

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee Webster [mailto:brewstermayor@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2007 1:53 PM
To: Scott Kreiter
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

Scott,

Thank you for the quick reply. Bob's comments were directly related to the proposed needs analysis, not the 2007 RAP. I felt obligated to pass those comments onto you. I realize some of these issues have been addressed, and will communicate that to Bob.

As you and I have spoken about, the City would like to focus more on working together with Douglas PUD. We are chasing some outside dollars to show we're serious on the RV Park at the Foyle property issue.

With regards to the Study Plans, I'd much rather see dollars spent on the ground than on paper in the form of a study. The one thing I have to bring up regarding the proposed economic study is the ongoing impact of Douglas PUD's focus on habitat versus recreation on the Wells pool has slowed down the influx of visitors to the area. I hope that the rest of the issues we've brought up can be addressed in the form of some kind of agreement and won't just be cast aside.

In a related issue, we at the City have just agreed to create a new salaried position as an Activities Director/Coordinator to help with the increased load.

Thanks

Lee

From: "Scott Kreiter" <scottk@dcputd.org>
To: "Lee Webster" <brewstermayor@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis
Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2007 11:08:50 -0700

Lee,

Thanks for the note.

The RAP you refer to is the 2007 Recreation Action Plan, which is not part of our relicensing process. You should be receiving a copy of the RAP early next week. If you have questions about the RAP, contact Darrin Sexton or Gordon Brett. With both processes taking place simultaneously, its easy to get the two confused.

The August 15 deadline you refer to in your email is the Relicensing deadline for comments on our Proposed Study Plan (PSP). Your comments should focus on studies that the City of Brewster feels are necessary to provide the information needed to make decisions about the new license. Based on our correspondence to date, my understanding is that you have two remaining study issues, 1) Recreation Needs Analysis Study Plan (Capturing information about evening recreation use); and 2) economic impacts.

In the Recreation Needs Analysis that is being proposed by Douglas PUD, you have expressed that there is a need to collect additional information on evening recreational use. As discussed in our correspondence below, the study plan has been modified to capture additional information on evening use, including Hispanic and non-Hispanic use. Please let me know if you feel further modifications are needed to address that issue.

Bob Fateley's comments refer to both recreation needs, and economic impacts. His comments on recreation needs (boat launch, RV parks, day use) will be addressed through the Recreation Needs Analysis study plan that we are submitting to FERC. The study plan, as it is written now, is designed to identify the types of needs that Bob Fateley refers to in his comments. Once the study is completed, we can then talk about specific measures that can be implemented in relation to the Wells Project license.

Bob Fateley also mentions negative impacts of the Wells Project on economic conditions of the City of Brewster. As discussed in the past, Douglas PUD is not proposing to conduct an economic impacts study.

Regarding the August 15th deadline, it appears that the issue of economic impacts is the only issue related to studies that remains unresolved. Again, the City of Brewster may have other issues related to future measures, but in regards to studies only and the August 15 deadline for comments, economics appears to be the only remaining issue that has been brought to our attention thus far.

I appreciate the ongoing communication on this. Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

-Scott
Scott Kreiter
Douglas PUD
509-881-2327

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee Webster [mailto:brewstermayor@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2007 9:47 AM
To: Scott Kreiter
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

I received some comments from Bob Fateley. I have transferred them to a word document as he has written them.

Comments on the 2007 RAP are due by Aug 15th, right? Is there a date comments are due to FERC by? I am waiting for the Planning Commission to finish the current Park element and for Council approval. Do you think I should go ahead and send a draft or do I have enough time to wait to send the adopted plan. This may take another two meetings - or two months.

Thanks

Lee

From: "Scott Kreiter" <scottk@dcputd.org>
To: "Lee Webster" <brewstermayor@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis
Date: Thu, 9 Aug 2007 14:11:00 -0700

Lee,

Below is essentially our correspondence to date. Let me know if you have any additional issues on the study plan.

Thanks.

-Scott

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott Kreiter
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2007 1:50 PM
To: 'Lee Webster'
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

Lee,

See the slight changes I made to Step 2 on Page 9. The changes are tracked.

Let me know if this works for you.

Thanks.

-Scott

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee Webster [mailto:brewstermayor@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2007 4:40 PM
To: Scott Kreiter
Subject: RE: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

Scott,

One thing I noticed is that most of the changes refer directly to Hispanics. While that group of folks is pertinent to the issue raised, I think that the emphasis should be on any person who recreates around and on the pool.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope this makes sense.

Lee

From: Scott Kreiter
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2007 11:15 AM
To: jime@iac.wa.gov; 'Lee Webster'; 'Susan_Rosebrough@nps.gov'
Subject: Wells Reservoir Rec Needs Analysis

Susan, Lee, and Jim,

Please find attached the revised Rec Needs Analysis for the Wells Project. I hope these edits address your concerns regarding Hispanic use of the reservoir. Please feel free to provide any feedback you may have. This was your issue, so I want to be sure that you are comfortable with the changes before sending out to the rest of the work group. All of the changes are highlighted in yellow.

You will also see that we added some additional detail to the methods section on estimating future recreation use. This was in response to a suggestion by FERC that we be sure that everyone in the RWG has an understanding of the protocol we plan to use. Jim and Susan - you are the experts on this, so your feedback on this added methodology would be helpful.

Thanks much for your input.

-Scott

Comments from Bob Fateley re: Wells relicensing, needs assessment, and the 2007 RAP

Issue Statement (PAD 6.2.2.6)

The new license should consider the impact on the Brewster Community, especially boat launch, RV Park, and day use areas because of the added fishing created by the (future) Chief Joe hatchery, Fort Okanogan and Overlook, Etc.

Most all of the (issues) mentioned will create demands for more City services which Douglas PUD needs to help finance and facilitate.

Issue statement should also include new facilities and enhancements to existing facilities and new facilities needed to satisfy the needs for such in the Brewster community.

It is a documented belief that because of the way Douglas PUD manages the Wells Pool it has a severe negative impact on the economic condition of the City of Brewster. Examples are loss of property tax revenue because of (lost waterfront building construction – I had trouble reading the writing) and loss of sales tax revenue because of lack of RV and Day use facilities, etc.