

Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation  
April 2012-June 2012 Public Outreach Comments Received

	Comment
1	Please consider the mission and goals of the 3FI team as they relate to the Corp's proposed alternatives. (Mission: To create and advance mutually beneficial strategies that support the long-term viability of agriculture and salmon while reducing the risks of destructive floods Goal 1: Restore estuary habitats and functions in the tidal Skagit Delta needed to meet the Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan goal (approximately 2,380 acres is the remainder needed). Goal 2: Reduce the risk of destructive flooding by implementing flood risk reduction alternatives that maximize river and estuary habitats and functions whenever possible and minimize the conversion of farmland. Goal 3: Protect and improve agricultural land base and infrastructure (20,000 acres protected through agricultural easements and drainage structures are maintained and enhanced).
2	Intake for Anacortes Water Treatment Plant is on opposite side of the river bank from the plant.
3	Propose a measure that would involve construction of a bypass channel that would run east of the Anacortes Plant through the River Bend area traversing what used to be the Ledger Lake location. Measure involves a meandering continuous flow channel with ability to increase capacity during flood events with a removable structure on the upper end. This measure follows a previously existing channel in this general area. This may be worth looking at in lieu of channel widening in the vicinity of the plant and the intake.
4	What are the benefits of the cost to implement Articles 107 and 106?
5	What is the compensation needed to implement Article 107?
6	What are the environmental impacts of implementing the Baker River FERC license Article 106 and 107?
7	The environmental studies needed to determine the impacts of implementing the Baker River FERC license are the responsibility of the GI.
8	PSE needs to consider maximum outflows during spawning season.
9	Do we know how deep the sheet flow is?
10	Would the sheet flow take a house off its foundation?
11	What's the hydrologic strategy? What levels are we looking at?
12	What is the most storage available in the dam before we trigger a structural modification?
13	Having a number of small dams along the systems still viable?
14	What happens if the 3x3x3 is inadequate (time and money) for the study?
15	Are there issues with putting people behind strengthened levees/ring dikes?
16	Do you have a check off sheet to show the analysis of the plans?
17	Preference for Alternative 5
18	Is curious as to how the Corps will utilize the City of Burlington's hydrological analysis.
19	Least prefers the no action alternative.
20	Stated the need for estimated costs, construction timelines, and the with project H&H
21	What hydrology is the Corps using for the GI? (What are the peak flow volumes?) City does not want to have to pay for improvements that they don't need.
22	Alt 2: Likes how there is minimal impact to the urban areas and prime agricultural areas. May have opportunities for riparian habitat restoration upstream of Burlington. No features of concern

23	Alt 3: Likes how flood waters are diverted from Burlington and Mt Vernon. However, appears that there is potential for substantial environmental impacts to Samish Bay. Floodway may result in reduced agricultural acreage in County.
24	Alt 4: No preferred features. Floodway may result in reduced agricultural acreage in County. And that floodway would fill Swinomish channel with silt and debris. Cannot see how this alt will reduce flooding anywhere other than downstream of Mt. Vernon.
25	Alt 5: likes that alt prioritizes protection of the urban areas. No features of concern
26	Alt 6: like that alt offers most potential for salmon habitat recovery and expands the functional floodplain. Has concerns regarding costs to construct levee setbacks.
27	Need to see cost/impacts before deciding on a preferred alternatives.
28	Alternatives need to be analyzed for potential to enhance salmon recovery.
29	GI alternatives need help achieve or be compatible with the goals of Envision Skagit 2060
30	Prefers the Joe Leary Floodway because topography lends itself to this solution and there are few buildings this way and it has potential for the highest capacity.
31	Second best is the Swinomish Floodway.
32	The most cost effective is to build setback levees. Proposes: that levees be set back and that the existing bridges be extended. Build a weir or overtopping levee a foot lower than the main Burlington levee along Lafayette Rd and UGH Hospital. The main Burlington levee would need to extend to Burlington Hill. A long weir can be installed at Avon as a relief value in large events. *Includes design drawings. Also improve fish habitat.
