

SKAGIT COUNTYWIDE FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT – AN EVOLUTION IN PROGRESS

Skagit County has had a long history of trying to manage the flood events of the Skagit River by forming or trying to form a countywide flood control district. ([See: History of Countywide Flood Control Districts](#))

In 1970, Skagit County actually passed a resolution forming the District; however, it was never activated for 37 years. (See [Resolution](#) re Countywide Flood Control Zone District)

During [a recent meeting](#) of the Skagit River Feasibility Study Executive Committee with the Corps of Engineers, legislative staff, and others the following was made public:

[Skagit GI Study Executive Committee Meeting Packet](#)

[Attachment 1](#)

[Attachment 1a](#)

[Attachment 1b](#)

[Attachment 1c](#)

[Attachment 1d](#)

A video of the entire meeting can be viewed at:
http://skagit.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=129

On November 6th, the Skagit County Commissioners approved the activation of the Skagit Countywide Flood Control District. (See [Packet to Activate Skagit County Flood Control Zone District \(SCFCZD\)](#))

What follows in this paper is a series of e-mails and documents dating back to 2005 when the Skagit County Public Works Department first began to push their agenda to find more funding for their department. Make no doubt about it: The Countywide Flood Control Zone District is based on power and money. It's always about the money.

[WARNING:](#) What you are about to read may destroy your faith in local government.

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." -- Edmund Burke

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge; LornaEllestad; Dan Berentson; ToreyNelson
Subject: New Flood Control Board
Date: 6/21/2005 3:50:40 PM

Ric, Lorna, Dan,

Chal has asked that we consider developing a new "Flood Control Board" that would most likely replace the current flood control committee. I have pulled the founding resolutions (1970) for the existing flood control zone district that covers the entire county and includes the cities and I think that this can be used as a good model for our new structure. I even found a resolution passed in 1984 that created a special "Flood Control Fund" that was to be used strictly for local flood control projects - no planning purposes.

I will review these documents and pass them on to you for your use however I wanted both of you to begin brainstorming on what this structure should look like and who should be on it. Cities, Diking Districts, Agencies, Tribes? Ric, please schedule a meeting next week with Lorna, Torey, Dan and us to put together a recommendation for Chal. Thanks

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: New Flood Control Board
Date: 6/22/2005 6:38:51 AM

Dave - I like the idea and look forward to working with you all on what this Board might look like and how it might function. I'll schedule something for next week.
R

From: KellyBriggs
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District - RCW 86.15
Date: 6/27/2005 3:57:38 PM

Dave -

At the present time, there are no districts that would be adversely affected by an additional levy of \$.50 per thousand of assessed value. Keep in mind, however, there is still a group of people trying to establish a county wide library district. If the library district was formed and they levied their maximum levy of \$.50 and the Flood Control Zone also levied \$.50 then there would be prorationing. If there were any levy codes on Fidalgo Island that exceeded the \$5.90 limit, the first district to be cut would be Fidalgo Park & Rec. The Flood Control Zone would be second. In the remainder of the county, the Flood Control Zone would be the first to be cut. In regards to the Constitutional One Percent Limit, the EMS districts would be cut first, then Park & Rec. districts, followed by Flood Control Zones

Based on the current assessed value, a levy of \$.50 per thousand dollars of assessed value would generate approximately \$5,220,000. This is based on the value of all taxable property in the county and does not include any exempt property.

Some things you might want to keep in mind when considering this levy (these are the ones you'll get the most "inquiries" from):

Some 2,500+ low income senior citizen/disabled persons who I don't believe would be exempt from this assessment.

Property owners on Cypress Island, Guemes Island, Sinclair Island (how would they benefit?)

Tideland owners

Property owners currently paying large assessments to diking and drainage districts

I did notice that the legal description for the district does except a portion of the county lying between Edison and Blanchard. I wonder what the reason for excepting that area was?

Let me know if you have any more questions.

Kelly Briggs
Skagit Co. Assessor's Office
(360)336-9370

-----Original Message-----

From: ChalMartin [mailto:chalm@co.skagit.wa.us]

Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2005 2:25 PM

To: DaveBrookings

Cc: Hanson, Jana

Subject: Thoughts on July 12 Mtg

Dave

I haven't been much help on this, but here are some thoughts I have for the discussion:

Invite:

Jon Aarstad, Rod Garrett

Dike 12

Dike 17, 1, 3

Commissioner D

You

Me

Mount Vernon staff

Topics of discussion:

- 1) We are at a transition point in the flood project - COE says expect 235,000 cfs at Mount Vernon and Burlington; also, no help on Baker flood storage
 - FEMA flood mapping project is also moving forward
 - County has become ineffective in carrying the flood project forward, but now has technical tools for options analysis

- Now seems likely there will never be a COE flood project in the lower basin

2) This puts future commercial and industrial growth within the cities, especially in Mount Vernon and Burlington, at risk.

3) Possibility: **form a Flood Control Zone District**, use as a basis for big projects as well as incremental improvements to the flood situation

- Improve political base for action

- Use as a more effective local method for accomplishing flood protection on the ground

- Make better use of limited resources, as opposed to inefficient COE process process process process

4) Jana, how did you want to relate this specifically to Mount Vernon's situation?

Use or discard. To start the thinking for the agenda. Chal

Chal A. Martin, P.E.
Director / County Engineer
Skagit County Public Works Department
1800 Continental Place
Mount Vernon, WA 98273
(360) 336-9400 chalm@co.skagit.wa.us

From: Jana Hansen
To: ChalMartin
Subject: RE: Thoughts on July 12 Mtg
Date: 6/28/2005 2:15:39 PM

I like it. Bud would like for Jon Aarstad and the mayor to attend rather than PW dir. so that would be the only change. I'll contact Burlington and ask Bob to coordinate with the Dike Dist. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Gary Rowe
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:02 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Chal's directives

Dave,

We need to get behind the study done by John Ghilarducci (FSG Consulting) and one of the options for funding. They recommend an increase of the drainage utility tax. I think you were looking at the **countywide flood control zone levy**. There are several choices.

