BEFORE THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR THE

SEATTLE DISTRICT

In the Matter of Public Meeting Proceedings on the
SKAGIT RIVER, WASHINGTON LEVEE IMPROVEMENT

PROCEEDINGS

Hearing Room
New County Admin Bldg.
2nd & Kincaid Streets
Mount Vernon, Washington
7:30 p.m. (1930 hours)
19 June 1979

The above meeting was called to order at said time and place by
Colonel John A. Poteat, District Engineer of the Seattle District, Corps
of Engineers; before a panel consisting of Walter Farrar, Chief,
Regional Planning Section, Planning Branch, Engineering Division, Vernon
Cook, Skagit Project Manager and Forest Brooks, Skagit Study Manager.
## SKAGIT RIVER, WASHINGTON, LEVEE IMPROVEMENTS

### PUBLIC MEETING

New County Administration Building  
2nd & Kincaid Street  
Mount Vernon, Washington  
19 June 1979

### Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, Harold R.</td>
<td>1359 Memorial Highway</td>
<td>Ditch District #19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-7366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Bennie</td>
<td>1410 Moore Road</td>
<td>Dike District #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-2983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Frank</td>
<td>2061 Babcock Road</td>
<td>Clear Lake Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-6081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Harold E.</td>
<td>2507 Cindy Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Harry</td>
<td>1413 Avon Allen Bd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td>Clear Lake Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-1253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Donald &amp; Barbars</td>
<td>1381 Austin Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-2393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Baillie, Geoffrey L.</td>
<td>1117-1/2 4th</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 50)</td>
<td>Anacortes, WA 98221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Alvin D.</td>
<td>2060 Fir Island Road</td>
<td>Dike District #21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-5981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendtser, Pete J.</td>
<td>1587 Sam Bell Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bow, WA 98232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benham, Roy F.</td>
<td>1500 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-0863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boettcher, Lawrence G.</td>
<td>2010 E. Rio Vista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke pages 67,79,82,</td>
<td>Burlington, WA 98233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and 92)</td>
<td>757-6682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boon, Charlie M.</td>
<td>2080 Mud Lake Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 45)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 856-1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyes, Kristen J.</td>
<td>2181 A Old Day Creek Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britten, Charles H.</td>
<td>2025 Urban Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 424-1751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Bernice L.</td>
<td>2229 So. Skagit Hwy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA 856-0114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Stan D.</td>
<td>2229 So. Skagit Highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA 856-0114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brough, Sally</td>
<td>3630 Wallingford Ave. N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, Cynthia H.</td>
<td>1331 Austin Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 856-1853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, Virgil W.</td>
<td>1331 Austin Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 856-1853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Buckley, Robert R.</td>
<td>1872 Skagit City Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cecotti, Gus</td>
<td>P.O. Box 426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 33)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 757-4044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausen, Orland E.</td>
<td>1359 Avon Allen Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273 424-6852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton, Robert L.</td>
<td>1060 Peter Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>756-6825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubb, Robert W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Puget Power
Puget Power Building
Bellevue, WA 98052
453-6871
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Crawford, Jack T.         | 1478 Fir Island Road  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273  
445-4383                  |                                                   |
| Cuperus, Richard A.       | 1776 Dike Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
429-0417                          |                                                   |
| Dahl, Vernon D.           | 1484 Allen West  
757-0417                          |                                                   |
| Dahlstedt, Norman H.      | 1306 Highway 237  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-1771                         |                                                   |
| DeBoor, Sidney            | 893 Dirshire  
Burlington, WA 98233  
757-6971                          |                                                   |
| Dralle, Milo & Pat        | 2077 Francis Road  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273  
856-6804                         |                                                   |
| Dunham, Laurie S.         |                                                   | Reporter, SV Herald  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-3251                         |
| Dunnerberg, Betty L.      | 1534 Bennett  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273  
424-1353                         |                                                   |
| Dykstra, Donne            | 1709 Gear Road  
Burlington, WA 98233                          |                                                   |
| *Dykstra, Kornelis D.,Jr. | 2201 E. Fir  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-7569                         |                                                   |
| *Dykstra, Tunis R.        | 1524 McLean Road  
Mount Vernon, WA                          |                                                   |
| Dyizkowski, Joseph P.     | 3327 Alikemont Avenue  
Cincinnati, Ohio                         |                                                   |
| Easter, Frank R.          | 2121 E. College Way  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-5151                         | Soil Conservation Service  
District Conservationist |
| Fisher, Herman            | 1524 Bennett Road  
Mount Vernon, WA                          |                                                   |
| Fields Rogers, Bess C.    | 325 W. Fairhaven  
757-6840                          |                                                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, William W.</td>
<td>1584 Sam Ball Road Bow, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fox, Dorothy B. (Spoke page 93)</td>
<td>13353-B Mount Vernon, WA 98273 856-1807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadbois, Carrol M.</td>
<td>1329 Babcock Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gadbois, Larry G. (Spoke pages 40 &amp; 99)</td>
<td>2046 Mud Lake Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273 856-1606</td>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadbois, Suzanne M.</td>
<td>2046 Mud Lake Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273 856-6541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilkey, Richard C.</td>
<td>2278 Mann Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin, Wallace I.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1361 Lyman, WA 286,3404</td>
<td>Lyman, WA - Councilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hageman, Edna R.</td>
<td>408 Baker Mount Vernon, WA 336-2097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg, Neil B.</td>
<td>2332 Riverbend Road Mount Vernon, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hanson, Florine Z. (Spoke page 64)</td>
<td>2187 River Road Sedro Woolley, WA 98284 856-6292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hanson, Ruthie O. (Spoke page 43)</td>
<td>1480 Memorial Highway Mount Vernon, WA 336-3129</td>
<td>Teamsters 411 Business Agent P.O. Box 702, Mount Vernon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Fred W.</td>
<td>1824 Beaver Marsh Mount Vernon, WA 424-3550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayduk, Duke &amp; Sarah</td>
<td>1972 Polson Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayton, Leroy R.</td>
<td>1450 Fir Island Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Henery, Ray C.</td>
<td>1509 Avon Burlington, WA 757-6137</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockman, Beulah E.</td>
<td>1528C Bennett Road Mount Vernon, WA 424-9788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Claude W.</td>
<td>816 Bayview Edison Road Bow, WA 766-6292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hoffman, Lawrence R.</td>
<td>1197 Maupin Road</td>
<td>Dike District #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, Dale P.</td>
<td>4757 Francis Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Howell, Patricia M.</td>
<td>4757 Francis Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 54)</td>
<td>424-9614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Huber, Neil M.</td>
<td>375 Martin Sedro Woolley, WA 856-2706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hulbert, Robert J.</td>
<td>2049 Dry Slough Road Mount Vernon, WA 445-4565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Huston, Janet</td>
<td>1816 Skagit City Road Mount Vernon, WA 445-3091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inman, Mimi</td>
<td>401 Stanford Dr #8 Mount Vernon, WA 424-7014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivey, Lloyd</td>
<td>1524 Beavermarsh Road Mount Vernon, WA 424-3048</td>
<td>Dike District #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenning, Philip R.</td>
<td>1610 Best Road Mount Vernon, WA 466-3478</td>
<td>Drainage #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jewett, Althea</td>
<td>2233 So. Skagit Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke pages 36 &amp; 91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Hubert C.</td>
<td>1929 Dry Slough Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-4222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Johnson, Ken F.</td>
<td>1981-C Francis Road</td>
<td>County Engineer (retired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 41)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Johnson, Lloyd H.</td>
<td>1765 Mount Vernon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 57)</td>
<td>424-6080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Gary T.</td>
<td>1180 Landing Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466-3809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastner, Joan E.</td>
<td>1849 Revilo Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, WA 98233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>747-4816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastner, Paul A.</td>
<td>1849 Revilo Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, WA 98233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>757-4816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Knutzen, Einer C.</td>
<td>727 N. Barl St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 63)</td>
<td>Burlington, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>757-6325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Knutzen, Jess A.</td>
<td>1183 Avon Allen Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 54 - deferred to R. Hulbert)</td>
<td>Burlington, WA 98233</td>
<td>Skagit Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutzen, Mark I.</td>
<td>118 Pulver Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, WA 98233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosbab, Geraldine C.</td>
<td>814 Fruitdale Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kosbab, Theodore A.</td>
<td>814 Fruitdale Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 51)</td>
<td>856-0322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kunzler, Larry J.</td>
<td>4801 Francis Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 43)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-4314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, Stephen G.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Lake, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Jack L.</td>
<td>1304 Fir Island Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Donn V.</td>
<td>1568 Moore Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-2964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Viernal K.</td>
<td>1568 Moore Road</td>
<td>Dike 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linvog, Elwood M.</td>
<td>1121 Sterling Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-6186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ed, Lipsey B.</td>
<td>1157 Cockplham Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 58)</td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lott, Kathi M.</td>
<td>226 N. 8th, Apt. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>336-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, Michael B.</td>
<td>1209 So. Walnut</td>
<td>Skagit County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, WA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>757-0961</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, Maryann E.</td>
<td>2036 Skagit City Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-2291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, Robert A.</td>
<td>2036 Skagit City Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-2291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie, Pete S.</td>
<td>1120-1/2 12th</td>
<td>Managing Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>Stanwood News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>336-3027</td>
<td>Box 999, Stanwood, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallett, Floyd (Mr. &amp;</td>
<td>2231 So. Skagit Hwy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.)</td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-2377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, Jerry</td>
<td>(No card)</td>
<td>Dike District #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mapes, Gerald D.</td>
<td>1065 Sterling Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 36)</td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856-0954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Frederick S.</td>
<td>Box 477</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaConner, WA 98257</td>
<td>Town of LaConner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, John W.</td>
<td>1380 Avon Allen Road</td>
<td>Mt. Vernon Meat Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>1327 D. McLean Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-5831</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNair, Douglas R.</td>
<td>1332 Beaver Lake Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>856-6659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Howard A.</td>
<td>423 Talcott</td>
<td>Skagit County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA</td>
<td>Courthouse, Mount Vernon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Munce, Ian</td>
<td>(No card)</td>
<td>(Spoke for Mayor Walley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Moeller, Dennis A.** (Spoke page 63) | 1877 Cascade  
Burlington, WA  
757-6670 |                                                   |
| Moore, William C.     | 1989 Swan Rd  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-3751 |                                                   |
| McMoran, Don          | 1270 McLean Road  
Mount Vernon, WA |                                                   |
| **Munson, Skip (Mr. & Mrs.)** (Spoke page 48) | 1824 Skagit City Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
445-5543 |                                                   |
| Murdock, Wm. H.       | 114 N. Front Street  
Mount Vernon, WA  
98273  
336-3926 |                                                   |
| **Neble, Sophie** (Spoke pages 29, 69, 87) | 2662 Utopia Road  
Sedro Woolley, WA  
856-0313 |                                                   |
| Nelson, Donald E.     | 4964 E. Div.  
Mount Vernon, WA  
424-1738 | Skagit County Engineer  
Courthouse, Mount Vernon |
| Nelson, Helen C.      | 1140 Bayview Edison Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
757-0235 |                                                   |
| Nelson, Kenneth C.    | 1521 Skagit City Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
445-2082 |                                                   |
| Nelson, Lucille       | 1383 Fir Island Road  
Mount Vernon, WA |                                                   |
| Nelson, Raymond L.    | 1140 Bayview Edison Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
757-0235 |                                                   |
| Nelson, Rodney N.     | 1200 Rawlins Road  
Mount Vernon, WA  
98273  
445-2554 | Dike District #15 |
| Norbeck, John R.      | 1970 Lafayette Road  
Sedro Woolley, WA  
98284  
856-4034 |                                                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norris, Bud</td>
<td>(No card)</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skagit County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Betty</td>
<td>1571 McLean Road</td>
<td>Retired (U.S. Engr. Dept.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Leary, Joseph E.</td>
<td>68 Kalama Place</td>
<td>Stokely-Van Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelter Bay</td>
<td>P.O. Box 456, Mount Vernon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaConner, WA 98257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466-3363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Carl R.</td>
<td>1410 Berniece</td>
<td>Secretary, Dike District #21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-1744</td>
<td>Ditch 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Olson, Gene L.</td>
<td>2018 Dike Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-4175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Winton W.</td>
<td>1323 Fir Island Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-4245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, William L.</td>
<td>1735 Stackpole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ondahl, Neil S.</td>
<td>1449 Allen Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>757-6861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Everet</td>
<td>1954-C Dry Slough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-3645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, Jay</td>
<td>3002 Colby</td>
<td>Congressman Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everett, WA 252-3188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petter, John H.</td>
<td>1721 E. Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-5149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey, Geneal</td>
<td>5109 Francis Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-3740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Power, Jack L.</td>
<td>953 Dist Line Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, WA 757-4671</td>
<td>Chukluck Farms, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressentin, Lyle V.</td>
<td>1570 Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberson, David E.</td>
<td>3630 Wallingford N. Seattle, WA 98103</td>
<td>Washington Bulb Co., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Roozen, John V.</td>
<td>1393 Calhoun Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td>(Spoke pages 65,97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Samply, Gene</td>
<td>(No card)</td>
<td>(Spoke page 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sibley, Donald S.</td>
<td>1847 Beaver Marsh Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>(Spoke page 64- declined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegal, Seth L.</td>
<td>1930 Dry Slough Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skinner, Thomas R.</td>
<td>1838 Dry Sough Road Mount Vernon, WA 445-2953</td>
<td>Fir Island Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Smith, Richard H.</td>
<td>1849 Dike Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>(Spoke page 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spragg, Norm G.</td>
<td>2034 Bulson Road Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>Dike District #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stamos, Gerald C.</td>
<td>4800 Oakes Anacortes, WA 98221 283-5562</td>
<td>Teamsters Local #411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stendal, Art G.</td>
<td>1531 Forest Ridge Place Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>Department of Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Terry C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skagit County Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Stoker, Bruce A.</td>
<td>2376-D Walker Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 30)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 98273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storrs, R. B.</td>
<td>1552 Junguison Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424-6859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straathof, Carole</td>
<td>P.O. Box 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Lake, WA 856-4321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Straathof, Jack</td>
<td>1214 Highway 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 41)</td>
<td>Clear Lake, WA 856-4321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuber, Alice Dee</td>
<td>1548 Moore Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445-2455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuber, Sanford</td>
<td>1880 Skagit City Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson, Leroy A. &amp; Jo</td>
<td>2239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA 856-0795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tellesbo, Alfred M.</td>
<td>1509 Fir Island Road</td>
<td>Dike No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 30)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA 445-5031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tellesbo, Joe</td>
<td>1954 Dry Slough Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Thompson, Robert G.</td>
<td>3600 Francis Road</td>
<td>Dike-Drainage 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke pages 82, 85)</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top, Emma</td>
<td>2247 River Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA 98284 856-1713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top, Sid</td>
<td>2247 River Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, WA 98284 856-1713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranum, Don</td>
<td>3036 165th Pl., N.E.</td>
<td>Washington Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellevue, WA 98008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treiber, Laurel J.</td>
<td>18018 85th Pl. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonds, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Treibel, Wilhelm E.</td>
<td>18018 85th Pl. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 48)</td>
<td>Edmonds, WA 776-7971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tronsdal, Owen Tony</td>
<td>Conway, WA 445-5806</td>
<td>Dike #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanderPol, Larry</td>
<td>1617 Moores Garden Road, Mount Vernon, WA 424-3362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Vander Sar, Carl I.</td>
<td>2028 Francis Road, Mount Vernon, WA 98273 424-6997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Slageren, Beverely</td>
<td>P.O. Box 122 Clear Lake, WA 856-1040</td>
<td>Clear Lake Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vander Sar, Cathy J.</td>
<td>2028 Francis Road, Mount Vernon, WA 424-6997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanWieringen, William</td>
<td>1646 Penn Road 424-1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Verdoes, Dick</td>
<td>2050 Babcock 856-6085</td>
<td>Abe Verdoes &amp; Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinje, Roy M.</td>
<td>1411 Avon Allen Road, Mount Vernon, WA 424-4513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vraner, Ruby D.</td>
<td>1057 Burlington, WA 98122 757-0506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Walker, Michael D.</td>
<td>610 Bellingham Tower, Bellingham, WA 671-2200</td>
<td>Nookachamps - Clear Lake Flood Defence Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Walker, Peter R.</td>
<td>1265 McLean Road, Mount Vernon, WA 424-9534</td>
<td>Skagit County Flood Control Council Public Works Department, Mt.Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walley, Donald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter, J. Ralph</td>
<td>1548 Sam Bell Road, Bow, WA 98232</td>
<td>Major - Sedro Woolley (Chairman, Skagit Regional Planning Council Burlington, WA 98233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Waltner, Charles E.</td>
<td>1987 Dike Road, Mount Vernon, WA 445-4171</td>
<td>Drainage Dist #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Steve</td>
<td>2021 E. College Way, Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td>Department of Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Wibbelman, Carl A.</td>
<td>2048 Mud Lake Road 865-0457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, James</td>
<td>P.O. Box 581 Conway, WA 98238 445-5232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wudtke, Gergrude L.</td>
<td>102 Front Street Mount Vernon, WA 336-2837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wudtke, Sharon</td>
<td>Martin Road Mount Vernon, WA 424-3982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wylie, Jim</td>
<td>2216 Mann Road Mount Vernon, WA 98273 445-3511</td>
<td>Dike District #18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke page 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Young, Zel</td>
<td>Box 433 Mount Vernon, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spoke pages 59, 79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTENDANCE:**

<p>| <strong>Poteat, John A.</strong>  | P.O. Box C-3755 Seattle, WA 98124            | District Engineer Seattle Dist, Corps of Engrs |
| Sellevold, Richard P.| &quot; &quot;                                         | Chief, Engineering Division Seattle Dist, Corps of Engrs |
| <strong>Farrar, Walter</strong>   | &quot; &quot;                                         | Chief, Regional Planning Section Engrg Div, Seattle Dist, CofE |
| <strong>Cook, Vernon</strong>     | &quot; &quot;                                         | Skagit Project Manager, Des Br Engrg Div, Seattle Dist, CofE |
| <strong>Brooks, Forest</strong>   | &quot; &quot;                                         | Skagit Study Manager, Plng Br Engrg Div, Seattle Dist, CofE |
| <strong>McNamara, Ginger</strong> | &quot; &quot;                                         | Recorder, Engineering Div Seattle Dist, Corps of Engrs |
| <strong>Thomas, Mary</strong>     | &quot; &quot;                                         | Public Affairs Officer             |
| <strong>Robinson, Walter</strong> | &quot; &quot;                                         | Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs |
| <strong>Stephens, Del</strong>    | &quot; &quot;                                         | Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malnerich, Michael</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box C-3755 Seattle, WA 98124</td>
<td>Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rowe, Wayne R.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Design Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towle, James V.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Design Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vert, Linda B.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Real Estate Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith, Linda A.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northup, Karen S.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump, Clyde J.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Design Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konold, John L.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Planning Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodard, Richard L.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Design Br, Engrg Division Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, David A.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2870 Portland, Oregon 97208</td>
<td>North Pacific Division Engineering Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anderson, Willie O.</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box C-3755 Seattle, WA 98124</td>
<td>Reproduction Branch Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sipes, Allen</strong></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Reproduction Branch Seattle District, Corps of Engrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spoke at meeting.
**Aided in meeting and/or preparation of meeting.
LIST OF EXHIBITS


2. Statement Skagit Regional Planning Council.


4. Statement - Officers and Directors of the Skagit County Flood Control Council.

5. Letter from Janet Huston for residents of Skagit City Road on Fir Island.


7. Petition submitted by Ruthie Hanson, Local 411 (115 signatures).

8. Statement of Lawrence Boettcher.


COLONEL POTEAT. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Those of you who I haven't had an opportunity to meet, I am Colonel John Poteat, the District Engineer for the Corps of Seattle District. I want to welcome you to our public meeting on the Skagit River Levee Improvement Project. We will be concentrating tonight on our flood damage reduction study for the Skagit River Delta and on the proposed recommendation that we have for modifications to the 1966 authorized project for flood protection in the lower part of the valley.

