Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

During 2012 we published 146 historical documents and 78 documents dated in 2012 for a total of 224 documents.

DOCUMENTS NOT CREATED IN 2012 POSTED IN 2012

Burlington Northern Sante Fe Document

4/10/1978	**Ltr to Corps fm BNRR re why they were opposed to flood project**	"Burlington Northern is opposed to raising the heights of levees because it will endanger our bridge and embankments in the vicinity of Burlington, Washington."

City of Burlington Documents

3/22/1978	**Burlington Mayor Letter to Corps of Engineers re Flood Project Alternatives**	"We need only remind ourselves that Skagit County is valued, for tax purposes, over one billion dollars, a large part of which is subject to flood damage, and that the City of Burlington is valued, for tax purposes, over fifty-five million dollars all of which is subject to flood damage." According to the City of Burlington the current 2012 total property valuation is $1,202,840,174. So how much did the flood threat influence/stop development? Obviously very little if at all. The commercial development alone ("all of which is subject to flood damage") is $805,453,934 million dollars. How serious can the flood threat be when this kind of development is allowed?
3/03/2011	**Reichhardt & Ebe Engineering Plans for Dike District 12 Levee Certification**	The current plans to certify Dike District 12 levees. This document was submitted to **the 2011 Skagit River GI Scoping Efforts** by the City of Burlington.
8/10/2011	**Skagit River General Investigation Study Scoping Meeting Comments - City of Burlington**	34 slide presentation to the **the 2011 Skagit River GI Scoping Efforts** by the City of Burlington. Main focus is flood storage. "•With additional Baker flood storage in place (139,000 AF in accordance w/ Baker advance drawdown targets), Skagit peak flow reduction will be 13,000 – 18,000 cubic feet per second. " – Reduces downstream surface water elevation 1.5 feet " – Coordination w/ downstream storage (40,000 – 60,000 acre-feet in the Nookachamps basin) reduces another 1.5 feet. "•Similar reductions can occur from Ross storage and operation "• At least 3-4 feet flood reduction in total."
11/10/2011	**Baker Hydroelectric Project Imminent Flood Reservoir**	Updated 19 slide presentation with the benefits of flood protection, fish enhancement, and power generation. The idea is to drawdown before

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Drawdown: Why Drawing Down the Reservoirs In Advance of a Skagit Basin Flood Reduces Flood Risk, Improves Salmon Survival, and Increases Power Generation	an imminent flood to be able to stop outflow during the crest of flood events. This strategy is to protect salmon eggs and hydropower capacity plus reduce amount of necessary dam storage in between flood events.

Corps of Engineers Documents

6/24/1977	**Northern Pacific Division (Portland) Headquarters ltr to Seattle District re Skagit River Levees and Channel Improvements**	". . . based on a review of the authorizing document and assuming such extension is justified and desired by local interests, extension of the project that far via a phase 1 report would require a significant Post Authorization Change report requiring Congressional action." . . . An alternative course of action would be to proceed with a GDM report covering the general project area reconsidering the degree of protection to be provided. At the same time preauthorization studies could proceed on the area upstream under the authority of the PSFAW study or under Section 216. Such a procedure would permit early construction capability and at the same time cover the full flood control needs of the area."
7/1/1977	**Ltr to Corps North Pacific Division Engineer fm Seattle District re Skagit River Levees and Channel Improvements**	The alternative course of action suggested in enclosure 2 involves considering areas upstream of Mount Vernon in a preauthorization study under authority of PS&AW. ... We feel the proper method of determining the best plan for the Skagit River Delta is through the General Design Memorandum.
7/5/1977	**Skagit County Existing Land Use Plans and Regulations Applicable to the Proposal (i.e. Proposed Interpretive Center) as interpreted by the Corps**	The 1968 Comprehensive Plan map designated Fir Island, the site of the proposed Interpretive Center Complex, as "Agricultural Floodway," and the area riverward of Wiley Slough and Freshwater Slough as "Floodway." However, the Comprehensive Plan text is very general and provides no specific definitions or policies for these designations. ... Skagit WRA is laced with sloughs of Skagit River, which are considered associated wetlands of the river. ... The proposed interpretive center program would serve citizens from all of the State of Washington. Statewide interest and public awareness of shoreline resources and their value would be served by the interpretive center program. ... The proposed interpretive center program would increase and enhance recreational opportunities on these shorelines. In conclusion, the proposed interpretive center would be in compliance with all regulations and policies of the Skagit County Shorelines Master Program. It is, in fact, encouraged by many of them (such as policies for shorelines of statewide significance).
7/11/1977	**Corps ltr to Skagit County Planning re deauthorization of the Avon Bypass project** Document contains attachments: Avon Bypass Information Sheet; Project Deauthorization Review; Basin Map	'. . . a. Additional Flood Control at Upper Baker Project. The Upper Baker Project recently received congressional approval. The operation of the Upper Baker Dam will be modified for flood control purposes by providing up to 58,000 additional acre-feet of flood control storage by increasing reservoir drawdown in the period 1 November to 15 November of each year. Implementation of the project will not require structural modifications to existing facilities. Coupled with flood plain management, the project will increase flood protection in the Skagit River flood plain below Concrete, Washington, by decreasing peak discharges from those now experienced. . . . b. Levee and Channel Improvements . . . the project involves raising and strengthening existing levees downstream from Burlington and Mount

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		Vernon, Washington, and making minor channel improvements to increase minimum channel capacities. In conjunction with the Upper Baker Project, the levee and channel improvements project, if constructed as authorized, would increase the minimum level of flood protection in areas downstream from Burlington, Washington, from 3 years to an average recurrence interval of 11 years, **with 3-foot freeboard**. Together with the projects mentioned above, the Avon Bypass Project would increase minimum flood protection from 11 to 59 years for the area downstream from Burlington. ' . . . The county has developed **a comprehensive flood control plan** for the Skagit Valley, one element of which is the Avon Bypass. However, local cost sharing requirements currently are beyond the means of the county.
7/11/1977	**Corps Regional Planning Branch Work Request**	"Request you proceed with the following: Hydrograph analyses at Sedro Woolley: Develop design quality 25-, 50-, 100-, and 200-year flood hydrographs for Skagit River at Sedro Woolley. These shall represent the present river condition and 74,000 acre feet of flood control storage in Baker-Lake. Hydrologic analysis of interior drainage; Routing, combining and backwater analysis."
7/11/1977	**Corps Study Manager ltr to local Dike District Commissioner on Fir Island**	Corps promises to determine the social economic and environmental effects of each alternative as well as the engineering, design and cost estimates
7/15/1977	**Corps MFR re Skagit Levees**	Document describes trip to Skagit for the purpose of locating drainage and control structures and other critical design features which might be impacted by levee project. ... Generally the trip served as a design orientation exercise for both Regional Planning and Civil Design Section representatives. Civil Design representatives will prepare a separate photo reconnaissance and field notes on the trip.
7/18/1977	**Letter to Corps Headquarters from Congressman Lloyd Meeds re Sauk River dry dam.**	Asked the following questions: 1)How much flood protection would be provided; 2)Will a dry dam on the Sauk be engineeringly sound, economically justified and environmentally safe?; 3) What type of time frame needed for study.
7/22/1977	**Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvements -- Project Schedule**	December 1978 Draft GDM; Final GDM April 1979; June 1980 initiate Construction
7/27/1977	**Corps MFR re responses to 7/18/1977 letter from Congressman Meeds re "Dry Dam" on Sauk River**	A "dry dam" for FC only would be "engineeringly sound." The economic justification has not been determined in any studies and would not be available until after re :on level survey studies. We do not understand the term "environmentally safe" but do believe an "environmentally acceptable" project could be formulated. A detailed study of the Sauk could be completed in 4 years at the cost of $400,000. Checkpoint 1 could be reached in 1-1/2 years at a cost of $150,000.
7/29/1977	**Outline for Briefing District Engineer on Skagit River Flood Problems**	Draft notes on what needed to be done for formal briefing to District Engineer.
8/15/1977	**Corps Draft Maps of the Avon Bypass**	Two sets of maps with different intake locations.
8/17/1977	**Corps "River Mile" maps**	March 1965 maps.
8/23/1977	**Corps Portland Division Headquarters MFR to Corps Headquarters in Washington DC re Reclassification of Avon Bypass Project**	Agreed with Seattle District that Avon Bypass should be reclassified from deferred to active. "... Avon Bypass Project authorized by the 1936 Flood Control Act would be constructed as a part of an overall Skagit Valley flood control plan. The authorized project includes construction of the by-pass in the vicinity of Avon as well as construction of upstream levees in the vicinity of Sedro Woolley. and

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		Burlington." NOTE: As of this date studies needed for project had not yet began.
8/23/1977	**Ltr fm Corps DC Headquarters to Division Engineer (Portland) re Reclassification of Authorized Skagit River, Wa Avon Bypass Project**	This document provided the authority for the Corps Seattle District to expand the study to include the area from I-5 to Sedro-Woolley. "The Avon Bypass is a separable element in a 3-element flood control plan for the Skagit River below Sedro-Woolley." . . . Previous reclassification of this element to the "deferred category was based on local interests unwillingness to provide the required local cooperation." . . . "Therefore in the absence of any reasonable expectation of obtaining local cooperation in the near future, the rationale for reclassification of the bypass at this time is not apparent since conditions have not changed."
8/31/1977	**Corps ltr to SCBCC re Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvements Project**	Current authority for project does not include the Burlington-Sedro Woolley area. Corps wanted to use the 1936 authorization for the Avon Bypass. Bypass had been in "deferred category since March 1972." Corps told County to send a letter asking that the Avon Bypass project not be deauthorized.
9/27/1977	**Corps ltr to Seattle Times re inaccuracies in their 9/16/77 editorial title "Ray's Ill-Advised Dip in Skagit River Issue" in which the Times reported that the Skagit had experienced a "100 yr flood"**	The levees along the Skagit River passed the 10-year peak flow in December 1975 only because of the successful flood fighting efforts of citizens and local, state, and federal agencies.. flood damages in the Skagit River Basin were estimated at $3,247,000. Damages from a 100-year event would have been about $35,000,000," based on 1975 price levels. Utilizing the authorized flood control storage behind Baker Dam will raise the level of protection to between 5 and 21 years. Adding the authorized levee and channel improvements would raise the protection to between 11 and 100 years. Addition of the authorized Avon bypass project that passes 60,000 c.f.s. to Padilla Bay would raise the protection to between 55 and 100 years.
11/14/1977	**Seattle District MFR re 11/9/77 meetings with local Skagit Officials**	Corps officials came to Skagit County to give them draft letters for the BCC, cities and towns and Ports to send to Corps showing local cooperation.
11/29/1977	**Corps response ltr to Whatcom-Skagit-Island Contractors Association**	"We are in an early state of our studies and cannot determine how many contracts would be involved in comp1eting the project - construction would be initiated in fiscal year 1980 if continuity of funding is maintained." See also: 11/15/1977 **Ltr to Corps fm Whatcom Skagit Island County Contractors Association requesting jobs go to local companies for levee project**, 1/13/1979 **Corps ltr to County re use of local contractors**
12/1/1977	**Corps Seattle District ltr to Division Engineer (Portland) re Office of the Chief of Engineers ("OCE") Reclassification of Avon Bypass Project**	OCE rejected Seattle District request to reclassify the Avon Bypass from a "deferred" to "active" status. Seattle District did not "wish to rebut the OCE decision on Avon Bypass Project." . . . " We support the local assessment of need, and believe the lower Skagit valley is the most serious flood threat in western Washington." . . . We are proceeding with base surveys, hydraulic and hydrologic studies for the Mount Vernon to Sedro Woolley reach because this information will be needed for the authorized project, as well as any extension of the authorized work. Foundation and exploration work and detail layouts and estimates will be proceeding after the first of the year.
12/23/1977	**Corps MFR re Skagit River Levees**	Planning Division needed, " Estimate of the additional cost over the authorized project to improve levees from Mount Vernon to Sedro Woolley".
12/23/1977	**Transcription of telephonic**	Discussion was about how cost estimate of additional levees was to be