Gary

From: DaveBrookings
To: ChalMartin
Subject: Fund 110
Date: 7/27/2005 2:27:58 PM

Chal,

I just sat through the SWM preliminary budget session. Fund 110 is a mess. As expected, we have loans to pay back to the road fund and ongoing costs with FERC and decreasing outside funding sources for the SRFS. A couple of early action suggestions:

...

C) Flood control zone district - I think that a project for us in 2006 is to propose a tax/assessment to cover these costs via the FCZD.

We left the meeting recognizing that we needed to update our cash flow/revenue/expenditure projections for fund 110 and we will focus on this over the next couple of days. This is just a heads up!

From: DaveBrookings
To: ChalMartin; Dan Berentson
Subject: Skagit County Flood Control Zone District
Date: 8/10/2005 10:12:56 AM

Chal, Dan,

This is listed on the MV agenda tomorrow. Given that the focus tomorrow will be on forming the new "partnership" interlocal agreement, any ideas on what we should provide for this discussion? I routed the draft document that I was playing with to each of you prior to leaving last week and did not get much feedback? Should we bring this draft? I would like to be able to better articulate how the Zone make-up would work within the framework of the new partnership, flood control committee ect. , however I have yet to fully figure this out.

At this point its strengths are:

- Its already in place
- Its County-wide and includes the cities
- It has the potential to be used as a funding source
- It has been successfully used in King and Whatcom County and others
- It can support the work of, but not replace in anyway, the work of the Diking Districts

Difficulties:

- How far ranging should its focus be - Skagit and Samish?
- Who should be on the Executive and tech committees?

Let me know your thoughts as we are trying to best prepare for tomorrow.

From: LornaEllestad
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Skagit County Flood Control Zone District
Date: 8/10/2005 10:19:44 AM

Dave,

It is my opinion that the County's FCZ should continue to be the County's FCZ and that the new MV flood group can come to the County and request both county support for funding requests from State and Fed sources as well as apply to the County for FCZ funds. Once this group is "organized", we will continue to organize our FCZ and be able to include information that we will learn from participating in the organization of this group. There may be some organizational "holes" that remain after this group is organized that the FCZ committee(s) will need to fill. Who knows.

It seems like it is important to not confuse folks at this point.
Just some thoughts.
Lorna

From: ChalMartin
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Skagit County Flood Control Zone District
Date: 8/10/2005 12:07:48 PM

Dave

From my perspective, we are flexible. I like the Flood Control Zone District concept because it carries with it a small funding possibility which could also be shown to demonstrate community support. I also wanted to volunteer our staff to provide administrative and technical support to whatever entities developed. I remain enthusiastic about this general concept. We may need more discussion and time to get established what needs to be established. I read through your Flood Control Zone District draft and thought it was a good start, appeared to be quite workable. CHal

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'Hanson, Jana'
Subject: Next Meeting?
Date: 9/8/2005 11:00:09 AM

Jana,

When will the group meet again and what will the focus of the agenda be? I ask because we have several hot issues that should be discussed with this group fairly soon and we need to properly prepare for them. Some suggestions based upon the recent dialogue:

Topics

- * FEMA Mapping Modernization - Need Carl Cooke of FEMA to talk specifically about the Skagit project and floodway designations
- * Army Corps/County - Future work elements - should we move forward? If yes, what specifically should we be evaluating?
- * Funding - Flood Control Zone District - Should we implement to generate

needed money?

* Baker/Skagit Flood Storage - Current status/costs and potential next steps

These are all important items that should be fully discussed at some point. I also want to respect the fact that you need time to finalize the MOU. Please establish our next meeting date and share your thoughts on the agenda. Once I have this info I can get the right people there. Thanks

From: Hanson, Jana <janah@ci.mount-vernon.wa.us>

To: DaveBrookings

Subject: RE: Next Meeting?

Date: 9/8/2005 12:56:45 PM

Dave, I believe that at the next meeting we will focus on the organization of the steering committee and exec. committee. Once this is done it would then be appropriate to precede with technical agenda items.

From: DaveBrookings

To: ChalMartin

Subject: Flood Control Zone District - Funding Implementation

Date: 9/14/2005 9:43:46 AM

Chal,

I have been giving this more thought and I think that the timing is right to implement a fee structure and propose it to our Board of County Commissioners in the spring of 2006. What I would like to do is turn this issue over to the Flood Control Committee to work into a recommendation to the BCC. We have draft documents, the enabling flood control zone resolution and we can spend 3-4 months shaping this into a recommendation. I would like to start working with Kelli Briggs of the assessors office to get some preliminary numbers put together.

The committee can address how much should be generated, purpose of funds, fee structure, ect.

