

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 11:57 AM  
To: [REDACTED] (ECY)  
Cc: [REDACTED] (ATG)  
Subject: North Bend

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: **Red**

Attachments: North Bend application -- Growth-related condition; RE: North Bend application - Quad City approach to mitigation

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION

[REDACTED]: We need to talk about North Bend and then we probably need to

**REDACTED** Based on the hydraulic limitations of the Hobo Springs mitigation option, North Bend will only be good for growth out maybe 15 to 20 years. We don't know the exact number of years but it is probably in this range. [REDACTED] is pushing us for the Quad-City treatment of phased mitigation. You will see in his attached e-mail to me that he has proposed specific language for us to consider.

**REDACTED**

Another issue that has recently popped up on this project is where we have issued water right decisions after the adoption of an IRPP but we did not condition the water rights to the flows. In the case of the North Bend project, the City wants to also use a 1985 Sallal Water Association water right for part of their mitigation package but the Sallal water right is junior to the Snoqualmie instream flow rule and it is not conditioned to the rule. The Sallal well is probably in direct and immediate continuity with the South Fork of the Snoqualmie River. So do we treat it as an interruptible or non-interruptible water right? There are a lot of other water rights in this Region and probably the State that have a similar problem. It would be a whole lot of fun to try and regulate these rights.

Let me know, when you have time for telephone call on these issues. Thanks, [REDACTED]



North Bend application -- Growth-related condition



RE: North Bend application - Quad City approach to mitigation