I am not a total stranger to your flood problems. I became acquainted with them in my previous position in the Office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington, D.C., when some years ago I was the Assistant Director of Civil Works for the Pacific Area. So, in my past job in 1975-76 in Washington, D.C., I became familiar with your flood problem out here, despite the fact that we were separated by about 3,000 miles. During the past three years as the District Engineer, I have had a number of discussions on your flooding problems with your senators, your congressmen, members of their staff, your county commissioners and other local officials, as well as many of you individually. As the District Engineer, I have felt a personal obligation to give this study a very high priority in my office, since in my view the Skagit River flood problem is the most serious potential flood problem in the entire Seattle District area which covers most of the State of Washington, northern Idaho and western Montana.

I find it a little difficult sometimes to come to any town, particularly Mount Vernon on a pretty day like this, with the sun out,
and talk about floods, but they do happen and big ones come. The one that you had here in 1975-76, that time frame that was what we call about a ten year flood, as I recall, that means, relatively speaking is a small flood, it occurs as often as once every ten years. In 1977, the area west of the Cascades, we had down in the Green River about a 75-year flood, so large that it occurs only once every 75 years. I think on the White it was about once every 90 years. The storage reservoirs were there so the floods didn't attract all that much attention, the reservoirs prevented much of the damage. To the people in Mississippi, who have recently experienced in April of this year, the Pearl River flood, that by the way was, all they will say now, well about a 100-year event, it looks like probably well above a 200-year event - what you call a real large flood. It was 24 feet above flood stage, the Pearl River. It caused $600 million of damage to the Jackson, Mississippi area.

During the same time frame the Red River up in Minnesota and North Dakota estimated at over a 100-year flood. In Fargo at over a 200-year flood in Grand Forks. So, what would a 100-year flood do, just to get the stage a little bit we put a red mark on the wall back there, on the column, you can see the red tape around the column - if we were sitting here tonight in a 100-year flood that would be a water level, so it can be very serious.

Just a little personal note, unfortunately my tour of duty as the District Engineer is coming to an end out here. I will return to Washington, D.C. the end of this month to take a new job as the Executive Officer to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. Though in
that capacity I will continue to be involved with this particular project
though from a little different angle. I am pleased that will continue
that association because I think we have a problem here, that you have
worked very hard on and members of my staff have and I would like to see
it progress satisfactorily with maximum benefit to each of you out here.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is your meeting. We are very interested
in hearing your views. I would like to make just a few introductory
remarks, announcements on the presentation of our study. I guess first
I ought to introduce members of my staff who are with me tonight. No
stranger to you is the Skagit Project Manager, Vern Cook; Walt Farrar,
the Chief of our Regional Planning Section, also at the table to my
right along with Forest Brooks, Forest is the Skagit Study Manager.
Mary Thomas, our Public Affairs Officer is in the back; Ginger McNamara,
the lady whose face you seldom see, because she is talking into the
recording equipment over here; Walter Robinson, Del Stephens, Mike
Malnerich, Wayne Rowe, Jim Towle, whom you met at the door, I think
tonight and they are all helping with the meeting and I certainly appreciate
their assistance. We do have a stranger from out of town, a member of our
headquarters staff our Division Office down in Portland, David Ross—
welcome David, it's pretty nice country up here in the Skagit Valley
and I suppose you already know that by now. We do have a number of
technical experts from our staff in attendance so that we can answer in
a good deal more detail your questions whether they be formally at the
or during the break, or after the meeting, or some members of my staff
will be remaining in the area tomorrow as I will announce later on. The
real brains of the outfit then, Karen Northup, our Environmental Coordinator, stand up Karen so that they can see you and if you have an environmental problem call on Karen; Ernie Sabo, Ernie is a total stranger to this valley, stand up Ernie, I doubt if very many people know you. Ernie is the Chief of our Exploration Section in the Foundation and Materials Branch. Ernies has had some small amount of flood fighting experience in the Skagit Valley too. Dick Regan, the brains of our Hydraulic Section; Bob Frey, did he make it, or Linda Vert is here from our Real Estate Office, Linda; Larry Scudder who works in Civil Design.

We are very pleased to have several of our locally elected public officials here tonight — Jay Pearson, Congressman Swift’s office is here Jay, again welcome to you sir. At a real sacrifice, Howard Miller, from the County Commissioners is here — Howard is in very bad shape these days he hasn’t been fishing in four days he said and you know there is a real crisis when that happens; Bud Norris, Bud’s the Chairman these days, Bud I was so anxious to get that little story in on Howard and try to get some sympathy I forgot to introduce the head of the outfit, Bud; and Jerry Mansfield is also here, Jerry. It is certainly nice to see you gentlemen the people that I have enjoyed working with a great deal during my tenure out here and have the highest regard for them professionally and a great deal of fun personally — I enjoy them very much.

We have Major Jack Miller here from Mount Vernon; Mayor Raymond C. Henery, Burlington and Mayor Don Walley from Sedro-Woolley. There may be others that are here.

Ladies and gentlemen, when you came into the room tonight some of
the members of my staff were at the door to encourage you to fill out an attendance card, one of these little things right here (holding up card). If you have not filled out a card, please raise your hand at this time and we will get one to you to complete and turn in. Does anybody need a card – in the back, in the very back. We need this information for our meeting record. Also, at the registration table there were copies of tonight's agenda, the single sheet here (holding up agenda), a public brochure (holding up brochure). Does anybody need an agenda or a brochure, particularly this brochure. The brochure, by the way, was mailed last week to all persons or agencies known to have an interest in the project. That's one of the reasons we keep these attendance cards is to keep you properly posted. In the brochure you will find information on our proposed recommended plan and the alternative flood damage reduction measures. If you have any comments or questions on the material you can speak to us tonight or you can use the buff colored page in the brochure for your written comments. That page can be removed from the brochure, folded so our address is on the outside, stapled and simply toss in the mail to us and we will pay the postage.

If some of you have specific concerns that we do not answer tonight at the meeting and you wish to discuss them with us, as I said earlier, several members of my staff will be in the area tomorrow and frankly, we will remain tonight as long as you care, to answer any questions. Forest Brooks is going to be in charge, I think, of the delegation remaining here tomorrow. He will be at the Skagit County Engineer's Office on the second floor of this building from 8:00 a.m. until 11:00 a.m. and from noon until 2:00 p.m.
Okay, could we have the lights turned down a little bit? Let's get to the meat of why we are here this evening. As most of you are aware, for sometime now, 2-1/2 years, the Corps of Engineers has conducted what we call advance engineering and design studies of the Skagit Levee and Channel Improvement Project, which was authorized by the Congress in 1966. It involved raising existing levees and strengthening them and channel improvement in the Skagit River downstream of the Burlington Northern Bridge at Mount Vernon. Our present study has reviewed that earlier authorization and determined that it did not address the complete flooding problem in the Skagit River Delta.

As part of our preliminary studies, we developed six alternatives that combined different flood protection reduction measures including the 1966 project, upstream storage was considered, urban levees, and the Avon Bypass. At the public meeting a year ago, March 1978, the general consensus of the group was that we should concentrate our detailed studies on improving the entire levee system including lower levees for rural areas, and higher levees, that is for a higher degree of protection for the urban areas, the so-called Alternative 3 that we discussed then and as outlined in the book.

We then pursued our detailed studies and developed five different combinations of rural and urban levee protection which we designated 3A through 3E. That is, the general Alternative 3, then was flushed out in a little greater detail to include five variations of Alternative 3. These were discussed at the public workshop in December of 1978. The primary concern expressed at that workshop centered on the increased flooding, which
areas riverward of the improved levee system would receive, what the
impact would be then and what to do about it. Following the workshop the
Skagit County Commissioners asked the Corps to undertake additional
studies of these areas to determine whether any flood damage reduction
measures could be implemented, not only to offset any added damage but
also to offset some of the potential damage that could result from condi-
tions today.

We have completed these studies and have modified Alternative 3 as
shown on page 3 of your public brochure, that little buff brochure. That's
been modified then to include some of the structural and non-structural
measures which you asked about at the workshop. These measures will then
not only reduce the flood damage that has been induced by levees across
the river, but also provide some general damage reduction over what
occurs under present conditions.

The meeting tonight will center on the decision to accept
Alternative 3E. I have tentatively decided that, considering on the
balance so to speak, considering the engineering, economics, environmental
and social factors, Alternative 3E should be recommended—that's our
proposal to you to see what you think about it. We have come here
tonight then to gain your views on this proposed recommendation. Our job
again, I emphasize, is to try to serve you in the best method possible and
to give you a project which best meets your needs, the needs of the state,
and the interests of the Federal Government. We are interested in each
and every opinion, whether you are an elected official, a private
individual, a taxpayer, a resident with a personal interest, or a
representative from a concerned group. So, we certainly do hope you will participate tonight.

In order to help us proceed, let me explain the pattern of tonight's meeting. Forest Brooks, our Skagit Study Manager, will review the process very briefly, go over the process the Corps of Engineers follows in building water resource projects and how this particular project for the Skagit Valley fits into this model. He will review the preliminary alternatives, that we have look at over the past, the detailed alternatives that we have narrowed down to and finally our proposed recommended plan, the so-called 3E proposal. At that point, we will listen to those of you who wish to make a formal comment. Following that, we will open up the meeting for general discussion, then you can ask questions or comment upon what has been presented before or what is in the book. So, Forest without further adieu let's have you discuss some of the details of our study.

FOREST BROOKS. Thank you, Colonel. I am pleased we have such a good turnout here tonight. I will now take about 20 minutes to review how the Corps of Engineers goes about studying and building projects and to discuss our tentatively selected alternative as well as the other alternatives which were considered.

The usual Corps process, by which we plan, design and build water resource projects, can generally be broken down into three phases — what we call General Investigation studies, Advance Engineering and Design studies and then actual construction.

In the first phase, the General Investigation studies, people ask
their congressional representatives for help in resolving water resource problems. Congress then directs the Corps of Engineers to study the problems and make recommendations as to the Federal interest in measures which could alleviate these problems. For the Skagit Project, Congress authorized such a study in 1960. This study was completed in 1965 and the Corps recommended that a project be constructed. In the Flood Control Act of 1966, Congress authorized the Corps to proceed with the project. However, Congress did not fund the second phase of the project until Fiscal Year 1977.

The second phase of a Corps project involves advance engineering and design studies. During this phase, the Corps reviews the authorized project to determine whether there are changes in the needs of the area, and the desires of the people and local officials since the first phase of studies. Then, either the formulation of the authorized project is affirmed or it is changed to meet new and greater needs. On the Skagit project, Congress first funded this phase in Fiscal Year 1977. We are scheduled to submit our report next month. It tentatively reformulates the project to Alternative 3 E. This recommendation would require additional congressional authority before construction can begin.

The third phase of a Corps of Engineers project is the actual construction. This can take from one to several years depending upon the scope of the project. Construction of this project, would probably first begin on Fir Island. Timing would be dependent upon congressional authorization and funding. Hopefully, construction could be underway by 1980 and would probably continue for three or four years. At that time,
the completed project would be turned over to Skagit County to operate and maintain.

In our preliminary studies we developed six alternative flood damage reduction measures which were discussed at our March 1978 meeting. The first alternative was to continue existing conditions. This is our "do nothing" alternative. Under this alternative, no new dams, levees, channel modifications, or diversion structures would be built for flood damage reduction purposes. Development within the flood plain would be restricted through existing zoning. The existing levee system and the upstream flood control storage would be maintained as they presently are. Under this alternative, the river would remain partially controlled by the existing structural flood prevention measures; however, existing average annual damages of $7.2 million, would continue.

The second alternative was the 1966 project which involved raising and strengthening the existing levee system from the mouth of the North and South Forks upstream to the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge, and improving the hydraulic capacity of the North Fork and Freshwater Sloughs so that the safe channel capacity downstream from the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge would be 120,000 cubic feet per second which is equivalent to about an eight or nine year flood.

Alternative three included the improvements described by Alternative 2 and in addition, higher urban levees to protect Burlington and Mt. Vernon.

Alternative four would include the improvements described by
Alternative 3 and, in addition, upstream flood control storage of 134,000 acre-feet provided by a dam on the Sauk River.

Alternative five would include the improvements described by Alternative 2 and in addition, the Avon Bypass and the urban levee system. The existing levee system would be extended to Sedro Woolley, and the bypass channel would have a capacity of 60,000 cubic feet per second.

Alternative six would include the improvements described by Alternative 2, and, in addition, the Avon Bypass and upstream storage on the Sauk River. The existing levee system would be extended to Sedro Woolley, and the bypass channel would have a capacity of 60,000 cubic feet per second. Since approximately 100-year flood protection would be provided to the entire flood plain downstream from Sedro Woolley, most of the restrictions regarding flood plain regulations would no longer be required.

Of the preliminary alternatives, Alternative 3 received public and local government support as the first priority for flood damage reduction in the Skagit River Delta and was selected for further development in our detailed studies.

For detailed studies, Alternative 1, the without condition, was carried throughout plan formulation, as was Alternative 2, the 1966 project, to serve as a basis for evaluating alternatives. We developed five combinations of urban and rural levee protection and designated them 3A through 3E.

Alternative 3A would provide urban levees (100-year or more
protection) for east Mount Vernon, west Mount Vernon, and Burlington.

Rural levees which would provide 50-year protection for Avon-Fredonia and for the area downstream of Mount Vernon. This would provide protection for 100-year or greater flood for 6,600 acres and protection from a 50-year flood for 35,600 acres. The total cost would be about $55 million of which about $12.5 million would be local. Average annual induced damages would be $102,000 with average annual net benefits of $956,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.2 to 1.

Alternative 3B would be similar to 3A except that the Avon-Fredonia area would be provided 100-year or more protection. 11,700 acres would be protected from the 100-year or greater flood and 30,500 acres from the 50-year flood. Total cost would be about $41 million of which about $7.5 million would be local. Average annual induced damages would be $64,000, with net benefits of $2,089,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio would be about 1.6 to 1.

Alternative 3C would be similar to 3A except that the Cook Road area, the Skagit overflow into the Samish, would be provided 100-year or more protection. 17,600 acres would be protected from the 100-year or greater flood and 35,000 acres from a 50-year flood. The total cost would be about $94 million of which about $13 million would be local. Average annual induced damages would be $117,000 and net benefits would be a negative $1,430,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio would be 0.8 to 1.

Alternative 3D would be similar to 3C except that the Avon-Fredonia area would also be provided 100-year or more protection. Under this alternative 22,100 acres would be protected from 100-year or greater floods.
and 30,500 acres from a 50-year flood. Total cost would be about
$80 million of which about $9 million would be local costs. The average
annual induced damages would be $120,000 and the net benefits a
negative $375,000 annually. The benefit-to-cost ratio would be 0.9 to 1.

Alternative 3E would be similar to 3B except that an overflow to
the Samish Valley would be provided at Gages Slough east of Burlington
with erosion control sills and levees added to protect the Sedro
Woolley-Sterling area and the Clear Lake area. Other flood plain
improvements would receive flood damage reduction through raising,
floodproofing, moving, or flowage easement. 14,200 acres would be
protected from 100-year or greater floods and 39,000 acres from the
50-year flood. Total cost would be $55 million of which $10 million
would be local. The average annual induced damages would be about
$25,000 and the net benefits $2,288,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio would
be about 1.5 to 1.

In evaluating these alternatives engineering economic and social
factors were considered.

Alternative 1, the without condition, was eliminated because it
did not provide any flood damage reduction to existing developments in
the flood plain. Little support has been expressed for this alternative
by any agency or group.

Alternative 2, the originally authorized project, was eliminated
because it did not geographically include the full flood control problem
of the Skagit Valley Delta downstream from Sedro Woolley.