I see this as being complimentary to the work that the Skagit River Partnership Group is doing as they will remain focused on the potential solutions while this group works to get some funding lined up. Commissioners will remain in control of the Zone and use of funds. Let me know your thoughts on this prior to me/staff launching into this direction. Thanks

From: rboge RicBoge

To: DaveBrookings

Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District - Funding Implementation

Date: 9/15/2005 9:03:00 AM

Dave - FYI, Tom mentioned to me on Tuesday that the option of using **funding from the FCZD** will be made more prominent in the recommendations from the FCS group for ongoing funding of water quality/natural resource protection programs. He expects to see the final (?) recommendation memo from FCS any time. R

From: ChalMartin
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District - Funding Implementation
Date: 9/26/2005 5:37:57 AM

concur

From: DaveBrookings
To: TomKarsh
Subject: RE: Revised memo
Date: 9/27/2005 10:04:09 AM

Tom,

I looked through the latest version of the drainage utility funding options per your request. Please see my earlier e-mails on this issue as I think that the comments are still applicable. In short, I think **we are still suffering from "scope creep" with this project.** We started out trying to fund our existing activities to reduce their ongoing general fund "life support" and **in the end we have a greatly expanded resource protection program.** As I had mentioned in earlier e-mails, the list of efforts to be funded seem to exceed the expectations of the drainage utility. Listed items such as: **On site sewage disposal, drinking water supply, moderate risk waste/solid waste and water rights seem to stretch the purposes of RCW 36.89.**

I would recommend that we also look at the work currently being provided to see how it links to the existing drainage utility service area to make sure that there is a legally defensible connection to the use of these funds for that purpose. In otherwords, **is there a benefit or contribution case for the work/cost for those paying the assessment?**

The recommendation by FCS group is to increase the drainage utility rate to pay for these services. Scenario #1 would suggest a new (fully funded) rate of \$80.80 per year as compared to the existing rate of \$25.80. This suggests that 68% of the new rate would be for resource protection work with the remainder available for projects. For background purposes, when the existing utility was created, there was a strong public mandate that the bulk of these funds be used for construction purposes and not studies and at one time there was a "drainage utility commission" that was formed to serve as a watchdog group over the use of these funds. This proved to be very cumbersome and inefficient as we had to place a lot of staff time with a committee for such a small amount of revenue/expense (\$1,000,000). **We were successful in having this committee abolished in the late 90's, however if we are not careful we could see this type of thing again. (Emphasis added by srh.com)**

Please note that we also have two fairly significant plans underway that will have an impact upon the drainage utility fund balance (approx \$2.7 Million) over time. The Bayview and Big Lake watershed plans have already identified projects that will need to be constructed to address current and anticipated stormwater problems. Depending upon the timeline associated with these projects, this will draw down the fund balance and may require a rate adjustment. FCS did not have this information at the time of its review, however when we are talking about rate issues I want to make sure that the BCC is aware of this.

The good news here is that with the current fund balance being healthy and the original language within our drainage utility ordinance being fairly "loose", we can continue to pay for those projects that can legitimately be linked to the purpose of the drainage utility while we work through this situation. However, Gary R. should be made aware that from a policy perspective Commissioner Anderson tends to reject this more liberal interpretation of use of drainage utility funds and lets us know about it when trying to move contracts through the BCC.

Thanks Tom and I apologize for being a day late with these comments.

From: LAUREN FREITAS <lauren.freitas@verizon.net>
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: Flood Control Zone District
Date: 10/10/2005 7:51:30 AM

Good Monday morning, Dave,
I will be missing the Flood Hazard Mitigation Committee meetings this Fall due to my class schedule. Dee gave me an update, and I am very interested in the concept that you put forward of creating a Flood Control Zone taxing district. If any new tax stood a chance, this will with the post-Katrina focus on funding for dike maintenance, and greater local self-sufficiency. Would this need to be sold to voters? I oversaw the Upper Skagit Library District initiative that passed with a large margin right after 9-11 (when the economy was taking such hit). I would be happy to offer support for this important revenue-generating initiative. I think that it ties in nicely with the PDA's comprehensive flood mitigation approach. At your convenience, I'd love to learn more and chat strategy.
Lauren

-----Original Message-----

From: James Geluso [mailto:jgeluso@skagitvalleyherald.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2005 2:41 PM
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: Flood control district

Dave:

A couple weeks ago you mentioned the county's flood control district, which I recall exists but is essentially inactive. What would the county have to do to make it active again, and what could it do?

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'James Geluso'
Subject: RE: Flood control district
Date: 10/13/2005 2:56:17 PM

James,

I have our legal folks reviewing this very same question. Can I get back to you within a week or are you on a timeline? I'm currently working with the assessors

office and legal to look into the implementation of the existing Flood Control Zone District. The goal would be to generate local financing for flood control improvements.

David Brookings

-----Original Message-----

From: LornaEllestad
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2005 11:50 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: rboge RicBoge; ToreyNelson; ChalMartin
Subject: RE: Flooding Comp Plan

Dave,

As you know, we have routed several "draft" work products for this request during the last three months.

The most recent work products are the schedule / Gantt chart that you and Ric requested that we revise to reflect the preparation of the CFHMP rather than the completion of the SRFS project management plan; and the modified draft scope of work for the 05-07 FCAAP agreement which reflected this same revision.

When the revised draft scope was forwarded to Chuck Steele for his comments, he wanted to know what happened to the references to the SRFS project management plan (PMP) that had been included in the scope that was submitted as part of the original FCAAP proposal. I told him that we had been asked to refocus the scope on the completion of the CFHMP and he said that the reason that DOE had been able to provide the County funding over the last several years was because we were partnering with the Corps on the completion of the Skagit River Feasibility Study. He directed me to the RCW that gave the DOE authority to fund up to 25% of the SRFS. During on discussion on the completion of the CFHMP, he thought that was a very "ambitious" goal to complete in two years, by June 2007. We both agreed that we should already have access to most of the information that we will need and that it could be done.

I explained to him that we still intended to complete the current PMP with the Corps with the exception that the measures would be screened at the conceptual level instead of the 10% and then 35% design as originally proposed. I assured him that the hydraulic screening would be completed utilizing the Corps H and H and we inserted language here and there making references to the Corps at his request. I also made a couple of similar changes on Wednesday at the Corps request. These were mostly clarification of who was the lead for the Environmental tasks which one of us should have corrected earlier.

