**To:** Owens, Kim[Owens.Kim@epa.gov]
**From:** Rueda, Helen
**Sent:** Thur 11/14/2013 6:52:42 PM
**Subject:** FW: Follow-up from Nov. 6 discussion

I'm on a call until 11:30 – will try to call you back then. Check out Sarah's suggestion on the agenda and let me know what you think

**From:** Furtak, Sarah
**Sent:** Thursday, November 14, 2013 10:51 AM
**To:** Rueda, Helen
**Cc:** Croxton, Dave
**Subject:** RE: Follow-up from Nov. 6 discussion

Helen,
Thanks for checking in on this.
I'm checking in with folks, and so far we think the agenda items look good. I have a meeting that may go shortly beyond 3, so I wanted to get back to you preliminarily.
One suggestion we have upfront is that we may want to include an overall goals/what we want to achieve item
Do you think that would be helpful?
Unless you hear otherwise from my shortly after 3:00 pm Eastern, we'll have no further comment.

Best,
Sarah

**From:** Rueda, Helen
**Sent:** Thursday, November 14, 2013 11:28 AM
**To:** Furtak, Sarah; Croxton, Dave; Keating, Jim
**Subject:** RE: Follow-up from Nov. 6 discussion

Thanks Sarah, these look good to me.
Below is a draft of an agenda for the meeting. Please send me any comments on it by 3 pm east coast time today. Sorry for the short turnaround.

Introductions
Overall objective and goals – what we want to achieve
Recap of our last meeting and our meeting with the Kalispel Tribe
Issues and options for moving forward

I. Issues with CFA methodology in TMDL

II. R10 conducted some additional analyses to examine certain CFA issues in relation to the TMDL's allocation numbers.

III. Discuss Specific Issues:

A. Idaho Border

B. TMDL allocation for Box Canyon Dam

IV. Paths Forward Discussion

**From:** Furtak, Sarah
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 12, 2013 2:08 PM
**To:** Croxton, Dave; Rueda, Helen
**Subject:** Follow-up from Nov. 6 discussion

***DRAFT-DELIBERATIVE* ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE***

As follow-up to our discussion on November 6, attached please find the "messaging for meeting with Washington Department of Ecology" revised to reflect discussion we had on that day. We understand these would be EPA messaging points or talking points, but not for distribution to Ecology.

Below is more context for the messaging paper attached:

- Item IV A ends with an optional sentence to add some detail if we wish. We reflect

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative**

- Item IV B ends with an optional sentence to emphasize the option of adjusting what is said about implementation over the possibility of re-doing the allocation itself.
- For item V: Interested in the Region's thoughts on when and how best to broach these topics with the state.
- [redacted]

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative**

- Also, let's discuss (e.g., Nov. 20) whether the next steps are for our own use or part of the initial messaging for the state.

If you would like to discuss any of the above or the attached, feel free to contact me.

Best,
Sarah

**Sarah Furtak**
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds
Assessment and Watershed Protection Division
Watershed Branch
Phone: (202) 566-1167

**From:** Croxton, Dave
**Sent:** Thursday, November 07, 2013 1:12 PM
**To:** Rueda, Helen; Cope, Ben; Owens, Kim
**Cc:** Furtak, Sarah
**Subject:** Edits to Pend O. Nine Pager

If you all could get your comments to me on the HQ Pend O. paper by noon 11/15, I will consolidate them as needed and get them to HQ by 11/18. This will allow us to be ready to discuss the paper if needed for our 11/20 meeting-hold. thanks