Alternatives 3C and 3D were eliminated because the total project
costs exceeded the total project benefits that would be realized by
building the project.
Alternative 3A was eliminated because it had the lowest amount of total benefits and would provide the lowest amount of flood protection and have the highest amount of induced damages of the three remaining alternatives.

Of the two remaining Alternatives, 3B has lower total benefits, lower net benefits, and a higher benefit-to-cost ratio than alternative 3E. 3B would reduce flood damages significantly for about 42,000 acres of the Skagit River flood plain downstream of Sedro Woolley but would increase flood damages somewhat for about 32,000 acres.

Alternative 3E has the greatest total and net benefits and includes additional structural and non-structural measures to eliminate much of the induced flooding damages. The environmental effects of Alternatives 3A through 3E are approximately the same with Alternative 3A protecting the least urban land having the least environmental impacts and Alternative 3D protecting the largest amount of land with 100-year or greater protection, having the greatest environmental impacts. From a social viewpoint, Alternative 3E would provide flood damage reduction of various levels to the largest number of people in the Skagit River Delta. Thus, after considering these factors and others which are discussed in the public brochure, Alternative 3E was tentatively selected as the recommended plan.

Following the selection of 3E as the tentative plan, the design was refined to insure that a catastrophic failure of the levee in a heavily populated area would not occur. The levee system includes designed overflow areas of reduced freeboard so that in floods greater than
the project design, protected areas would be flooded gradually by
backwater preventing a sudden flowout which could cause a wall of water
to rush through either Burlington or Mount Vernon. As part of this design
refinement, it was determined that by raising the east side levee at
Mount Vernon by only about 0.3 or 0.4 of a foot over the 100-year levee
height, standard project flood protection could be provided to downtown
Mount Vernon. Standard project flood would be a flood which is greater
than, in this case, would be greater than a 500-year flood. We could
provide this protection without significantly impacting any other area.
We deemed this additional protection for the highly developed downtown
area of Mount Vernon was appropriate.

Thus the tentatively selected plan includes - standard project
flood protection for 2,200 acres in Mount Vernon; 100 year or greater
protection for 12,000 acres in west Mount Vernon, Avon-Freedonia, Burlington,
Sedro Woolley, Sterling and in Clear Lake and 50 year protection for
39,000 acres of rural agricultural land. Also, in addition on
Alternative 3E we have non-structural measures for those lands which are
located riverward of the improved levee system.

The improved levee system has a basic levee design. The top of
the levee height was selected by determining the design water surface
which is 50 years for rural levees and 100 years or standard project flood
for urban levees. This design water surface includes an allowance for
sedimentation over the economic life of the project, which in this case is
100 years. To this design water surface an allowance for wave action
for superelevation and bridge losses is made as appropriate and then a
A factor of safety called freeboard is added to determine what the top of
the levee should be. For the urban areas the freeboard is generally three
feet and in rural areas it is generally two feet. The amount that we will
be raising the existing levees to the new height would range from
generally one to seven feet.

Now, the typical earth levee embankment will be constructed of
silty, sandy gravel or silty, gravelly sand placed on a ground which has
been cleared, grubbed, and stripped as required. The standard levee top
will be 12 feet wide; the side slopes are typically one vertical on two
horizontal. Maximum use will be made of embankment materials from the
existing levees. The side slopes would receive topsoil and seeding with
the top of the levee having gravel and seeding. In many areas of the
project, a 12-foot gravel berm on the landward levee side is necessary to
control water seepage under the levee and to prevent loss of levee
integrity. This gravel berm will also serve as an access road during
floodfighting and for levee maintenance purposes. In many locations
where the existing county road is located adjacent to the existing levee,
the road will be moved and placed on top of the berm. In these cases
the berm will be whatever width is required for the road. To provide
protection against erosion where levees will be subjected to high-water
velocities, wind waves and debris attack, rock riprap will be placed
along approximately 8.3 miles of the total project length. In cases
where a sufficiently wide bench is available between the levee and the
river, a buried toe levee design will be utilized as shown on this slide.
In other cases where encroachment into the river is unavoidable, a weighted
toe levee design will be utilized as shown in the slide on the screen now.

On the left bank of the river through Mount Vernon, where right-of-way through the urban area is limited, a floodwall will be constructed instead of a levee. This will occur along approximately 1.4 miles of the total project. The bank protection in this reach will be rock riprap with a weighted levee toe. The basic levee design is shown in this slide.

Because of the esthetic impacts a wall would have in the Lions Club Roadside Park and in the downtown waterfront parking area in Mount Vernon, a folding floodwall has been proposed for these areas and it is shown on the slide on the screen now. This design would be similar to one which the Corps of Engineers has built in Monroe, Louisiana which is shown in these pictures on the screen now being erected during a flood exercise last year. When not in use for preventing a flood the levee can lie flat and be used as a sidewalk. As part of the modifications to 3E the weir which was located near Sterling has been removed and two erosion control sills installed. These sills are designed to prevent the 100-year flood overflow to the Samish from the Skagit from being any worse with the project than would be experienced without the project as well as prevent a possible channel shift during a major flood. The screen shows the levee in the Sterling area. The new levee would start in Sedro Woolley, come along the southeast side of the Burlington Northern to District Line Road, then cross the railroad and highway and follow along the District Line Road to high ground adjacent to Sterling Hill. At this point a buried sheet pile wall with a buried riprap blanket for erosion protection would
be installed from the end of this levee to Sterling Hill. A cross-section through this sill is shown on the left screen. Prior to construction, topsoil would be stripped from the area and excavation for the riprap made after placement, the material that would be removed from the excavation will be replaced over the riprap and reshaped with flat side slopes to form a berm, so that the water increased caused by the project is compensated for in the design of the erosion control sill and once the topsoil has been replaced over it then normal farming operations could be resumed in the area.

On the left side of the Sterling levee slide, the existing levee system will be raised and a new levee constructed along the south side of Gages Slough almost to Sterling Hill where it turns to the west to tie into the Burlington Hill. A sill similar to the one on the east side of the hill would be placed from the hill to this levee.

The modified 3E Alternative includes structural and non-structural measures to not only substantially reduce any flood damages cause by the project but, where possible, to provide flood damage reduction up to the 100-year flood for improvements in the flood plain riverward of the improved levee system. These non-structural measures include raising or flood-proofing buildings, relocating or removing buildings and if necessary purchase of flowage easements. The measures to be used will vary depending upon the specific area and the structures under consideration.

At west Mount Vernon the levee alignment has been moved from Ball Street one block east to Front Street. The property between Front Street and the river will probably be purchased and the buildings removed since
since they are presently located in the Skagit River floodway.

On the other side of the river at Mount Vernon, raising, flowage easements, or floodproofing would be probably provide for the Moose Hall and the Stokley Van Camp Warehouse which are currently outside the proposed levee alignment.

For the community fo Clear Lake a levee would be added west of Highway 9 to provide 100-year protection to Clear Lake and the area south of it on the East Fork Nookachamps Creek.

At Sterling the levee along District Line Road has been added. This will provide 100-year protection to the houses and the developments such as the hospital and convalescent center that are adjacent to and northwest of Highway 20.

For the remainder of these riverward of the improved levee system improvements would be raised, floodproofed, relocated, removed or a flowage easement obtained. Generally it would following the following criteria. All residences would be floodproofed so that the first floor would be one foot above the 100-year flood, with project water surface, or the residences would be acquired in fee and removed from the flood plain.

All farmers having livestock would have mounds constructed to one foot above the 50-year flood water surface with space provided for livestock feed storage, and emergency milking operations if that's applicable to the type of livestock involved.

All land that would flooded during the 100-year event because of the project, that would not have been flooded without the project, would be subject to flowage easements.
All improvements, other than residences, would be considered on a case-by-case basis for floodproofing to offset any significant detrimental effect caused by the project.

The limited recreational features which were proposed as part of the project originally have now been dropped from the present plan, due to problems regarding the Federal interest and the type of development proposed and the local desires.

We have included a special habitat restoration features into the project to minimize adverse environmental impacts associated with the loss of habitat due to project construction. To accelerate the re-establishment of vegetation following project construction, all levee tops and berms will be seeded with native grass species. Stripped material stockpiled during levee construction will be placed on all riprap and quarry spall slopes above ordinary high water and grass seeded. Buried levee toes will be backfilled with excavated material and also seeded.

In certain reaches of the project where immediate restoration of shrub habitat has been identified as critical to fish and wildlife, revegetation with shrubs, in addition to grass is proposed. This occurs at five locations with a total length of 7,500 lineal feet, in these locations the riprap would be thickened and the rock sizes increased in reaches for shrub plantings in order that the vegetation, when established, would not weaken the riprap or the levee protection. The program of revegetation will consist of placing topsoil over the riprap and into the voids and seeding it in grass, followed by the planting of a 4-foot zone of shrub species above the ordinary high water line. Restoration planting is also
planned for the 400-foot reach of Fisher Slough that will be realigned. Planting will occur on approximately 0.2 acre of the right bank and will consist of native species existing there at the time that the realignment takes place.

We have proposed sufficient wildlife mitigation to reduce impacts resulting from the project-related losses of shore zone habitat and overstory with vegetation. It will be located on the Skagit wildlife recreation area, which is currently owned and operated by the Washington State Department of Game.

Mitigation for the loss of shallow rearing habitat for juvenile fish would be provided by reopening the slough on No Name Island on the Skagit wildlife recreation area which is between Steamboat and Freshwater Sloughs. This involves the placement of two culverts, one at each end of the 2,500 foot slough to permit freshwater into the Skagit River. The planting of trees on the wildlife recreation area is planned to mitigate for the loss of approximately 10 acres of overstory vegetation which would be permanently lost along the river due to levee right-of-way and maintenance requirements. One site involves improving the existing levee along Freshwater Slough to approximately 10-year protection sufficient to maintain the planting of a zone of trees along the inside of the levee.

A second zone of vegetation will be planted on Milltown Island along the river's edge. In the future other sites may be identified in the wildlife recreation area during continued coordination with the resource agencies.

Now, I will just say a few words about the local cost sharing requirements. Federal participation in water resource projects is
contingent upon the local governmental agency serving as the local sponsor, which in this case is Skagit County, providing the items of local cooperation. These generally include all land, easements and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; providing alterations and relocations of buildings, transportation facilities, and utilities; holding the United States free from damages due to the construction work; and maintaining and operating the project after completion. In the case of this project there are probably several other requirements which were part of the original authorization and these included to prevent encroachment on improved channels and to annually notify the public of the limited flood protection provided by the project.

Another item which would be added as part of the modified 3E would be cost sharing for the non-structural measures on a 20 percent local, 80 percent Federal basis. The total local cost to provide these items is currently estimated at about $10 million.

Now, what will happen next? We are currently in the third year of our advance engineering and design phase of the Skagit Levee Improvement Project. We have completed our studies and tentatively selected the plan which we feel is the best when engineering, economics, environmental and social effects are considered. After this meeting we are scheduled to submit to our higher authority in Portland, Oregon, our project report which we call our General Design Memorandum and also a final Environmental Impact Statement. For your comments to be considered as part of our process we must receive them by the end of the month, by the 30th of June. We consider your input essential so that we can have a complete evaluation.
As Colonel Poteat said, we will be willing to stay tonight to speak with you, if you don't get your question answered during the meeting, either at a break or afterwards and I will stay. I will be here tomorrow upstairs in the County Engineer's Office to meet with whoever wants to come in and talk about the project, about our plan or anything else about it. I will be there from 8:00 to 11:00 and from noon until 2:00. Now, if there is somebody who can't come during those hours please see me tonight and we will try to work out another time when I can be there. Generally I will be there from 8:00 to 11:00 and from noon to 2:00. Now, this concludes my presentation on this and I think I will turn it back over to you.

COLONEL POTEAT: Thanks Forest. Ladies and gentlemen, this is basically your meeting. We are here, of course, to provide information but we particularly want to hear and record your comments and to do our best to answer your questions. For those of you who indicated on the attendance cards that you would like to say something, we have a couple of microphones in the center aisle or you can use the one up here but please use one the microphones so that the audience can hear you. Ginger can record your comments. When you speak, would you please give your name and an organization that you represent, if indeed you do, state whether your views are your own or those of the organization.

Now, to expedite the meeting tonight I would ask that those of you who have formal written comments to submit, turn them in to us and then summarize the significant ideas in your comments for the people in attendance. We will, by the way, print the entire version which you turn
in to us. We will take the speakers who wish to make formal comments in the following order - first, the elected officials, Federal, State, local; next, representatives of Federal, State and local agencies; third, persons from organized groups and then individuals. Following the formal comments, we will open the floor to general questions and discussions on the issues that are raised tonight. I think that about 9:30 or so, we will be about two hours into the meeting and we will take a little break.

The first card I have here for the County Commissioners I think they are matching out over in the corner to see who will deliver this. I believe the Chairman is Bud Norris.

BUD NORRIS. Thank you, Colonel. I would like to express the words of appreciation to Colonel Poteat for his continued support for flood control in the Skagit Basin and for the efforts of Vernon Cook and Forest Brooks and the others who have continued to work closely with the county on this project.

As Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners, I speak on behalf of the entire Board in unanimous support of the proposed Skagit River Levee Project as we now understand it. Flood protection for the Skagit Valley is long overdue; the development of the project to this point has been a tedious process and I would be the last to say that the proposed project is a perfect solution to our problem. However, realizing there is no perfect solution, it is the opinion of the Board of County Commissioners, that the Skagit River Levee Project here tonight, is the best alternative for flood protection available to Skagit County at this point.
It is important to emphasize that although this hearing is being conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers, it is a Skagit County Project and we as your County Commissioners will be carefully considering your comments here tonight.

There are many concerns which have been expressed, many of these have been resolved while others will be considered in the detailed project design phase and through continued study on the part of the Corps in cooperation with the county. The proposed project includes flood damage reduction measures for areas affected by the higher levees. These measures will be discussed in the Corps' presentation tonight also.

The Board is continuing its efforts to gain congressional approval for the project. Congressman Swift and Senators Magnuson and Jackson have given their support and we expect through their efforts to have authorization in the near future.

You have heard the presentation of the project tonight, including new information and developments since the last public meeting, you will be given the opportunity to comment on the proposal and express your support and concerns. Your comments are important and we encourage you to either share them with us verbally or use the sheet, I think it's page 21, of the brochure or, if you wish, you may write the Corps of Engineers, or telephone them, or write the Skagit County Department of Public Works, or the Board of County Commissioners and we sure welcome your input and we really appreciate the great turnout we have tonight.

Thanks again, I submit this for the record. (Statement attached as Exhibit 1)
COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Mr. Ray C. Henery, the Mayor of Burlington to be followed by Mayor Donald Wallace of Sedro Woolley. Mr. Henery.

RAY C. HENERY. Thank you. I am Ray Henery, city of Burlington Mayor and our City Council has been on record as supporting the Corps of Engineers in this levee project and at the present time we are in favor of Alternative 3E, and will support the Engineers in this project. Our question if I am not out of order - what effect does this program have on our present dike districts? Is this a question that is in order at this time?

COLONEL POTEAT. Gene, can you help us on that?

GENE SAMPLY. My name is Gene Samply, Director of Public Works, Skagit County. The county has been working closely with the Dike District Commissioners through the Flood Coordinating Council, as well as all of the Commissioners of the Dike Districts and there would be no immediate effect. The county is responsible for maintenance of the project, at its completion, once it's turned over to the county we have full responsibility for that maintenance, but we do intend to facilitate that through our Diking Districts and we do appreciate their support and efforts in this regard and I hope that answers the question - I think that's the best I can do tonight, off the cuff, thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, Gene. Mr Mayor anything else.

MAYOR HENERY. Shook his head "no."

COLONEL POTEAT. The Mayor of Sedro Woolley.

IAN MUNCE for MAYOR WOOLLEY. I am not Mayor Woolley but I have a
brief statement to make in his behalf. I am speaking this evening as Chairman of the Regional Planning Council which is a local concept of government made up of representatives from each of the eight cities in the county and the County Commissioners. The Council is responsible for long-range planning objectives for both the unincorporated and the incorporated areas. Through our ongoing planning program, the Council has established a fairly comprehensive program of capital improvements directed to local needs. The project is number one priority in this capital improvement program is the lower levee flood control project. It is the position of the Council that this project is urgently needed to protect both our urban areas and our farms. We strongly support this project for early construction as a minimum measure for providing flood protection for the lower valley and the urban areas up to the city of Sedro Woolley. Thank you. (Statement attached as Exhibit 2)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Mr. Jim Wylie of Diking District #18 and Mr. Wylie will be followed by Sophie Neble of Sedro Woolley. Mr. Wylie.

JIM WYLIE. I would like to say that Dike District 18 is in favor of 50-year protection on our levee and we have no objections to the alternative plan of 3E. Our District has no dikes on the river but we do have saltwater and when the river breaks it has to go some place and it wipes out our saltwater dikes. At the present time it is my estimation that we have maybe 8-year protection on Fir Island, and that's enough to make anybody move off the island. So you can see what 50-year protection would do to Fir Island.
COLONEL POTEAT. The next speaker is Sophie Neble, Mr. Harry Anderson to follow.

SOPHIE NEBLE. I am Sophie Neble and I live five miles east of Sedro Woolley right on the Skagit River and what puzzles me is this - if you building those levees, the dikes or whichever you call them and I can't see how much good they will do up in my area. In the last 33 years that I have lived up there we have lost at least between 50 and 75 acres of the prime farmland that the river takes it and moves it right back out where you are putting your levees so it is going to fill it right back up just as it's been doing for years and years and it is still doing it. So, I can't see where those levees is going to do much good down there if it takes the soil from above and so on and so on and moves it down and fills your dikes and so the way I look at it, I think if the river was riprapped above your dikes would last a lot longer down below. I remember about 30 years ago a lady by the name of Mrs. Armstrong from LaConner and she preached the same thing. She's said we've been raising and raising and raising those dikes, she says and every time we raise them a foot she says they could fill two feet so she figured there was not much sense of raising the dikes unless you riprapped the river so that the silt doesn't come down because I understand that there are ten million tons of silt does down the Skagit River and dumps it into the bay annually. So I think that some of the riprapping should go up there to slow down the silt that is washed down between the dikes and fills the riverbed up and raises the river and you can only go so high with those dikes - I thank you.
COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. I think what we will do is try to go on through the comments and then when we get into the more informal question and answer period we might double back and comment on some of the questions that have been raised in the formal comment period. Thank you very much. Our next speaker Mr. Harry Anderson. Mr. Anderson to be followed by Mr. Alfred M. Tellesbo. Let's take Mr. Anderson and then I will work on the pronunciation. Mr. Anderson.

HARRY ANDERSON. Did not show.

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Tellesbo — do we have anyone from Diking District #2? Card says a farmer from Diking District #2.

ALFRED M. TELLESBO. Well, I am from Diking District #2 on Fir Island and I am tired of fighting floods and I would like to see this project go through and I am for it.

COLONEL POTEAT. Next is Mr. Bruce A. Stoker. Mr. Stoker to be followed by Mr. Gus Cecotti.

BRUCE A. STOKER. Hello — I feel that by proper zoning and proper building code that a 100 or so years from now the levees wouldn't be needed anymore which would eliminate the need for our grandchildren to be sitting in this room here trying to decide what they are going to do about the flooding here in the Skagit Valley. People have always lived along rivers and you would think by now that some of the people would learn that rivers flood and you would think according to that — some people have learned that floods come through here and they built their houses up higher, they've built mounds for their farms, they designed their farms around the fact that it does flood. However, in the past 100 years
folks have built with no regard to flooding in a lot of the areas here. To me, to live in a flood plain and act shocked when the floods come is ridiculous. To live in a flood plain without raising the buildings is ridiculous and to expect taxpayers all over the country to pay the bills because some folks in Skagit Valley just didn't build their town right is obsured. If you are going to spend $55 million plus $88,000.00 a year on management costs we had better get a solution to the problem and the most recent June 1979 brochure which you got today there is a list of alternatives, only four lines in this brochure are used to gloss over the only alternative that I feel that would bring a long-term solution to this flood damage problem. That would be rezoning, floodproofing and raising the structures. The reason it's not considered is the estimated value of present flood plan structures, in other words, you are saying that we are already too far developed in the flood plain to get back to the sensible path, but ask the question "How many of these urban buildings will be replaced in say 50 years and for sure 100 years a lot of them will be replaced. As old buildings are replaced they can be built up to flood code – for example, this building here won't be really wiped out by a 100-year flood if you look at that stripe back there, it was designed up to the present code. In urban areas, this would mean building up, creating parking space below for example. This would also be a more efficient use of limited urban space. We can continue with the levees and in 50 years will still have the problem. Actually the problem will be worse and the bigger the levee gets the higher the flood gets – take a look at what levees really are in relation to a river. The Skagit
River collects water from about 3,000 square miles and during normal flows sends it down the main channel. During a flood a river receives more runoff than a normal channel will hold, but flood waters spread out into the low lying flood plain which means the energy of the flowing waters spreads out and the potential energy for doing damage is spread out. There is a shallow backwater called bank storage over the entire area.

Okay, the Army Corps method of dealing with this is to concentrate the floodwater into one narrow channel. This concentrates the flood energy and therefore the potential energy for doing damage into one narrow zone. It also puts the region into a cycle of always needing new and improved levee projects. Look at the Mount Vernon flood levels before and after the proposed 3E project if you will look on page 25 in your brochure you will see that a 100-year flood for example, the water levels are higher and this is from concentrating the water into one zone. Okay, this works the other way, the levees are removed and the flood waters are spread out so the flood levels are lowered. If there were no levees how high would the 10, 15 and 100-year floods be or as another option, move some of the levees back to define a less constricted floodway. This would spread the waters out enough that farmers and urban folks could easily live with the floods that come through there. An example of this is to - for example on the south of Mount Vernon here move the levee over towards the east, towards Burlington Railroad that would give you a bigger floodway, less damaging energy in the flood. Those levee removals and levee setbacks would lessen dangerous flood levels because we would have a lot of the bank storage back. This requires floodplain residents
to start slowly getting together sensible flood plain buildings which
means we would be moving towards a solution to the flood damage problem.
Levee removal or setback would also enhance the fisheries and the shoreline
of the river. We can take the $4 million estimated annual costs of
Alternative 3E and build bigger levees and have the endless cycle of
new and improved river projects or we could take that $4 million a year
and build this region into the farming, fishing and lumber area it is
suited for. And, I could summarize all this by a statement by a
professor down in Portland — river management that regulates land-use to
sustain the minimum disruption of the river will preserve the maximum
natural values and require the least maintenance cost. Thank you and I
forgot to say I am Bruce Stoker from the Big Lake area and is there any-
thing else I am supposed to say? I am sorry I took so long from somebody
else, maybe. (Statement attached as Exhibit 3)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Our next speaker Mr. Gus
Cecotti and he will be followed by Mr. Dick Verdoes.

GUS CECOTTI. I don't think the people of Snohomish a few years
ago that had that flood and lost all their cattle would find too much
comfort in the comment he just made about unrestrained riverflow. My name
is Gus Cecotti. I am a lifelong resident of Skagit County and the Mount
Vernon area. We are in the construction business and we do work on dikes.
For this reason I happen to know that most of our dike system is sub-
standard. We just finished completing and upgrading the dike across from
the Lions Park area in town and the December 1975 flood that dike very
nearly blew, another half a day of rain or a day at the most would have
made western Mount Vernon look a lot different that it is today. So, I support the dike system as proposed by this alternative then.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Mr Dick Verdoes and he will be followed by Mr. Peter R. Walker.

DICK VERDOES. I am kind of interested in the flood in Snohomish when those cattle were killed when the dike failed, not because the dike protected it, it was because of the fault of the dike pumping station - the wall of water came down and washed them all up in the barns and trees in five seconds and five minutes later the water was back to knee level. I am against the Skagit River project. I believe that it is mismanagement of the river that help can be established or instituted for the entire valley including the upper river towns by a flood containment structure on the Sauk River not a dam, but a flood dam where flow would naturally go until the river started to flood. Also, this plan is at the expense of people in the Nookachamp and we're going to be subjected to increased water, increased flow - it's going to change the bounds of what we know in the Nookachamp. We have, among other species, we have the trumpeter swans who live there during the winter. When the water comes its going to force the dairy farmers out of the area increasingly subjecting the land to crop farming. Most of the land in the Nookachamp is now in sod. With the removal of the animals, because I don't believe that mounds will sufficiently take care of the animals. The pesticides used on the crops over five or six thousand acres in that area will directly adversely affect the wildlife in that area. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. The next speaker is Mr.
Peter R. Walker to be followed by Althea Jewett.

PETER R. WALKER. My name is Pete Walker. I am a member of the Board of Commissioners of Diking District #12. Besides the city of Burlington Diking District #12 has in its confines about 19,000 acres of fine agricultural land. I am not here to speak on behalf of the Board, I am going to let the Chairman of the Board do that. I am here to present a statement for the Skagit County Flood Control Council. I am presently serving as its Chairman. The statement is addressed to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concerning the Skagit River levee project Colonel John A. Poteat. The Skagit County Flood Control Council comprised of all the Dikes and Drainage District Commissioners of Skagit County, the Commissioners of Conservation District of Skagit County and representatives of the Skagit County Engineers Office have long recognized the vital need for additional flood protection for the Skagit Valley. Realizing that levee improvements is the last viable option to obtain this flood protection, enthusiastically support the flood control project presented by the Army Corps of Engineers. The members of the Skagit County Flood Control Council believe that the modified flood control project plan know as Alternate Plan 3E will provide the most flood protection obtainable by a levee system, at the least cost and adversely impact fewer persons than any other thus far presented. The Council feels that Alternate Plan 3E closely meets the request of the majority of the Skagit County citizens testifying at the Army Corps of Engineers preliminary hearing on this project held on March 22nd, 1978. Thus, the Skagit County Flood Control Council supports the Army Corps of Engineers Skagit River
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Levee Project Alternate Plan 3E and request the Army Corps of Engineers
to continue and pursue this fully to early construction and completion.
Signed the Officers and Directors of Skagit County Flood Control
Council. I submit this for your record. (Statement attached as Exhibit 4)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Our next speaker Althea
Jewett to be followed by Gerald D. Mapes.

ALTHEA JEWETT: Well, I don't have too much to say but I am against
the flood control. I live on the south Skagit Highway and I know what
it was like the last time and also, I would like to know which area is
going to be affected by this overflow that we are going to have by raising
the levees. It seems to me that its all concentrated on Fir Island and
Mount Vernon, it doesn't have too much to say about Sedro Woolley,
Hamilton, Lyman and further up the river and I think we people are just
as important as the ones that living down below and I thank you.

(Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Fine, thank you very much. We will come back to
that question later. Mr. Gerald D. Mapes. Mr. Mapes to be followed by
Kornelis D. Dykstra.

GERALD D. MAPES. Yes, I am speaking for Dike District #12 that
Mr. Walker just mentioned and we go on record, the Commissioners of Dike
#12 in supporting the measures proposed. In our opinion it gives the
most benefit to the most people and land for the least cost to the tax-
payers. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Kornelis D. Dykstra. Mr.
Dykstra to be followed by Thomas R. Skinner.
KORNELIS D. DYKSTRA, JR. I feel and I believe that a good many people do feel that the real solution the water is always rising why not dig it out, I mean to lower the water down, sure you can build your dikes up but if you dredged the river out from Mount Vernon or Burlington on to the bay I think it would be a lot better than building the dikes up. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. That's certainly one we want to address in a few minutes. Mr. Thomas R. Skinner to be followed by Tunis R. Dykstra.

THOMAS R. SKINNER. I am a resident of Fir Island and have a smaller home there and I would like to thank the Corps for calling the meeting so I might have a chance to speak tonight and the Engineering Department of Skagit County that's been real helpful of informing me of how the dike project was going to affect my house and some of the other people that live out there. Janet Huston has prepared a statement to present to the Corps and a petition that we hope they will consider and she arrived late and if she would like to speak now I would like to turn over my time to her. She's in the back here. It's kind of a cop out I am nervous and I am sure she is more nervous than I am but all she has to do is read it you know.

COLONEL POTEAT. Real fine, please state your name.

JANET HUSTON. My name is Janet Huston and I live on Skagit City Road on Fir Island and I don't think I will read this. I think I will just talk. We have a group of small little houses over on Skagit City Road that are there because it was originally Skagit City. Some of the houses sit on one-half acre, some more than that and what the plan is to build a
new county road all the way down Skagit City Road. We feel that it would
be a great hardship to us in this little non-agricultural resident lots
to have the county appropriate up to 30 feet of our front yard and we feel
that there is an alternative plan where they could build on the land away
from the road towards the river. Some of the land goes out 1,000 feet to
the river so there would be no impact on the river in a great many places
and we would like to have the Corps consider us as human beings, people
that care about our property and we don't want to lose the front yard.
Thank you. (Statements attached as Exhibits 5 & 6)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Mr. Tunis R. Dykstra to be
followed by Charles E. Waltner.

KORNELIS D. DYKSTRA. I am speaking for my brother Tunis. The fact,
another problem if you raise the dike you are going to get more and more
sub-irrigation under the land, if the water is high, the land and the
valley gets wet from the high water in the river so you raise the dike, it
is just making more soggy out in the planting fields in the valley so this
is where my statement before to dig it out would be to keep the problem
from the river flooding. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Charles E. Waltner to be followed
by Neil S. Ondahl.

CHARLES E. WALTNER. I am Charles Waltner. I am with Drainage #17
its the District that drains the land south of Mount Vernon down past
Conway and a dike break south of Mount Vernon the east side of the river
would be a real catastrophe to the drainage district and we are vitally
interested in improved dikes all through the area.
COlonel Poteat. Thank you very much. Mr. Ondahl to be followed
by Michael D. Walker.

Neil S. Ondahl. Hello there, my name is Neil Ondahl. I am a farmer
next to the Samish River and I have a couple of things to say. Number one
at the meeting at the Midway after we got done the newspaper there the next
day, the Skagit Valley Herald said that we wanted more protection which
wasn't true, but you know what comes out of the paper sometimes. The thing
that really kind of bothers me is a couple of things - Number one - this
weir or this other pilings that you tried to put in there. When we talked
to the Corps out at Allan that night they kept on talking about gallons
of water that was going to go over this, and being farmers it was kind of
hard to understand so we finally asked them this question "How much water
would come over there?" They said well if you go to the Skagit River and
look there will be three times that amount of water right now if you go
down and look at it that's what would be coming over there. The Samish
area will have flooding before then. This water will totally take care
of the Samish River and the area around it. Thank you. (Clapping).

Colonel Poteat. Thank you. Mr. Michael D. Walker to be followed
by Larry G. Gadbois.

Michael D. Walker. My name is Michael Walker and I am an attorney,
I represent the Nookachamp's Valley Flood Defense Organization and basically
I am here to point out on behalf of the members of that organization that,
we don't feel that the Corps has adequately considered the induced flood
damage that will occur in the Nookachamp's Valley area. On December 20th
the Skagit County Commissioners requested the Corps to study in more detail
the flooding problems of the Nookachamps area. In response to this the
Skagit County Commissioners request we would like to know what further
studies did the Corps undertake with respect to the Nookachamps area and
what did those studies reveal? We would further like to know if it is feasible
for the Corps to include flood damage protection for the Nookachamps area
and we would like to know very specifically, what are the non-structural
and structural measures planned for the Nookachamps Valley under
Alternative 3. Further, we would like the Corps to specifically point out
the amount of increased water that will come to the Nookachamps Valley
as a result of Alternative 3E and we would like to point out, we would
like to ask whether Alternative 3E provides funding for damage to
improvements in the Nookachamps Valley such as raising barns, roads,
electricity and what the Corps' position is in detail with respect to the
livestock in the event induced flood damage occurs. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you. I believe its Mr. Larry Gadbois to be
followed by Mr. Jack Straathof.

LARRY G. GADBOIS. Gadbois is correct. My name is Larry Gadbois
I live at 2046 Mudlake Road in the Nookachamps area. At present I and
my business are above flood level. I have lived in the Nookachamps area
all my life. I have been faced with high water periodically over the
years. The community has raised levees in the area to protect farmland
and communities. During this period we have experienced greater amounts
of water at lower river levels. This then becomes a manmade problem. I
have recently purchased a bench mark to determine the degree of impact
upon me and my property. My one question is "What are you going to do for
me?" As far as I can see there are no preventions for my business. For the type of construction, my shop employs, it is virtually impossible to raise or move. Considering the time of year – November, December, January, the winter months, the busiest time of the season for us, should we not be able to move our meat products the amount of damages are all based on the first day with lesser damages on days following. In addition, we would have clean up costs the installation of refrigeration and moving cost of equipment. I am sure these damages will far exceed the Corps or county's expectations. Considering the problems presented to us we have anticipated abundance of little factors that we cannot foresee at this time. Again, our type of construction eliminates being able to raise the building. Federal and State inspection make the laws I live by therefore, unless the Corps can assure me that I will have the same protection that I do now I will have to remain opposed to the project. I will support the Sauk River Containment Project or Alternative 1. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you. Mr. Jack Straathof to be followed by Mr. Ken F. Johnson.

JACK STRAATHOF. I would like to go on record as being against it because it does not do enough for the people in the outlying areas and especially the Nookachamps farmers of which I am one. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Ken Johnson to be followed by Ruthie O. Hanson.

KEN F. JOHNSON. My name is Ken Johnson and I do live right in the middle of the Nookachamps area. I have lived there since I was born,
basically on the place. We hear different comments at different
times, will you guys in the Nookachamps you always flood. Well, we have
learned to live around the water that man has now tried to add a little
bit to and we don't feel that it should be our expense to have to go to
raising our buildings and that so that we can live with this increased
flow. I am pleased that the Corps has come on record this evening as
taking a look and trying to alleviate the building and livestock situation.
Our biggest concern is for our businesses, our livestock, we have always
some alternate system when the water comes - Where are you going to go
with your cows? How are you going to milk your cows? Up till today
why we felt reasonably secure that only a certain flow of water could
come and anything greater than that why we wouldn't be impacted because
it would go to the west and so we feel that the responsibility to flood-
proof us above this impact lies with the Corps rather than having to
come upon our own position. There is one question that has been really
haunting us and when we met here in December 1978 the Nookachamps area
was considered as consequential damages in your project and through our
requests you folks have came in there and taken a good hard look at what
was there and considered the fact that "Hey there is more there than
we thought" and you have made some amendments. We are asking that when
construction starts in the upper project that construction on our area
starts simultaneously as that is the part of the project that adversely
impacts us. Since we were left out in the beginning we feel there is a
possibility that we might get left out in the end and when the project
gets to a point where it affects us directly we feel we should be receiving
our protection at that time rather than as being the very last ones
done. I do not support the project in its proposal as a whole although
I feel the cons are going to be conditions that have been offered from
the Corps would make the project much more acceptable to us. I do think
that upper river containment is a much better way that can solve a
lot problems for a lot more folks. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Ruthie O. Hanson to be followed by Larry J.
Kunzler.

RUTHIE O. HANSON. Thank you. My name is Ruthie Hanson. I live
in Dike District #1. I am also a representative of Teamsters Local 411.
As a private citizen I would like to go on record as being in support of
Alternative #3E. I would also like to submit for the record the
signatures of 115 Skagit County residents that also support Alternative 3E.
Thank you. (Signatures attached as Exhibit 7)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you. By the way be sure that we get a copy
of what you are going to submit and there's a lady in the back that her
good friend put the bite on her so to speak and I think you had something
to submit to the record too so be sure to turn that in to us. Larry
Kunzler next to be followed by Charlie M. Boon.