Chuck understands the information that is being produced by the SRFS; the hydrology and hydraulic modelling, development and evaluation of measures and the preliminary environmental assessment etc. and how it will be referenced as a component of the County's CFHMP. Chuck said that the DOE also considers the SRFS as a study that the DOE has invested a considerable amount of money in and has a vested interest in completing. We then discussed the fact that if we had submitted an FCAAP application to the DOE for the completion of the CFHMP, the County would have been eligible for 75% match from the DOE instead of the 25% match DOE is limited to for feasibility studies like the SRFS.

To respond to Chal's question on what will happen if the "measures evaluation" component that I (Chal) have not yet authorized are delayed? (from the email below):

The completion of the development, evaluation and screening of the measures will not "hold-up" the preparation of the CFHMP even through the adoption phase. The "recommended actions" section of the CFHMP can reference what ever information is available on any and all flood damage reduction measures and proposed alternatives that are still being considered at that point in time and the Plan can be completed with out any measures report being finalized.

However, the delay in the completion of the development, evaluation and screening of the measures and the preliminary selection of the preferred alternatives will delay the completion of the current SRFS project management plan which is the study that Chuck and the DOE have been providing monetary support to complete. Chuck also wanted to see a reference in the scope as to the what happens to the Corps report for the Skagit project. Linda Smith and I then included a reference to the "initiation" of the Corps "Plan Formulation and Evaluation report" which we all understand is dependent on both continued funding for the Corps and the development by the County of an implementation strategy that includes a Corps flood control project.

It appears that if one of the intentions of the 1-page outline, listing milestones, for completion of this plan, is to also comply with the DOE's expectations for the FCAAP funding; then it will also need to include the timeline for the completion of the measures even though the CFHMP does not require this.

Both Chuck and the Corps have signed off on the draft FCAAP sow. If it still meets the County's approval, we can forward it to the DOE so they can start drafting the agreement for the County's signature. Chuck was hoping that they could do that this Friday.

Please let me know if you have any questions and how you would like us to proceed.

Thanks,
Lorna

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2005 8:27 AM
To: LornaEllestad
Cc: rboge RicBoge; ToreyNelson; ChalMartin
Subject: RE: Flooding Comp Plan

- Thanks Lorna. I would recommend that we have a meeting with Chuck Steele to discuss in greater detail. I understand that we all have a great deal invested in the SRFS and that we should complete the next phase of work should Federal funding be authorized. I view this next round of work as two projects that can work concurrently with each other. Assuming that the federal funding is authorized and that the BCC allows us to proceed with PIE contract modifications for the measures evaluation, it is my expectation that we should be able to make good progress on both fronts - SRFS and Comp Plan development. The PMP work plan is pretty well laid out however the CFHMP schedule has yet to be

defined and I think that this is what Chal is looking for.

- I guess what we are coming to here is a basic question - " Can the team use this next biennium to make significant progress on both the SRFS and CFHMP?" I see the bulk of the work in the SRFS being accomplished with PIE/Corps (if \$\$\$ are authorized) with some County oversight. My thinking is that we have adequate staff to handle both? (Ric, Lorna - Please correct me here if my assumptions are erroneous) In other words, we should not have to choose one project over the other, the two should compliment each other and we should be able to make good progress on both over the next biennium.
- The FCAAP agreement should allow for this if you think we can do this. Give this some thought and talk it over with your staff then lets get together to discuss.
- Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: rboge RicBoge

Sent: Monday, October 17, 2005 4:26 PM

To: DaveBrookings

Cc: ChalMartin; LornaEllestad

Subject: RE: Flooding Comp Plan

- Dave - I've been giving this some thought and am compelled to throw up a caution flag - directed at the expectation of handling both, SRFS and CFHMP. We have staff capable of performing good work on both, but I am concerned about a factors largely outside their control: 1) coordinating with the Corps and the requirement to utilize some products generated by the Corps for the PMP, 2) responding to/helping shape the discussion on the FEMA mapping matter, as it unfolds and 3) switching directions in response to changes in County priorities, directly or indirectly related to the SRFS and/or the CFHMP. It's my opinion based on experience that the possibility of either or all of these factors impacting the ability of staff to stay 'on task' and accomplish both is high and that either or all of these factors have great potential to impede significant progress on the SRFS and/or the CFHMP.
- Lorna and I discussed this today, and she's going to 'tone down' the work to be accomplished with the new FCAAP, including the expectation for completing and adopting the CFHMP by July 1, 2007, and discuss same with Chuck. My sense is that it would be very useful for you, Lorna and I to meet with Chuck to be sure we are all on the same page with spending this round of FCAAP money - once the three of us are all clear about where we are going with it. FWIW, R

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2005 4:46 PM
To: ChalMartin
Cc: LornaEllestad; rboge RicBoge; Dan Berentson; ToreyNelson; JacqueGent
Subject: RE: Flooding Comp Plan

Thanks Ric. I understand your concerns and have been spending time thinking about this myself.

Chal,

It is time to pull ourselves together and have a strategic planning meeting to define where we want to go with things. I would like to get at least a one hour time block on your calendar with our SRFS team/Chuck Steele to talk about the following:

- A) SRFS - What is our level of commitment to complete this effort?
- B) CFHMP - When should we make the push to get this completed, what will it take to complete? What does the process look like?
- C) Baker Dam Relicensing - Status and update from last executive session. Is it time to strike a deal? If so, who is leading this effort?
- D) Flood Control Zone District - Next steps?
- E) FEMA Mapping Modernization - How will this effect what we need?