	conversation between Corps officials	calculated. ". . . "The authorization for flood protection on the Skagit River, Washington, contained in Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966, Public Law 89-789, 80 Stat. 1422, is hereby modified to include levee and channel improvements in the vicinity of Sedro Woolley authorized in Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1936, Public Law 738-74tt Congress, at an estimated additional Federal construction cost of $6,000,000." . . . "maybe we can simply take a million dollars a mile and go from there."
1/26/1978	**Corps MFR re value of land at Burlington**	Interesting computation of how Corps values property. Document shows us that when property is protected by a levee its value increases by 25%. With levee improvements Burlington was valued at $82,000,000.
2/1/1978	**Corps MFR re Formulation of Alternatives--Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvement Project**	This document walks you through the 1st and 2nd iterations of Corps thinking on proposed projects. "This project is one part of the comprehensive basin flood control plan. The other two parts are potential upstream storage and the authorized but deferred Avon Bypass (due to lack of local assurances). . . . Both the Avon Bypass and the upstream storage have serious problems and may never be built."
2/13/1978	**Corps "Fact Sheet" justifying an Amendment to Skagit Levee and Channel Improvement Authority**	The Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvement Project was authorized by Section 203, Public Law 89-789 dated 7 November 1966 "The Avon Bypass Project was authorized by Section 5, Public Law 74-738, dated 22 June 1936." It was designed to handle 60,000 cfs, ironically the same amount of cfs that Dike District 12 is currently sending downstream towards Mt. Vernon and Fir Island.
2/14/1978	**Corps MFR re Wild & Scenic Rivers Act Status**	"Further, Mr. Mead is proposing that a clause be written under the Values Section of Burton's bill that states that future riprapping be permitted to protect farmland along the upstream Skagit River reaches. The proposed Recreational classification does allow existing riprap to remain but precludes future placement. . . . Of the five structural alternatives to be presented at the public meeting for the Skagit Levee and Channel Improvement project, the two which contain upstream storage are incompatible with the subject proposed legislation as currently written."
2/21/1978	**Corps MFR re Meeting with Dike and Drainage District Commissioners re reactivation of the Skagit Flood Control Council**	Corps answered questions re: legislation which is currently proposed in Congress to extend the authority for the project upstream to Sedro-Woolley, using set back dikes, dredging the river channel, the basin flood control plan, funding source, local responsibilities, the actions the diking districts should take this summer to repair their dikes, and the status of the Avon Bypass project.
2/22/1978	**Corps Amended "Fact Sheet" justifying an Amendment to Skagit Levee and Channel Improvement Authority**	We expect that the estimated cost, given in the proposed legislation as $12 million, would be offset by an attendant incremental rise in benefits. Based upon updating of information from old reports, the benefit-to cost ratio of the levee extension is about 1.3 to 1. The detailed flood damage appraisal which is being performed as part of the Levee and Channel Improvement Project may increase the flood damage reduction benefits due to increased development in the area. In any event, each levee increment will be economically justified.
3/1978	**Corps Public Brochure re Skagit River Levee and Channel Projects**	See also **Public Meeting Transcript** and **3/23/78 SVH** for a meeting summary. Pg2...The 100-yr flood at SW is estimated at about 215,000 cfs. Pg3...The existing levees below Burlington vary in level of protection ... from 84,000 cfs to 130,000 cfs with a minimum 2 ft levee freeboard. Pg7...The two "PSE" dams on the Baker river provide flood control for the Baker River Basin which amounts to approximately

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		10% of the Skagit River drainage ... Skagit River flood damages in Dec 1975 totaled $3,247,000... Skagit County has considered a comprehensive flood control plan to guide future planning and has formed a county-wide flood control district to enable the county to sponsor flood control improvement projects. (See **1973 Comp Plan Alternatives for the Skagit**) which was clearly never enforced.
12/20/1978	**Partial Transcript of Corps Skagit Public Workshop**	Public workshop to receive public input on how **1979 Corps Levee Project** was evolving. (See **Public Hearing Transcript 1/10/1964** and compare to **Transcript of Public Hearing 6/17/1979**.) This transcript describes a project very similar if not the same as what the people of Skagit County voted down in 1979 and what the Corps is evidently considering in 2012.
2/9/1978	**Corps MFR re Formulation of Alternatives**	Early discussion of the hydrology, Sauk River Dam; flooding the Samish; Avon ByPass: and levees for the 1979 levee improvement project. Hard to see much difference from what is being considered today. See also: 5/9/2012 **Corps of Engineers GI Study Presentation**
4/17/1978	**Corp MFR re Field Trip Meeting with Local Officials**	Corps officials met with local officials. Discussed possible alignment for a floodwall at Mt. Vernon. "Corps would coordinate study with WSDOT for the SR20 freeway along the river.
4/12/1978	**Corps Colonel Poteat Speech to the Builders Association re Levee Project**	This document provides us with a great bit of history of the Corps of Engineers. "The corps of engineers was organized in 1775 as part of Washington's continental army. Some years later, in 1802, we were charged with operating a military academy At west point. For 64 years west point remained a corps' installation, and for a quarter of a century it was the only engineering school in the nation."
4/13/1978	**Corps MFR re coordination meeting on GDM on 3/30/1978**	The effects of the tide on the floods are being considered as part of their present study. . . . Skagit River is one of the few projects which we have been given a high priority on by the District Engineers. We will be burned unmercifully if we do not fulfill our obligations.
4/13/1978	**Corps Telephone or Verbal Conversation Record re t/c re Wild & Scenic Rivers Classification**	Nuclear Power Plant could have still been constructed under the proposed designation of the Skagit as Wild and Scenic.
4/19/1978	**Corps MFR re Meeting w/County Officials With Attached Agreement**	County primarily interested in the available survey data and mapping Corps.
4/21/1978	**Corps ltr to Skagit County Engineer re support shown at 3/22/1978 public mtg and needed assistance in coordinating the collection of data**	“Since we are gathering basic data, the questionnaire is only a guide. If a group knows about some past history, present conditions, or future plans that could affect our project or be affected by it, please have them provide it to us.”
4/27/1978	**Corps response to Swinomish Executive Director re his comments on the Swinomish Channel Maintenance Dredging DEIS**	Your letter of 9 April 1976 provided detailed comments on the Swinomish Channel Maintenance Dredging draft environmental statement. Your comments concerning the draft statement were not included in .the final environmental statement because we received them approximately 8 months after the deadline for public comment. Although we have discussed the comments with representatives of the Swinomish Tribal Community and various resource agency personnel, we delayed our formal response until we had examined all sources of information which were available.. . . .Response: The Goat Island dike, built in 1937, reduced the amount of Skagit River 'water reaching the fishtraps and oyster beds on the southern and southwestern shores of the reservation. Furthermore, the amount of Skagit River water flowing through the Swinomish Channel. was greatly reduced. "For the period 1890 to 1970, and especially since 1937, most of the sediment

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		from the North Fork of the Skagit has passed between Goal and lka Islands, fanned out, and come to rest on the cast bank of Saratoga Passage." "Average per trap catches of Coho salmon from both Indian and non-Indian fishtraps in Skagit Bay, while showing large annual fluctuations, began declining in the early 1930's, several years before the Goat Island jetty was constructed. Catches of Chinook salmon also declined in the early 1930's, increased in 1936, and then decreased again."
4/27/1978	**Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvement Project -- Interim Foundation and Materials ""F&M") Report**	The existing levees are predominantly fine sands and silty sands of loose-to-medium compaction. Foundation soils are very similar to the levee materials in most cases, and are composed of alluvial and estuarian marine sedimentary deposits consisting of fine sands, silts, and clays, with wood debris and shells. . . . River-bottom materials investigated consist mostly of sands and silts with seashells, wood debris, and logs, except near the mouth of North Fork. In this area, gravels and bedrock were encountered in the channel bottom between R.M. 3.9 to R.M. 4.2, so additional shallow wash borings were made to define the areal extent of gravels and rock. '. . . vicinity R.M. 12.5, where debris from a sanitary landfill was encountered. A/C NOTE: No analysis or mention of volcanic soils. What the analysis does show us is that the soils are the same in Sedro-Woolley as they are on Fir Island.
4/28/1978	**American Canoe Association ltr to Corps re Skagit River & Channel Improvement Project**	"We were pleased that alternative 3 received the greatest support from those attending the hearing. We would also support alternative 3. Our greatest concern is with alternatives 4 and 6 which include construction of upstream storage facilities on the Sauk River." A/C NOTE: Very opposed to Sauk River Dam project.
5/1978	**Hand written notes re Corps in house discussions re Levee Project**	"Anything we do, we don't want to aggravate flooding elsewhere."
5/15/1978	**Corps MFR re mtg with Skagit County Personnel**	"On 15 May 1978, Messrs Brooks, Erlandson, and Williams met with Mr. Ray Skrinde and Mr. Don Nelson of Skagit County to discuss the surveys we have completed and the methods Skagit County could use to locate property along our levee alignment." A/C NOTE: Ray Skrinde used to work for the Corps. No conflict of interest here.
5/26/1978	**Corps reply ltr to Edna Breazeal re Avon Bypass**	The Avon Bypass project, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, included a bypass channel to divert excess Skagit River floodflews from the main river near Burlington through a bypass channel to Padilla Bay and also an improvement and extension of the right bank levee from Burlington to Sedro Woolley. The Flood Control Act of 1966 added recreation as a project purpose. Preconstruction planning studies were started in Fiscal Year 1966 and stopped in Fiscal Year 1968 because of lack of a local sponsor.
8/22/1978	**MFR Re: Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvement Project - Meetings With Local Officials [About Flood Risk to Burlington & Sedro-Woolley]**	“Mr. Hansen said that, in the past, downtown Burlington had usually not been flooded. We discussed what would happen under existing conditions, and both agreed that the danger to Burlington comes from the existing dike being encircled by a flood which would then get into Gages Slough and flow through the city of Burlington and then toward Avon or Samish Bay.”
1979	**Non-Structural Alternatives**	Computation of what the annual cost/benefits would be for non-structural approach.
1/2/1979	**Skagit County BCC ltr to Corps Seattle District re Skagit River Lower Levee Project --**	As a result of the public meeting held December 20, 1978 in Mount Vernon regarding the Lower Levee Project, Skagit County does hereby request the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to perform a study of the

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Nookachamps Study Request	Nookachamps area in which backwater from the Skagit affects this area in flood stage as a result of the Lower Levee Project.
1/3/1979	**Corps Task Force Meeting Minutes**	One room was dedicated to just materials for the GDM. They had $700,000 for FY 1979.
1/5/1979	**Corps notes of mtg with Skagit County**	(4 Corps players and 3 Public Works Dept individuals) Corps was asked question could dredging be considered. Told "Not really in the cards." PW wanted to know what was the impact of widening the river. Told "Small". Survey of Nookachamps was done to 1 inch = 200' on 5' contours. Nookachamp study cost to the County was 0 (zero). PW had plan to consolidate Diking Districts into 1 District. Hamilton was to come in seperate study if requested by County.
1/11/1979	**Corps MFR re Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvements**	MFR describes 3 mtgs: Al Swif in his Everett office, a luncheon with the Elks Club, and the County Commissioners . Corps gave Congressman draft legislation for 79 Omnibus Bill on Skagit. Congressman told Elks Club mtg that they had to choose between levee improvements, Avon Bypass or Sauk Dam because only one stood a chance of making it through Congress.
1/11/1979	**Corps Frequency Curve for the Skagit River near Mt. Vernon using unsteady flow model.**	Unregulated curve was based upon 52 years of gage readings, Stewarts 1815, 1856, 1909, 1917 and 1921 estimates and bulletin 17A. Regulated curve based upon 120,000 acre feet at Ross and 74,000 at Upper Baker; observed regulation of dams after 1959 for discharges less than 100,000 cfs; regulation of dams discharge greater than 90,000 cfs at Concrete. All waters over 150,000 cfs flow toward the Samish.
1/13/1979	**Corps ltr to County re use of local contractors**	Corps tells county they will give full consideration to using local contractors. Corps wanted meeting with local contractors to discuss bidding process in the fall of 1979 as by that time more detail would be available. County wanted payback plan to be over 50 years. Corps provided draft legislation to county for congressional approval. See also: 11/15/1977 **Ltr to Corps fm Whatcom Skagit Island County Contractors Association requesting jobs go to local companies for levee project**, 11/29/1977 **Corps response ltr to Whatcom-Skagit-Island Contractors Association**
1/15/1979	**Corps Seattle District ltr to Division Engineer in Portland re City of Seattle's application for a new major license for Skagit River Project**	Seattle District states "Article 36 requires the licensee to provide 120,000 acre-feet of flood control storage between October 1 to March 15. By reference Article 36 included "Details of Regulation for Use of Storage Allocated for Flood Control in Ross Reservoir, Skagit River Washington revised May 25, 1967. Reference states that "In the event that the high dam is constructed at Ross (1725-foot pool) or any appreciable change in the economic development of the valley takes place which would necessitate a lower control flow at Concrete, a maximum of 180,000 acre feet of flood control storage may be required. Corps confirmed the need for 180,000 behind Ross Reservoir."
1/30/1979	**Corps MFR re Skagit River Levee Study, Nookachamps/Clear Lake Area**	"The project would have no affect (sic) on water levels of flood events equal to or less than that which occurred in December 1975. Should another flood equal in magnitude to the one in February 1951 recur with the proposed project, the Nookachamps/Clear Lake area may experience about 1/2-foot higher water levels. The proposed project is estimated to induce about 1-1/2-foot higher flood stages to the hypothetical 50-year and 100-year floods." See also: 12/1982 **Dames & Moore Report**, **Graphic Summary of Increases in 1990 Flood Levels Due to Levee System**, **Skagit**