LARRY J. KUNZLER. Colonel, for the changes that you have made in
the Nookachamps as they affect me as an individual you have done exactly
what I asked for of our County Commissioners on the 19th of December
when I appeared before them, but as part of the Nookachamps farming
community, I still have strong reservations about the residents in the
farms along Mud Lake Road, especially the meat cutting plant and the
dairy farms and the dairy farm on Babcock Road. The issuance of
flowage easements seems to fall way short of what is necessary. Now, as
a Skagit County resident I cannot sell my principals for profits. I
could never support this project for three reasons - the build up of
silt in river floor which will eventually raise the bottom of the
river above the surrounding land levels; two prime farmland, our greatest
natural resource, will be subject to development. I feel that if we
are going to leave a legacy for the young, for the yet unborn, then let
it be one that we left them the land in the condition that we found it.
This project does not do that. My third reason is that we have another
alternative that provides flood protection for Hamilton, it keeps the
water out of the Samish River basin, it limits the flooding to a minimum
in the Nookachamps without nonstructural compensation and it would limit
additional construction to existing levees to a minimum. In my opinion,
there has been, there is now and will continue to be only one sensible
solution to solve the severity of the flooding in the Skagit and that is
the Sauk River Flood Containment structure. Now, Colonel, with your
indulgence sir, I would like to show you something - I hope I am going to
show you something. The Corps held a meeting with the Samish River
basin farmers earlier this year. At that meeting one of the farmers
asked the Project Manager, Vernon Cook "Was the Sauk River Flood
Containment structure completely ruled out?" Mr. Cook's reply was "no"
however, he did not see any great, I like his words, ground search of
public opinion for the Sauk River facility. If it would be possible,
which I fully believe it is, and the Corps was here tonight with this
project in one hand, the Sauk River Flood Containment facility in the
other, taking into consideration that this project is temporary and in
the future will have to be completely redone, but the Sauk River
facility would contain 94,000 c.f.s. during a 100-year flood which is
over half of the 100-year flood which goes through the city of Mount
Vernon, all of those in favor of the Sauk River Flood Containment
facility would you please stand up? (several people stood up) (Clapping)
Mr. Cook viva the ground search and finally, I hope that out of all of
this out of the last 16 months one thing has been made perfectly clear
the day has come and gone forever when any entity of government, be it
the County Engineers, the State Transportation Agency, the Diking
Districts, the Burlington City Planning Commission or the County Planning
Commission will construct anything on the river that will adversely
affect their neighbors, realizing that fact of live, and since the
Draft Environmental Statement addresses itself to the proposed Highway 20
extension off the George Hopper exchange, that road will never be built
as proposed as it would add 5 feet of water in the Nookachamps and I
don't need anymore water. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Mr. Charlie M. Boon to be
followed by Wilhelm E. Treibel.

CHARLIE M. BOON. Charlie M. Boon and I live at 2080 Mud Lake
Road, representing Nookachamp Dairy. I said to the board myself I
don't know if Sid is going to say something later on or not but I would
like to thank the Corps and the County and all for the availability to
talk to them and to discuss these problems that we have had in the light
of new information which has come about, but the problem is that we
are only moderately affected on the 100-year flood and I say moderately
we are affected, but moderately. With the improvement we would be
severely impacted. Now, its one thing to have a mound of dirt to run
your cows on as you are protection and it is one thing to have your barns
as your protection, you know. We want to make sure that we get equal
protection as to what we have got now. We've only been there for about
a year and a half, two years, on the place and we didn't go in debt to
buy cows and to buy land and everything to have somebody run water all
through the barns and have us put our cows on a pile of dirt. We've got
to have the operations go on as it was before. Now, we would like to
have these questions really addressed and we would like to have, we would
to know who really is responsible for these damages? Who do we talk to?
Do we talk to the County? Do we talk to the Corps? We don't want to
go to the Corps and say well the county is responsible for part of it
and we don't want to go to the county and have the county say well I
tell you the Corps is going to be responsible for part of it. I know
these are things which have to be worked out but we want to know exactly
who it is we go to and how we address the problem and we would appreciate
more facts being made available to us. It wasn't until the meeting we
had in Clear Lake a while back that I finally looked on the big deal
they had on the wall to find out where our barns were at and all of a
sudden we had water in the barns see. Now nobody came to us, well
Mr. Nelson popped by one day, Don Nelson, the engineer and he said with
his little eye level he said well there should be no reason it is going
to be in the barn but according to your flood maps there it's going to be in the barn so all of a sudden we are excited "Hey what's going on here?" So, we don't like surprises we kinda like to know what we are dealing with and we want to know how we are going to deal with it because like I said a guy doesn't go in debt to have somebody take it away from him or to demolish that debt or to devaluate his problem. There is so much value of property to be increased on this side of the river and the areas protected. Now, the thing is we have to plan as long a range as possible. Like Mr. Norris said, the County Commissioners are for it realizing that it is not the perfect plan. Well, if its not the perfect plan, then lets find the perfect plan, lets not throw something together because maybe we can quick get the money. I know that things have to be protected down here we've got a lot of development and all, but at the same time, the Sauk River Dam would help a lot, it would - sorry, I am not supposed to say dam - dams scares people - supposed to say Sauk River Containment structure. Now, the people up river would get benefit from it, the people from Concrete down to Sedro Woolley all the way down river, instead right now the people up river have no protection under this here plan - they are spending $55 million over $10 million of the county's money and the people up river are just helping to pay the bill. Now it would be one thing if it was just the areas affected had to pay the bill but when everybody in Skagit County has to pay then everybody should have benefits. Although I realize they can quick drive down to the mall where as before they would have to drive through water, but these are things we've got to address and like I say I would just like to put my
two cents in and say that we favor the Sauk River Containment structure.

Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Treibel to be followed by Mr. or Mrs.
or both, Ship Munson.

WILHELM E. TREIBEL. I am Wilhelm Treibel and I am throwing my
chip in with Nookachamps Valley - looking over all of your proposals
I have not seen any proposal that will provide any levees on the east
side of the river. Neither have I seen, do I see anything that proposes
to take the big kinks out of the river which would increase the
hydraulic head by a considerable amount and increase the waterflow.
In the Nookachamps Valley, I would like to know what the 1949 or 1950
flood relates in to your 100-year plan as far as floods? Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you. Mr. and/or Mrs. Skip Munson to be
followed by Gene L. Olson.

SKIP MUNSON. My name is Skip Munson and we have a residence at
1824 Skagit City Road it is in a category as Janet Huston described
as a small piece of property and in fact it is one of the only remaining
buildings of Skagit City. Now, I know that stripes on columns kinda
scare people, this high water that we had in December of 1975 was kind of
a joy. There was a lot of effort put out and I think traditionally
people that live along the river have learned to deal with the problems
that might come from it, but we live, this house in Skagit City is very
old we have, I don't have it with me, but we have a picture that was
taken in 1882 and it was an old house in the picture and you people are
talking about 100-year floods, that house could maybe tell us something
it is 1,000 feet from the house to the riverbed and when we had the high
water in 1975 I claim that it was the safest place on Fir Island because
the level of the water just over the dike was very low and your plan
at this point widens the road on the west side of the dike and we are
on the South Fork of the Skagit River and it widens the dike on the road-
side and takes part of our house and I think that house has been around
long enough that it should stay around a little longer and that's about
all I have to say. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Gene L. Olson to be followed.
by Mr. Lawrence R. Hoffman.

GENE L. OLSON. Thank you. I am Gene Olson and I have retired from
the County Assessors office and I think I know the county pretty well.
We have been down in the flats, in our family since 1800 and we have
lived through many floods and every flood seems to get worse and the
whole valley down there is a very very rich valley and I favor 3E and
I have talked to a lot of people and they do favor the 3E. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much, sir. Mr. Lawrence Hoffman
to be followed by Owen T. Tronsdal.

LAWRENCE R. HOFFMAN. Lawrence Hoffman, Diking District 15. We
support the 3E levee. We had a little controversy in our District
over dredging and we are at the very mouth of the mouth of the river and we
attended quite a few of these meetings and we understand why and we
accept 3E as the project.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Mr. Tronsdal to be followed
by Geoffrey L. Baillie.

OWEN TONY TRONSDAL. My name is Tony Tronsdal from District 3 and
it is our responsibility to keep the water within that red strip there and our district has a valuation of about $40 million and that's a lot of valuation and I want to go on record, together with my colleagues, we favor this plan that the Army has proposed. I would like to make a comment here about dredging the river. I happen to be one of the only living sternwheeler captains around and I have skippered on the river quite a bit and I watched the river for the last 45 years and I want somebody to prove to me that that river bottom is coming up. Now at Phil's Boathouse I dropped my anchor there one time and it was minus tide and I put out 22 feet of chain and I asked Phil Summers how come its so deep here - that's the way it's always been he says, hasn't changed a bit and he was 65 years old, born and raised there. Now in regards to the people in Nookachamps why don't they do like we did down there in the lower part of the valley put some dikes up and that would be their answer. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Mr. Geoffrey L. Baillie to be followed by Gerald C. Stamos.

GEOFFREY L. BAILLIE. Basically the only two questions I have were one is I see some pretty some substantial revisions to your Alternate 3E and I believe these revisions were only made available to the public at large just a week or so ago and I really feel that, that combined with the number of the questions that have been raised tonight there is really insufficient time to consider the number of things you are speaking about. As well as I have some questions regarding the manner in which the local funding would be made and I received some answers and I want to
thank both the county and the Corps for the responses they have made
but at the same time I feel this time I really don't have enough informa-
tion available to me to be able to decide one way or the other on any
of the alternatives you have presented. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Stamos to be followed by Theodore A. Kosbab.

GERALD C. STAMOS. My name is Gerald Stamos. I really don't have any-
thing to much to say one way or another because I live in Anacortes and
I don't think the water is going to bother me too much although I am in
favor of this for the people that need it for their protection and I
think just the fact that I have been able to sit here and listen to all
the comments, pro and con, I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Theodore Kosbab to be followed by Patricia M.
Howell.

THEODORE A. KOSBAB. Glad by name isn't Avon because it would be
Avon I believe (laughter) I have a lot of people from some other
country coming in here and telling us what to do a little bit, but I am
with the Skagit River Guide Association and we do a lot of work. We help
the Boy Scouts clean up the river; we're always up there when the people
have their lands being flooded we like to be in there with our boats and
help them out; and we probably spent quite a few more hours along the
Skagit River than the Army Corps of Engineers have and we have lived here
all of our lives and as far as helping if you get here and have pros
and cons and fighting all night and maybe that would be fun but we do
have something to suggest. Here a while back in the paper they have a
highway coming from the George Hopper Road and going up and there's road
they would like to have, I don't know if the Corps or whether its businessmen in Duncan or Mount Vernon or Sedro Woolley or wherever going along the north side into Sedro Woolley and cutting across some good farm land. It seems to me like that, and you can look, you travelled the airways I don't know if you have Colonel or your civilian population that's running this helicopter that took pictures for years since the helicopter come out of every inch of it you can go across that George Hopper Road, you could take one bridge putting in right there going across the Skagit River and it would help the Nookachamps area, Clear Lake area, and we are putting money into the project, the Highway Department is putting money into this north side that they have in mind but I would think that if they would take into consideration the Nookachamps area, the Clear Lake area, its going to cost those people a lot of money, us a lot of money and a lot of your time but it could be brought in say we have the Nookachamps area, you think the creek is what is flooding every year. In 1975 the water backed up, it backs up every year, backed up from the Skagit River into the Nookachamps area and in 1975 it backed up four times in there and on December 5th of 1975, what they called the flood was actually caused, if they remember right, they closed Baker Lake there was a, the Corps was afraid of a mudslide on Baker Lake and they had to keep a low level of Lake Shannon and Baker Lake and when the water did come what happened the Corps says you gotta maintain this so it was a manmade flood what went in there and backed into Hamilton, which there hasn't been any levees put in there of any kind which they really need because its on a flood plain, we've got the Nookachamps area that
could be very well developed – I am only going to be another minute –
if they would run across there with their highway, all they would have
to do you want to cut down on costs and everything, well I think a
bridge would solve a lot and it would blend in with the road that's
already there and build it up above your flood plain and when you come
across the Nookachamps Creek you can have a floodgate there so you can
close off, if the river is going to back up, that's what the people
really want, some people really want the water in there, it helps some
of the farm land. You could give them a certain amount shut it off and
if too much comes down there could be a pumping station there and of
course like I say that could be Highway 20 coming up the south side and
the business men in Sedro Woolley would like to have their business
brought into Sedro Woolley, they can have their signs right there at the
Sedro Woolley bridge which way to go with their food, gas and lodging
and the same way at Concrete, Rock Fork clear up to Marble Mountain and
it would blend in, it could blend in again with north cross-state highway
and I would just like to see it taken into consideration and as far as
a lot of things that the Corps has done with the river, with the Game
Department, the Department of Fisheries, I don't think it's gonna hurt too
much in that swan area out there if the highway went in because they are
only there about two or three months out of the year, there is no
nesting in that area at all and I would like to mention too about the
sloughs that have already been blocked off up above, they should not
powerful
have ever been 'blocked off, there's been an awful lot of mismanagement
there and our Guide Association would like to have us all get together
and have a little more talk about this and maybe us sending our complaints or pros and cons in to you it might help in a way. I thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. Patricia M. Howell to be followed by Jess A. Knutzen.

PATRICIA M. HOWELL. My name is Patricia Howell and I live in the Nookachamps area. When I came in tonight I told them I didn't want to make a speech but at this point I would like to ask a couple of questions but I since my name was called I will say that I am against this dike, levee whatever you want to call it, I will always be against it, I don't trust it. I would support the Sauk River Containment and I would like to know, somehow I would like to know and I would like to know how I could find out how the Skagit River got to be a wild and scenic river so quickly and without any publicity to speak of at all. I would like to know who pushed that through so quickly and what their motivation was.

COLONEL POTEAT. Next is Jess A. Knutzen to be Carl VanderSar.

JESS A. KNUTZEN. I would like to defer my comments to our chairman of the Conservation District of which I am vice-chairman and he's here tonight and I will let Bob speak for our group, Bob Hulbert.

COLONEL POTEAT. Okay - its good to see you this evening.

ROBERT J. HULBERT. Good evening, my name is Bob Hulbert, I am a Fir Island farmer and speak as the Chairman of the Board of Skagit Conservation District. I know Jess and I were a couple of the fellows that stood up when they said they liked the idea of the Sauk River flood control structure. I think probably Howard Miller might have stood up too, I
know he's at the front of the room. I might say we were with a group
who went to see the Governor of the State of Washington when we expressed
our reservations on behalf of the Conservation District in the county
when the river was classified as a wild and scenic river system. You
people must realize that any flood control and the Corps certainly
realizes, I am sure, that any flood containment structure on the Sauk
River is now against the law of the land because such a structure,
because the river is classified. Now, if you people want to fight the
Congress - there were three hearings held I remember them very
distinctly on the wild and scenic river - one was held in Bellingham,
one was held in the LaVenture School in Mount Vernon and one was held
in Bellevue. The river, of course, a lot of people don't think belongs
to the people of Skagit County it belongs to the people of the United
States. Addressing the proposal tonight, it has long been the
position of the Skagit Conservation District that increased flood
protection for the Skagit for all of the Skagit, is a vital necessity
for the community. We are primarily a farm oriented group - 50 or 40
years ago we raised the oats to feed the horses in Seattle that pulled
the streetcars, we simply cannot have a viable agriculture anymore
in Skagit County with reoccurring flooding. Sure we can build our houses
up where I live on Fir Island most of us do. We would compliment the
Corps on your proposal 3E, there is a lot of things we haven't cared
about, we would compliment your making the changes in it, you are
listening to the people in the community we feel. I have neighbors on
Fir Island who have expressed their views tonight and they've got a good
point to make. The river does not flood, flows a long way from their houses why can't you move a little bit towards the river rather than come into the farmland. I would hope that this project, we would hope that this project would be a continuing interaction between the Corps, the people in the Skagit County and the county officials with the Engineering Department. I think we are making, the weir proposal I don't understand now where the weir proposal and the Samish how you have changed that but this I think is again in response to expressions and views from the people and farmers in the Samish basin. We would hope for continuous interaction between the people in Skagit County and the Corps and the county officials who must be the prime sponsor of the project. We earnestly entrust that out of such things, such interaction will come a workable plan which will give us the increased flood protection which we most assuredly must have. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you sir. Mr. Carl VanderSar to be followed by Lloyd Johnson.

CARL VANDER SAR. Yeah, I am also in favor of the flood containment dam on the Sauk. In reference to what Mr. Hulbert said I don't believe that it's impossible laws are made by people it can be changed by people, enough people from the Skagit County telling them they don't think that's cool and it would be nice to put a dam up there would be feasible. I do have a question its in regards to the changes made in the Nookachamps area it was with a 100-year flood protection to their Clear Lake area into the town in general. As far as I know Clear Lake is a town, although unincorporated, my question pretty much is "Is it possible for the project
through if Clear Lake does not have the 100-year protection. As it
stood in the beginning the Corps didn't even realize there was a town
there but now that there is they are giving them 100-year flood
protection so that is my question - is it possible that without that
100-year flood protection to Clear Lake would the project be "go"? You
do have a ruling, I believe, that states that the Corps cannot go
through with a project unless 100-year protection is given to your
urban areas. Thank you.

COLONEL POTTEAT. Mr. Lloyd Johnson to be followed by Lipsey B. Ed.

LLOYD H. JOHNSON. Colonel, I would like to tell a true story for
the people here that comment that we ought to take down the dikes or
go back to nature. I know a young couple about 30 years old who
started out with two children in the Skagit River basin and in the
period of 35 years were completely flooded six times, wiped out. The
only thing that kept them going and alive, that one flood was the
friendship of a large farmer who loaned them a barrel of flour. There
was no food stamps, no help that exists today and of course, this was
90 years ago, but what I am saying is the people don't realize when they
say wipe out the dikes, the suffering and the ugly things that would
occur. I want to congratulate the Corps on their proposal 3E, I know
its imperfect, I congratulate you on trying to better it and I think
it can stand some other improvements such as being suggested tonight but
I think its the best proposal we ever had.