If you concur that it is time for such a session, I will schedule the meeting and prepare an agenda so it stays on track. Let me know your thoughts on this. Thanks

From: TomKarsh
To: Gary Rowe
Subject: Meeting with Gary Rowe to discuss 2006 water quality/resource funding options
Date: 10/18/2005 11:42:37 AM

Attachment N1: [10-17 Essential Activities List](#)

When: Thursday, October 20, 2005 9:00 AM-10:00 AM (GMT-08:00) Pacific Time

Where: Sauk Room

~~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

At the conclusion of yesterday's BCC discussion on water quality/resource funding options the Board directed staff **To:** 1) Research funding the \$987,000 "essential activities" (see attached list of activities) via the countywide Flood Control Zone District (to be able to assess both city and county lands); and 2) Research ways to create a comprehensive, countywide, flood protection/drainage program. The following are my thoughts on this charge, which will be discussed with Gary Rowe this coming Thursday.

The #1 charge is possible but to be effective for 2006 the BCC would need to adopt a rate structure resolution by November 30 (Treasurer requests mid-November if possible). I figure this is doable based on the following schedule:

10-26-2005 Public Hearing Notice to BCC
10-31 or 11-1 BCC approves PHN
11-3 and 11-10 PHN published in SVH
11-14/15 BCC conducts PH
11-21/22 BCC deliberates and takes action
11-23 Approved resolution sent to Assessor/Treasurer

The #2 charge clearly can't be accomplished in the next month to be effective for 2006. Perhaps Dave Brookings can weigh in on this topic, as I believe he is working on this very initiative with our city/district partners.

To accomplish #1 requires/assumes:

* The existing SCC 6.36 "Skagit County Flood Control Zone Districts" does not have to be modified and that the rate structure resolution is exempt from SEPA. I believe that is current (perhaps Ron Marshall can address this question at/or before our meeting?)

* The BCC agrees on a rate structure. Here's two options: 1) In 1991 the BCC used the FCZD to assess a charge of \$10/parcel charge (Resolution 14115) to develop a rate structure and capital improvement plan. This generated (or at least the County billed for) \$597,000. To generate \$987,000 it would seem that \$20/parcel would be necessary. 2) Use the same rate structure (based on impervious surface) currently in place for the drainage utility (this generates about \$1,000,000/year) based on a service/benefit area excluding: cities, drainage/diking districts, and forest lands. If the service/benefit area were to be expanded to include all county lands (still excluding forestry lands) would mean a charge of about \$10 per residential unit.

I realize that this is short notice. If you are unable to attend and have strong opinions on this subject, please forward those thoughts to the group via email.

Thanks

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: rboge RicBoge

Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2005 7:59 AM

To: DaveBrookings

Cc: LornaEllestad; ToreyNelson; JeffMcGowan; Janice Flagan; ChalMartin; Dan Berentson; Oscar Graham

Subject: yesterday

Dave -

Despite what I'll call the 'fluff' throughout much of yesterday's session with the Corps and all, I did come away impressed with the largely civil dialogue that took place over many very important and contentious issues. I think most of us left a little let down as we said goodbye at the end now that we know lots of significant

obstacles and lots of ideas to help overcome them - but ?

It's my belief that the groups and individuals most keenly interested in and affected by the Skagit River and all the issues surrounding it, will continue to fight and spend a great deal of time and money, while no one individual or group will accomplish a great deal in the meantime - and when they do, it will be at the 'expense' of someone else or some other group. I suggest a concerted, facilitated, long term effort and commitment involving all the groups and individuals there yesterday, and probably some others that weren't is what it will take to really begin moving forward in a number of fronts - at least during my lifetime. My sense is that such an effort could be largely financed and perhaps even coordinated by the state or our congressional reps/aides. But it is for sure not going to happen unless the County is unified internally on the matter and plays a lead role pulling it helping it to happen and succeed.

By the way, the Ag-CAO compliance matter is heading downhill again. FWIW, R

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: yesterday
Date: 11/3/2005 1:32:26 PM

Ric,

My take was a little different. While I think that there was good dialogue at the tables, I felt that many of our key players (mayors, diking district commissioners) felt like they were being preached to and left the meeting asking themselves if this is where we should be sinking millions of dollars and staff time in the hopes of gaining additional flood protection. I think that unfortunately, the Corps as an agency lost additional credibility yesterday and demonstrated that they have too many internal competing interests to deliver a civil works project at this time. I think that this strengthens the case that we should complete the current PMP as long as it suits our needs, **form a flood control zone district**, develop a locally driven CFHMP and work closely with the SRIP to start initiating projects. If a project comes along that looks like it could fit within the Corps process (like a clean 205 project) then I think we should carefully consider reengaging. Also, over the next several years I hope to see additional reform of the Army Corps of Engineers as Congress tries to respond to the Katrina fallout.

One thing that I picked up on was that we on the local level have a much greater sense of urgency about our situation as compared to the other players. My take home thought was this:

Stan Walsh was correct when he mentioned that the driving ingredient in the FERC process was the fear that if the parties did not reach settlement that FERC would deliver their own version of the license. This pressure was felt by all parties and motivated us to seek agreement. In our situation, not all parties share this motivation. If there is a flood, the County and Diking Districts will see litigation. The other parties will be excluded from this however their decisions impact our ability to proceed. **Add to this that Sally Hintz (Maria Cantwell staffer) says that unless the project is "not controversial" and has consensus, it will not get funded,** reinforces the fact that we are heading down a faulty trail. If we want additional flood control in the next 5 to 10 years it has to be a locally driven effort. My 2

cents worth.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: yesterday
Date: 11/3/2005 4:40:08 PM

Dave - let me clarify, I was not suggesting sticking with the Corps to pursue a collaborative effort on river issues, just the need for a sustained, collaborative effort. R

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2006 4:36 PM
To: ChalMartin
Subject: 2006 Objectives - SWM/Solid Waste

