

SKAGIT LEVEE PROJECT  
COMMENTS ON JUNE '79  
PUBLIC BROCHURE

SKAGIT 2-12  
COMMENTS ON  
PUBLIC WORKSHOP  
STUDY EPA 441

# YOUR COMMENTS

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
REPRESENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

ROBERT L. CLINTON  
10 PETER ANDERSON  
BURLINGTON, WASH.  
98233

- I want to continue receiving information on this study.
- I do not wish to receive further information on this study.  
Please remove my name from the mailing list.

On the \$3 3E plan for the 100 year flood control for Burlington and Mount Vernon where does the dike run from the river to Sterling Hill? I live just south of the hill, with Gages slough running about 20 yards east of my house. My 20 acres runs from the Peter Anderson rd to the east 1220 feet and is 660 feet wide.

If this 3E plan goes through I'd like to know how it will affect me and my property, I can't tell from your plans just where the dike runs.

I feel a much more sensible approach would be to use the new Hiway 20 from the Hopper road east as a dike, and then to do something to help the nookachamps area with dikes, or raise their homes and barns above the flood plain.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

*Robert L. Clinton*  
Robert L. Clinton

*I talked to Bob and Helen Clinton on  
20 June in Mt Vernon about their concerns,  
(Brooks)*

13

# YOUR COMMENTS

NAME: JACK STRAATHOF PHONE: [REDACTED]  
ADDRESS: [REDACTED] HIWAY 9, [REDACTED] CLEAR LAKE WA. 98235  
REPRESENTING: \_\_\_\_\_


I want to continue receiving information on this study.

I do not wish to receive further information on this study.  
Please remove my name from the mailing list.

I am located just north of Clear Lake on highway 9. The levee you have planned to protect Clear Lake begins on the property that I farm & continues around my barn. I would like, if it is possible, for someone to come out to my farm & show me exactly where this dike is going to be on our farm.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible.

Thank You  
Jack Straathof



Don Soderland, Forest Brooks and Don Nelson meet with Mr and Mrs Straathof on 25 June to discuss their concerns. (Brooks)

# YOUR COMMENTS

NAME: Harold E Andersen PHONE: [REDACTED]  
ADDRESS: [REDACTED] CINDY PL, Mt Vernon, WA 98273  
REPRESENTING: Self ; Land owner Francis Rd.

I want to continue receiving information on this study.

I do not wish to receive further information on this study.  
Please remove my name from the mailing list.

The Corps has made improvements in its proposals by making changes which to some extent will mitigate impacts on Nookachamps, Babcock Rd and Clear Lake area. The farms in this area are also an important economic asset.

It is most unfortunate that Congress included the Sook River in the Wild & Scenic River system. A containment facility on the Sook would be best and most cost effective solution to the problem.

I shall continuously work to get this mistake corrected.

I therefore reluctantly accept Alternative 3E as an interim measure; provided that everything possible be done to eliminate adverse effects on Nookachamps, Clear Lake and Babcock Rd.

Harold E Andersen  
6/25/79 21

# YOUR COMMENTS

NAME: Jon & MARY Jo Schmidt PHONE: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS: [REDACTED] PETER ANDERSON ROAD, BURLINGTON WA.

REPRESENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

I want to continue receiving information on this study.

I do not wish to receive further information on this study.  
Please remove my name from the mailing list.

*our home and acreage lie at the south end of  
Sterling Hill - Sec 28 Twp 35 Rge 4.*

*We are interested in just exactly how Alternative 3E  
will affect our home and property.*

*He called and talked to me about this  
subject on 27 June 1979 (Brooks)*



# MICHAEL D. WALKER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

610 BELLINGHAM TOWERS • BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON 98225 • (206) 671-2200

June 28, 1979

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

Dear Mr. Brooks:

The purpose of this letter is to provide the Corps of Engineers with written comments in response to its proposed plan for levy and channel improvements in the Skagit River system. This letter is written on behalf of numerous residents in the Nookachamps area, all of whom will be significantly affected by the Corps' present proposal as embodied in Alternative 3E and described in the public brochure prepared for the June 19, 1979 meeting on Draft #2 of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Both in the public brochure prepared for the meeting and at the meeting itself, the Corps publicly stated that Alternative 3-E will have a significant environmental impact on the Nookachamps area in that it will cause induced flood damage to the area. The residents of the Nookachamps area are rightfully concerned about the damages that they will suffer personally and in their businesses as a result of the induced flooding.

The June 19, 1979 meeting was well attended by many of the residents of the area. Near the end of the meeting, the Nookachamps residents were encouraged by Colonel Poteats' statements that his staff will be specifically directed to meet with each and every landowner in areas where induced flood damage would occur. The residents were further encouraged by his statements that no work of any kind would be begun on the project without first identifying specifically each and every damage that would occur and therefore preventing the damage through structural and/or non-structural measures.

In order that the final environmental impact statement will adequately reflect the concerns of these residents, we would request that the Corps fully consider all of the questions below prior to submitting the general design memorandum and prior to the introduction of any legislation in Congress:

1. Will Corps of Engineers staff meet with each and every landowner in the Nookachamps area to determine what specific damage would occur as a result of induced flooding?

Forrest Brooks  
page two  
June 28, 1979

2. After having met with Nookachamps residents to determine consequential damages, will the Corps outline in detail what structural and non-structural steps it will take to prevent economic loss as a result of induced flooding? Will these structural and non-structural steps included in the general design memorandum be included in the legislative authorization bill?

3. To the extent that structural measures to prevent induced flooding are not feasible, will the Corps compensate each and every landowner fully for each and every economic loss that will arise out of induced flooding?

4. Has the Corps taken the 1974 Public Works Act into consideration in formulating its plan to prevent induced flooding and, in the alternative, in formulating its plan to compensate affected landowners.

5. After meeting with residents who will be affected by induced flooding, does the Corps still take the position that the average annual induced damages as a result of proceeding with Alternative 3E will be only \$25,000? At the June 19, 1979 meeting, Corps staff stated that non-structural measures will be paid for with 20% local monies and 80% federal monies. Regardless of the source of the monies, does the Corps guarantee that all losses suffered by affected owners will be paid for in their entirety prior to beginning the project?

6. Does the Corps have exact figures on what will be the increased water levels in the Nookachamps area at a 10-year event, a 25-year event, a 50-year event, and a 100-year event? What are those increased water levels in the Nookachamps area as a whole? What are those levels with regard to each individual landowner in the Nookachamps area?

7. Does alternative 3E contemplate Congressional funding to compensate for damage that will occur to farm improvement such as livestock, barns, roads, homes, milking operations, and electricity?

8. Does Alternative 3E contemplate the payment of flowage easements to any of the residents of the Nookachamps area? If so, on what basis will these flowage easements be computed and when will they be paid?

9. Has the Corps of Engineers considered what affect the construction of a highway between Sedro Woolley and Mount Vernon on the dike would have in terms of increased water flows to

the Nookachamps area? If so, what are the increased water flows which would be caused by the construction of this highway and who would pay for the increased damages?

10. In past floods in other areas similar to the Nookachamps area, farmers have lost their whole livestock operations within minutes as a result of the drowning of the livestock. What attention has the Corps given to this possibility in the Nookachamps area? What steps, if any, does the Corps anticipate taking to prevent this possibility from happening? Has the Corps considered the possibility of insuring the farmers against catastrophic damage that might occur as a result of flooding in the Nookachamps area?

11. Prior to submission of legislation, will the Corps do a complete economic analysis of the farming operations in the Nookachamps area so that they will have an adequate base upon which to compensate farmers for damages that cannot be prevented by structural measures.

12. What procedures, if any, must individual landowners in the Nookachamps area follow in order to notify the Corps of specific damages they will suffer as a result of the induced flooding that will occur?

13. After the December 20, 1978 Workshop, the Skagit County Commissioners requested the Corps to study in more detail the flooding problems of the Nookachamps. In response to the Commissioners' request, what further studies did the Corps undertake and what did those studies reveal?

14. Corps Manager Vernon Cook has stated, "No matter which alternative the County Commissioners decided to pursue, the Nookachamps will get more water." Would the Nookachamps get more water under the Sauk containment alternative?

15. If it were not for the existence of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, would the Corps have recommended the Sauk Containment Alternative? Please explain.

16. What factors have led the Corps to conclude that flood prevention in the Nookachamps area is not cost effective? Please outline in detail all factors considered.

17. According to Colonel Poteats' statements at the June 19, 1979 meeting, Alternative 3E has been modified to include structural and non-structural measures to alleviate the induced flooding and, where possible, provide for flood damage reduction measures for improvements on the land in the Nookachamps Valley. Please outline in detail the total cost the Corps anticipates in providing these structural and non-structural measures.



Forrest Brooks  
page four  
June 28, 1979

Finally, please outline in detail how these costs will be allocated.

Having in good faith attempted to apprise the Corps about their concerns about the damage they will apparently suffer if the Corps proceeds with Alternative 3E, the residents in the Nookachamps area now submit this letter in the hopes that the Corps will do everything in its power to prevent flood damage where at all possible and to fully compensate each and every landowner for the risks they will take to benefit all of the residents of Skagit County.

Sincerely,

*Michael D. Walker*

MICHAEL D. WALKER  
Attorney for NOOKACHAMPS VALLEY FLOOD DEFENSE ORGANIZATION

cc: Larry Kunsler  
4807 Francis Rd.  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Larry Gadbois  
2046 Mudlake Rd.  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Barbara Austin  
1381 Austin Rd.  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Ken Johnson  
1981C Francis Rd.  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Skagit Valley Herald  
Sedro Woolley Courier-Times  
Congressman Al Swift  
Senator Henry Jackson  
Senator Warren Magnuson  
Bud Norris, Chairman  
Skagit County Commissioners

# YOUR COMMENTS

NAME: Larry J. KUNZLER PHONE:                     

ADDRESS:                     Francis Rd Mt. Vernon

REPRESENTING: Self

XXXX I want to continue receiving information on this study.

           I do not wish to receive further information on this study.  
Please remove my name from the mailing list.

Since Federal funds were used to create the existing conditions in the Nookachamps (WPA in early 30's) federal funds must now be made available to correct those conditions. Perhaps funds from other agencies could be made available to the corp.

Livestock mounds (50 years plus one foot) must be created on all existing farms in our area with emergency milking facilities for dairy farmers. This is an uncompromisable issue. But as late as 3PM the 19th of June local officials were still telling us that they would not do this. Clairification on this issue between Corp and local sponsor and farmers in our area is a must.

Please ~~send~~ send me a copy of the final Environmental Impact Statement.

*Larry Kunzler*

*I discussed his concerns on 20 June in Mount Vernon (Brooks)*



**BURLINGTON NORTHERN**

ENGINEERING DIVISION  
Portland/Seattle Region

510 Third Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98101

The District Engineer  
United States Army  
Corps of Engineers  
P. O. Box C-3755  
Seattle, WA 98124

June 29, 1979

ATTENTION: Mr. Forest Brooks

Gentlemen:

Referring to your public brochure dated June 1979 entitled "Skagit River, Washington Levee Improvement" and your invitation to comment on Alternative 3E.

You have my letter of April 10, 1978, in which I commented on your proposals to raise levees along the Skagit River and those comments are still valid.

You have selected Alternative 3E for further study and in general this Alternative proposes to raise existing dikes one foot to seven foot from Sedro Woolley to the river's mouth. Following are our comments:

1. The currents to the water surface under our Bridge 36 over the Skagit River at Burlington would be two feet to three feet. This clearance is not adequate to pass the debris which comes down the river. We need six feet of clearance above high water to pass large trees. We should, therefore, have a new bridge or possibly raise the existing bridge and open the waterway under the north approach by removing some of the girder spans and placing a truss span.
2. At Fischer's slough near MP 61.2 on our Coast Line, you propose to construct a new dike and cause the river surface to be at a higher elevation than our track. We need details of your plans so that we can determine if raising the river will be adverse to us at this location.

The District Engineer  
June 29, 1979  
Page 2

3. At Gages' slough at about our MP 18 between Burlington and Sedro Woolley, your engineers state that the 100 Year Flood would inundate 4,000 feet of track if levees were constructed as proposed by Alternate 3E. Inundation of track leaves the ballast full of silt and this is not satisfactory. It appears that we should raise our track and provide a bridge for passage of flood waters.

We are, in general, opposed to the raising of dikes. Your plan is to construct levees to such an elevation that they are overtopped in the lower reaches of the river (below Mt. Vernon) before the levees are overtopped in the upper reaches. We find that local people raise the dikes when they are in danger of being overtopped (and the Army Engineers sometime help them in this). When flood waters recede, the material brought in to raise the dike is left on top of the dikes and thus, they are gradually raised.

The data contained in the brochure, which you have furnished us, is not adequate for us to completely analyze the effect of raising the levees along the Skagit River. Please furnish us working drawings as soon as you have them and we will ask for a meeting with your engineers to discuss the proposal to raise levees along the Skagit River.

Sincerely



C. F. Intlekofer  
Director, Engineers

cc: Mr. J. W. Wicks  
Mr. B. G. Anderson  
Mr. D. H. Burns  
Mr. G. E. Haug

P 002489