33	Joe Leary Slough Alt takes pressure off the dikes downstream
34	Has the Corps calculated the impacts of debris that may be introduced into the Swinomish Channel?
35	The urban levee alternative needs to incorporate interior drainage and evacuation plans
36	May want to consider not completely enclosing the urban areas.
37	Please define levee modification.
38	Should consider using sheet pile wall at Mount Vernon and the Riverbend Area rather than a setback levee. This would be cheaper than having to buy land for setback levees.
39	Will the setback levees include excavation? There are concerns that the setback levees will fill up with sediment.
40	How much will the levees cost?
41	Cost of the levee setback alternative is a concern.
42	number one priority is to get water off the floodplain (interior drainage). Their current ability to get water out without damaging the bay dikes is short of capacity.
43	Letting floodwater exit at Sterling makes sense.
44	In the Riverbend area there is a lake area that gets wet during flood events
45	Are bridge modifications necessary for the levee setback alternatives?
46	It should be noted that when the Fir Island levees breached, Sterling still flooded but the base elevation dropped south of Mount Vernon
47	Breaching of Fir Island levees didn't help anyone.
48	The Fir Island bypass won't help relieve the pressure for the upper part of the system.
49	How much does levee setback reduce the flood effects?

50	Corps should look at NHC report to determine the importance of modification of the BNSF Bridge for flood control.
51	Has the Corps done a bathymetric survey of the system lately?
52	Need to look at what it would cost to harden upstream levees when trying to decide between the two bypass alternatives.
53	What will be done about the Riverbend area?
54	There is a risk associated with evacuation. The presence of a ring dike should not change protocols for establishing evacuation procedures.
55	GI should focus on increased upstream flood storage (including but not exclusive to Upper and Lower Baker Dam storage), enhancement and redevelopment of existing infrastructures, increase and divert conveyance of waters to accommodate a major event (with focus on upstream diversions); enhance and redeveloped interior drainage to displace inundating flood waters. Concerns that potential upstream bridge modifications associated with the Swinomish Channel bypass will be cost prohibitive.
56	Propose the following measures (from the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan) as vital parts to achieving the study goals relocation of Hamilton, Sewage Treatment Plant Ring Dike Sedro Woolley, Ring Dike General Hospital, Burlington Levy Certification Program, Three Bridge Corridor Levy Setback and Certification, Anacortes Water Treatment Plant Ring Dike, Downtown Mount Vernon Floodwall and Redevelopment, and La Conner Ring Dike.
57	There is lack of representation for the residents of the Nookachamps in discussion regarding the ability of the area to take overflow.
58	Submitted article outlining her concerns regarding the safety of aging dams.
60	Is this alternative eliminating any preexisting structures?
61	The resource agencies would like some hard criteria to evaluate the bypass alternatives
62	What about Cherry Point/railroad. What about increases in traffic/commuter rail lines – would this lead to improvements/reconstruction of the bridge?
63	What does levee modification mean? What are these modifications?
64	Need some clarification on assumption of design—whether or not existing levees that are set back are completely removed (including toe).
65	What does the econ analysis include?
66	Power loss Compensation is another issue.
67	If we encircle Burlington, how do you calculate the costs and benefits?
68	How receptive are landowners to selling land?
69	The cost of levee removals might be a drop in the bucket compared to the land acquisition.
70	How is the Corps dealing with climate change?
71	How will the Corps deal with a moving environmental baseline?
72	There would be some issues with moving outside Section 106 because there may be reservoir issues with Coho management.
73	Change in seasonality of a early drawdown would require an analysis of productivity of salmon of the river. Table 2 is not an existing condition. There will be an environmental effect to using those tables despite the fact that they are listed in the FERC license. Productive capacity was not analyzed the in the FERC license EIS. The GI process is supposed to do the environmental analysis of changes resulting from adopting the section 106 and Table 2. Productivity issues behind the dam and then flows downstream.