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		Surveyors & Engineers 1995 Flood Elevations,
1/31/1979	**Skagit System Cooperative ltr to Corps re Levee Impacts on the Fishery Resource**	"The interest of the Skagit System Cooperative is to maintain natural production of salmonids in the Skagit basin at least at the present levels. In fact, some populations are gradually increasing."
2/2/1979	**Corps MFR re Field Reconnaissance of Nookachamps Area on Skagit River**	"The high-water elevations were estimated to be about 41.7 feet for 1951 high water and 39.8 feet for 1975. (Estimated water levels are: 42.5 feet for 100-year flood without project, 44 feet for 100-year flood with project at day 1, and 44.5 feet for 100-year flood at end of project life.)" . . . Mr. and Mrs. Don Austin told about having 3 inches of water in their house in 1951 and in 1921 water was up to the window sill (about 2 feet of water in the house). "
2/7/1979	**Corps ltr to Portland Office3 (Division Headquarters) RE a draft copy of the GDM**	Skagit County (along with other local governments and groups), is a strong supporter of the proposed project and has obtained solid support from both Senators Magnuson and Jackson along with Congressman Al Swift. A Skagit County Commissioner will be in Washington, D.C., during the week of 5 February talking to the Washington Congressional Delegation to gain support for construction funding in FY 1980. . . . 6. There has been no organized opposition to the project.
2/7/1979	**Seattle District MFR to Portland District RE: Status of Studies**	"Increased level of flood protection for MV to standard project flood (SPF) level and other urban areas to 100-year or more without threat of catastrophic flooding for floods up to SPF. ... Estimated total cost about $55,000,000. ... Just upstream of suburban area of Avon a reduced freeboard area will be provided that would permit overtopping prior to other urban levees being overtopped ... By raising the levee height 0.4 foot around Mount Vernon, standard project flood protection has been provided." There will be 2 feet of clearance under the BNRR bridge during the 100-year event after allowances for bridge swellhead and debris blockage are included.
3/9/1979	**Corps Seattle District Ltr to North Pacific Division re Additional Funding**	The $113,000 was used to complete preliminary review of all alternatives within the area affected by the project. The $267,000 is being used to template the expanded scope of general design memorandum (GDM) studies in the project area due to increased levels of flood protection. During the time from mid-December 1978 to early February 1979, much of the technical work on the GDM was being completed. A public meeting on the final alternatives was held 20 December 1978 which resulted in a selected plan. ; the local sponsor called a special meeting on 8 January 1979 which resulted in requests for supplemental studies for the Nookachamps area and areas riverward of the proposed levees at West Mount Vernon and Sterling. . . . Additional authority will be needed to construct the selected plan of improvement.
3/10/1979	**Corps new language for draft GDM**	Elimination of Channel Improvements: The authorized project recommended channel improvements (excavation and widening) to increase the hydraulic capacity of the Skagit River below MV. . . . Total proposed excavation was $1,466,600 cu yds over a total length of 2.5 miles. . . . The channelization features of the authorized project met with opposition from resource agencies and members of the public. . . . Major environmental impacts. . . to fisheries due to the loss of shallow vegetated shore zone habitat, critical rearing area for juvenile anadromous fish during their out migration; impacts to water quality. . . alteration of sediment deposition patterns as a result of channelization. . . . any significant impacts to fisheries as a result of the propose channel improvements. Loss of fish could impact upriver Bald Eagles. Channel improvements also would have unacceptable impacts

		on set net fishing areas used by the Swinomish Indian Tribe below the North Fork.
3/12/1979	**Ltr to Town of Hamilton fm Corps study manager re impacts of proposed project on Hamilton.**	"The backwater effects from the Skagit levee project on Skagit River floodflows diminish rapidly upstream from the project and zero out at approximately river mile 26.0 which is just upstream of Sedro Woolley. The town of Hamilton is at approximately river mile 40.0 so the town would be approximately 14.0 miles upstream from the end of env project effects."
3/23/1979	**Portland Headquarters comments on Seattle District draft GDM**	The Standard Project Flood (SPF) discharge at Sedro Woolley is 397,000 second-feet. The final GDM should address the economic feasibility of providing SPF protection for urban areas. . . . The GDM and EIS presently recommend a plan that OCE has ruled is beyond the discretionary authority of the Chief of Engineers. Although authorization of this plan may be provided by Congress in the near future, OCE indicates that they would process the report in a normal manner in the event that this does not occur. Accordingly, the u:-1 and EIS must he revised to support) ,A staged construction that can be started in FY 1980 and result in a completed project also protecting Burlington. OCE feels that the 1-5 bridge is the approximate upstream limit to OCE's authority to approve changes in scope. . . . 3. We also recognize-that we must consider the problem of induced flooding when a levee is constructed on one bank. For this reason, the district may choose to .recommend maintaining equal levels of protection on adjacent banks without an economic analysis as described above. Such a recommendation must be supported in the final GDM as to why this economic analysis of subareas is not appropriate.
3/28/1979	**Corps draft page for GDM re Diking District's**	“Chart shows us the Corps estimate of what the levees could withstand in 1979. Dike District 12 was 142,000 cfs, Dike 17 was 135,000 cfs. In 1990 and 1995 the Skagit River experienced 152,000 cfs and 141,000 cfs respectively between the two Dike Districts.” See also: **Historic Flood Flows of the Skagit River**
4/11/1979	**Corps Transmittal Slip re BCC concern over ltr fm SCD and project manager stopping by before pig roast.**	"They do not want the Samish to be a relief valve for the whole Skagit system and do not want a weir." See also: 4/4/1979 **Ltr fm Skagit Conservation District to County Commissioners re Alternative 3E of Corps Project**
4/13/1979	**NPD Portland MFR referencing 3/13/1979 Portland Headquarters comments on Seattle District draft GDM and mtg with General Wells re discussion on Draft GDM.**	“Discussion included a control structure at Avon Bend to discharge flows exceeding the 100-year event; requiring flowage easements downstream of Avon; independent plans for Stanwood; and adding recreation as a project purpose.” See also: 3/23/1979 **Portland Headquarters comments on Seattle District draft GDM**
4/20/1979	**Ltr fm Portland District to Seattle District re Skagit River Levee and Channel Improvements**	Project was not authorized to include Burlington but because downstream work would have "significant induced damages" on Burlington, the city was included.
4/30/1979	**Ltr fm Seattle District to Portland District re copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)**	100 yr protection to Urban areas, 50 year for rural. Total estimated cost $50,270,000. $40,720,000 federal cost, rest local. Benefit-cost ratio was 1.4 to 1.
5/2/1979	**NPD MFR re induced damages and requirement of local governments to purchase flowage easements**	"Compensatory measures may consist either of engineering remedies or of payment for damages caused." . . ."there is a Federal interest in identifying 'expected detrimental effects of project implementation. In addition a plan to mitigate these effects should be formulated. In

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		formulating a plan, consideration should be given to structural solutions when practicable and economical, as well as, easements and/or requiring the local interests to hold and save."
5/8/1979	**Seattle District Floodplain Management Section comments on DEIS**	Determined that "50-year protection will increase the pressures for development."
5/8/1979	**Nookachamps/Clear Lake, Sterling, Lower Sedro Woolley and West Mt. Vernon Structural and Non-Structural Alternative Studies**	Report references **Corps MFR re Field Reconnaissance of Nookachamps Area on Skagit River** Levees were looked at for both Sterling and Nookachamps. Rejected in part to additional cost of raising downstream levees for loss of the "reservoir space".
5/9/1979	**Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission comment ltr on Corps DEIS**	Project would have no impacts on property owned by Commission.
5/11/1979	**Telephone or Verbal Conversation Record from FEMA to Corps**	FEMA was going to blast the DEIS due to the fact that it violated Section 3(a) of EO 11988 by raising water on unprotected lands i.e. Nookachamps.
5/14/1979	**Corps ltr to Barbara McNair re her questions concerning market value of real estate on impacted properties from project**	Corps response was typical bureaucratic non-speak. "The final plan to be recommended by the District Engineer at completion of current studies has not been determined. Suggestions, comments, and recommendations which are brought to our attention through workshop meetings, letters; and even the final public meeting to be held on 19 June at Mount Vernon, will all contribute to development of what will become the recommended plan".
5/14/1979	**Corps ltr to Barbara Austin re her questions about water levels, with attachment**	Answer to question #2 shows 50 yr. flood at 37.2 at Mt. Vernon. In 1990 and 1995 the Mt. Vernon gauge was at 37.3. 100 yr flood at 37.7. Answer to question #5 states 1975 flood was 41.6 feet on SW gauge. In 1995 the river level was at a minimum 41.9 feet. Levee btwn SW & Burlington would raise flood levels 4 feet in Sterling & Nookachamps.
5/17/1979	**Corps handwritten notes concerning discussion of mitigating measures in unleveed areas**	Would raise homes 1 ft. above new 100 yr fld level. Proposed same for Nookachamps. Levee in Clear Lake would destroy 3 homes.
5/17/1979	**Corps handwritten notes concerning meeting with Skagit County**	County wanted District Line Road raised in "swale" (i.e. Gages Slough). Elevation 44 feet. County wanted to drop recreation at 3 sites.
5/23/1979	**US Dept. of Agriculture comment letter to Corps re DEIS**	"The economic wellbeing of the agricultural community is very dependent on drainage improvements." "Considerable seepage now occurs through several reaches of dike during high river flows." "The magnitude of a weir that will spill 60,000 cubic feet per second during a 100-year flood event should be more adequately addressed...". . .Farmers should have the opportunity to install subsurface drainage system's in proposed ponding areas before dikes are constructed north and west of Burlington."5/23
5/23/1979	**WSDOT Ltr to Corps re DEIS**	"The selected route for SR 20 has not been determined yet."
6/1979	**Several Public Comments on June 1979 Levee Improvements**	The issues presented in this document will be the same issues that have to be dealt with in 2013. The comments from the Nookachamps Attorney and the BNRR are most interesting.
6/1979	**Skagit River Levee Improvement Public Brochure**	52 pages of critical historical documentation on the Skagit River Flood Risk dating to 1979. Also includes multiple public comment letters.
6/3/1979	**Corps MFR re mtg w/Skagit County BCC and residents of the Sterling**	"...erosion control sills were necessary to avoid a possible channel change from the Skagit Channel into the Samish Basin during a very

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	and Samish River Areas	large flood."
6/11/1979	**Corps Addendum to DEIS dated May 1979**	Proving that the Corps can move with precision and speed the addendum to the DEIS was published within 30 days of the DEIS. It will be very interesting to compare this document with what the Corps comes up with the current study because under today's regulations the project within this document would not be allowed.
6/15/1979	**Ltr fm NW Regional Council to Corps**	Endorsed improved levees fm Sedro Woolley to mouth of Skagit. 50-yr rural south of MV; 100 yr for Urban areas.
6/18/1979	**Ltr to Corps fm MV Chamber of Commerce.**	"...the majority wished for Board to go on record as being in support of the Skagit River Levee Project"
6/19/1979	**Corps District Engineer Remarks and Project Study Manager description of measures evaluated and reasons for being dropped from consideration**	This is a wonderful document that shows us exactly what was considered in 1979. See also **Transcript of Public Hearing** where these comments were made. Most importantly compare what is currently being "studied" by the Corps (5/9/2012 **Corps of Engineers GI Study Presentation**) to what was "studied in 1979 and rejected. If it was rejected in 1979 BY THE CORPS, why are we "studying" the same proposals again?
6/19/1979	**County Commissioner Chairman Bud Norris speech to the Corps at public meeting**	"...there is no perfect solution..." See Also: 6/19/1979 **Transcript of Public Hearing**
6/19/1979	**Skagit Regional Planning Council testimony to Corps**	The Swinomish Tribal Community was a member of the SRPC. "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." The chairman was the Mayor of Sedro Woolley.
6/20/1979	**Skagit County Public Works ltr to Corps re proposed levee project**	County was concerned about "considerable numbers of property owners" who voiced concern over road construction. No mention of "considerable numbers" who were impacted by higher water levels.
6/25/1979	**Corps handwritten notes from mtg w/Samish farmers**	43 people in attendance. Favored doing nothing vs Corps project. Question about how funds would be raised persisted back then as they do today in 2012.
6/27/1979	**Skagit Soil Conservation District comment letter to Corps on DEIS**	"Drainage of our agricultural land is very important in Skagit County. . . . Many of these systems were installed with Federal assistance, both financially and technically and represent a sizeable investment to the farmers. . . . We cannot afford to loose anymore farmland than is absolutely necessary. . . . We now feel we could support an alternative that will give Skagit County better flood protection but people and property must not be left with a worse flood situation than prior to the project."
6/27/1979	**Washington State Dept of Fisheries DEIS comment letter to Corps**	"The Skagit River is the single largest producer of salmon in the Puget Sound region and the Department is vitally interested in maintaining the present level of salmon production. . . . While sewage outfall, agricultural practices and siltation can affect fish production, they are not major factors within the project area."
6/28/1979	**Attorney letter to Corps re impacts to Nookachamps residents**	" . . . 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. "
6/29/1979	**BNRR letter to Corps re 1979 levee project**	"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

