

**From:** [Briard, Monique](#)  
**To:** [Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPCK \(USA\)](#); [Webber, Lisa](#); [John Spranza](#); [Vondergeest, Michael](#)  
**Cc:** [Haley, Nancy A CIV USARMY CESPCK \(USA\)](#); [Jewell, Michael S CIV USARMY CESPCK \(USA\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Sites Reservoir (SPK-2001-00055) (UNCLASSIFIED)  
**Date:** Thursday, October 1, 2020 8:00:11 PM

---

Hi Matthew,

Thank you for responding so quickly and your willingness to continue to work us to move forward with the delineation. We are talking internally about the proposed level 2 method of delineation approach and will circle back with you on it either at our next meeting or beforehand.

Thank you again,  
Monique

Monique Briard | Sr. Managing Director, Environmental Planning | +1.916.231.9551 direct  
| [monique.briard@icf.com](mailto:monique.briard@icf.com) | [icf.com](http://icf.com)  
ICF | 980 9th Street, Suite 1200, Sacramento, CA 95814 USA | +1.916.842.0894 mobile

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

From: Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPCK (USA) <[Matthew.J.Roberts@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.J.Roberts@usace.army.mil)>  
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2020 12:31 PM  
To: Webber, Lisa <[Lisa.Webber@icf.com](mailto:Lisa.Webber@icf.com)>; John Spranza <[John.Spranza@hdrinc.com](mailto:John.Spranza@hdrinc.com)>; Briard, Monique <[Monique.Briard@icf.com](mailto:Monique.Briard@icf.com)>; Vondergeest, Michael <[Michael.Vondergeest@icf.com](mailto:Michael.Vondergeest@icf.com)>  
Cc: Haley, Nancy A CIV USARMY CESPCK (USA) <[Nancy.A.Haley@usace.army.mil](mailto:Nancy.A.Haley@usace.army.mil)>; Jewell, Michael S CIV USARMY CESPCK (USA) <[Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil](mailto:Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil)>  
Subject: Sites Reservoir (SPK-2001-00055) (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Good morning everyone,

I wanted to follow up about yesterday's meeting discussing the delineation of the proposed Sites Reservoir. The proposed project has a massive footprint (30,700 acres with a 300-foot buffer). There was discussion of conducting the entire delineation by desktop. The 1987 manual discusses three levels to conduct a delineation (pg. 45). You have suggested to use level 1 - Onsite Inspection Unnecessary. This method may be used for simple routine determinations. There are very few roads with public access, and this is a large complex proposed project, that would require a level 2 method of a delineation, which states an onsite inspection is necessary. This comprehensive method is necessary to ensure no waters are missed. With a large site and limited resources the Corps will not be able to make a jurisdictional determination based on desktop review only.

However, for planning purposes (404(b)(1) alternatives, and EIS), the desk top delineation can be used and we can move forward, but the Corps would not be able to issue a permit, or verify a delineation until a field investigation is conducted. You stated that you could get access to some sites. It may be best if we break those up and verify what we can right now with field methods used. However, I will still be able to comment on your desktop delineation moving forward to better assist you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you very much for your time.

Respectfully,

Matthew Roberts

Senior Project Manager  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Regulatory Division/Sacramento District  
(o) 530 223-9538  
(c) 530-723-3355  
(f) 530-223-9539

\*\*\*In response to COVID-19, Regulatory Division staff are teleworking from home or other approved location. We will do our best to administer the Regulatory Program in an effective and efficient manner. Priority will be given to health and safety activities and essential infrastructure. Action on your permit application or other request may be delayed during this emergency. We appreciate your patience over the next several weeks.\*\*\*

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED