface recharge) this makes it a regulated watercourse. For WDFW's purposes the discrepancy for Trib 2 is not whether or not it's a stream but whether or not it would be presumed fish bearing or non-fish bearing.

Please email or call if you would like to schedule site visits for these or if you have any further questions.

Casey Costello

Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Habitat Biologist
Region 4, Issaquah Field Office
Office: (425) 427-0969
Cell: (425) 420-0601
Email: Casey.Costello@dfw.wa.gov

From: Tom W. Hardy [mailto:TWHARDY@redmond.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2016 9:01 AM
To: Costello, Casey D (DFW)
Cc: Reinbold, Stewart G (DFW)
Subject: Stream Questions

Hi Casey,

Redmond has several stream questions that I am hoping to get feedback on from you and Stewart on.

I can provide more site specific maps and background information on the streams, and do site visits if it helps with clarifications.

Unnamed Trib 1: The first situation is a stream flows through a ravine for about 700-feet before flowing through 215-feet of storm pipe and then daylighting. It then meets up with another trib and that combined channel flows ~2,000 feet to the Sammamish River. The City has the upper 700-feet as "fish bearing or potential fish bearing". The upper 700-foot channel is about 5% and the wetted width is 2.5-feet. Would WDFW consider this a fish bearing stream, or potential fish bearing? See map #1.

Unnamed Trib 2: The stream channel is relatively steep; 8%. The only current open channel is downstream of Red-Wood Road where it comes out of a culvert (installed in the 1920s or 1950s). Upstream of the road culvert is an approximate 5-acre basin; half is single family homes built in 1997 and half in forested condition. Most of the flow comes from the developed area, although some flow was there prior to the development. The channel continues from the road through an area where the channel isn't deeply defined (~400-ft), and then flows into a deeply defined ravine section (~900-ft) with mature trees. The channel is between 1-2 feet wide and flows year around (partly because of ground water intercepted in the development). The question we are being challenged on is: Is it a stream? See map #2.

Give me a call if you would like to discuss.

Thanks,

Tom

City of Redmond
Stream & Habitat Planner
(425) 556-2762

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.