74	You have not done any of the environmental scoping yet for the alternatives.
75	There are varying effects to the fish for each of these alternatives.
76	NRCS has several easements within the floodplain.

77	Fish are important, but the bigger issue is where we are dumping sediment
78	Skagit In stream Flow limits total diversions to 860 cfs, if this is a diversion from the river, then this would be a water rights issue. The Corps will need to get a Department of Ecology contact.
79	The Corps should look at offsetting impacts with good riparian habitat
80	: Not taking into account climate change will have considerable impacts on what gets support. Not considering increased flows would be a fatal flaw.
81	TNC and NRCS have easements for almost every footprint of the alternatives we have presented
82	How is the Corps dealing with climate change?
83	How is the Corps dealing with the Mount Vernon Floodwall?
84	Any analysis of storage needs to be done through the GI
85	Pinch points are areas to focus on where there isn't an opportunity to setback levees.
86	Why do we have new levee construction in the Sterling area? Impacts to Sterling and Nookachamps. Is the levee setback alternative an all or nothing deal, or are there specific areas where you can gain conveyance and reduce your risk?
87	Would the cross-island bypass reduce the water surface through Mount Vernon? If so, why isn't the Fir Island Bypass included in other alternatives?
88	Is it possible that dam modifications with the Fir Island Bypass would get you a 90% solution?
89	All of the alternatives can be designed to have a positive effect, but they can similarly be designed to have serious showstoppers from permitting and tribal concerns. We need to keep in mind the opportunities to do more good.
90	Can we have an alternative that only addresses the impacts at Sterling and Nookachamps? How do we do economic analysis for the benefits to an area when it would otherwise be cost ineffective . Do we need to provide something for everyone?
91	How far we will go with our analysis? There are concerns that we don't have enough time for studies or money.
92	Another fatal flaw is that the Corps is focusing on ESA, etc, but not as much on the tribal trust responsibility and how this is going to be handled in the planning and review process.
93	No one north of the dike will find the Joe Leary Bypass acceptable.
94	Will the environmental community find the Joe Leary Bypass acceptable?
95	Has the Corps studied what will happen once the floodwaters are emptied into the Swinomish Channel? Does the channel have enough volume to hold the flood water?
96	Did you know that there is a hotel located in the proposed Swinomish Channel floodway?
97	Is there an issue with the jetty on Goat Island? Has the Corps looked at this?
98	For the ring dikes, what would happen if the levee broke? You would get a bathtub - how will you drain this area?
99	There is a choke point in the river system at the North Fork Bridge
100	When will the Corps have costs?
101	What will happen if the costs are really high?
102	What will be the efforts of the economist?
103	How is the cost benefit ratio developed?
104	Will the 3 year schedule also include the EIS? How detailed will the EIS be?
105	The Environmental Committee has good knowledge and can help with the study.
106	When will the Corps confront ESA issues?
107	What are the benefits to wildlife/salmon?

108	How will environmental impacts be considered in the Corps analysis?
109	What does a flood event look like without flood fighting?
110	What is the difference between a floodway and bypass?
111	The Joe Leary floodway area needs to be increased. Need to delete the floodway area shown south of the levee.
112	How much water will be passed through the bypass/floodway?
113	Will the floodway/bypass have water in it throughout the year?
114	Where will the spill into the bypass occur and at what elevation?
115	How frequently will the floodway/bypass be engaged?
116	Will the scale of the improvements be based on the hydraulic model?
117	What is the impact of the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge on the flows during a flood event? Are you aware of a past lawsuit regarding the bridge?
118	Will the Corps assess interior drainage?
119	Has the Corps looked at the Phillips and Williams study which outlines the paths of water?
120	Will there be cross integration of the alternative?
121	Non-structural measures should be part of every alternative.
122	The community can really help with narrowing the alternatives.
123	I would like to see 100yr protection for the urban areas and no less than existing protection for the upstream and downstream areas.