Chal,

Attached is your listing of objectives back when we prepared our budget. In the next week or two, I will be meeting with staff from both SWM and Solid Waste to not only celebrate the accomplishments but to get ourselves on track with our objectives for 2006. (This has been awkward year and it is hard to find the positive however if you look hard enough there has been progress made in several areas, despite our managerial frustrations, the troops still need the recognition for the work performed!) << File: Chal's 2006 directives.doc >>

I know you are busy with the preparations for you next big trip to D.C. however if you have a moment to highlight or add to the main issues you would like to see dealt with by each group in 2006 it would be nice to take into these meetings. Here is my initial list for your consideration:

SWM

110

SRFS - Complete flood control alternatives work - wrap up PMP (target date) - Support reaching a decision on future of SRFS

Baker - Remain actively involved in Baker Relicensing Process, provide review and comment on DEIS and continue to take actions to improve flood control

SRIP - Continue to support, develop a way to shift funding into other members of the partnership for continuing studies

Flood Control Zone District - In spring of 2006, propose a rate approach for generating money for flood control work

CRS - Maintain existing class 6 - evaluate the possible pursuit of a class 5.

Flood Awareness Week - Continue

Cockreham Levee - Resolve current mitigation issues and develop long range approach for the levee in conjunction with the buyout program.

Environmental Mitigation - develop alternatives for a Public Works environmental mitigation program

FEMA - Work closely with FEMA and community to ensure accurate flood

elevations and maps for our community

120

Continue to support activities identified in the AG CAO, Habitat Survey, WQ Monitoring

Lake Management Districts - continue, possibly add Clear Lake, clean up legal issues related to the assessments

Clean Water Program Funding - Need to tighten this funding approach by working with cities and making sure that the assessments fit the benefit areas. Close work required here with the assessors and cities.

Marine Resources Committee - This is a potential growth area as more money is coming down the pike. This group has been very effective by keeping a low political profile and pounding out the projects.

McElroy Slough - Support the work of Janices team for construction in 2006

Legal Support - Continue to provide support for both the legal and settlement fronts with GMA.

402

Wrap up the agreements necessary to implement the Bayview Ridge Stormwater Plan

Continue the Big Lake Stormwater Study

Work with Janice's team to implement larger DU projects (see list)

Continue with small drainage complaint investigations and follow up projects (see list)

Solid Waste

401

Finalize and publish the RFP for privatization

Support the Review, selection and possible negotiations of future contractor

Support work with AFSCME for the possible transition of employees

Maintain safe working operation at Transfer Station

Keep transfer station going.....

Better anticipation of work force requirements for summer time peak - early on-call work force training required!

Finish crane removal and roof repair work

Improve communications with elected's with this issue

From: ChalMartin

To: DaveBrookings; JaniceMarlega

Subject: Work for Tom Karsh

Date: 1/4/2006 7:24:22 AM

Dave, Janice

Tom is available and wants to help. Let's discuss tasks to put him on. Janice, one thing that we need to reengage on is the McElroy Slough project. Dave, I figured Tom would be managing the new clean water fund, but also could **help with the flood control zone district.** Thanks Chal

From: ChalMartin
To: JacquGent
Subject: Scheduling
Date: 1/11/2006 7:24:38 AM

... Tom, let's discuss moving forward with establishing a levy for our county wide flood control zone district. I believe Mount Vernon and Burlington would support this and we will need a revenue source to pursue flood control improvements on the Skagit, outside of the dike district areas -- like a spillway on Lower Baker. I would like to introduce this topic to the Board at our stand alone session the 23rd. Thanks all. Chal

From: DaveBrookings
To: TomKarsh
Subject: Flood Control Zone District Formation
Date: 1/11/2006 9:52:53 AM

Tom,

When you get a chance, lets sit down and talk about you taking over the initiative towards implementing a rate structure for the Flood Control Zone District. Ric and I have been working on this and have draft formation information that we need to share with you as you move this project forward. I also have established a couple of contacts in Whatcom, King and Yakima counties that you may want to consult with as you proceed. I will prepare a an electronic folder with this information so you can access it. Thanks Tom.

From: DaveBrookings
To: TomKarsh
Subject: Flood Control Zone District Draft Document
Date: 1/17/2006 8:30:55 AM

Attachment N1: [Skagit County FCZD1 Draft](#)

>
Tom,

In anticipation of our meeting this morning, here is the latest working draft related to the Skagit County Flood Control Zone. I will also have a notebook of other relevant information to hand off to you. Thanks

From: ChalMartin
To: TomKarsh
Subject: Flood Control Zone District
Date: 1/23/2006 2:45:24 PM

Tom

Let's get going on this. Looks like the Board is amenable to pursue it further, **if the zone treats all parcels equally, including the urban parcels.** Let's put together a work session, invite the cities and Dike Districts, and see what develops.

Ron

In accordance with this concept, it is true that the Commissioners may simply levy the property tax, correct? Is there a minimum or maximum? Regarding governance after the levy is in place: do the Commissioners decide how the money is spent? Thanks Chal

From: ChalMartin
To: Gary Rowe
Subject: RE: Disbursement of Clean Water Program (CWP) Money for 2006
Date: 2/2/2006 7:11:27 AM

Gary

We met yesterday with Tom and looked at the elements funded by the clean water program. These elements will be a tough sell to the cities, providing little benefit to the cities from their perspective. However, a county-wide flood control zone district would provide benefit to the cities as well as the rural area. Recognizing the Board wanted to expand the Clean Water Program to the Cities, but seeing what a hard sell that would be, my thought is that we should **focus Tom's efforts on getting the county wide flood control zone levy in place, instead of trying to expand the clean water district into the cities.** County wide flood control zone district, in concert with the Clean Water District and the Drainage Utility, would provide an additional capability to respond to a wide variety of water issues. Board seemed supportive of the possibility of a county wide levy (8 cents would bring in about \$1 million / year) when we discussed this with Commissioners Anderson and Dahlstedt 2 weeks ago. I would like to get Tom going on this, instead of trying to push expansion of the Clean Water Program. OK by you? Thanks Chal

