April 28, 1978

Forest Brooks, Study Manager
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
P. O. Box C-3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Dear Mr. Brooks,

We are writing in response to your request for comments at the public hearing held on the status and progress of the Skagit River flood control programs, March 22, 1978. Our organizations represent many of the boating enthusiasts and river users in western Washington.

We were pleased that alternative 3 received the greatest support from those attending the hearing. We would also support alternative 3. Our greatest concern is with alternatives 4 and 6 which include construction of upstream storage facilities on the Sauk River.

The cost of choosing one of these alternatives would be great. In addition to the estimated 150 million dollar price tag, the region would experience significant costs in the form of lost agricultural and timber lands, fisheries, and natural, scenic and recreational resources. We would urge you to carefully weight all of these costs when evaluating both alternatives 4 and 6.

The primary urban areas in the Skagit Valley will receive 100-year flood protection under alternative 3. Thus, an upstream storage facility on the Sauk will only provide additional flood protection to agricultural or non-urban areas. Furthermore, the protection afforded these agricultural lands will be limited to an increase of only a few more years of protection than would be provided by alternative 3.

Due to the great resource losses and the marginal benefits associated with alternatives 4 and 6, we would recommend and strongly support the rejection of these alternatives and the adoption of alternative 3.
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