

**Initial Questions Needing Responses in CFHMP Process**

The Table below shows a few of the CFHMP components/questions that may need consideration by the Advisory Committee. The Committee decided at their June meeting to begin a dialog at their July meeting on a few of these components/questions - possible solutions and pros and cons of those solutions – and then consider appropriate assignments for the Technical Committees. The Advisory Committee will also need to consider an appropriate schedule for discussing the other components/questions as well as any additional components/questions that should be added.

Initial Components/Questions	Advisory Committee Date for Initial Dialog	Comments
1. What is the problem?		
2. What is the history of flooding and flood planning efforts in Skagit County and what has resulted?		
3. What are our goals and objectives for this plan?		
4. What criteria might be used to choose projects for actions?		
5. What are potential solutions?	July 14, 2008	Initial AC Dialog and potential Technical Committee assignments
6. What are pro’s and con’s for these solutions?	July 14, 2008	Initial AC Dialog and potential Technical Committee assignments
7. What does data/analysis of the solutions show?		
8. For the solutions, what environmental considerations are there?		
9. What solutions do we recommend?		
10. How can we pay for implementing these solutions?		
11. What does the public think and what can we do to show the public the importance of doing something? What if we do nothing?		
12. What are our final recommendations to the Board of Supervisors?		

**Preliminary**  
**What does the Advisory Committee Need to Know?**  
**Advisory Committee Worksheet for Potential Solutions and Pros and Cons**  
**July 14, 2008**

<b>Potential Solutions</b>	<b>Description</b> (Document if part of Skagit GI)	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Needed information by the Advisory Committee</b>	<b>Technical Committee Assignments</b>
<b>Storage</b> – General concept and approach of storage as a flood risk reduction technique					
<b>Potential Examples</b>					
Nookachamps Sub-Basin Storage					
Baker Lake Storage					
Removal of Structures in middle reach of Skagit River and let nature take its course					
Other?					

<b>Potential Solutions</b>	<b>Description</b> (Document if part of Skagit GI)	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Needed information by the Advisory Committee</b>	<b>Technical Committee Assignments</b>
<b>Conveyance -</b> General concept and approach of conveyance as a flood risk reduction technique					
<b><u>Potential Examples</u></b>					
Avon bypass					
Riverbend bypass					
Cross island connector					
Burlington levee certification					
Mt. Vernon downtown project					
Three bridge corridor					
BNSF bridge replacement					
Levee setbacks					
Goat Island rock dike					
Do not dredge river					
Other?					

<b>Potential Solutions</b>	<b>Description</b> (Document if part of Skagit GI)	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Needed information by the Advisory Committee</b>	<b>Technical Committee Assignments</b>
<b><u>Non Structural -</u></b> General concept and approach of non-structural as a flood risk reduction technique					
<b><u>Potential Examples</u></b>					
Limit development in flood-prone areas					
Relocation					
Floodproofing					
Insurance					
Encourage Low Impact Development (LID)					
Urban villages in upland area					
Flood warning system (upstream areas)					
Consistent land Use policies county-wide					
Flood response approach					
Others?					