COLONEL POTTEAT. Thank you, sir. Mr. Lipsey B. Ed to be followed
by Mr. Zel Young.
I am Ed Lipsey and I live between Lyman and Hamilton.

I live right on the bend of the river and I don't think anybody knows what a flood is, other than I am sure we all do but I felt the impact after the last one. It came across in about two different places and thanks to the Corps of Engineers they were there to help to support my place along with the neighbors. Levees I think are really fine and we really gotta have these but we've always depended in our area on these levees but the thing of it is the Skagit River is starting to fill up and I can sure prove that point by my place by the pictures that have been taken on it and I feel that the only way to control a river is like a garden hose if you start on the lower end of it, its going to be pretty hard to control, that's about what we are thinking about a lot of these lower levees I think we've got to get up to the source of where it's all happening at. This would be on the Sauk River and I feel that we have an engineer here that I have talked to that said a dam is pretty hard to put across a river such as the Sauk River because of environmentalist and ecology and he told me that he seen a dam that was a big culvert that would handle only so much water and no more, this would back up the water in the Sauk River and turn as much loose so it didn't come to a flood stage so I think we ought to be thinking about this I know the wild and scenic river has taken over 200 or 300 feet of my place in which I could do nothing to stop it, most of this was voted on back east which they didn't care so they put us in a heck of a spot up there in that area so the levees down here I feel that are going to help you people I feel that if we are going to pay for them by golly we should have some support.
up there too. Thank you. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. Mr. Zel Young to be followed by Vernon D. Dahl.

ZEL YOUNG. Thank you, Colonel. I would like to reserve the right to ask Mr. Brooks some questions later on if I could. My name is Zel Young. I live in west Mount Vernon right against the dike, as a matter of fact the dike in front of my place I think is around 12 feet tall, it varies a little bit because there is a little slant. I have looked at this thing and have seen the water up where it can lap over the top of that dike over through there, it looked like it, 1975. By the way the '75 flood was considerably less if I understand it right than the one in '49 or '50 along there sometime. Cubic feet-wise it was a great deal less but it was a great deal higher in Moose Hall than the other was. To me this is an indication the bottom of the river is coming up and one of the questions I was going to ask Mr. Brooks later on was - the amount of the sedimentation at the end of this 100-year project you speak about how much higher is the bottom of the river going to be? Is it going to be higher than the land outside the river? And, if so since the river will still be flowing over the sediment on the bottom of the river that means even when you hold water that the river will be considerably higher than the land outside. Now as someone here proposed what happens to that water, doesn't it seep into the ground and doesn't the ground level come up and don't we have swamps down on each side of the river? I've live all my life on the Skagit River, same location, except for about five or six years in World War II you really couldn't say, I
mean that was still my residence, even then. I boated on the river, swam in it when I was a kid, I've drifted from way up the river down several times and seined. Anybody drifting in that river, even at low water, can see the awesome evidence of the power of this river, the sweeps, in places that have been cut and so on. I am quite intrigued with this Alternate 3E that you proposed, mechanically I consider it quite/ingenious thing. However, I have a feeling that if we build it you would be in the position of the guy with the leaky intertube you keep on putting a patch here and a patch there then maybe it won't let you down but you get an extra load in that intertube and the leak spots are going to give and its going to go well these people down on Fir Island are say that we need this protection, you are only going to get 50-year protection. The Army Engineers stood up here and told us that a 100-year flood they expect those levees down there to give way this will protect the upper part because otherwise even this 100-year flood protection we have here from the urban areas wouldn't be good enough. Now despite what Lloyd Johnson said about the hazards of having no dikes this is one alternate that they never considered all the way from one to six and alternates 3A, B, C, D and E, they have never considered whatsoever the possibility of moving the dikes we have. Now, if we retain the dikes we have we're always up against the hazards like in 1975. If we had had one more day of this warm weather and so on we would have had a catastrophe that would have broken through. We just didn't have any reserve left in those dikes as I understand it, so as long as we maintain the dikes we are maintaining that wall of water inside
and every year, remember the bottom of the river is coming higher so
the water is going to be higher even with the same amount of water. I
don't deny they can build the dikes they say in the front of my place
another eight feet, let's see it's 10 feet tall, add another eight feet
and that makes 18 feet I am going to be looking up at in front of my
place there that's quite a mound. They have done this in Mississippi
but they keep on having floods and I understand their bottom of the river
is considerable than the lands surrounding it and they have the seepage
problem never having driven through Mississippi I can't speak from any
personal experience. I see our friends in the Nookachamps who have
lived ever since pioneer days with no dikes, if we had not built our
dikes they wouldn't even have a flooding problem (clapping). Now,
people speak about what would happen if we had floods if there were no
dikes the water would flow over everywhere. As it is if it breaks
in front of a guy's place he's lost out, the land is covered sand, logs
and so on, he's wiped out, true but the rest of the county is protected
because the dike broke at that point. My vote will still be remove the
dikes and terrace this land in such a fashion the water can drain away
gently over the whole valley. This Skagit Valley was built by the river
all this silt as Mrs. Neble spoke about coming down what was it 400
million tons or whatever figure she had I don't know I haven't read the
figures but that silt is still going down there one of these days
Deception Pass is going to be the lawful river by the way things are
going. Water flows downhill and it seeks the easiest way out. Given
its choice and I think even the engineers will agree with me, given its
choice it would no longer be going the South Fork as it used to be over channels, it wouldn't even be going the North Fork, it would be flowing out here by Padilla into Padilla Bay either on the north or south of Bayview Ridge, probably maybe even down the Samish River I don't know. The people in Samish River area are always going to catch this water just like the people in the Nookachamps and I am not talking about regulation, but they are not talking about stopping it as I understand you can correct me on that, but I have taken enough of your time this I will leave with you - I am still in favor of working with Mother Nature rather than being opposed and one factor that has not been brought up by anyone here is this is an expensive and heavy project and its going to require a great deal of earth movement and equipment which runs on diesel of which we seem to have a shortage here in the country of this land. Now, we are going to get it, the Government always gets their's and there's going to be that much less fuel given to these people, even the farmers and the tractors are going to start suffering I am afraid. I realize that its kind of a drop in the bucket in the United States but these projects are going on all over the United States too and I don't feel that we have need of it. (Clapping)

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you very much. We've come a little over two hours, why don't we take about a ten minute break and we will resume in just a few minutes. (Meeting adjourned at 2100 hours and reconvened at 2110 hours) Our next speaker will be Mr. Vernon D. Dahl to be followed by William H. Murdock. Is Mr. Dahl still with us? Maybe he is just coming back in let's try Mr. William H. Murdock and then we will try Mr. Dahl. Mr. Murdock. How about Mr. Dennis a Moeller.
DENNIS A. MOELLER. I think you answered my question during the break.

COLONEL POTEAT. Let's try again and see if Mr. Dahl has come back in, Mr. Vernon Dahl, has Mr. Murdock come back in. Mr. Hulbert, anything else - then we will come back to them in just a minute.

EINER C. KNUTZEN. I am all in favor of the up river dam, of course, like most everybody else, but being realistic if maybe we can't have that I think it's going to take an Act of Congress to get the dollars to do this, it's going to take an Act of Congress to let us use that dam up there so either way it's maybe hard to get but one thing that I haven't heard anything about that I would like to ask about - we are talking about the big floods running a pretty good amount of water up in the Edison area into the Samish and so forth - we've got saltwater dikes down there now that are much higher, that are rock and the water is going to get awful deep before it goes over the top of those and I am wondering if any provision at all is being made to take care of where its gonna be let go, they say well we always dynamite it, but I don't think I have anything right next to the dike, I am back a ways but I could see this channel put there if there is very much water and it seems like there should be some control outlet to run it back into the Samish River or into the bay whichever but it seems like some thought ought to go into that. I don't know the real answer but I could see after its all over with we should have done something and I think its well enough to bring this into consideration. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Lets see if Mr. Dahl has come back, Mr. Vernon Dahl, Mr. Murdock and Bob Hurlet, he hadn't finished. We will catch them
later maybe. Florine Z. Hanson to be followed by Neil M. Huber.

FLORINE Z. HANSON. I didn't have anything especially to say, I just thought I might want to ask a question or two. I am on the north side of the river at Sedro Woolley. Now, this dike is not going to extend up that far, it isn't going to go up beyond the river road there.

MR. COOK. Where specifically are you?

MRS. HANSON. Well, the little strip of river road before it makes the job that goes up, its between Third Street and Township Street.

MR. COOK. I will have you come up and point that out on the map.

COLONEL POTEAT. We will take a photograph map in the question period in just a little bit - okay?

MRS. HANSON. Alright.

COLONEL POTEAT. Now Mr. Huber.

NEIL M. HUBER. I had a question as a matter of fact - do you want me to hold off?

COLONEL POTEAT. If you have a question, let's just hold them off. I have just three or four more people who have prepared remarks and then we will go into a more informal answer and question period. Let's just double check and see if Mr. Dahl, Mr. Murdock or Mr. Hulbert are with us again. Mr. Hulbert we will get you during the questions.

COLONEL POTEAT. Mr. Buckley. Robert R. Buckley.

ROBERT R. BUCKLEY. I have some questions.

COLONEL POTEAT. Okay, we will get that in just a few moments.

Donald S. Sibley.

DONALD S. SIBLEY. Nothing at this time.
COLONEL POTEAT. Sidney DeBoor.

MAN IN AUDIENCE. He's outside the door.

COLONEL POTEAT. We will come back to him in just a minute then.

The last card Mr. Richard H. Smith.

RICHARD H. SMITH. I am Richard Smith. I happen to be one of the farmers south of town and I really don't care for the idea of removing our dikes. I don't think it's a practical solution. I would like to commend the Corps for the work they have put into the project and I fully support this 3e. I would also like to commend the Corps on their receptiveness to input from the areas like Nookachamps where they have had problems to try and alleviate the problems that they would encounter. The same thing in the Edisor area. You know there is a lot of comments tonight about the flood containment project on the Sauk River and there's been a lot of work by individuals in the crowd here tonight to back that project, but realistically we don't think it's feasible and we don't think it's possible anyway with the Legislature being what it is, certainly we all know that. that's a practical alternative but at this time this seems like the most practical alternative. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thank you, sir. I have run out of cards for the people that wanted to make prepared statements. Now let me just double check is there anyone else now - one man here and another gentleman in the back.

JOHN F. ROOZEN. My name is John Roosen from the Washington Bulb Company River Marsh Road and we raise flower bulbs and basically they love water but they are like all of us they don't like it over their heads.
And, I originally was a very staunch supporter of the dredging in the river but after considerable schooling from the Engineers of the Corps reluctantly they convinced me that it was not feasible and I think that I do agree with them – it's something that maybe sometime from now would be, but 3E the cost benefits from 3E would probably give us more at this time. I also believe strongly on the Sauk River Dam, but that's a whole other story that's also been spoken of tonight so I shouldn't containment dam, I should say that, I shouldn't elaborate on that. I also want to say in regards to some of the people who are talking about removing the dikes that agriculture can no way at all stay alive in this valley with continued flooding which would occur on that basis. It is also very unrealistic to believe that agriculture could survive in this valley without cohabitation with industry as a tax providing base. Industry and urban growth need 100-year flood development. We, in agriculture, need a minimum of 50-year. Proposal 3E gives these things to us and I think that at this time the Corps has come a long ways in helping some of the people that have problems and if the same amount of progress is made after this meeting is made in relation to the last meeting I think that this problem is going to be solved. And lastly, it's too bad that the old saying goes "that you can please some of the people some of the time all of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time" and it's only too bad that it has to be that way, but I think we are on the right step and we should proceed this way and we support proposal 3E. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT, Thank you very much. Yes sir, please promise to tell us a little story now... a joke.
LAWRENCE G. BOETTCHER. My name is Lawrence Boettcher. I live at 2010 E. Rio Vista, Burlington. I am a farmer. I am from the old school that was taught to begin a speech with a story - it's about Momma fly - "Now Momma fly lived under the sink; Poppa fly was just a think; three baby flies were hungry too - all Momma heard was shoo shoo shoo; Momma went to look for food—she went to the butcher where the food was good; a big baloney on the rack did lie; Momma became a satisfied fly. Her happy tummy made her sing; the butcherman got mad at any old thing; he hit Momma with a resounding splat; Momma sol ended right there with that. Now the moral of the story is this - if you are full of baloney, keep your mouth shut. (Laughter - Clapping) Skagit's mysterious poet.

Now, being full of baloney I should keep my mouth shut but here goes. I approve of Alternative 3E for levee improvement in Skagit County with one exception "Property values could increase in accordance with the degree of flood protection provided in each area;" that's probably one of my human frailties, landowners with greater protection should expect to pay the larger share of the cost. I wish to offer a rebuttal to Burlington Northern dikes cause greater disaster when they break and give people a false sense of security. If levees are raised and then washed out heavy loss will be sustained by property adjacent to the levees increasing levee heights raises water surface and so when flooding occurs floating debris damages bridges. The key words are "floating debris." I believe that accounts of flooding between Mount Vernon and Sedro Woolley will show that inadequate channel capacity plus debris
collected by these multiple pier bridges increased flooding in that area. Dike District #12 removed the fill between an additional set of piers. Burlington Northern threatened lawsuit. My neighbor, now passed away, told the folly to the Dike Commissioner at that time, Carl Johnson of 2011 E. Rio Vista was a lifelong resident of Skagit County "The Great Northern, the Burlington Northern, applied to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a charter to build a bridge across the Skagit River at Mount Vernon. The charter was granted for a bridge to be built 500 feet downstream from the river curve so as not to hinder navigation. This location was not desirable for the railroad so the bridge was constructed at its present location. When log tows and riverboats were damaged because of navigation problems caused by the improper location of the bridge, the Great Northern Railway was obliged to pay damages. The lawsuit by the railroad was never pursued. I brought with me, I have it in my pick-up a momento of bank erosion control supervised by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I asked my old neighbor, Carl Johnson, what was that slab of concrete 16" x 16" and 5" thick with a wire bail in the center used for? Carl replied "Well, I'll tell you that was from the time the U.S. Army Engineers riprapped the Skagit River. It was all WPA labor - yeah, you see they cut all this willow brush and they sloped the banks, then they tied it all together with wire and put these concrete blocks on to hold it down." "Did it work, I asked?" Old Carl snorted, "The first high water we had washed it all out, the Army never came back." (Laughter) I have the latest - you won't know which side I am on pretty quick (more laughter). I have related
this incident so hopefully we do not become complacent concerning floods in the Skagit Valley. We should gather all information available concerning previous floods. We should contact local residents with past flood experience. I think it would be wise to study rock revetment damage in our land flooding the summer of 1972. Many of us are aware that we had a very unstable subsoil - heavy equipment causes a ripple effect ahead of the machine. We only need remember the near disaster suffered by Thorburn (?) and LaGossa (?) installing Burlington sewer system or J. P. Anderson & Sons' financial loss when they extended the dike for District 12. I thank you. (Clapping) I gave you a story. (Statement attached as Exhibit 8)

COLONEL POTTEAT. Thank you very much. After that story I am afraid to say anything. Is there anybody else now that wants to make a prepared remark? We have a poet and now a historian.

SOPHIE NEBLE. The original dike that was built, the dike was I don't remember like about two or three miles long and I think the only part of that dike is left is the cement blocks on it and I got lots of them I have been using them - is on my place the rest of the dike is all washed out. It was a shame they had those cement blocks in there and I could never figure out what they were supposed to hold, but they were laying on the surface of the dike about every four or five feet, maybe it was about three feet, I don't know but they were all tied together and they had the little ole' wire in the center of the block and it was flat on one side and rounded on the other. I thank you.

COLONEL POTTEAT. That would be interesting to go out and see that.

