Message

From: Thiesing, Mary [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=B7B594716A844C65BD55C43A6B033F58-THIESING, MARY ANN]
Sent: 6/5/2017 4:03:27 PM
To: Shaw, Hanh [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=60509321022b49a39f6f6f8df62858de-Shaw, Hanh]
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Hanh, you're absolutely correct in this. However, David is a lawyer, and really smart. I think this style works better for him. In any case, the Fact sheet is at most two sides of a page, and so for any smart decision-maker, it probably doesn't make a difference—they get it in about 5 minutes.

From: Shaw, Hanh
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 9:01 AM
To: Thiesing, Mary <Thiesing.Mary@epa.gov>; Bujak, Charissa <bujak.charissa@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

It is certainly a matter of style. In my experience, many of the decision makers wanted to know up front what the bottom line is. I defer to you.

From: Thiesing, Mary
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 8:59 AM
To: Shaw, Hanh <Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov>; Bujak, Charissa <bujak.charissa@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Hanh,

We usually put the recommended action at the end. The reason is that we want to make the case first by laying out the facts.

From: Shaw, Hanh
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Bujak, Charissa <bujak.charissa@epa.gov>; Thiesing, Mary <Thiesing.Mary@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Charissa – Great job with the fact sheet. I recommend moving the "Recommended Action" to the very front of the paper. Also, the paper made a couple of references to the litigation by the Paradise Ridge Defense Coalition, yet it is not clear what their issues are.

Thank you for pulling this together.

Hanh

From: Bujak, Charissa
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 6:57 AM
To: Thiesing, Mary <Thiesing.Mary@epa.gov>; Shaw, Hanh <Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Hi folks,

Thanks for your patience with the email traffic. Mary Anne thanks for the final word-smith comments. Attached is final version with Mary Anne's edits accepted.

Cheers,

Charissa Bujak
Biologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10, Boise ID Ops Office
950 W. Bannock St.
Boise, ID 83702
Phone: (208) 378-5754
Email: bujak.charissa@epa.gov

From: Thiesing, Mary
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 7:31 AM
To: Bujak, Charissa <bujak.charissa@epa.gov>; Shaw, Hanh <Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Hi Charissa,

Very nice job, especially with the attachments—the 1-km overlays of buffer for the 3 alignments really demonstrates why the local folks object to the proposed alignment. I had a couple of word-smith comments, but other than that, I think this looks like a good. Well done.

Mary Anne

From: Bujak, Charissa
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2017 5:22 PM
To: Shaw, Hanh <Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov>; Somers, Elaine <somers.elaine@epa.gov>; Thiesing, Mary <Thiesing.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: US 95: ThornCrk_Moscow_FS & Briefing Info_6.5.2017

Good afternoon Hanh and Elaine,

Thanks for your time! Mary Anne has kindly helped me put together the US 95 Thorncreek to Moscow fact sheet, and additional material, for David's perusal during our Tuesday discussion (thanks Mary Anne). The fact sheet utilizes a format which Mary Anne suggested and the material provided in the briefing package is the supporting documentation to help lead the discussion.

Attached for your review/edits are: 1) draft Fact Sheet, and 2) Complete Briefing Package (including: Public Notice, Project Overview Map, Tabular Comparison of Alternatives, and Remnant Palouse Prairie Vegetation Impacts).

Please feel free to send any edits/ suggestions back or change at will!

Additional things to briefly note with attached information:

1) Table 8. Summary of Alternatives' Benefits and Effects from the Final Environmental Impact Statement (July, 2015) shows different numbers than what is shown in the public notice. For example, the public notice states that 5 drainages, total linear ft. of 2,592 will be impacted for E-2 whereas the public notice states that 5 drainages, total linear ft. of 4,290 will be impacted.

2) The vegetation maps showing the impacts to Palouse prairie habitat are from the DEIS Vegetation Report in 2005 and used again in the FEIS published in 2015. As this vegetation report reflects impacts described in the 2005 DEIS, and the impacts in the 2017 public notice are different, it is not clear if these maps accurately reflect the potential impact.

Thanks!
Cheers,

Charissa Bujak
Biologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10, Boise ID Ops Office
950 W. Bannock St.
Boise, ID 83702
Phone: (208) 378-5754
Email: bujak.charissa@epa.gov