124	What about Fir Island?
125	How will the Corps determine what work needs to be done to determine the feasibility of the bypass?
126	How far into the 3 year schedule are we?
127	People want to know the study process. When can we engage in the process? Will the Corps look to the County's technical subcommittee's for assistance?
128	The Corps should use the technical sub-committees as a resource
129	When will we get a FEMA map?
130	Does alt 1 include the ongoing improvements that the levee system?
131	Cattle mounds are non-structural
132	We need interior drainage once the floodwater gets in.
133	Alert warning systems – we are currently limited in our capabilities – audible alarm system, telephone system, door to door.
134	Evacuation routes and shelters. No evacuation plan for West Mount Vernon, shelter at the airport. Mount Vernon has no marked routes. Burlington has some marked evacuation.
135	Interagency coordination for state troopers. People stop to look at the water when crossing the bridge.
136	How does Corps deal with this alternative? How does the Corps execute non-structural alternatives?
137	We need early warning system for the upper valley. (Marblemount down).
138	When we drive over the Kincaid Bridge the elevated water levels are visible – there could be visual markers (education and outreach).
139	We need an upsystem Doppler weather forecasting system.
140	We should look at watershed management particularly on public lands. We should try to do something to keep the water up the valley
141	We should look at changing logging practices.
142	Does Cockreham Island include removal of the levee? Studies have shown that this levee induces flooding on Hamilton.
143	Non-structural suggestion: all the homes in harms' way should have it written in the deed of the house that says that they live in the floodplain.

144	You will find the Samish Alt unacceptable to anyone above the dikes, unacceptable to the residents of the Samish. By the time that you get the water into the bypass, you've raised the water levels too high in Sterling.
145	Samish River community will not tolerate the induced flooding. You would need to buy flowage easements.
146	There is a county drainage group. We would need to figure out how to get their drainage incorporated into the Joe Leary Slough.
147	This alternative doesn't need modification of the three bridge corridor – bridge modifications may cost more (6 bridges) then the bypass may be cheaper.
148	You have to distinguish between the two bypasses – how are these going to be made differently than the ones created in the past. We need to look at the impacts.
149	This alternative could be of benefit as long it's triggered to flow before it backs up too much. People in Sterling don't realize that without this, their levees will be very substantial because water will pool up here.
150	We have looked at bypass concept but we have never looked at the floodway bypass. The floodway bypass idea would re-nourish the soil in the floodplain.
151	It is interesting to see how the County roads follow the floodways. There is an opportunity for the County roads to cost effectively become flood weirs without take of farmland. Opportunities to use existing road alignments.
152	Swinomish Alt - This is impossible without a bridge modification
153	Swinomish Alt- If you do this, then you must have a ring dike around La Conner.
154	Swinomish Alt- Bypass blocks hwy 20. There will be no north south traffic; it would be cut off by the floodway.
155	Swinomish Alt - There is already a dike around La Conner.
156	Samish Alt- All you are doing is building the floodway into the Samish. You are forcing water into the Samish. Water doesn't naturally go between the two hills. No Action ends up being a better option for the Samish people.
157	Burlington got themselves into their mess. Is flood control the reward for poor urban planning?
158	West Mount Vernon: Looks like a levee setback. How are you going to get memorial rd and McClain road over that back levee?
159	There are two major trucking companies in West Mount Vernon.
160	Seems like Alternative 5 may be skipping the step of interior drainage
161	Should be more than three bridges here –should be 6 proposed bridge modifications.
162	West Mount Vernon there is a bypass channel. Are you proposing to replace the Division Street Bridge?
163	Division Street Bridge should be looked at.
164	Setback depending where they are will fill up with sediment. What is the lifetime of levee setbacks? (ALT6)
165	The main problem of the levee setback is that you are going out to build a new levee foundation on a soupy foundation. (ALT6)
166	Is there a cost analysis associated with capturing the costs of improving the levees?
167	If Mount Vernon finishes the flood wall, then the benefits resulting from this improvement cannot be counted towards the GI, correct?