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		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 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." See also: 4/10/1978 **Ltr to Corps fm BNRR re why they were opposed to flood project**
7/1979	**Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Corps 1979 Project**	This is the final Environmental Impact Statement for **the Corps 1979 project.**
7/6/1979	**Department of Ecology DEIS letter to Corps**	"The Dept. of Transportation has expressed a desire to work with your office on the feasibility of incorporating SR 20 into the levee system."
7/9/1979	**Corps letter to US Fish & Wildlife re changes to levee project**	"The intent of the proposed levee project is to protect existing development, not to promote the undesirable development of agricultural land, and no project benefits have been claimed for any higher or more intensive use of any of the protected areas."
7/18/1979	**Corps letter to Nookachamps attorney in response to meeting in Seattle**	Construction of a highway on continuous fill along the river between Burlington and Sedro Woolley could increase water surface levels in the Nookachamps area by 4 to 5 feet in a 100-year flood. See also: 6/28/1979 **Attorney letter to Corps re impacts to Nookachamps residents**
7/24/1979	**Corps ltr to DOE**	"...require the State of Washington to contribute an estimated $2,750,000 in cash toward project construction. ... The combined non-Federal share would be 25 percent of project first costs."
7/25/1979	**Corps ltr to BNRR**	We plan to investigate the feasibility of opening the waterway under the north bridge approach to lower the water surface for large events under the bridge and in the area upstream of the bridge.
8/9/1979	**Corps Statement of Findings re 1979 FEIS**	The remaining 9,500 acres is undeveloped land which will incidentally be provided highlevel protection as a result of measures taken to reduce existing flood damages in the urban areas of Mount Vernon, Burlington, and Clear lake. The provision of 100-year or more protection to undeveloped areas could result in significant secondary impacts from increased pressure to develop in the protected flood plain. The extent of impact will depend upon the degree that existing local land use regulations are enforced.
11/26/1979	**Corps MFR re electon results**	Citizens of Skagit County, on 6 November 1979, voted 28.1 percent for and 71.9 percent against providing County Commissioners authority to obtain required local funding to construct the Skagit River, Washington, flood damage reduction project. District effort will be deferred on the project. Work in the various elements was examined to determine requirements for funds and time to complete activities. Funds requested by the various elements will be used to wind down the project and leave it in good condition to perhaps be continued sometime in the future.
3/15/1993	**Ltr fm Corps to Larry Kunzler with attachments**	Attachments show 10yr to 100 yr. flows at Sedro Woolley and Mt. Vernon as of 8/21/1978, and report on first flood of 1990. "In addition to the above amounts, Ross Dam reported a 24-hour rainfall amount of 9 inches which is nearly a 100-year rainfall event."
7/24/2001	**Flood Damage Reduction Project [GI Study] Schedule**	EIS completion projected by mid-2003, public vote planned for November 2003, construction was planned to start in 2006.

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

9/6/2002	**Memorandum thru Deputy Commander, Seattle District for Commander, Seattle District re: IR Audit Report NWS-IR 2002-09**	There have been many of us that have wondered for almost a decade now why our Federal partners started giving Skagit County the cold shoulder around the same time that the County hired Pacific International Engineers. (See **DC Trip Experience** and at the urging of a former Mt. Vernon Mayor see also **Concerns about Pacific International Engineering (PIE).)** It is now my firm personal belief that based on this document, that should have been relayed to Skagit County a decade ago, (either by the Corps or by PIE),why we received no cooperation and in some instances outright hostility from Federal agencies. You be the judge.
6/18/2010	**Shannon & Wilson: Skagit River Levee General Investigation Geotechnical and Hydrogeologic Data and Liquefaction Evaluation Report Skagit County, Washington**	"The borings drilled on the levees encountered 9 to 17 feet of fill soil with variable properties. Most of the levee fill encountered in our borings consists of very loose to medium dense, silty, fine sand to fine sandy silt that is similar in composition to the native underlying overbank and channel deposits. The fill material is generally massive with scattered clayey pockets and a trace of organics. Based on the similarity in grain size distribution between the fill and underlying native undisturbed soils, we believe that most of the levee fill soil was locally derived."
11/2010	**DRAFT Skagit River Flood Risk Reduction Study, Environmental Without-Project Condition Report**	"Two volcanoes, Mt. Baker and Glacier Peak, are located in the upper watershed. Previous eruptions of Glacier Peak have generated lahars that traveled through the Skagit River to Puget Sound. Mt. Baker eruptions have deposited pyroclastic and lahar material in the Baker River watershed, but have not deposited substantial volumes material in the Skagit River floodplain (Gardner et al. 1995). Future large eruptions could form thick fills of lahars and pyroclastic-flow deposits in the upper valleys near the volcano. Lahars from Glacier Peak could reach the delta, or there could be induced flooding due to temporary damming of watercourses in the upper watershed. Subsequent incision of volcanic deposits could fill riverbeds farther downstream with sediment for many years after the eruption, thereby affecting the capacity of stream channels and locally increasing flood heights (Waitt et al. 1995). These effects would be especially significant for the extensive low-lying areas of the Skagit river floodplain and delta. Although not a direct volcanic hazard, the increased susceptibility of lowland areas downstream of volcanoes to earthquake generated liquefaction is enhanced by the thick deposits of volcanic lahars, sand, gravel and generally saturated conditions in many of those areas." ... "Today, the majority of the riparian zones below Sedro-Woolley are either entirely devoid of trees or consist of sparse, narrow, and patchy strips of small to medium sized cottonwood, willow, and alder. Approximately 48 miles of levee participate in the PL 84-99 program and are therefore subject to the Corps levee vegetation maintenance requirements. The riparian vegetation that is downstream of Sedro-Woolley is located on these levees. This required vegetation removal results in the majority of the banks being covered with grasses and invasive species (i.e. blackberry, knotweed, and reed canary grass). Upstream of the delta, 32 miles (62 percent) of the mainstem channel edge was hardened with riprap within about 200 feet of the channel's edge."
7/24/2001	**Flood Damage Reduction Project [GI Study] Schedule**	EIS completion projected by mid-2003, public vote planned for November 2003, construction was planned to start in 2006.
1/31/2011	**Shannon & Wilson: General**	"Our scope of services was to identify subsurface geotechnical,

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Investigation Report Skagit River Basin Levees Skagit County, Washington	geologic, and hydrogeologic conditions for the existing levee and underlying foundation soil along the Skagit River. This information would be used as a first step in procuring subsurface information for levee failure analyses and in identifying opportunities for the development of a flood reduction project. Our research was limited to the information collected by the USACE Seattle District from Skagit County, the City of Burlington, and other USACE projects. ... "Early settlers in the area individually constructed dikes to protect their holdings. During the late 1890's Dike Districts were formed and by 1963, levees had been constructed from the cities of Burlington and Mount Vernon to Skagit Bay. In general, the existing levee material consists of very loose to medium dense, clean to silty, fine to medium sand and slightly sandy to sandy silt. Occasional to numerous organics were locally identified. Coarser grained material consisting of silty sandy gravel, rock spalls, and cobbles were used at select locations for levee repairs. ... "Except for the recent work along 4.6 miles of levee adjacent to the city of Burlington, the available foundation and levee composition information along the Skagit River is not adequate to prioritize where levee improvements are most needed. The subsurface information collected by the USACE provides background information that will assist in the development of an exploration program for levee characterization, but it is our opinion that the provided information is outdated and could prove misleading. Flooding and repair along the levees since the explorations likely have resulted in changed ground conditions by loosening the soil, altering the levee geometries, and changing the levee composition. Additionally, no comprehensive assessment of the levee and its protective measures was available for review. Updated information such as the current levee geometry, levee and foundation composition and consistency, erosion protection, and seepage control measures are necessary to perform geotechnical and hydrogeologic seepage and stability assessment of the levee system."
1/31/2011	**Shannon & Wilson: Skagit River Levee General Investigation (GI) Levee Risk and Reliability Analysis Skagit County, Washington**	A highly technical analysis of the risk of levee failure along the Skagit River.
8/31/2011	**List of Potential Measures**	List of all 38 potential measures - with potential additional variations - under consideration by the US Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District for the Skagit River.
9/1/2011	**Skagit River GI Path Forward Alternatives Formulation Strategy**	"The purpose of the Skagit River GI Path Forward Alternatives Formulation Strategy is for the PDT to establish an alternatives formulation process that efficiently utilizes time and resources."
9/1/2011	**Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Skagit River Basin Narrative September 2011**	"The purpose of the Skagit River Basin Narrative (narrative) is to provide a watershed description of the Skagit River Basin (Basin) and to provide a general narrative of flooding in the Basin during flood events per HQUSACE comments to the 2009 Skagit River GI Feasibility Scoping Meeting Read-Ahead. The narrative was developed from a narrative produced by Skagit County."
9/1/2011	**Revised Text to Section 5.3 Without Project Conditions Economics of the 2009 FSM Read-Ahead Report**	"An economic analysis was conducted to estimate the expected future without-project flood inundation damages for the study area. The analysis is based upon geotechnical assumptions regarding levee performance and associated hydraulic modeling results."
11/23/2011	**Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation**	"The subject document has undergone review by Headquarters USACE (enclosure). Based on the District's work since the June 2011 reset

	Study, NWS 2011 Response to HQUSACE Comments to 2009 Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) Read Ahead Packet	meeting and the findings of the Headquarters review team, I recommend that the District schedule a FSM."

Puget Sound Energy/Puget Power Documents

1/11/2011	**Tetra Tech Imminent Flood Analysis Article 107 (c) Presentation to the Jan. 11, 2011 meeting of the PSE Aquatic Resources Group Meetng**	55-slide presentation on how preemptive drawdowns of the Baker River reservoirs would impact flooding. This document was submitted to **the 2011 Skagit River GI Scoping Efforts** by the City of Burlington.
5/10/2011	**Draft Meeting Minutes Baker River Project Implementation Aquatic Resources Group Article 107(c) Workshop**	"Settlement Agreement 4.1.1 created the requirement for PSE to use reasonable best efforts to draw down the reservoirs to target elevations ahead of an imminent flood event. Article 107(c) calls for PSE to consult with ARG members, the USACE and Skagit County to develop means and operational methods to operate the reservoirs in a way that is consistent with the license. This workshop provides an opportunity to gather input from the various stakeholders. ... When a water event is approaching, the National Weather Service generally issues a warning several days in advance. 107(c) is focused on actions during this time period. At a point when a flood is declared, the Corps assumes control of the project with PSE's cooperation. ... "**What triggers an imminent flood draw-down?** Mark responded that each event is evaluated on a case-by-case basis, depending on weather conditions, forecasts, time of year and reservoir levels, etc. Chal concurred and referenced the "double pumper" event in Oct. 2003 as an example of successful drawdown ahead of a flood." This document was submitted to **the 2011 Skagit River GI Scoping Efforts** by the City of Burlington.

Skagit County Documents

2/7/1961	**Ltr to Corps fm Skagit Soil Conservation District with attached report of land damage caused by the 1951 flood**	This is perhaps the best description of the 1951 flood that we have reviewed to date. Important to remember is that in 1951 there was no Upper Baker Dam and the levees were nowhere near as large as they are now. Dike 12 levees were in some locations 4,000 ft. from the river and not over 6 feet tall. The report stated Ross Dam provided only 35,000 acre feet of storage.
9/1/1970	**County Commissioner Public Hearing Transcript RE: Formation of Flood Control Zone**	"We can't do anything. Our hands are completely off of it. If we form a flood control zone district it gives us some power to start doing something with our own problem locally. Up to now it has always been the Corps of Engineers or somebody distant from us who has wasted our taxpayers money doing all these studies. We are trying to correct this. If we don't make some chances we will be powerless to do anything about this."
1973	**1973 Comprehensive Plan**	Shows the three historical paths of the Skagit River.