VOICE IN AUDIENCE. Wrong - very wrong.
COLONEL POTEAT. Now, I guess we ought to go into the question and
answer period. If you will bear with me, I would like to preface that
with just a little bit of a detail of where we stand on this thing.
What we did we started out with a basic 1966 levee and channel improvement
authorization which was limited from roughly I-5 of the Burlington
Northern Railway Bridge down to the mouth. It did not address the
upstream area. One of the reasons perhaps was that there was and still is
an earlier authorized project, flood protection project, the Avon
Bypass, which had the Bypass itself and it had upstream levees. Now,
the Bypass channel doesn't, frankly, if I am listening to you up here,
in reading the tea leaves right, that just isn't in the cards, probably
the high cost of relocating bridges, environmentally unacceptable and
so forth so that doesn't appear to be in the cards. That old 1936 thing.
The levee portion of that project is so we took the 1966 authorization
and then we said, well, what we had better do is look at plucking out
of the 1936 authorization and tacking on to the 1966 authorization those
upstream levees and so now we've got a project from roughly the vicinity
of Sedro Woolley down to the mouth. The next thing that we said was
again if you are looking clearly into the crystal ball it appears that
some kind of a levee scheme is perhaps the only thing in the cards.
Earlier on, it had appeared that an added increment in flood protection
up here would be some kind of a storage scheme. The Sauk being the
likely site in that has, that contributes more of the water into the
Skagit than the Skagit itself. That frankly doesn't appear to be in
the cards either. The wild and scenic river is one factor, another
factor is that any kind of a retention storage scheme up there would be a single purpose. It would just store flood water, there wouldn't be any other kind of benefit, municipal water supply or power, there wouldn't be anything like that to help give benefits to is so a single purpose structure probably would not be economically feasible. So, for several reasons that didn't appear to be in the cards. So, the next question, the next thing that came up, was if we are going to look at the scheme, the expanded scheme, Sedro Woolley down to the mouth, and if upstream storage just isn't in the cards for some reason, it appears that this is about the last shot some kind of a levee thing so that's why we started looking at a somewhat higher degree of protection for the rural levees below Mount Vernon. The 1966 authorization talked about a 15-year protection, level of protection, it appears that values, benefits, having changed the way they have it is quite economical to go to a 50-year level of protection and it might be also prudent to do that because this is the last solution in the sequence, you see, if upstream storage is out, so we looked at that. The next thing is coming up with a level of protection for the urban areas where you have a higher concentration of property values, its a higher chance of loss, you also have a higher chance of life loss in the concentrated urban areas. 100-year is the minimum there - you wanted the advantages of flood protection is that you don't have to pay the flood insurance premium, well if you have less than 100-year protection you see, you still have to pay the flood insurance premium so you want to get at least 100-years. Now, our policy, the Corps of Engineers' policy is somewhat
conservative we strive, mightly, in urban protection or at least we recommend strongly that you go for standard project flood protection and back off from that to a lesser degree of protection only because — I have talked now about the expansion upstream and I have talked about a higher level of protection — there are two other little bits in modified authorization, one is to allow the consideration of recreation as part of this project, say trails on levees that may or may not work I don't know and the other thing is because of the expanded project, size, protection and the added cost is the possibility of a local pay back of the local share, not immediately, but over a period of 50 years. So, those four things are in legislation that your congressional representatives in the House of Representatives and the Senate has asked for, that has been provided and that is tentative legislation to modify the authorization of this 1966 project, that could be considered in the Public Works Authorization Bill by the Congress. It's now under study and that conceivably could be passed late this summer or early fall, that's the authorization part. Meanwhile, what we have been doing is working on a General Design, what we call a General Design Memorandum validating let's say, the nature of the problem, validating the conceivable alternatives, looking at them once again up to a certain level of detail environmentally, socially, engineering wise, the economics and all those factors. We have kicked off perhaps six alternatives, we narrowed that down to 1, 2 and 3 and 5 versions of 3 to look at in a little more detail. That's what we call Phase I, this is kind of technical jargon, it doesn't mean anything particularly but it's
to a certain level of detail, a Phase I level of detail. Now, in addition to that we have gone to an even greater level of detail in the downstream portion what we call a Phase II level of detail. We would go to that higher level of detail in the upstream portion after this authorization modification that I am talking about. Now, following that comes the detailed plans and specifications before going into construction. Its at that time that we get very, very precise on the levee alignments. I would charge my staff that in this detail design, some very good points have come up tonight, working very closely on a one on one basis with individual property owners to see where this levee is. For example, its no use to put it right through a persons house or through his front yard if you can move it across the street or something, so we will do this on a one on one basis, talk with individual property owners on a precise place to put that levee and I am certainly sympathetic to the concept that you have pointed out here tonight to try to minimize the adverse impact. So, those details will come later on. On the Nookachamps, I want to tell you what my understanding is and based on that understanding what I have charged my staff to do. By providing protection let's say on the Burlington side, that keeps water out of Burlington, that water stays in the river, there is a tendency for that water that now stays in the river to be pushed to the other side as you have heard the people from the Nookachamps articulate so well this afternoon, this evening. The Nookachamps gets some water now, what I have just described would tend to put more water on the Nookachamps. So, what I have told my staff - look, it is not right to do adverse things to the
people in the Nookachamps in order that benefits can be obtained on the other side of the river. That's what we call the induced damage. So what we need to do is look at a way to one offset the adverse impact over in the Nookachamps and at the same time, if at all possible, reduce the flood impact that's occurring over there now. So then we said - what tools can we come up with to help over there in the Nookachamps. Well we have concentration of some development in the Clear Lake area. There are enough benefits there by preventing not only the additional damage but damage that could occur now by putting some fragments of levees there now, tying it into the higher ground to keep the water out of Clear Lake, not only the added water, the induced water, but the water that would go there now. That's the concept we seem to think would be the best for Clear Lake. Now, there are some other more sparsely developed areas in the Nookachamps that we are looking at and conceptually what we should do is talk to the people, one on one, to explore which alternative is best; one would be to floodproof, raise, another would be to relocate now we give me that sheet — we have come up with a half sheet of paper here a lot of this stuff is feedback that you have given us — how you perceive the problem and some of the ideas we ought to approach on how to do it so we have talked about floodproofing residences or relocating residences. Farmers with livestock that have mounds we ought to consider raising and extending those mounds to bring them up so that they are certainly no worse off with or without this project. Where it's just land, not structures, some kind of an easement thing could be looked at. Other improvements, other than residences, should
be considered on a case by case basis. Now, this is kind of a long
winded way of saying as we get into the details on this we must and
again I must charge my staff, the real estate people as well as the
technical people to work with people and with the county on a one on
one basis to see what is best suited for this individual person's
situation in the combination of relocating, floodproofing, easements
and that sort of stuff. Now, if, the purpose for that is to offset
damage caused by flood protection on the other side of the river then
the project ought to bear that cost and there is precedent for that in
the 1974 Public Works Act that says these nonstructural measures would
be carried on 80%-20% basis - 80% Federal and 20% local coming out of
the local share of the project. Now, I talk about the Nookachamps
because that's the type of problem of induced flood damage but there
are other areas that have been mentioned here tonight too where this
conceptual approach should be applied. I appreciate your patience in
bearing with me because I wanted to go over my understanding and my
instructions to my staff again here with you tonight so they can hear
once again what I am saying to you and they can hear it and then of
course what the county has to say. Maybe in the question period we
ought to rather than just random maybe we ought to take topics since I
kind of ended up here talking on the Nookachamps - are there any other
things that ought to come out on the Nookachamps right now from members
of my staff or members in the audience. Now, let me tell you my
perception, it's my understanding that for various reasons diking off
the Nookachamps that valley, is not an acceptable solution, is that right
or wrong? Obvious wrong – okay, let's talk that out a little bit. Who
would like to – let me get Vern up on his feet – get him up here a little
bit – come on Vern.

VERN COOK. I am Vernon Cook. I have seen some of you before,
some of you repeatedly (laughter). One of the things that was looked at
in the early 60's was that very fact leveeing not only the 1966 project
ended but the Burlington Northern but on upstream too that was looked
into and one of the things that we did as we started this was again to
look at that very self-same problem. Now, one of the facts of life is
that the regulations we work under is we must end up with some kind of
a favorable benefit-cost-ratio on projects. Anytime you have a large
area that is sparsely populated and not have a large development or
expensive things that would get damaged during flood waters it is
difficult to spend great deal of amounts of money when that won't be
offset by great amounts of benefits. On the Nookachamps side specifically
that failed to pass the test of favorable benefits versus costs. It
also had another adverse effect that if you levee off the Nookachamps
and the Burlington side and the Sedro Woolley side the water has not
place to go, obviously but downstream and when you do that you raise the
levels further on downstream and we find that about the 100-year event
or less that would require raising most of the bridges, the Burlington
Northern bridge, the Highway 99 bridge and most likely the bridge at
Mount Vernon, probably not the I-5 bridge, those bridge relocations
costs are substantial and would probably one bridge, at least, maybe two
would have to be borne by the local sponsors what that did was drive the
cost of the project should you levee off the Nookachamps up so high
that the entire project would fail because of economic feasibility. We
did look at it, individually, and in combination with the rest and
its economics that broke down.

COLONEL POTEAT. Another topic that came up tonight is the Samish
and maybe we ought to take just a minute to go over the history of
the weir, the dropping of the weir and the going to the erosion control
structures and the impact on the Samish with and without the project.
In other words, there comes a level of flood in about the 20-25 year
where the water is going to go over to the Samish anyway and that's
about the same insignificance difference with or without the project
that we are talking about. Maybe you want to come up again Vern and go
over why - what the weir was designed to do, why it was dropped and
why the erosion structure was substituted.

VERN COOK. The overflow into the Samish really parallels quite
closely the story regarding the leveeing off of the Nookachamps. If
you seal off the side on the right bank, or the Burlington side, the
Sedro Woolley side, the water that would have went down through the Samish
during the higher flows then would not be permitted to go down through
the additional water then must stay in the channel, some additional water
would go into the Nookachamps area or go downstream. The alternatives
that we looked at if you block off the Samish, still did nothing to the
Nookachamps side you simply can't get enough water down through the
Burlington Northern, the Highway 99 and the Mount Vernon bridge without
having to relocate them or else you have substantial less protection for
Burlington-Sedro Woolley in other words less than 100-years. The original meeting that we had up here we talked about the weir that would be out in front of the railroad. The primary purpose of the weir was to assure that there was not a channel shift during high flows over into the Samish. It's possible, maybe Mr. Regan a little bit later will chat about the hydraulics of the stream and sediment as well as some channel shifts that could occur so what we attempted to do was to permit the natural overflow that occurs there now to not to be altered as small a measure as possible with the plan. So what happens is the existing condition out there about 20-25 year even or about a 1951 event the water goes overbank out of the Skagit those flats and reaches about the railroad track some water then goes into the Gages Slough and if you watch it it would slowly go down to the Burlington area and start flooding, back flood in behind the hospital there, it would go across the road on over into the farmland and there's a valley storage that occurs in that immediate area. About a half a mile to the I guess north and a little bit west there's that Sterling Hill we call it, a large protrusion sticks up out of the valley. About in that area there is a natural rise in the ground that is at the elevation of about the existing 50-year water surface down through that reach, the existing condition of it, if you have about a 50-year event it will start to tip over into the Samish and drain from the Skagit watershed into the Samish. With this project, you have some raise in the backwater or water surface out in front of the railroad area so by putting the piling, driving those down in the subsurface area, berming up about a foot out in the field or a foot and a half on the one area, you maintain
the with project condition when the water reaches the 50-year elevation it won't tip over, would be the same condition that you would have now in a 50-year event. Now, the sole purpose for the piling that will be driven across there with some riprap protection on the top is to prevent those high flows the 100-year beyond from eroding the ground surface and permitting a larger hole or larger channel to go down into the Samish. Now that's a real threat for a large flow it could occur and that's what the weir was about and that's what the piling is about. We feel the piling will be just as effective a job about the same cost with less disruption to the farmland in the area generally. Any questions on this?

MR. BOETTCHER. How deep are you going with the pilings?

MR. COOK. The tops of the piling would be about 38.5 to 39 which would be about three to four to five feet in that range beneath the existing ground surface out there or what would be left, the elevation of the ground range is from 41 to 43 feet now.

MR. BOETTCHER. How deep in the ground? How deep is the foundation? How long do they protrude in the ground?

MR. COOK. Oh, how long do they protrude down in the ground - we based our estimate on about 35 feet. When we get into the more details of that particular reach we will be doing some subsurface investigation and that could vary. The idea being to go deep enough so that they are strong enough and won't be eroded or washed out. On the same subject on the weirs -

ZEL YOUNG. What you're saying is the 100-year flood the river might
try to make itself ----

MR. COOK. Its possible, that's correct.

JACK L. POWER. The Samish River storage won't occur until at the same time you talk about elevation this 38 to 41 feet.

MR. COOK. Yes, I will try to clarify that. The existing conditions that occurs right now, if the waters were to occur at about a 20-25 year event it would start to go into the Gages Slough and over the railroad and but it would not go on over into the Samish because there is a natural raise in the ground that would preclude that, there would be some ponding over there. At about a 50-year event today that's when it would start to spill on over into the Samish, you know the first drops start to go over there and because of the project the with project condition there is a natural raise under the water just upstream of Burlington. Now, to offset that where the pilings are driven the ground would be raised about that much a foot, foot and a quarter in some places and there would be broad slopes, one on four or five slopes so it could be farmed and seeded so it would back to back condition.

MR. POWER. The only problem we have then is the existing line on the dike road.

MR. COOK. That's correct.

MR. POWER. Okay, if you get a 100-year flood then we are making a flow for the water to run in the district at Sterling Hill - is that correct?

MR. COOK. That's correct.

MR. POWER. I am assuming you are talking 60,000 feet per second.
MR. COOK. For the 100-year event the design would be such that 60,000 c.f.s. would be permitted to pass through that area, that's correct and that would cause some erosion but not to exceed that, the pile top.

MR. POWER. But you are still going to force the floods further west than would be natural.

MR. COOK. Actually not —

MR. POWER. I disagree with you.

MR. COOK. Okay, let me finish, the existing condition that occurs we have some maps and I will be happy to show you the topography as the water rises the first water goes into Gages Slough and goes under the railroad and the road there. But if that were blocked right in that slough area would be the first area where the water would go over - now as the water got higher it would go further up the railroad tracks toward Sedro Woolley and you would have a broader and broader weir but as the water tumbles over there just behind the houses that are right along that area there's a natural raise in the ground so the water goes across the tracks and the road and would migrate back down towards Burlington up to about the 50-year event. It would still float down in about that area. Because of the levee construction that will be along that stretch as the water rises you won't have as broad a crest at the weir and the water won't go across the railroad and then channel down toward Gages Slough it will be there and go across that area. We are the first to confess that the water from the 25 to the 50-year event will be more concentrated through there from the 50 to the 100-year event less
water will be going through that throat than would have went through there before simply because it is a constricted opening there will be less water getting into that area and less water getting down into the Samish because it just can't get through there as fast as it did before.

MR. POWER. I think your statement in your public brochure should be more specific on this - there's a lot of confusion and a lot of people want to know what the hell you are talking about and we don't know and I hope you are right.

MR. BOETTCHER. You are concerned about that 15 - 10 - 20 year floods but what are the engineers going to do about getting it channelized in the event of a spring runoff so it can go down there.

ROBERT G. THOMPSON. So we will not be flooded every time you have a runoff - I don't care about the floods I am talking about the runoff.

COLONEL POTEAT. That's a very good question that I think is probably in order at this point for us to discuss channelization. Now, there are three things that I think are very very significant must be considered when you talk about channelizing the river, digging it out or something like that - number one, when you dig it out, how much additional carrying capacity are you going to get and Dick I want to ask you in just a minute to address that. You have some alternatives because you can dig out a little bit within side the existing channel and that will give you so much additional carrying capacity and maybe that would be the carrying capacity you are talking about on the other hand you wanted to carry a 50-year or even a 25-year flood you couldn't get it within reason within the existing channel you would have to consider setting the levees back and
excavating all that material between the new levees and the old river bank so Dick can talk about that as to just what kind of opportunities exist for getting additional water carrying capacity from a channel. It is not very promising, you are not going to get much additional carrying capacity for your buck without for your buck. To get additional channel capacity you will have to go to some very expensive stuff which brings us to the second thing that's high cost, not only high cost of the original work but high maintenance cost. This material will fill back in very, very rapidly, it will have to be maintained very frequently at high cost and that's a local responsibility. We couldn't advise you to that's a winner of an idea - now there is another thing that you need to think about conceptually - rivers that appear during slack water to be filled in with silt and gravel and stuff like that dredge themselves out, temporarily during the high flow. There's a hell of a lot of material during a high flow that goes out and that river is much, much deeper you don't realize that because when the water drops it fills back in again, that's new material so during a high flow you do get additional carrying capacity that you don't realize but the time that the water drops where you see it its filled back in and you think nothing has happened there. Now the third thing is environmental damage, just call you know a spade a spade my friends you will play hell getting environmental approval to dredge out that river, the fisheries being one of the angles. Now Dick, why don't you elaborate on that a little bit on the carrying capacity of the river and if Karen is still back there and awake I am going to get Karen up front to elaborate a little bit on the environmental aspects of dredging because we did go through that and we did in fact modify this project we are talking about by taking
out six proposals to play with individual constrictions in the channel.

This is Dick Regan, our Chief Hydraulic Designer.

DICK REGAN. I will get up and give my usual dredge them out speech which I gave here about a month ago. You can dredge out the mouth of the Skagit River and we will start at the mouth and go down to China if you want and you are not going to change the water surface, that is governed by the tide and we aren't going to change the tide by dredging. So now you are at the mouth and you haven't changed anything and you've done a lot of dredging. You can start up the river and you can, we did a study, where we dredged out two million cubic yards of material, forgetting about where you are going to put it, we just assumed we could get rid of it and we stopped at the confluence where the North and South Forks come together - did quite a bit for flood control at that point we had lowered the 100-year flood by about 4 feet, sounds great, except now you get up here at Mount Vernon no change, you lose it immediately it comes right back to the existing river very, very rapidly that means if you want to continue, you take out another two million cubic yards to get up above Mount Vernon. Now you are talking about four million cubic yards of material that you are going to take out and you have to put it some place - you have dropped the river somewhat up here now where do you stop? You stop at the Highway 99 bridge or go up a few miles further and you haven't made any betterment you are right back to where the river was and without dredging on further up and where do you stop you just don't you get very little benefit out of dredging. We also found that in our studies that approximately two to four
years later on the study we did from the mouth up through the confluence of the North and South Forks two to four years later you start all over again and you dredge it all out again at the same expense to get your same benefits of four feet again and that two to four years it fills right back in, it will fill in at a much faster rate after you have dredged it than it is filling in now because you have dredged a track you have changed the regime of the river to something that it doesn't really want to be and it will fill in much much more rapidly than the way it is filling in now.

MR. BOETTCHER. We have been having an argument here - that gentleman and I and I made the statement that the river remains constant and it will have an effect on the 85 Highway that changes the river channel - now would you agree with me that the length of the river remains constant depending on the amount of sediment that flows in there.

MR. REGAN. You are coming close to it, the river likes to have a certain length to carry the material that is coming down and it has to do with the soil that's in the valley - there's a number of factors and that's one of them, yes.

MR. BOETTCHER. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON. There is a ripple by the railroad track, by 99 part of it being, they cleaned up the ripple and they took it out and made a big dip - when things are nip and tuck that little ripple just made a big difference.

MR. REGAN. Yes, some things like that would.

MR. THOMPSON. That made a big difference and that wasn't a big deal either.
MR. REGAN. Yes, some things like that, some areas will make a
difference, yes, some small difference.