168	If there was no action – what is the cost of damages?
169	What about Burlington? Does the Corps account for inflation/appreciation?

170	County citizens want to know how much the damages are and how much we will save if we are asked to pay. The citizens need to see the economic damages. IN addition to assessor's information, this probably doesn't include government infrastructure, cost to rebuild levees, the cost to rebuild the pipelines, and costs associated with Olympic pipeline shut down.
171	How does the Corps calculate damages?
172	Don't just think damages in the flood plain but also damages to the Islands. And the loss of the/economic impact of road closures.
173	What types of things can the Corps pay for? (non-structural items)
174	Building a levee for ALT3 would be extremely expensive. We need to consider cost.
175	Surely there are cost estimates from WSDOT on Centralia from their flooding shutdown. (ALT3)
176	Some of the housing areas that look new are really quite old. (ALT 4)
177	We need to look at the potential cost of levee setback/three bridges mod and the bypass. ALT4
178	But with the floodway, you could open it up earlier, let the water go out soon. ALT4
179	If there are going to be coal trains going through – it seems like one of the conditions is that you should plan for is building a new RR bridge ALT4
180	We need to realize the impact of a 100 yr flood but we have to look at the impacts on the economy – we all pay the price collectively. The flooding that affects Burlington not only affects Burlington but it affects all of us. (ALT 5)
181	Will cost of mitigation be included in project cost? ALT6
182	Biggest environmental issue is the flow of sediments. We have lost a lot of sediment inputs in the estuary. The bypasses may put a lot of sediment into Padilla Bay and starve the Skagit of sediment.
183	What are the dangers for the eelgrass sedimentation in Padilla Bay? (ALT3)
184	Just south of hwy 20 along the channel, you have the braided remnant of the Swinomish slough. This area is a high priority area for the County to look at. This is Telegraph Slough. ALT4
185	In a hundred year flood, the water goes through Gages Slough, then goes through Burlington (in no action scenario).
186	No water goes through the two hills because there is high ground – then it goes into Joe Leary Slough. Then assuming that if a levee breaks then the floodwaters goes all over the place. (in no action scenario)
187	Were the alternatives designed for a probable event?
188	Whenever the Skagit is at flood stage, the Samish is also at their flood stage so that area is already getting a log of water.ALT3
189	In the government land survey, the low point is the Olympia marsh. The water would probably go through the Olympic marsh. ALT3
190	When the river was blocked with logs, then it went to Beaver Marsh and Olympic marsh. (ALT 3)
191	How long will the water be on the property of people who are behind the sea dikes? (ALT3)
192	Key to interior drainage is velocity. Want to have very slow velocities. (ALT 3)
193	ALT 4: Looking at the map at the back of the handouts, water will flow through farmland and to Swinomish Slough and it will go right through a row of houses from McClain road and go straight and then turn right and then there are a row of houses on a levee.
194	How do we know what direction the water exiting the bypass would flow? (ALT 4)

195	Lots of rip rap in the river – removal of the rip rap would allow Nookachamps and Sterling to increase conveyance. We should also remove the rip rap from the railroad – there is a lot of rip rap here. (ALT4)
196	Lots has been said about storage in Nookachamps and Sterling. There is less and less storage in this area. (ALT 5)
197	I live in the Nookachamps, I have standing water on 800 acres that has been there for the last 5 years. I don't know where the water will go. ALT5
198	The Corps has been telling us to setback the levees, but the advantage of keeping the levees at the edge of the river makes the river travel faster and scour out the bottom of the levee. (ALT6)
199	Does this have a set of options such as the interior levees in Fir Island or like the other overland flow options would you create too much flow. Maybe we still need to talk about flowage easement. (ALT6)
200	Do you count tides in the hydraulic model? ALT6
201	flo2D hydraulic model. Where is it? (ALT 6)
202	However, your predecessors have told us the reason you can't move back the levees in West Mount Vernon is because West Mount Vernon put a garbage dump there. ALT6
203	Burlington old dump didn't have anything in it because it was all organics – no plastics back then. (ALT6)
204	What if the plans don't operate the way we plan? ALT4
205	What is the Corps stance on ring dikes? (ALT 5)
206	For this alternative, do you need to do a survey? ALT6
207	"Alternative 2:Non-Structural and Dam Modifications" is a map that does not seem to explain what exactly the these modifications are. Do these include the "Operational modifications to Upper and Lower Baker Dams" and if so:1. What exactly are these modifications? 2. What are the steps to get these procedural modifications adopted and implemented? 3. Overall in terms of efficacy, where do the dam procedural modifications fall on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the most effective? Alternative 5 slides speak about urban area protection though doesn't seem to address the highest density areas.