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Soils Map	
7/14/1977	**Ltr to Corps Seattle District fm Port of Skagit County re potential deauthorization of the Avon Bypass. Also has attached Port resolution concerning the Wild and Scenic River designation.**	The Port Commissioners do concur that the Avon Bypass project should be dropped. The proposal to cut through the valuable farm lands of the Skagit Delta is very hard to support. We wish to specifically point out to you, however, that the proposed upgrading of levees on the Skagit River from I-5 at Mount Vernon to Skagit Bay and your suggested release of flood control storage on the upper Baker Dam leave a great deal to be desired. Frankly, the purpose is far inadequate. Port did not want the River west of the Town of Concrete to be considered in the Wild and Scenic River Designation and wanted maintenance dredging and siltation ponds constructed along with 75 year protection levees..
7/25/1977	**SCBCC response to 7/11/1977 ltr from Corps**	"... Skagit County's county-wide flood control zone will be an asset should any large projects, such as the Lower Levee Project or the Avon Bypass Project, be undertaken..." . . . "All of the Diking Districts and the County Engineering Department feel that we should keep working against the deauthorization of the Avon Bypass.
11/15/1977	**Ltr to Corps fm Whatcom Skagit Island County Contractors Association requesting jobs go to local companies for levee project**	"As you probably know, there are several qualified contractors within the local area who could perform the flood control work. However, several of our members cannot tackle extremely large projects due to their bonding capacity. The purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not you would consider breaking the project up into smaller units such that it could be let out in $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 parcels that would be within the capabilities of local contractors." See also: 11/29/1977 **Corps response ltr to Whatcom-Skagit-Island Contractors Association** , 1/13/1979 **Corps ltr to County re use of local contractors**
2/8/1978	**Skagit County Flood Control Council Minutes**	Reactivation of the Council. Corps stated "considerable right-of-way will be required to construct the Lower Levee Project." The project would have allowed the Skagit to carry a 120,000 cfs flood from I-5 to the mouth of the river at a cost of $15,000,000 for construction only.
3/14/1978	**Skagit County ltr to Corps of Engineers**	Ltr assured the Corps that Skagit County would meet its obligations under the Local Cooperation Agreement.
3/22/1978	**County Engineer ltr to Corps re Lower Levee Project**	"Following six years of study, the Lower Levee Project was approved by Congress in 1966. Today 12 years later we are beginning to see the reality of that study and are looking forward to construction about 1980."
3/22/1978	**County Commissioners Statement at 3/22 public hearing.**	"We know that a major flood such as has occurred would today be catastrophic, causing extensive damage to property and endangering the lives of our citizens in the flood plain. Flood protection is urgently needed to protect the Skagit Valley and the urban areas containing cities and towns in Skagit County. The development in the urban areas of Skagit County, together with the sophisticated farming development in Skagit County are in no way compatible with flooding of the area." Yet even with that knowledge the BCC never objected to all the urban/commercial/residential development that took place after that hearing.
3/22/1978	**Skagit Regional Planning Council Testimony at Corps Public Hearing**	We know that a major flood such as has occurred would today be catastrophic, causing extensive damage to property and endangering the lives of our citizens in the flood plain. Flood protection is urgently needed to protect the Skagit Valley and the urban areas containing cities and towns in Skagit County. This is the exact verbiage submitted by the BCC.
5/31/1978	**Skagit County Memo to**	"New residence construction and substantial improvement of any

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Real Estate Salespersons, Developers, Builder's and other people interested in land use regulations in Skagit County re Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	residential structure shall have the lowest habitable floor elevated to or above 100 year floodplain elevation. "
1/22/1979	**Skagit County ltr to Corps with attached "Skagit River Flood Warning Schedule".**	Schedule contained 11 elements. #3 PW will start recording river gauge readings at the Riverside and Concrete gauge each 1/2 hour. #5 PW will alert all Dike Commissioners of pending flood condition. #8 The Skagit County Engineers Dept. has a special telephone number with a recorded message relating to Flood information. This message will be updated each hour. (Telephone No. 336-9488).
3/8/1979	**Skagit County Cooperative Extension Memo re Outline for Critical Evaluation of Corps Project**	D. Effect on EQUITY - Who benefits from the project alternative, and who bears its costs? (Project alternatives involve the shifting of risk and exposure from one group to another, such as, exposure to a rise in 100 year water surface elevation.) E. FEASIBILITY - Is the project alternative politically feasible? - Are the equity impacts of the project considered fair? - Is accomplishment of the project goals considered worth the local share of implementation and annual management costs?
5/1992 NEW!	**Neal Hamburg May 1992 Testimony Before Joint Select Committee on Flood Damage Reduction**	A great oral history of dike districts' means of operating/modus operandi. “The reason we're not elevating is an old (intelligible) problem by the bend there. We don't have the understructure underneath the dikes to hold more than a 25 year flood, not in our area. We have boil ups that will raise anywhere from 10 feet from the dike to 150 to 200 yards inside. So we're about the level that we are going to be.” ... “If either of you were going to spend 5 million dollars to raise the dike level to 100 years level, I am sure that he would be at my door or calling me quite rapidly because his tax statement would reflect that and he would well know that it was going to be ineffective and he would be followed by probably another 150 people very promptly. So there are regulatory things that aren't written but they're there.”

Skagit County Flood Control Council Document

3/22/1978	**Skagit County Flood Control Council ltr to the Corps re Levee Project**	"The Skagit County Flood Control Council is of the opinion that the Skagit Valley is vulnerable to severe flooding from the Skagit River and that the existing flood protection is inadequate. The Council feels that a flooding of disastrous proportion is eminent, that flooding of this nature will place an economic burden of grave consequence on all of Skagit County."

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

Swinomish Tribal Document

4/3/1978	**Swinomish Tribal Community Public Notice re fill in the Swinomish Channel**	Preliminary determinations indicate that the proposed activity will not affect endangered species, or their critical habitat, designated as endangered or threatened pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 844). . . . Presently unknown archeological, scientific, prehistorical or historical data may be lost or destroyed by work to be accomplished under the requested permit. . . .The decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact of the proposed activity on the public interest.

US Fish & Wildlife Service Document

1/24/1979	**United States Fish and Wildlife Service ltr to Corps re Section 7 consultation as require by Endangered Species Act of 1973**	Addressed flood control levee project impacts on eagles only. "Very few, if any salmon spawn in the Skagit River below Rockport within the project boundaries."
10/10/2000	**Letter to District Engineer, Corps of Engineers Seattle District - Re: Planning Aid Letter; Skagit River Flood Feasibility Study**	"Levees have channelized the river and isolated the flood plain, nearly eliminating flood plain storage of water, sediments, and nutrients. The loss of flood plain function has exacerbated flood problems and disrupted ecological functioning. By precluding lateral movement of flood waters, levees reduce groundwater recharge, important for retaining a natural range of variability of flows to which salmon have adapted. Routing of nutrients is also disrupted. "Of all the structural measures discussed as part of the Skagit River Flood Feasibility Study, we believe that setback levees hold the most promise for restoring natural processes in the Skagit. Setback levees would increase the river 5 connectivity with its flood plain and would allow more room for water storage and conveyance in high flow events. Loss of flood plain storage has worsened flooding and habitat for fish, so it makes sense to reverse that process by pulling back the levees." This document was submitted to **the 2011 Skagit River GI Scoping Efforts** by the City of Burlington.

USGS Documents

10/6/2011	**Shallow Stratigraphy of the Skagit River Delta, Washington, Derived from Sediment Cores**	"The transformation from a mud-rich tidal flat to an energetic, sandy tidal flat across the 75 km^2 area of the modern Skagit Delta tidal flats represents a significant change in environment. A natural coarsening of the delta is expected as it grows seaward over itself. The sharp changes in lithofacies, observed as distinct contacts between the underlying laminated mud, mud, and siltysand facies and the overlying cross-bedded and massive-sand facies across the tidal flats and delta front, suggest that this transformation was abrupt and likely correlated to changes in sedimentation expected from emplacement of the Skagit Bay jetty in 1940 and the extensive dike complex along the Skagit River beginning in the late 1800s. Similarly, the abrupt transition from a silty, sandy tidal flat to a mud-dominated tidal flat across Martha's Bay also can be best

		explained by the emplacement of the Skagit Bay jetty."

Washington State Department of Ecology Documents

9/7/1994	**Ltr fm the Dept. of Ecology to Skagit County re FCAAP spending and CFHMP**	"I also want to assure you that a revised comprehensive flood hazard reduction plan for the Skagit River remains one of our top priorities for FCAAP." It's now the middle of July 2012, 18 years after this letter was written and Skagit County still does not have a revised comprehensive flood hazard reduction plan. If this was one of the "top priorities for FCAAP" I wonder what else has fallen thru the cracks.
10/22/2001	**Governor Gary Locke Endorsement of the GI Study**	"Of course, any flood bypass proposal must address decisions concerning future land use of the existing floodplain, as well as design features critical for fish habitat. In addition, it must consider transportation corridors and impacts upon stream flow, existing water rights, and the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve. An Environmental Impact Statement that satisfactorily addresses these concerns could be the critical next step in this project, and we stand ready to assist you in its preparation."
1/3/2002	**Department of Ecology Letter RE: Skagit River GI Study/Skagit Feasibility Study/EIS & Avon Bypass Impacts on Padilla Bay**	"An EIS for the Skagit Feasibility Study that fails to evaluate the effects of diverting floodwater into Padilla Bay will be flawed and potentially undermine successful funding and permitting of the project. ... The Department of Ecology has committed over $1 million to Skagit County in support of the Skagit Feasibility Study. It is essential for the project to have an EIS that fairly and objectively analyses potential project impacts. Competition for public funds, permitting issues and public trust in the project hinge on a viable EIS."
12/30/2011	**Letter to County Commissioners, Re: Skagit River Basin Instream Flow Rule**	"Thank you for your follow-up letter of December 7, 2011, regarding the Skagit Instream Flow Rule. I am pleased to hear that we have a mutual commitment to finding solutions to the water supply problems in the Nookachamps and Fisher/Carpenter Sub-basins of the Skagit Watershed. As you point out in your letter, we also recognize the difficulties presented by the ongoing lawsuit brought by the Swinomish Tribe." **See also:** 11/15/2011 **Letter to Governor Gregoire, Re: Skagit Instream Flow Rule,** 11/28/2011 **County Commissioners Letter to Governor Gregoire, Re: Water Rights in the Skagit River Basin**, 12/7/2011 **Letter to State Department of Ecology Director, Re: Director Letter of Dec. 6, 2011**

Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife Document

1/28/1992	**DOF ltr to Senator Anderson**	This policy has a goal of no net loss of productive capacity of fish habitat. . . . As noted in Mr. Haring's testimony, proposals for vegetation removal from gravel bars are reviewed on a site-specific basis to determine the impacts to fish life. WDF also considers increased flood risk if the vegetation is to be left in place, although our expertise is in evaluation of impacts to fish life.

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

Guest Document

1954	**An Investigation of the Effect of Baker Dam on Downstream-Migrant Salmon - Full Report**	The conclusions reached in this report show that "95% of the migrants leaving the reservoir used the surface spillway as their exit route and that less than 5% left through the turbine intake." Further the report concludes that In considering the rates of return of marked sockeye "it is quite evident that the spillway fish suffered a higher mortality than the tunnel fish and that both suffered a higher mortality than the river releases" and "64% of the native Sockeye and 54% of the native Coho were killed in passing down the spillway."

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

DOCUMENTS CREATED IN 2012 POSTED IN 2012

LJK Documents

1/1/2012	**Documents Posted in 2011 on SkagitRiverHistory.com**	"During 2011 we published 165 historical documents and 125 documents dated in 2011 for a total of 290 documents." Document lists each posting by jurisdiction of creation divided by pre-2011 & 2011.
5/20/2012	**LJK Response to Skagit GI Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**	8 page response to the 4/16/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives** & video of the 5/9/2012 **Corps of Engineers GI Study Presentation.**
10/7/2012	**Skagit River Corps of Engineers GI Study Deadlines**	A compilation of deadlines in the GI Study process dating from 2001, 2007, 2009 and 2012.
12/31/2012	**Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Comments Received (April 2012-June 2012 Outreach) With LJK Comments**	A response to the 323 comments submitted to **the Skagit River GI Study 2012 Public Outreach** citing many documents on **SkagitRiverHistory.com.**
12/31/2012		

City of Mount Vernon Document

12/12/2012	**City of Mount Vernon Letter RE: Scoping of Proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal Project**	"In addition, Mount Vernon is located along the banks of the Skagit River. There is a substantial and well-documented risk of flooding. River flooding has the potential to cripple key infrastructure, transportation, water, residential areas, and farmland as well as injure life and property. Thus, Mount Vernon not only provides public safety services needed to respond to typical emergency medical services but also provides resources, materials and volunteers all which need to be quickly mobilized along the Skagit River to assist in mitigation of river flooding. In the event flooding is imminent, for example a levee breach occurs; Mount Vernon's emergency plan includes evacuation of citizenry to higher ground. In such an event, time is critical. ... "The City spent a great deal of effort and capital on the revitalization of its downtown and envisions significant redevelopment over the next 5-10 years."