From: TomKarsh
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 5:45 PM
To: Gary Rowe
Cc: ChalMartin; TrishaLogue; JeanAlden; rboge RicBoge
Subject: Disbursement of Clean Water Program (CWP) Money for 2006

Gary,

You requested that I provide you a summary of the CWP budget as it relates to disbursements to outside entities. The CWP (Ordinance O20050014 and its

accompanying Budget Resolution R2005048, both attached) called for a \$999,000 CWP budget of which water quality related programs in the listed organizations would be funded as follows:

1. Skagit Conservation District.....\$163,000
2. Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group...\$30,000
3. Skagit Watershed Council..... \$30,000
4. Skagit Conservation Education Alliance. \$12,000

The approved 2006 budget for Public Works reduced the overall CWP budget to \$500,035 (when it was discovered that the fees/charges to cover the CWP expenses would not be effective until 2007). This amount is now a loan from the General Fund to be paid back over the 3 year life of the current CWP. It impacted the listed organizations as follows for 2006:

1. Skagit Conservation District.....\$87,000
2. Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group...\$12,000
3. Skagit Watershed Council..... \$12,000
4. Skagit Conservation Education Alliance. \$12,000

Since the 2006 County budget was adopted, it was determined that the \$20,000/yr contract with Western Washington Agricultural Association should also be covered with CWP funds. This necessitated further reductions (and other internal PW budget adjustments) to the outside organizations in order not to increase the overall CWP budget as follows:

1. Skagit Conservation District.....\$87,000
2. Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group...\$10,000
3. Skagit Watershed Council..... \$10,000
4. Skagit Conservation Education Alliance. \$10,000
5. WWAA.....\$20,000

These organizations are expecting to enter into contracts with the County (as called for in the CWP). Please advise if you want PW to go forward as noted above.

P.S. I have been advised (verbally to date) by Carolyn Kelly (Conservation District Director) that she will be requesting an increase in County support to cover unanticipated State funding reductions to district programs related to keeping livestock out of surface watercourses. I will further advise you on this matter when I see the written justification.

Tom Karsh, Special Projects

From: DaveBrookings
To: ChalMartin; Gary Rowe
Subject: RE: Disbursement of Clean Water Program (CWP) Money for 2006
Date: 2/2/2006 7:58:10 AM

Good call on this one Chal. I think this will do a couple of things a) generate needed revenue for Flood Control and b) put the Commissioners in the drivers seat for controlling how the funds will be spent. I have heard both Commissioner Munks and Anderson express the need for this.

From: Gary Rowe
To: ChalMartin
Subject: RE: Disbursement of Clean Water Program (CWP) Money for 2006
Date: 2/2/2006 9:51:26 AM

Chal,

Whether it is the clean water/shellfish protection district or the flood control zone district is the solution, we need to get buy-in from the cities on what the problem is and that they share in the responsibility of finding a solution. The concern raised by the Board is that they believe the cities contribute to the degradation of water quality outside of the urban areas. By focusing on the flood control zone district, it seems we are giving up on that argument. I would like to see the problem defined first, and then decide what solution is the best.

Gary

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge; TomKarsh
Subject: FW: Disbursement of Clean Water Program (CWP) Money for 2006
Date: 2/2/2006 11:32:14 AM

FYI - CWP issues.

I agree with Chal that this is a tough sell. One way around this might be for the cities to agree to join in and then demonstrate the millions of dollars that they spend each year dealing with water quality treatment. Net result - they acknowledge that they are part of the problem/solution and that they pay their fair share. No change in assessments for rural property owners but addresses the politics end of things. Just a thought.

From: ChalMartin
To: TomKarsh
Subject: CWP Elements
Date: 2/3/2006 6:35:17 AM

Tom

I want to attempt again to sway Gary Rowe to support going after a flood control zone district levy, instead of more funding from the cities for the CWP. One argument I would like to make is that as it now stands, if we go after additional CWP funding from the cities, our program elements are just "more of the same." Is that true? Seems like you pared down the original "minimum" list to the current \$500k. What were the elements you deleted or pared back from the original proposal, and did you delete any elements that would have been of more interest to the cities? My concern is, I don't think we can do both, it is already

February, and we need to get serious about flood control, and a flood control zone district, with revenue, would give our Commissioners resources to influence the direction of flood solutions, as Dave pointed out. Thanks Chal

From: TomKarsh
To: ChalMartin
Subject: RE: CWP Elements
Date: 2/3/2006 11:01:59 AM

The CWP program/activity list was not changed from the initial \$999k proposal to the current \$500k (just less money in some of the categories). So I don't believe the cities would be too inclined to jump on the band wagon when the \$999k budget kicks in for 2007. The CWP report from FCSGroup has a larger list of activities (Appendix "B" that if fully funded would exceed \$5m/yr.). There may be some activities on the expanded list (I will provide both of you with hard copies of this report) that would be more pertinent to cities (e.g., stormwater/drainage practices, moderate risk waste/hazardous waste/solid waste practices, golf course impacts, etc) but the focus of the program was on rural issues. The key to me is to look for duplication of services/activities. Can we combine our CWP with existing programs in the cities/towns? Can we combine/coordinate water quality with other related flood protection, stormwater management, drainage needs? In essence carry out the CWP mandate to create the comprehensive countywide program.