208	What determines when and where structural modifications are offered as an alternative?
209	Where does the data come from for the brown and light brown population density regions on the map? The Nookachamps area inaccurately identifies river bank area as highly populate while densely populated areas are not noted at all. I speak specifically to the south end of Francis Road.
210	Is there a long-term timeline that takes flood management in Skagit County through to alternative adoption and implementation?
211	Who is the responsible government agency that makes the final decision regarding which alternative to adopt?
212	Concerned whether or not proposed levee heights will sufficiently consider the impacts of sea level rise.
213	Would like to see B/C ratios.
214	Concerned that plans may not be following the Draft Executive Order on Floodplain Management.
215	Prefer Alt 3- their property would be in the flood area in Alt 4.
216	Alt 4 will flood their property – like this the least.
217	Should consider dredging the Skagit Channel.
218	Like the Fir Island Bypass.
219	Would like to see improved flood protection.
220	Sedimentation at the mouth of the river is an issue that should be considered.

221	Least prefers Alt 3 (Joe Leary Slough Bypass) – it would be devastating if flooding in both the Skagit and Samish happen simultaneously.
222	Prefers Alternative 4 (Avon Bypass) and dredging of the lower river.
223	He has observed silt build up in the freshwater sloughs that meet Skagit Bay.
224	There was historically a third river (Swoolahmish River, 1859 survey) between the Skagit and Samish Rivers.
225	Alt 2: is the most favorable alternative. Dam storage is the most cost effective, environmentally friendly flood protection measure. Also need to limit development in floodplain.
226	Swinomish Bypass has a lot of political controversy
227	Alt 5 coupled with dam storage could be viable if coupled to land-use policies preventing further encroachment on the floodplain.
228	Alternative 6 is unacceptable
229	Concerned about affordability and effectiveness of the proposed alternatives. There is no point in pursuing study further if the County cannot afford the project or if there are major environmental obstacles.
230	For levee setbacks the old levees need to be removed for this to be effective.
231	Propose that dam storage only be proposed as an alternative.
232	Ranking : From most favorable to least favorable: Alt 2, Alt 5, Alt 6, Alt 3, Alt, 4, Alt 1
233	Submitted map developed by Dames and Moore for FEMA. (see file) Maps suggests that in order for water to flow between the hills you would have to dig a channel between the two hills. Also another problem you are going to face is that FEMA designated the Gages Slough area as an area of “Special Flood Hazard” and “should be” treated as floodways. This would prohibit any building of a levee (i.e. fill in the floodway) in that area.
234	Submitted 1897 map prepared by the Corps of Engineers. Shows locations of Beaver Marsh area and Olympic Marsh. Also, shows river depths. The river depths have changed little since 1897.
235	Alt 2: Prefer this alt. Need to give consideration to flood storage at the dams.
236	Alt 3: Benefits of the Alt are similar to Alt 4. Major disadvantage of this alternative is the potential for mixing of fish species and the potential for increase sheet flow flooding the Samish River Basin if both the Skagit and Samish flood at the same time.