Corps of Engineers Documents

1/31/2012	**Congressman Larsen Press Release: Larsen, Skagit County to Army Corps: Commit to Funding the**	"The Skagit Valley community is united behind the Skagit G.I. which provides the basis for comprehensive flood control projects. The Skagit G.I. has been progressing for more than fourteen years, funded primarily by Congressional appropriations each eligible year. With a long history

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Skagit GI	of devastating floods, the communities along the river have been looking to construct flood control projects that will increase safety for those living in the Skagit River valley. The Corps itself has recognized how important this G.I. study is. Through the Reset Initiative the Corps gave the Skagit G.I. a much needed higher priority level to bring about its completion in a fiscally responsible manner. An interruption to the forward progress of the study due to a stoppage in funding would be a disservice to the residents of the Skagit Valley. Less than $4 million is needed to complete the investigation. Allowing the Skagit G.I. funding to lapse would waste the $6.5 million of federal funds already invested in addition to the matching funds contributed by the local community. "
1/31/2012	**REVIEW PLAN: Skagit River Basin Flood Risk Management General Investigation**	"This Review Plan (RP) defines the scope and level of review for the Skagit River Basin Flood Risk Management General Investigation, Skagit County, Washington. ... Flood damages have been reduced in recent years with a well-maintained local levee and dike system on the Lower Skagit River, and a well organized and effective flood fighting effort. The purpose of the feasibility study is to formulate and recommend a comprehensive flood risk management plan for the Skagit River floodplain that will reduce flood hazards and damages in the urban and rural parts of the basin. ... The public will be invited to comment directly to the PDT through informal and formal public scoping meetings and public review comment periods programmed into the feasibility schedule. This includes but will not be limited to documents developed for the FSM, AFB, and NEPA documentation. The Draft and Final FR/EIS will be made available for public comment either when the document is submitted to, or is being reviewed by, the Type I IEPR team. A public meeting may be scheduled. Additionally, the public will be provided with the opportunity to nominate reviewers." Document also covers on pages 4-5 of the PDF "challenges and controversies" plus "It is expected that flood fighting, which is utilized to protect against flooding, will not be able to stop larger hydrologic events and there is potential for devastating flooding throughout the valley. The District Chief of Engineering has determined a significant threat to human life exists in the study area."
2/2012	**Revised Skagit River General Investigation Study Scoping Summary Report for the Draft Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement**	"The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District (USACE), in cooperation with Skagit County, is preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for a proposed flood-risk management General Investigation (GI) Study for the Skagit River Basin from Ross Lake to the river mouth at Skagit Bay. This study was requested by Skagit County because of the potential for significant flooding on the Skagit River. "An initial notice of intent (NOI) for this project was originally published in the Federal Register on November 20, 1997, for a Skagit River Flood Damage Reduction Study (62 FR 62019). Since the original NOI was issued in 1997, the study has evolved to meet new challenges and include ecosystem considerations associated with Puget Sound Chinook salmon and bull trout species listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). On July 29, 2011, an additional NOI was published, recommencing the scoping process (76 FR 45543) (see Appendix A). The purpose of this most recent NOI was to provide opportunity for additional public input and ensure that the study still accurately reflects stakeholder resource issues and concerns." UPDATED "This final Scoping Summary Report for the Skagit River General Investigation Study has been revised to include a comment letter from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that was

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		inadvertently excluded from the October 2011 Scoping Summary Report. Revised text is italicized. ... Address environmental justice in the EIS. ... Consider a natural processes alternative as one of the alternatives in your range of reasonable alternatives. Develop and disclose project specific standards of significance." See also: 11/26/2011 **www.SkagitRiverHistory.com Comments on October 2011 Corps Scoping Summary Report**
2/7/2012	**Congressman Rick Larsen: Army Corps Commits to $700,000 in Funding for Skagit G.I.**	"This is great news for Skagit County, and shows the strength of the Skagit G.I. and the community's united support for the project," Larsen said. "This is a major commitment from the Army Corps and it means the Skagit G.I. is moving forward. I made it clear to Assistant Secretary Darcy last week that the G.I. is at a critical stage. This funding pushes the study toward completion, bringing the entire Skagit Valley community one step closer to constructing flood control projects that will protect the lives and the property in the community."
3/13/2012	**Skagit River FRM, Washington Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM)**	"The FSM is an important milestone in the planning process that brings the USACE vertical team- HQ/NWD/NWS + the sponsor together to reach agreement on the problems and solutions to be investigated during the Feasibility study, it identifies the future without project conditions, and it identifies the scope of analysis required."
4/16/2012	**Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**	Blank survey form for public comment on 4/25/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012** & 4/25/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012**
4/16/2012	**Corps of Engineers Presentation Skagit River General Investigation Preliminary Alternatives**	22-slide presentation explaining the GI Study and current alternatives. See also: 4/25/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012**
4/25/2012	**Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012**	"The primary purpose of this meeting is to present the preliminary alternatives and to discuss natural resources issues/concerns relating to the preliminary alternatives. ... It is likely that the final set of alternatives will look different from the preliminary set of alternatives presented today. Agency and public input will be considered in the refinement of the preliminary alternatives into a range of alternatives that will be carried forward to a 10% level of design. Additional analysis (hydraulic, economic, environmental, and policy) will be performed on the refined range of alternatives. Agencies and public will have several opportunities to review the alternatives throughout the remainder of the study. " See also: 4/16/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012**, 4/16/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**
5/7/2012	**USACE Seattle District Skagit River General Investigation Preliminary Alternatives Presentation**	Basic presentation given to various interest groups in Skagit County. States the project's objective is to "Reduce flood damages in the Skagit River Basin over the 50 year project life."
6/2012	**Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Comment Received (April 2012-June 2012 Outreach) Report**	"This report documents comments received in response to outreach efforts to gather public feedback on preliminary alternatives for the Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation (GI) in Skagit County to the public and stakeholders during the months of April 2012-June 2012."

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

		See also: 4/16/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**, 5/9/2012 **Corps of Engineers GI Study Presentation**, 5/20/2012 **LJK Response to Skagit GI Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**, 9/26/2012 **Summary of Comments In Response to 4/16/2012 Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives,**
9/26/2012	**Summary of Comments In Response to 4/16/2012 Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**	Summary of comments received about the Skagit River GI and proposed alternatives for Skagit River Flood Risk reduction. See also: 4/16/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation Study Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**, 5/9/2012 **Corps of Engineers GI Study Presentation**, 5/20/2012 **LJK Response to Skagit GI Public Outreach on Preliminary Range of Alternatives**

FEMA Documents

1/20/2012	**FEMA Levee Approach for Public Review Online Forum Presentation**	69-slide presentation on FEMA's plans to map non-accredited levees for the National Flood Insurance Program. The **webinar with audio is available from FEMA** as well as **a Q&A webpage**.
5/16/2012	**National Flood Insurance Program Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement - Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement**	"FEMA is undertaking an EIS of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to consider new information relating to the environmental impacts of the NFIP, to update the 1976 EIS on the NFIP, and to consider potential changes to the program's implementation. The CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1501.7 and 40 CFR 1508.22 require the issuance of a notice of intent to prepare an EIS to initiate the scoping process. Scoping is an early and open process that assists the Federal action agency in determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying significant issues related to a proposed action."
5/16/2012	**Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on the NFIP**	"FEMA is proposing to modify the NFIP from the way it is currently administered to include enhanced environmental and historic preservation considerations including but not limited to climate change, and the impacts of the program on endangered and threatened species and critical habitat. FEMA will also account for program changes that have taken place since the publication of the 1976 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Revised Floodplain Management Regulations of the National Flood Insurance Program."

Skagit County Documents

4/17/2012	**Commissioners' Letter to Washington State Department of Ecology**	"We write to express grave concerns about the 2006 Skagit Instream Flow Rule's exempt well provisions as a viable concept for resolving regional conflict and meeting rural landowners' water needs. ... Skagit County is a government of general jurisdiction, with the obligation to equally and impartially represent all citizens of the county, both urban and rural alike, focusing limited resources on basic governmental functions. Skagit County has neither the obligation nor right to negotiate the property interests of rural landowners, who clearly stand to lose significant land value as a result of the ongoing effort to reduce reliance on exempt wells."

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

5/7/2012	**Skagit County Government Invite to Skagit River General Investigation Preliminary Alternatives Open House**	"On May 7, Skagit County and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will host a public open house from 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. at the Skagit County Administrative Building, located at 1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon, Washington, 98273. ... "The goal of the Skagit River General Investigation is to identify the challenges and opportunities associated with managing flood risk and to develop a watershed scale flood risk management plan. The purpose of this meeting is to present preliminary alternatives and to solicit feedback from the community on the proposed solutions. Each alternative uses a combination of projects and actions that work in combination as a comprehensive flood risk management strategy."
8/29/2012	**Skagit County Public Works: Skagit River General Investigation reaches major milestone as County, Corps move ahead to study three alternatives**	"On August 20, Skagit County officials and U.S Army Corps of Engineers staff participated in the Alternatives Milestone Meeting for the Skagit River General Investigation in Seattle. ... Earlier this year, the General Investigation Project Delivery Team (PDT) developed six preliminary alternatives and received feedback from the community at various forums. At the Alternatives Milestone Meeting, the PDT recommended carrying forward three alternatives for further design and evaluation: Levee Setbacks, Swinomish Bypass, and the Joe Leary Slough Bypass. Each bypass will be analyzed as both a confined channel and unconfined sheet flow. Optimizing flood storage at the Baker Dam reservoirs and non-structural measures will be a part of each alternative."
9/17/2012	**Skagit County Public Works Update Presentation on Corps GI Study**	Skagit County Public Works gave an update to the Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee (**Issues Page**) on the Skagit GI. Last page is the latest timeline with a projected Fall 2015 completion date.
10/2/2012	**Skagit Flood Awareness Week Events**	Activities that Skagit County Government will undertake to prepare to fight the Skagit River Flood Risk during the week of Oct. 2nd to Oct. 5th.
12/14/2012	**Skagit County Commissioners' Letter to Swinomish Tribal Community & the City of Anacortes**	"Mayor Maxwell's December 6 letter also claims that Skagit County breached the 2007 County-Anacortes Settlement Agreement, a document signed in the wake of six different unsuccessful legal actions by Anacortes against the County. The 2007 agreement required Anacortes and the County to mutually "work in good faith" on water planning, an obligation Anacortes promptly breached in 2008 by suing to eliminate the entire Skagit water allocation for farmers and rural landowners. Skagit County has no further duties under the 2007 Settlement Agreement either. "...We are all here for the long term. Rather than remaining mired in the battles of past generations, we prefer to work ín cooperation with Swinomish and other Skagit tribes to prepare our community for the environmental challenges of the future, including the threats that climate change poses."

Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee Documents

1/23/2012	**Agenda for Monday, January 23, 2012 Meeting**	Meeting will have a Skagit GI Update & a nhc Hydraulic Effectiveness Report presentation.
11/4/2011	**Handout: Skagit River Flood Risk Management Study Hydraulic Effectiveness of**	A series of spreadsheets in small print showing the impact in CFS of potential flood projects.

