

Hi Stan,

Here is a draft (in black) of the Environmental Technical Committees 4/27/09 meeting summary regarding comments on "emergency spillways". I have included your initial response to Larry Kunzler for reference. You may wish to share this information at the ETC report out at this afternoon's AC meeting. I plan to incorporate these draft meeting notes into the 4/27 ETC meeting summary so if you see any changes I should consider please let me know.

Thanks

Tom Karsh

Hi Larry,

Your proposal generated quite a bit of discussion including general discussion not directly applicable to the ETC.

As far as the committee outcome it was deemed red as proposed with the potential for yellow with more information. The main question is where does the water go? Would there be a potential for environmental restoration associated with the project? The ETC sees by-pass projects (depending on design) as one of the types of projects the group favors because there is the potential for environmental restoration and reconnection of the river with a portion of its flood plain. The spillway project as the group understands it does not have a defined channel or defined location flow would hit the bay or Swinomish channel. Given that lack of definition environmental restoration potential is limited.

Other discussion included there is a lot of roads and infrastructure south of highway 20 and west of the river, do those roads have to be fortified, what about the homes in that area, what would be the cost of flood easements for all of those people? There was also discussion around directly flooding people that did not get flooded in 90 or 95 when flows were up around or above 145,000 cfs. Another question was would you just put one spillway or several smaller ones in several locations? There was an assumption in the group that the spillway would have to be fortified for some distance that may be considerable and discussion of a potential fire hose type effect from the fortified section. As I said some of the discussion was general and did not apply directly to the ETC.

That is the general discussion and outcome of our discussion.

Stan

"Emergency Overflow Spillway" comments: The ETC applied its screening criteria to the proposal and determined that, as presented, there were not enough project details to fully evaluate the proposal or to recommend it be forwarded to the Army Corps of Engineers to be considered as part of the Skagit GI. It was agreed that spillways, as a concept, may have potential environmental benefits if properly designed. But at this time there just was not enough information to warrant moving the proposal, as a specific project, from red to yellow. The following questions need to be answered: 1) Hydrodynamic modeling. Where would the water go? Will there be a defined channel and/or flowage easement? Will sediment reach the Swinomish Channel and Padilla Bay? 2) What provisions can be made for stranded fish and habitat restoration? 3) What about interior drainage capacity to move the water to the saltwater? 4) Will there be a need to fortify roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure west of Mount Vernon? 7) What happens to the homes that will be in the flowage path? 8) Will there need to be additional fortification (hardening) of the existing levee system near the spillway site(s)?

The ETC sees levee setbacks and by-passes (including by-passes with spillway controls), in general, as having potential for habitat restoration, depending on design details.