237	Alt 4: This bypass idea has been proposed before. It was last considered by the County in 2002. There are significant economic and environmental issues with this alternative. Floodway aspect of this alternative would need an agricultural exemption to allow for construction of agricultural outbuildings and rebuilding of damaged farm houses. Benefits of this alt/floodway version: floodwaters would not impact Burlington or Mount Vernon, would preserve farmland from urban encroachment, prohibit further development in the natural flood corridor. This alternative will likely be the most affordable and provide the most benefits. This alternative will impact fish but this impact can be mitigated. An additional benefit of this alternative would be that Mount Vernon would not need a floodwall.
238	- Alt 5: This alt is not favorable because it overlooks poor land use practices (allowing development) of the floodplain by Burlington and Mount Vernon. Should also construct levees around Clear Lake and Sedro Woolley waste water treatment plant, and stopgap levee for La Conner.

239	Alt 6: This alt is not favorable because the proposed levee at Sterling. This levee would add a 3-4 ft of height in flood water level to the Nookachamps area which in turn makes a deep lake upstream of the Burlington Urban Area. Widening of the 3 bridge corridor to allow for increased conveyance would result in higher levee and/or bridge replacement costs.
240	Analysis from NHC indicated that a significant amount of water leaves the system at Nookachamps. Nookachamps is an artificial storage basin because of levee system of Dike 12 and 17. Nookachamps Creek does not contribute any flow into Skagit River into flood.
241	Concerns regarding storage in Lower Baker Dam. An adverse impact of imminent drawdown is that if you fill up the reservoir and a second storm hits, then there will be no flood storage at the dam.
242	Dredging will not work; however dredging at the mouth of the river may help with drainage of flood properties adjacent to the river during low tide.
243	I-5 was designed by WSDOT to overtop from Gages Slough just north of the Target Store and again north of BEHS to Cook Road during a serious flood event.
244	Interior Drainage: This is an absolutely necessary element.
245	Ranking (from preferred to least preferred): Alt 2, Alt 4, Alt 3, Alt 6, Alt1, Alt 5.
246	Prefers Alt 3- get the water out of the system, ASAP combined with Alt 4 and 5
247	PDT needs to combine the alternatives
248	Stated need to protect public infrastructure and public safety.
249	Ranking (preferred to not like: Alt 3, 4, 5, 6, 2, 1)
250	Stated the need for the burden of flood control shouldn't fall on a few individuals.
251	What about the three bridge corridor?
252	Is there one bridge that make more of a difference or do you need to take out all the bridges?
253	There are a lot of bridges, the railroad bridge, the Division Street Bridge and the bridges over the forks
254	Can you set back the levees without major bridge modification?
255	Does the Corps do bypasses in other parts of the County?
256	Why can't we dredge the river? It has been done in the past.
257	All the alternatives look expensive
258	I can see mixing and matching different pieces of the different alternatives
259	Explain cost-benefit.
260	One of the problems with dredging was that the Corps would pay the first time and then the sponsor pays maintenance.
261	Both bypasses have sheet flow and channel options. What happens to the value of farmland in the path of the bypass?
262	Previous options of bypass had 9-10 year levee corridor. I can't imagine what kind of agriculture that can exist in the bypass.
263	You can farm a bypass but it is not as profitable.
264	I have concerns about limiting the study to three years. Concerned about funding and there are vegetation management issues, ESA consultation. There are lots of things that we can't control. This is too quick.
265	Are steps being taken to streamline the vegetation management and ESA process?
266	What about dredging the river system?
267	Explain what a flowage easement is.
268	At the mouth of the river, the biggest problem is silt build-up. There are a bunch of plugged up sloughs. The issue is maintenance of sloughs and sandbars at the mouth. Dredge a few miles of the river and at Sterling would help. The river is full of snags that need to be cleared out.