MR. THOMPSON. Well its a big deal here.

MR. REGAN. What is the big difference - are we talking many feet
or —

MR. THOMPSON. When the water table was at Mount Vernon, it was
still — you are talking about a matter of two to three feet in the
Nookachamps area which covers a lot of land.

MR. REGAN. We did make a study where we opened up under the
Burlington Northern bridge on the north side all those vents filled up.

MR. THOMPSON. Yes.

MR. REGAN. Our study indicated that by doing that we would lower
the water from the 100-year flood from what we are talking about now
with our proposed project that was that dredging in that small amount
of dredging would lower it about a half foot.

MR. THOMPSON. We weren't talking about a 100-year flood, we are
talking about river runoff - it made a big difference.

MR. REGAN. The only study we did was for the 100-year flood - it
had made about a half foot.

MR. THOMPSON. Thank you.

COLONEL POTEAT. Thanks Dick. Karen why don't you come on up you're
not going to escape this evening. Karen Northup is the Environmental
Coordinator on this project and w-s involved in some of the details
environmental assessments that necessitated the removal of the six
localized channel clearings bits of work that had originated under this
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authorization. Now I want Karen to go over some of the considerations that were brought up by a lot of people on why it was very very desirable not to mess with the river.

KAREN NORTHUP. The major environmental concern that was raised regarding channelization was the impact of channelization and associated dredging on the fishery resources of the Skagit River and this concern was raised early in the study by various resource agencies and they requested that the channelization part of the levee project be removed from the project. The reason for it was the fishery resource of the Skagit River was vital, not only to the biological system as a whole, but also in particular the salmon resources to people as both a sport and commercial fishery and as you dredge the channel you have associated long-term impacts as well as many of the impacts are temporary and short-term, but as a necessity comes about to increase the frequency of the dredging many of the short-term impacts become long-term and as the frequency increases the long-term may become a permanent impact and when you weigh the tradeoffs that would be involved with these long-term permanent impacts to the fishery resource we have tried to plan a project that we looked at a project where such channelization would not be necessary. So one of our objectives became staying out of the river whenever we could, whenever it was possible.

SOPHIE NEBLE. What impact is there on the fish? I know nothing about fish, but when the siltation goes down the river and covers up the little fingerlings, or whatever you call them, I am not that good at fishing - I know nothing about fish, but I would think that there would
be some impact on them because I have heard that Wiseman Creek that
goes through my place whenever the siltation got so heavy coming
down off of that hill on the north side there is no more fish and the
silt covers up the eggs and if there are any that hatch out it covers
up the little fish so there is just nothing there anymore in fact
they cover up the whole creek.

MS. NORTHUP. Siltation definitely impacts the fish, in fact
in the project reaches of the Skagit River there is no spawning, the
spawning is upstream in Sedro Woolley and in some of the tributaries
such as the Nookachamps. The siltation is a problem to fish, but our
objective was not to take away what is naturally there but not to
increase the impacts of such, not go go out and intentionally indirectly
increase the impact to the fish, which are man caused stupidity, such
as dredging and going out and stirring it up so if at all possible
could we, this is what we are considering, could we avoid that if at
all possible.

COLONEL POTÉEAT. Thank you very much, Karen. Let's see now what
I have tried to do is touch on a few topics and go over generally, lump
together and go over generally some of the questions that cam up. Now
let's see who else has an individual question that maybe we haven't
covered - back in the back there. Yes sir. I would like if you don't
mind if you would come up to the mike and state your name so everybody
can hear and we can get it on the record.

CARL WIBBELMAN. My name is Carl Wibbelman. I live in the
Nookachamps area so this concerns my home rather than a farm. A couple
of questions that come to mind - the first meeting that we had it
was brought upon us that really the Corps of Engineers was really not
interested in the involvement of people affected indirectly by this
dike - in other words if you lived upriver that was just kind of a
tough ballgame, that seems to have changed and it kind of leaves a hard
taste in your mouth, if you are up in the upriver end, you kind of
wonder what's happening and looking over your final Alternate 3E in the
Nookachamps area I don't even see the added diking that's to block off
the Clear Lake area on that map back there which leads me again to
believe that its in this chart here that was maybe just a last stop-
gap measure and the thing that's bothering me about looking over what you
are proposing to do in the Clear Lake area and the hill areas out here
it is not all too well marked. I assume that this is what you are
diking - looking at the chart.

COLONEL POTEAT. Let me send a delegation back there to look at
the map with you.

MR. COOK went back to look at the chart with Mr. Wibbleman -
this chart is a broad scale and lacks a lot of detail, the yellow area
on this chart lies behind the town of Beaver Lake area shown to be 100-
year protection and the area in front of Clear Lake - it has non-
structural measures and this chart does not show ----

COLONEL POTEAT. It might be better if you talk a little bit one-
on-one on that particular thing and I could go over some more general
things.

MR. COOK AND MR. WIBBELMAN talked over the charts.
COLONEL POTEAT. The gentleman did mention something about the Corps was not interested and reduce damages on the Nookachamps - that certainly hasn't been my position and I am the District Engineer down there. I am very interested in that. If part of the price that you have to pay to protect Burlington is to hose down a little more of the Nookachamps, then I feel that we are obligated to look at a way to offset that adverse impact or what is called induced damage on the Nookachamps and I have so instructed my staff to do that and incorporate that into the plan as a cost of protecting Burlington, let's say. In other words it shares on the same cost basis. I feel I am on a pretty sound structural basis because of Section 73 of Public Law 93-251 which I will read if you will bear with me - it says in the survey, planning or design by any Federal agency of any project involving flood protection, consideration shall be given to nonstructural alternatives to prevent or reduce flood damage including but not limited to floodproofing of structures, floodplain regulation, acquisition of floodplain land for recreation fish and wildlife and other purposes and relocation with a view toward formulating the most economically, socially and environmentally acceptable means of reducing or preventing flood damages. Where a nonstructural alternative is recommended non-Federal participation shall be comparable to the value of lands, easements and rights-of-way which would have been required of non-Federal interests under Section 3 and it sites the legal reference here, for structural protection but in no event shall exceed 20% of the project cost. In other words the local share is 20% so I think I am on sound basis with the intent of Congress
and just the general principals that this is one of the prices to do something over there to offset the adverse effects its one of the prices that the project has to bear to protect Burlington and that's been my position all along. Okay, who else has a question? Yes mam.

ALTHEA JEWETT. By looking at your map here on page 2, again you take the Nookachamps and all the area from Sterling, Sedro Woolley isn't going to be protected at all. It these nonstructural measures as you call it. I see no levees or anything here along the Skagit River which I live on the South Skagit and Mrs. Hanson lives just across the river from me and it got pretty wet there in 1975 and a little eery too. So, is that, am I correct then that we have no protection whatsoever?

MR. BROOKS. The Alternative 3E as presently outlined does not have a levee around Sedro Woolley and the primary reason for that is the majority of Sedro Woolley sits up on a bench, its off the river. Part of it is down over the bench and next to the river, do you know what I am talking about, the bench.

MS. JEWETT. Yes, I understand.

MR. BROOKS. The bench itself at Sedro Woolley, the majority of it is above the 100-year flood and probably above the 500-year flood. Sedro Woolley is basically outside the floodplain. Now individual, one or two houses, may be in the floodplain and you would have to talk about that on a house-by-house basis, but generally speaking the reason there isn't a levee protecting Sedro Woolley is that it isn't needed. Now, for the people who are off that bench and down on the floodplain near the river and the people who are on the other side of the river, it is not concentrated
development and you are into the same type of problem that you have at
the Nookachamps, plus the thing that if you were to build a levee there
you would be necking down the river much, much more than it is today
because now the river in a major flood would use that whole overbank
area going through the narrow spot at Sedro Woolley and you would
increase the flooding on the people upstream from Sedro Woolley then.
So for several reasons the Sedro Woolley people would be, the people
at Sedro Woolley and basically from Sedro Woolley downstream would be
treated the same as the people in the Nookachamps, in other words —

MS. JEWETT. Perhaps you could answer my question why then when
the taxes were $7,000 and now it's run up to $33,000 and still we have no
protection and we are in the flood area and yet we are considered
waterfront property and we sure are.

MR. BROOKS. I think that's a question for your County Assessor
(laughter)

COLONEL POTEAT. Howard Miller just jumped out the window.

MR. BOETTCHER. Lawrence Boettcher. I'd like to ask for a
modification of your specifications for your dike from a two to one
slope to a three to one slope for maintenance and if you are going to
pasture them why the two to one slope isn't as satisfactory as it should
be and you are spending that many millions of dollars why I think I have
a logical question — right?

MR. BROOKS. Your question is logical I think that when you — several
aspects would have to be looked at. We have had some people get up
today particularly people of Skagit City and say the levees into my — I have
a small property the levees force the road into my property and that's with a two to one slide slope. The three to one side slope obviously requires more land. You have tradeoffs in anything. A three to one slope would require more land and it would also have a longer seepage path but on the project itself rather than go to a three to one side slope and probably take more farmland we used a gravel berm on the back side of the levee to provide allowance for seepage and used two to one side slopes on the levee itself. Now, one of the items of local cooperation is the county has to agree to operate and maintain the project and so agreed today many farmers utilize the levee for their grazing for pastureland and that probably can continue in the future. However, the levee integrity itself would have to be maintained so that if it is trampled that it would have to be rebuilt or kept up to what it was built to originally. I think, it's one of the things we considered in the project design and we figured that considering all the factors that the two to one side slope was the best solution to the problem when everything was considered.

COLONEL POTEAT. Who else has a question?

DOROTHY B. FOX. Dorothy Fox. I live in the Nookachamps area, or Beaver Lake. I want to know if you are going to guarantee to begin that project when you do the others. I have heard too many political promises that are not carried through. On that last meeting at Clear Lake you said it might run short of funds so we wouldn't get it so I think we want that to be done right when you start the other and finished too.

COLONEL POTEAT. I have no problems with that. I understand that,
of course, I won't be here but

MRS. FOX. That was I was thinking because I saw a piece in the
paper --

COLONEL POTEAU. I know of nothing, no objection on our part to
doing that. I guess I understand and agree with you that if there's
going to be an adverse impact over there as the construction work
proceeds on the levees that are going to cause that adverse impact
what you would like to see is simultaneously work on your side so that
you wouldn't get that adverse impact and I am in agreement with that. I
don't see any problem with that, you know conceivably something could
come out of the sky, but I would be surprised I don't see any problem
there.

MRS. FOX. Nothing suprises me in these days, not with ----

COLONEL POTEAU. What you are asking is much of an assurance as I
can give you and I understand what you are saying and I am in agreement
with what you are saying and I don't see a problem with that.

MRS. FOX. You don't do anything for Hamilton and yet the whole
town has been here screeching about their assessment evaluation I can't
understand it.

COLONEL POTEAU. Okay, that's a good point and I am glad you brought
that up.

MRS. FOX. Fir Island isn't so densely populated anymore than some
of these other areas.

COLONEL POTEAU. Go ahead --

MR. BROOKS. In regards to upriver problems. This project is an
outgrowth of the original study back in the mid 60's and in the mid 60's it was determined that the lower levee project was what was feasible at that time. We are looking at modifications to that project at this time. We are not looking at solving all of the problems in the Skagit River basin. Now mindful of recent problems that have come up, not problems, but mindful of say the Wild and Scenic River legislation and other factors that have entered into it, is that future studies could be done by the Corps of upriver flooding problems at the request of the local officials, either county or city, and that we could look at the problems and see if there are any feasible solutions under our criteria and under present law. I think its accepted that flood problem, its the same flooding but its a separate study problem in the way that we are set up in our agency is that its not, its a separable problem is the word I am trying to find.

MRS. FOX. Its the same river affecting ——

MR. BROOKS. It's the same river but in the way that the Government we are set up to look at water resource problems, it would be handled under a separate study which we could initiate after the request of local officials.

MRS. FOX. Karen was concerned with fish and you say the channelization affects the fish, well certainly those dikes affect the people and lots of things.

COLONEL POTEAT. I don't know how the Hamilton thing would come out that's a separate area upstream that should be looked at on its merits and there are several authorities that would allow us to do that if the local public body requested that.
MRS. FOX. Hamilton is separate; Burlington is separate there's a picture of 1921 floods flowing through Burlington in the book that you put out and there's a service station right across from that ---

COLONEL POTEAT. That's right and we bit off a chunk of the river from in essence from Sedro Woolley to the mouth that's what this is looking at, there could be from the same river, the same type of a problem, a flood problem up at Hamilton and that should be looked at if the locals want it to be looked at under perhaps Section 205 of the Flood Control of 1948 or as a separate congressionally authorized study and we would be glad to work with any of those local officials that wanted advise on how to proceed along those lines.

MS. JEWETT. What was the cubic foot per second on the flood of 1975?

COLONEL POTEAT. Dick Regan do you have the c.f.s. from 1975?

MR. REGAN. Not right off hand.

COLONEL POTEAT. Let him check that out and then we will come back to it in a second or so. While we are waiting —

MRS. JEWETT. Could you tell me within a few feet of how much the proposed diking, downstream of Sedro Woolley —what would be the increase in the water?

COLONEL POTEAT. If I understand what you are saying there would be the increase in backwater surface in the vicinity of Sedro Woolley on the lower ridge.

MR. REGAN. Right at the upper end of the Nookachamps Valley is about two foot increase but as you go on upstream towards the Sedro Woolley area this drops off very quickly back to no problem and within a couple of
miles after you go past the Nookachamps area where the river is deeper
the effects drop off very quickly and within two miles there is no problem.

COLONEL POTEAT. If I understood you correctly within two miles
upstream of the mouth of the Nookachamps the increase is zero.

MR. REGAN. Two miles upstream of the bridges.

COLONEL POTEAT. I think what he corrected that to say within two
miles upstream of the bridges at Sedro Woolley there is zero increase,
definitely by the time you get to the pipeline crossing. How about
standing up and giving your name?

JOHN ROOZEN. John Roozen. It seems like the bridge there's two
bridges there as you go above the Nookachamps to Woolley and I was just
thinking about - we were talking about that area - that other bridge isn't
being used and I am sure you've been up there its just like a dam behind
that bridge if the river is high at all it is just standing on the
Highway 90 Bridge I think it is looks like there is about two feet of
drop right coming through that dam there - maybe that in itself would
help that area where they are at considerably.

COLONEL POTEAT. Apparently this bridge does act as a dam, retarding
structure and if that were eliminated it would ease the problem upstream
is that correct?

MR. REGAN. We haven't looked at that bridge in our detailed study
but it could. The discharges for the 1975 flood we have three numbers -
one is at Concrete it was 122,000 c.f.s.; at Sedro Woolley it was 121,000
now that's within the accuracy in other words they are both about the
same numbers 120,000 at Sedro Woolley and you get down to Mount Vernon
it was 130,000 cfs.
COLONEL POTEAT. Who else wants to ask a question, make a comment?

Well, I guess that - we've had a move here and maybe we can get a second

let me just mention one or two quick things. In all honesty with you

after listening to my staff and reading all this stuff and listening

to it tonight and talking to your officials it appears to me that 3E is

about as close as we can come from a fairly detailed concept right now

we have to work out precise levee alignments and the individual problems

with people, but I would say that on the balance this is validated, 3E

is being about the way we should go.

MRS. FOX. Did you explain why it is 121,000 at Sedro Woolley?

COLONEL POTEAT. Ask Dick as soon as we break up in just a minute -

there is an opportunity for some additional considerations to be provided

during the environmental impact statement review which continues for a

few more days and in the public brochure comments in the next couple of

weeks. Now, in addition to the information and the views we have

received here tonight we want to urge, very strongly that if you have

any further comments, send them to us by the 30th of June so that they

can be included in the record of tonight's meeting. As I explained

earlier the last sheet of this brochure is suitable for that or just

cut it out, write your comments, fold it so the address is out and stick

it in the mail. Again, if you would like to talk to either to me or

members of my staff after the meeting we will remain for these

individual discussions as long as there are people that want to talk to

us. Again, Forest Brooks will be in the area tomorrow in the County

Engineer's office up on the second floor from 8 to 11 and from noon until

2. So, if anyone has any additional statements they wish to make or
questions on the matter I will be glad to have—we have one other
gentleman here.

LARRY GADBOIS. The only question I would like to know is what
time, tomorrow, next month, next week, when will the Corps be out
to set up these meetings, to answer our questions on a one-to-one basis
as to what you are going to do to us individually?

COLONEL POTEAT. Let me put it this way, I don't know what will be
in the budget for Fiscal Year 1980 which starts 1 October of this
coming year. If there is something in the budget the schedule that we
could maintain is working this fall on the detailed plans and
specifications fall and early next year, the detailed plans and
specifications for the downstream portion say below Mount Vernon,
primarily that would be the Fir Island area and at the same time coming
to a little higher level of detail next spring in the upstream area,
the Burlington, the Nookachamps area so from a general statement more
detail in the downstream area this fall and getting into the nitty gritty
details in the upstream area of the Burlington and Nookachamps area next
spring, if there is money in the FY 80 budget, if not, that could be
delayed a year. That's kind of a general statement because as we continue
you know its kind of an evolving thing there's been a lot of dialogue
with the people in the Nookachamps in the past now and will continue
in the future. So, I would think that on through this summer and fall
we'll keep in contact with the people in the Nookachamps. But the real
detailed levee alignment and scheduling with you guys would come no
sooner than probably next spring.
MRS. FOX. Would it go through the hopper and congress with our new representative Mr. or Honorable Al Swift, if the Nookachamps essentially hired a lawyer and he put a kabonze (??) to it.

COLONEL POTEAT. Well you know there is always that avenue open to you, if you want to do that.

MRS. FOX. They did do it and prevented them from taking a shortcut that's what they did and I think that's why you are transferred too.

COLONEL POTEAT. Is there anything else? Okay thank you very much for coming, the meeting stands adjourned. (Clapping)

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m. (2325 hours)