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Measures Spreadsheets	
1/12/2012	**Handout: Skagit River Flood Risk Management Study Hydraulic Effectiveness of Measures FINAL DRAFT**	"This report describes analysis of the hydraulic effectiveness of various measures proposed for management of floods in the lower Skagit River basin, focusing on conditions at and downstream from Sedro-Woolley. The intent of the work is to identify those measures which hold promise for improving flood management and for which additional more detailed analysis is warranted. Hydraulic effectiveness is defined for current purposes as the impact of the proposed measure on flows and water levels in the Skagit River (including the North and South Forks) upstream and downstream from the measure location, and the impact on spill from the river channel onto the floodplain." **See also: nhc Presentation to SC FCZD AC, Re: Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Hydraulic Effectiveness of Measures**
1/12/2012	**nhc Presentation to SC FCZD AC, Re: Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Hydraulic Effectiveness of Measures**	33 slide presentation on the Skagit River Flood Risk reduction potential of measures being reviewed by the Skagit River GI Study. Hydrology is from the Corps March/April 2011 report. **See also: Corps Skagit River Basin Skagit River Flood Risk Management Study Draft Report Hydraulic Technical Documentation, nhc Skagit River Flood Risk Management Study Hydraulic Effectiveness of Measures FINAL DRAFT**
2/21/2012	**Agenda for Tuesday, February 21, 2012 Meeting**	Meeting will have a Skagit GI Update, CFHMP Update & finally a discussion on "funding".
1/23/2012	**Handout: January 23, 2012 Meeting Summary**	"Dan Berentson reiterated the Future Scoping Meeting **Read-Ahead Report** has been submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Headquarters. The County is continuing to position the Skagit GI so that staff will be able to move forward with the study when more funding is available. ... Malcolm Leytham, NHC, gave a **presentation** regarding the hydraulic effectiveness of several flood management measures that could be constructed along the Skagit River at and downstream of Sedro-Woolley."
2/21/2012	**Potential Future Agenda Items**	Ideas to get floodplain management measures into the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan (CFHMP), address the debris-attracting railroad bridges over the Skagit and find sources of funding/revenue.
3/19/2012	**Agenda for Monday, March 19, 2012 Meeting**	Meeting will have a Chairman Comment, a Historical Perspective, a Skagit GI Update, a Feasibility Scoping Meeting report and Public Comment.
1/23/2012	**Handout: January 23, 2012 Meeting Summary**	"Dan Berentson reiterated the Future Scoping Meeting **Read-Ahead Report** has been submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Headquarters. The County is continuing to position the Skagit GI so that staff will be able to move forward with the study when more funding is available. ... Malcolm Leytham, NHC, gave a **presentation** regarding the hydraulic effectiveness of several flood management measures that could be constructed along the Skagit River at and downstream of Sedro-Woolley."
2/21/2012	**Handout: February 21, 2012 Meeting Summary**	"**Skagit GI Update** "Dan Berentson reported the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has received $700,000 to continue the Skagit GI for Fiscal Year 2012. The USACE is scheduling the FSM for March. Kara Symonds added the USACE is currently preparing for the Alternatives Formulation Briefing. Preparation includes the 10% design of the alternatives, the cost-to-

		benefit ratio of each alternative, recommend the National Economic Development plan, and the Locally Preferred Plan. "**Feasibility Scoping Meeting Read-Ahead Report** "Symonds explained the purpose of the report is to document technical studies and findings related to flood risk management of the Skagit River basin. Once a report is ready, the USACE can schedule a meeting to discuss it. This is a continuation of the report that was submitted in 2009, which received several comments that needed to be addressed. Additional comments and responses were received in 2011, as well. The final submittal includes things such as all comments, environmental and economic reports, levee failure analysis, basin description, and alternatives formulation strategy. This is the meeting anticipated to take place in March. "**CFHMP Update** "Symonds has been getting up to speed on the WACs and RCWs that guide the process of creating a CFHMP. Currently, she is updating the bibliography and incorporating recent publications from the USACE and others into the document, such as the NEPA scoping comments, Hydrologic Effectiveness Report, FSM Read-Ahead documents, the Geotechnical report by Shannon & Wilson, and a Stratigraphy report from the U.S. Geological Survey. "
4/16/2012	**Agenda for Monday, April 16, 2012 Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory and Technical Committees Joint Meeting**	Meeting will have two second votes on housekeeping issues, a Skagit GI Update / Feasibility Scoping Meeting Read-Ahead Report, and a Alternatives from Project Delivery Team Workshop Presentation. **See also re Skagit GI:** 7/24/2001 **Flood Damage Reduction Project [GI Study] Schedule**
1/23/2012	**Handout: March 19, 2012 Meeting Summary**	"As was discussed at the previous month's meeting, the idea to move to quarterly AC meetings was broached again. After some discussion, the AC made the motion to hold meetings every other month, starting after April's meeting; no less than six meetings per year. ... "Hamburg suggested the AC adopt a new rule that states if a member misses three (3) consecutive meetings, the AC can remove him/her from the membership. Pursuant to current policy, the replacement members would be picked by the committee the member represented. At-Large and City representatives would still need to be appointed by the BCC. If passed by the AC, this revision would then have to be written into resolution for the BCC's approval. ... "Feasibility Scoping Meeting "Dan Johnson, USACE, was unable to attend the AC meeting as had been scheduled. Instead, Kara Symonds gave a brief run-down of the FSM, which took place on March 13. The USACE documented technical studies and findings related to flood risk management. Hand-outs included the agenda, a copy of Johnson's presentation, and the USACE's comments. Johnson presented an overview of the basin, and a summary of work completed to date. The group also discussed responses to USACE Headquarters comments of the FSM Read-Ahead Report. It is anticipated Johnson's FSM presentation will take place at the AC meeting in April. "
4/16/2012	**Corps of Engineers Presentation Skagit River General**	22-slide presentation explaining the GI Study and current alternatives. See also: 4/25/2012 **Skagit River General Investigation (aka GI Study) Preliminary Alternatives Presentation Read-Ahead, April 25, 2012**

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Investigation Preliminary Alternatives	
5/21/2012	**Agenda for Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory and Technical Committees Joint Meeting of May 21, 2012**	Meeting will be mainly be an alternatives workshop w/ Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District staff.
4/16/2012	**Handout: April 16, 2012 Summary**	The April meeting discussed a new attendance rule where missing three meetings without a proxy can mean dismissal, the six alternatives the Corps of Engineers Seattle District Project Delivery Team (PDT) came up with, and a Q&A session.
5/15/2012	**Handout: Skagit GI – Alternative Workshop Questions for Alternative Discussion**	Questions posted to the Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee and Technical Committees about the six **Preliminary Alternatives** the USACE Seattle District has came up with.
7/16/2012	**Agenda for July 16, 2012 Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee Meeting**	Meeting will have regular business, a Skagit GI Update and a Puget Sound Energy presentation.
5/21/2012	**Handout: Draft SC FCZD AC Meeting Summary**	"Preliminary Alternatives Workshop "The AC and TCs were previously given a link to the Preliminary Alternatives presentation, a PowerPoint of the presentation, and a Read-Ahead document. The group attended an alternatives presentation in April, as well. The AC and TCs were also provided with a list of questions, for each alternative, to begin thinking about. For reference, the questions are attached to this meeting summary under Attachment A. "Kara Symonds, Skagit County Public Works, and Dan Johnson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), lead the meeting. Public input is a part of formulating each alternative, therefore, questions and comments were accepted throughout the workshop. It was restated that the alternatives can and may change as more information is gathered."
9/17/2012	**Agenda for September 17, 2012 Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee Meeting**	Topics planned for discussion include a GI Study Update, Dam Storage, and a Farm, Flood, Fish Initiative plus regular business.
7/16/2012	**Handout: July 16, 2012 Summary**	"Dan Berentson said the County has been meeting with Puget Sound Energy (PSE) and the USACE to address issues regarding hard storage in the Lower Baker system. The FERC relicensing agreement held 29,000 acre feet as a placeholder through the Skagit GI. The first point was to find out how much, up to 29,000 acre feet, can be stored at the Lower Baker dam without dam modifications. Irena Netik, PSE, stated it to be about 20,000 acre feet. The next question centered on the cost of replacing lost power; another stipulation of the relicensing agreement. If dates were changed from November 15 to October 15, about 1,500 megawatt hours would be lost at the Upper Baker Dam, and about 6,500

		megawatt hours would be lost at the Lower Baker Dam. About 3% – 4 % inflation would be figured into the formula for figuring out cost, as well. This would be figured into cost to benefit ratio in the Skagit GI."
12/10/2012	**Agenda for December 10, 2012 Skagit County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee Meeting**	Meeting will discuss general business items plus the Farm, Fish, Flood Initiative. See also: 7/13/2012 **Letter to Corps from Farms, Fish and Floods Initiative ("3FI")**
9/17/2012	**Handout: September 17, 2012 Summary**	"The next steps for the Skagit GI involve comparing the alternatives. Major aspects to consider include risk reduction to life, agriculture, and environment. Other items to be considered will be economic damage reduction, construction, operation and maintenance costs, and overall acceptability. In 2013, there should be an alternative analysis and selection of a plan. A report should be finalized by the fall of 2014, with the Chief's final report being finalized in the fall of 2015." Also discussion about Lower Baker Dam storage & the Farms, Fish and Floods Initiative (3FI). See also: 7/13/2012 **Letter to Corps from Farms, Fish and Floods Initiative ("3FI")**

Skagit River GI Study Public Outreach Comments on Preliminary Range of Alternatives

4/30/2012	**E-mails to/from Corps/ Swinomish Environmental Policy Manager**	**"Swinhomish**: "I think not incorporating an analysis of climate change related hydrology is a fatal flaw from a NEPA perspective, and a think the development of a clear pathway to address this issue would be timely." **Corps**: "I would also add that we are not attempting to build a Flood Risk Management project that meets any specific protection goals such as 100 year protection. As stated when we last met, we will be designing to the level of protection that aligns with the Benefit Cost Ratio that we think makes us competitive at a national level for approval and funding and meets our project goals.**"**
5/1/2012	**E-mail to Corps fm Eric Hall**	"I am looking at a PPT that was presented at the **4/16/12 Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee meeting.** I am just coming up to speed on this concern and realize that this document may be the tip of an associated-studies iceberg. Please forgive me if my questions have already been addressed in another document."
5/7/2012	**E-mail to Corps fm Anacortes Public Works Director**	"The alternative involved a bypass channel essentially east of the Anacortes plant through the River Bend area traversing what used to be the Ledger Lake location. The proposal involved a meandering continuous flow channel with the ability to increase capacity during flood events with a removable structure on the upper end. There were low flow channels, ponds and opportunities for salmon habitat and a host of other aquatic uses [duck hunters etc]. Except for the continuous stream, the area could remain in productive farming during non flood events. . . . Admittedly does not provide much relief for the bridge corridor or the downtown MV area but it might be worth looking at, in lieu of widening in the vicinity of the plant and the intake. "
5/7/2012	**Comment sheet to Corps fm George Wells**	Dredge & remove debris from the north & south forks of the Skagit.
5/7/2012	**Comment sheet to Corps fm**	"The #3 proposal definitely looks best to us, using the Joe Leary Slough

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Don Henkle	plan. Our property would be in the flood area if #4 plan was followed. . . . How about dredging the Skagit channel?"
5/7/2012	**News article submitted by Carol Ehlers titled "Dam failures predicted -- Old study warned of chain-reaction breakdowns"**	Article addresses dam that were determined 25 years ago to be unsafe and in July 2004 "almost a dozen failed". Evacuation plans "to evacuate did not come until hours after a wave of water rolled through hixs neighborhood." Spillways on the dams were inadequate to handle floodwaters from a 100-year storm.
5/7/2012	**Comment sheet to Corps form from Burlington City Councilwoman Tonya Bieche**	"I prefer Alternative 5: Urban Area Protection. It is hard to decide without estimated cost and time concerns. The options also lack the amount of water expected to flow thru the alternative and the resulting flow thru the rest of the system." .... The City of Burlington has provided its Skagit Basin hydrological analysis to the Corps pursuant to the Corps Scoping Report. How will the Corps use this information.
5/7/2012	**Comment sheet to Corps fm Bob Helton**	What's happened to the Draft Executive Order on Floodplain Management dated 5/10/2009?
5/10/2012	**E-mail fm Robert Dow to Corps re Save the Nookachamps**	"What I don't want to see is a plan that puts excessive water on a single area to protect special interests who have the money and power."
5/11/2012	**Comment Sheet to Corps fm Josef Kunzler**	"I absolutely favor the non-structural alternative coupled to dam storage. We need dam storage as the most cost-effective, environmentally friendly flood protection measure. Only those advocating for dam removal, profits before people or fish before people could possibly oppose logical drawdown and storage requirements for public safety. We also need to limit development in the volcanic floodplain for safety & agriculture, which is what the nonstructural alternative does. ... Even if dam modifications have to be made to Lower Baker Dams, a thoughtful contribution from Puget Sound Energy to this project is arguably in the long-term interests of Puget Sound Energy shareholders to ensure the dam's long-term viability and continuing returns to Puget Sound Energy shareholders."
5/20/2012	**E-mail to Corps from Dennis Clark**	"...alternatives I prefer and why: "Preliminary Alternative 2 Non-structural and dam storage: I like that there is minimal impact to the urban areas and the prime agricultural land downstream of the cities. It seems that this approach would also allow for more salmon habitat restoration upstream of Burlington. "Preliminary Alternative 3 Joe Leary Slough bypass: I like that the floodwaters are diverted away from Burlington and Mt. Vernon. "*Features ...I least prefer: "Preliminary Alternative 2 No features of concern. "Preliminary Alternative 3 It seems there is potential for substantial environmental harm to the resources of Samish Bay, even if only on an episodic basis during the biggest floods. I am concerned that the floodway would detract from agricultural production and effectively reduce agricultural acreage in the county."
5/20/2012	**Comment Sheet to Corps fm Larry Kunzler**	The non-structural alternative is one that takes care of a lot of the problems that man (not Mother Nature) has created. (***See*** **The Realities of Flood Control in Skagit County**) Nookachamps/Sterling area people would not have flood waters in their homes due to the actions of

		Burlington and Mt. Vernon dike districts. Additional storage and/or modification of dam operations is the one component of the GI Study that should be given priority over all other alternatives due to the fact that it is the one component that will benefit everyone in the floodplain. Key in this study will be to answer the question did the Corps of Engineers use the wrong hydraulic figures in computing the Ross Lake amount of storage and should storage begin in October. (***See* 8/14/1953 Corps document**) While we are on the subject of hydraulic figures, paramount to the completion of the GI Study should be a serious consideration that when the Corps changed its computations from Extreme Low Water to Mean Sea Level did the Corps fails to adjust the gage readings appropriately for historical flood events? (***See* Low Low Water in Puget Sound vs. Mean Sea Level**)
5/29/2012	**Letter to Corps fm Skagit County Dike District #17**	"Through the evolution of the GI District 17 along with District numbers# 12, #I, #3, and #22 have created a perceivable set of goals for flood risk management on the Skagit River delta. . . . The Corps in our opinion must study potential ways of increasing conveyance or divert water volumes during such an event. We believe the opportunity to divert and covey waters further up the river system will be more productive. Impacts further up stream conveyance changes are made, the greater benefit to flood control structures downstream."
6/15/2012	**E-mail to Corps fm USFWS**	"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). . . . 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."
7/13/2012	**Letter to Corps from Farms, Fish and Floods Initiative ("3FI")**	**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).
7/13/2012	**Public Outreach Comments Received Report**	Table of "all" comments received by the Army Corps Seattle District on the GI Study.