269	Over the life of project, how are we considering sea level rise?
270	Why can't we continually dredge the Skagit? They continuously dredge the Mississippi River.
271	How is the sheet flow problem going to be defined? Will eminent domain be involved?
272	Looking at alternatives, I don't see interior drainage.
273	What will tidal influence do to the sheet flow/channel bypass?
274	There is only one thing that helps everyone: dam storage.
275	You have to be careful as to when you let water down the bypass.
276	Has there been a cost analysis and estimated construction timeline?
277	Study has gotten harder and time reduced.
278	Suggestion: The outreach is good but it has to be meaningful.
279	How will the incoming tide affect the water that moves through the Bypass?
280	How will Alternative 3 (Joe Leary Bypass) affect Sedro-Woolley
281	What will be done about the houses located in the floodway?
282	Did the team analyze the effect of the Samish River Flooding in the Skagit Basin?
283	Water begins to overflow at Sterling between a 16-20 year event. Sedro Woolley begins flood fight when gage at Mt. Vernon reads 34ft. This is when the river flows across the railroad tracks.
284	Why wait until larger events to use the bypass?
285	What about NEPA Issues? Has the team looked at the impacts to the Marine Sanctuary in Padilla Bay?
286	Where will the bypass/floodway discharge? Will it empty into Padilla Bay? Padilla Bay currently has pollution issues. How will the bypass affect pollution issues in the Bay?
287	How much water will be diverted from the River into the bypass?
288	This plan will have less impact on Sedro-Woolley (individual opinion)
289	The path of this bypass would affect fewer houses in the city.
290	What do you mean by move-out? Is this a mandatory evacuation before the flood?
291	Is the Mount Vernon floodwall part of this strategy?
292	Will the Corps buy land that is within the floodway?
293	What about Hwy 20 and Cook Road? Closure of these roads would trap Sedro-Woolley - people would not be able to evacuate if needed.
294	Does the Corps have an estimate of project costs? The biggest cost will likely be real estate.
295	Will the FEMA hydrology be used in this study?
296	What about implementation of 107c in the Baker FERC license?
297	Has the team considered placing a bypass on Fir Island to serve as a third fork of the river?
298	Do any of the alternatives incorporate management of woody debris in the river?
299	How did the team formulate the preliminary alternatives?
300	When does the 50 year project lifetime start?
301	Will the project be constructed in phases?
302	How can the City of Sedro-Woolley contribute to this discussion?
303	As the Corps drafts the new list of alternatives, we recommend that the Corps promote alternatives that would improve habitat for listed species, anadromous fish, and other species in the Lower Skagit River and its tributaries. Many such alternatives are likely to have positive influences on the ability of the system to convey and/or more naturally attenuate flood flows compared to channelized conditions (e.g., setbacks).

304	We encourage the Corps to draft alternatives that include promoting setbacks wherever possible, appreciable restoration or enhancement of functional riparian corridors, restoration and/or construction of high quality and fish friendly side channels (that are designed avoid stranding or other impacts to aquatic organisms), and removal of hard shoreline armoring (to reduce edge habitat impacts, constriction of the stream, preclusion of riparian buffer establishments, and other effects).
305	Where certain stream configurations or hard armoring is planned to be maintained or constructed, as in the case of Preliminary Alternative 3 (Urban Areas and Critical Infrastructure Protection), we encourage the Corps to include and consider a reach-based analysis for determining stability and indirect effects of a given feature, and adequately determine and avoid downstream and across-stream negative effects from the features.
306	This GI process gives the Corps an important opportunity to implement section 7(a)(1) of the Endangered Species Act, by “carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species...”, and section 2(c) of the Act, “...to seek to conserve endangered species and threatened species” and use “authorities in furtherance of the purpose of this Act”.
307	Not incorporating an analysis of climate change related hydrology is a fatal flaw from a NEPA perspective, a development of a clear pathway to address this issue would be timely
308	Submitted letters he received from the Skagit County Public Works Department in 1996 documenting the Public Works Department’s investigation of the drainage complaints on Starbird Road. In 1997, the Department found that the existing culverts were adequate but that downstream maintenance was necessary for the full performance of cross culverts under Starbird Road.
309	Prefers dredging and removal of debris from the North and South Fork.