Swinomish Tribal Documents

5/9/2012	**Letter to the Swinomish**	"Tribe does not oppose Anacortes exercising its existing water right

	Indian Tribal Community	(including its decision to sell water to Tethys) and does not agree that science demonstrates that the Tethys contract will harm salmon in the ways and to the degree you speculate below. Therefore, the Tribe is unable to take any role in opposing the Anacortes-Tethys contract."
5/9/2012	**Swinomish Tribal Concerns RE: Skagit General Investigation Study**	Tribe is concerned about changing hydrology due to climate change; Baker River Dam Operation and Storage; floodplain growth patterns due to flood control efforts; water rights; Fir Island Bypass; leaving existing levees after building setback levees; alleged shortcuts "to the analysis of Treaty-reserved fisheries resources." Furthermore, "We are concerned that although we have been involved .in this process since 1993, it is only now, after an expenditure of millions of dollars, that the necessary environmental studies are being identified. It is unclear to us how studies associated with impacts to fish, fish habitat and consequences of climate change, can be accomplished in the next few years and with the limited budget that your staff has identified. In the past, when inadequate resources were available to undertake studies, assumptions mutually agreeable to the Tribe, federal agencies and the Corps of Engineers ("Corps") were identified to expedite environmental review. It is unclear to us how the Corps intends to fill in these gaps at this point in time. Having stated this overreaching concern, the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community (the "Tribe") would like to identify the following concerns that may constitute "fatal flaws":"

Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife Documents

7/1/2012	**Incident Reports of Swinomish Tribal Chairman Interaction with Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife Enforcement Officers**	"We explained that the fisherman had to follow his own tribal regulations, and it was our understanding that CLADOOSBY had to land his salmon and put them onto a fish ticket prior to selling them. As we were talking, I observed CLADOOSBY haul in his net and begin to motor away. I told Officer Gaston that I wished to contact the commercial fisherman before he departed the area. We informed the group that since they did not have a receipt or any paperwork for the salmon and that the area was closed to the recreational harvest of salmon we were seizing the six sockeye salmon. ... CLADOOSBY asked us if we wanted to buy some fish. Officer Gaston politely said no. Officer Gaston asked how fishing had been. CLADOOSBY asked Officer Gaston if he wanted to see, and pointed toward the fish tote. Officer Gaston told CLADOOSBY that he would like to see his fish. CLADOOSBY invited Officer Gaston aboard to look at the fish. CLADOOSBY told me that he thought he had about 35 sockeye in the tote. ... As Officer Gaston boarded our patrol vessel I asked CLADOOSBY if he had put the fish down on a fish ticket before he sold them. CLADOOSBY stated that he hadn't, but that he would record the fish under the "Take Home" category on the fish ticket when he landed the rest of his fish later in the day. I informed CLADOOSBY that if this was a similar situation involving a non-tribal gillnetter selling fish to passing recreational vessels, and the fish were not landed on a fish ticket it would be a violation of state law. "
7/2/2012	**Weekly Hot Topics for North Sound Marine Detachment, for Week of 6/25/2012**	"The fisherman stated that he had sold fish to numerous recreational boats who wished to purchase fish. The fisherman then offered to sell some to the officers. The officers asked if the salmon had been recorded on a fish ticket prior to being sold. The fisherman stated that he would later record the sold fish on his fish ticket as take home fish. The tribal

		member was informed that this was a violation of state and tribal law, and that the officers would be in communication with tribal fisheries officers. Officers later made contact with Swinomish Fisheries officers and verified that all tribally caught sockeye had to be landed to a licensed dealer before being sold. Charges will be referred to Swinomish Tribal Fisheries enforcement for prosecution. It appears that the violator is the Swinomish Tribal Chairman!"

Guest Documents

1/2012	**Biological and Physical Effects of "Fish-Friendly" Tide Gates Final Report for the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office, January 2012**	"*Biological effects*. Increased tidal connectivity appeared to improve cumulative density of juvenile Chinook salmon rearing above tide gates at one of two BACI sites. At Fisher Slough, the replacement of manually and passively operating side-hinged gates with side hinged SRT gates was followed by a reduction in the cumulative density ratio by over 80% (Fig. 11A). This loss in cumulative density resulted in the tide gate cumulative density ratio decreasing from nearly 50% to 10% of Fisher's reference site before and after SRT installation, respectively."
3/8/2012	**GAO Report to the Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives: Army Corps of Engineers - Peer Review Process for Civil Works Project Studies Can Be Improved**	"Section 2034 established a trial to look at the cost and impact of conducting peer review for controversial and costly projects over a 7-year period. After the trial period, based on information provided by the Corps, Congress could reconsider whether to retain or revise section 2034 or allow it to lapse. Because the Corps generally does not specify the authority under which peer review was conducted, however, it has not provided Congress with the information needed to evaluate the merits of the section 2034 requirements. In addition, the Corps' implementation of peer review has not focused on the larger, more complex, and controversial projects that were contemplated when section 2034 was enacted and as recommended by NAS a decade ago. As a result, project studies are being selected to undergo peer review that may not be warranted and may thereby be increasing project costs and schedules needlessly. Further, essential to the integrity of the peer review process is the assurance that the Corps has effective processes not only to ensure overall contractor independence and freedom from conflicts of interest but also to ensure project-level independence and freedom from conflicts of interest. The Corps' current process, however, has a number of weaknesses with respect to ensuring no conflicts of interest exist at the project level. Finally, with peer review generally -occurring late in the Corps' project study process, peer review serves more to strengthen the Corps' presentation of its decisions than to influence its decision making."
3/10/2012	**American Surveyor: Helping Floodville**	"If classified as a "severe repetitive loss property", NFIP coverage can be denied. Two conditions may throw the premises into this undesirable category: (1) there have been four or more claims for flood damages, and each claim payment has exceeded $5000; or (2) at least two claim payments have been made and the cumulative payments exceed the value of the property. In such instances, owners may choose to enroll in buyout programs, a voluntary process of selling their properties to recoup whatever amount they can from a now (at least through the NFIP) uninsurable property. Pre-disaster fair market value must be assessed and Elevation Certificates completed so that the purchasing entity can conduct benefit cost analyses to prioritize where the limited buyout funding resources will go."

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

3/22/2012	**stltoday.com: Guest commentary: Lessons from the 2011 flood**	"Here in Missouri we want it all from our namesake river. We want enough water in any season to float the very meager navigation traffic on the river; we want narrow river corridors and high levees so we can build and plant in the floodplain; and we want few restrictions that would keep farm runoff from polluting the river and contributing to the "dead zone" in the gulf. The record high runoff into the Missouri in 2011 is forcing us to face the fact that we can't have it all. The huge mainstream dams in the upper river didn't prevent flooding, but only reduced its severity. The flood of 1993 already demonstrated that we can have flooding on the lower river based primarily on regional rainfall. Normally two-thirds of the river's total flow comes from tributaries entering below the dams."
5/1/2012	**Property Casualty 360° - A National Underwriter Website: 'Flood the Hill' Effort Sees Insurer Groups, Others Team Up for NFIP Extension**	"The insurance industry and allied trade groups are launching a full-court press to ensure Senate action on flood legislation before the current authorization expires May 31. ... The campaign is set to launch the week of May 7—the first in a three-week stretch during with the Senate can act before the NFIP expires on May 31. The coalition behind the campaign includes groups from across the spectrum of NFIP-reform supporters, including the National Association of Realtors, National Wildlife Federation, Mortgage Bankers, Nature Conservancy, Consumer Bankers Association and American Land Title Association."
5/18/2012	**Heritage Foundation Issue Brief: Congress Should Act on FEMA's Refusal to Reform**	"No More FEMA Bailouts "Congress can no longer simply give FEMA another round of taxpayer dollars to maintain the status quo. After last year's record-breaking year of FEMA declarations, Americans can no longer afford FEMA's desire to operate as a bailout bank. The current approach leaves state and local governments less prepared and FEMA undoubtedly ill-equipped for the next truly catastrophic disaster."
6/1/2012	**Property Casualty 360° - A National Underwriter Website: Pres. Obama Signs 60-Day NFIP Bill; Industry Pivots to Long-Term Efforts**	"Ben McKay, senior vice president of federal government relations for the Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, says that although PCI is pleased that the 60-day extension avoided a lapse, "this only delays the fundamental debate over the future of the flood-insurance program. We remain hopeful that the Senate will schedule floor time for its long-term NFIP reauthorization and reform bill in June."
6/29/2012	**Property Casualty 360° - After Years of Delays, Congress Passes Long-Term NFIP Extension**	"Congress today finally passed and sent to the President legislation providing long-term certainty for the National Flood Insurance Program. The House voted just before 2 p.m., 373-52, to pass the legislation, and the Senate voted a few minutes later, 74-19, to send the legislation to President Obama. ... Key highlights of the legislation include allowing FEMA to raise rates a maximum of 20 percent annually, as compared to 10 percent annually under the current program. It also mandates that rates for second homes, properties with repetitive flood claims and commercial properties will go up 20 percent over the next five years. That will be effective July 1. The bill reiterates FEMA's authority to buy private reinsurance to back the program, which is aimed at reducing FEMA's reliance on Treasury loans to fund the program. The reforms are projected to generate an additional $2.7 billion in new revenues over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The bill also authorizes FEMA and the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on various options, methods, and strategies for privatizing the NFIP. Furthermore, it requires lenders to accept non-NFIP backed flood-insurance coverage provided by a private entity if that coverage meets all the same requirements as NFIP-backed flood insurance."
10/2012	**Missouri River Flood 2011 Assessment Report -**	Absolute flood protection for the Missouri River Basin is not possible, so the basin needs to plan and prepare for future flooding events. Flood

Documents Posted in 2012 on www.SkagitRiverHistory.com

	Volume I: Summary & Volume II: Technical Report	control storage in the reservoir system is just one piece of the solution. Increasing the carrying capacity of the floodway and reducing encroachment in the floodplain are two of many ways to reduce flood risk. Land-use management and regulation of development within designated floodplain areas (responsibilities of state and local governments) are also considerations. A Missouri River Watershed Flood Risk Reduction study could be initiated to consider opportunities for additional flood water storage and improved floodway conveyance in the context of all other uses of the river system. The benefit of approaching flood risk reduction in a more holistic manner is that it provides flexibility to respond to a wide range of flooding situations and the resiliency to recover quickly following an event.
11/2012	**Can There Be A Silver Lining In Sandy? Proudly reprinted with the permission of Bill Becker**	3 part series of articles by the Executive Director of the Presidential Climate Action Project. "Broadly speaking, federal policies encourage people to build and rebuild in disaster-prone areas. No one with a heart would suggest that government should not help disaster victims; it's quite another thing, however, to help people become victims."
12/5/2012	**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES DECISION: ARKANSAS GAME AND FISH COMMISSION v. UNITED STATES**	"We rule today, simply and only, that government induced flooding temporary in duration gains no auto-matic exemption from Takings Clause inspection. When regulation or temporary physical invasion by government interferes with private property, our decisions recognize, time is indeed a factor in determining the existence vel non of a compensable taking. See Loretto, 458 U. S., at 435, n. 12 (temporary physical invasions should be as- sessed by case-specific factual inquiry); Tahoe-Sierra, 535"