Tom

From: ChalMartin
To: 'Hanson, Jana'; 'dkdist12@cnw.com'
Subject: RE: draft agenda
Date: 2/10/2006 10:10:56 AM

Jana
We might also want to discuss

- 1) Funding requests update (State and Federal)
- 2) Flood Control Zone District property tax levy -- is it time for this? District is already in place, but no revenue. 8 cents county wide produces about \$1 million. This would be a tremendous help to leverage other dollars, demonstrate to our state and federal legislators we are serious, and also help our folks efficiently get real work done on the ground.

Chal

From: ChalMartin
To: TomKarsh
Subject: Flood Control Zone District Followup
Date: 3/9/2006 1:26:36 PM

Tom

Let's chat about this. Maybe we can discuss this with the Board at our stand alone session next Tuesday? Just say, for example, that we would like to get going on some outreach for this concept -- speak w/ Dike Districts, Cities, etc. I want to get some actions underway, as the clock is ticking. Thanks CHal

From: DaveBrookings
To: TomKarsh; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: Coordination: Update of **Drainage Utility** Assessment Roll and establishment of Clean Water Program Assessment Roll
Date: 3/14/2006 2:39:43 PM

Tom,

I concur with your recommendations and thanks for serving as the contact for this work. As Jan probably mentioned this morning, **we need to start collecting data for the Bayview Stormwater Plan financing and for the Flood Control Zone District.** We have a task order for FCS Group to assist us with looking at options for funding the Bayview Plan. You should get a copy of this from Ric so you can see where we are going with this. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: TomKarsh
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 12:09 PM
To: rboge RicBoge; DaveBrookings
Cc: EAurand (Erick Aurand); Janice Flagan; Matt J. Barrett
Subject: Coordination: Update of Drainage Utility Assessment Roll and establishment of Clean Water Program Assessment Roll

Ric/Dave:

I met with Janice, Erick, and Matt this morning to discuss this matter and we agreed on a couple of points:

1. In response to Wes Hagen's request for a designated project manager, we decided that it would make sense for me to be the contact person between Public Works and the Assessor/GIS/Mapping. I would coordinate with Jan on any drainage utility related issues or needed surface water engineering inputs.

2. **To the question whether the existing regulations [SCC 12.19 Drainage Utility, SCC 6.68 Clean Water (Shellfish Protection) District and their implementing resolutions] were _ fatally flawed_ and needed to be amended? We don't believe it is necessary at this time (unless the Assessor does).** While the code and resolution language could certainly be improved and made more precise, it seemed that **it would make more sense to make any _ clarifying_ corrections at a time when the rates and charges were also being revised.** In addition, any changes to these regulations would involve a time consuming public hearing process (2-3 months) and raise the specter of not meeting the target date for the

new assessment rolls.

Please let me know if you agree with these recommendations and clear with Chal so that we can move forward. Wes was hoping to get underway by April 1.

From: WesHagen
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 4:43 PM
To: ChalMartin
Cc: KatieJungquist; MarkLeander
Subject: Rather than assume....

Chal,

Thanks for expediting the meeting arranged by Tom Karsh on Tuesday (2/14) to hear "concerns" that I had had with regard to assessments under the **Drainage Utility** (existing) and Clean Water Protection (new) ordinances. For everyone present, I think that it was VERY ENLIGHTENING. **It became apparent that there are several "glitches" in the process that few were aware of.** In large part, this is because, to be implemented, the plan must be consistent with data parameters in the Assessor's Database (WATS). I felt the meeting was tremendously successful in that **"enlightenment" shined.** **On the other hand, the discovery of "Ignorance" also put items on the table that must be addressed as a prerequisite to the project(s) moving forward.**

Given my understanding of 1) the importance of seeing that the Clean Water Protection Program is implemented, and 2) the challenges **[we have no problems, only challenges and opportunities]** I have discovered in the County Drainage Utility District levy structure, I now have two tactical concerns. At this point, **PREVENTION, is a priority [and very cost effective] so that there will be minimal need for EXPENSIVE REMEDIAL MEASURES.**

My first concern is simple: Who is the project manager on this? I'm not going to assume here, because there needs to be accountability. Someone needs to be responsible for making it happen. It is under the jurisdiction of Public Works, but to happen it has to be structured on a basis consistent with the parameters on the Assessor's Database. This is not a huge problem, from my view. For people in PW, there is no basis to expect them to understand our WATS system structure, and its requirements. I'd be happy to work with a project manager, or take the lead with someone to handle the PW side of things.

Second, the work that needs to be done by Mapping and the Assessor needs to be started by 4/1. There is a lot more to do here than I had originally anticipated [detail available if required, but I'm trying to keep it brief]. We can't start until some things are defined and clarified. **This does not have to be complicated, but it must move forward quickly. I think I can already supply most of the solutions, but someone needs to make some decisions.**

Kinda reminds me of the FLOOD WORK we did a couple years ago. I don't have a couple month's for committee meetings on this. Let's "gitter done!"

Thanks?

PS: It ain't a job, it's an adventure.

From: TomKarsh
To: ChalMartin
Subject: draft letter regarding funding the FCZD
Date: 3/15/2006 2:59:24 PM

Attachment N1: [2-7 Draft Commissioner letter](#)

Is this what you had in mind? Comments anyone else?

From: ChalMartin
To: TomKarsh
Subject: Flood Control Zone District - Meetings w/ Councils and Commissions
Date: 3/28/2006 6:33:38 AM

Tom
Can you develop a schedule for a team approach that will enable us to hit all cities, towns, and Dike Districts to spell out this proposal, discuss costs, and gain feedback? When we get confirmed meeting slots, we'll schedule our staff to attend. Thanks Chal

From: DaveBrookings
To: JacquGent
Subject: Flood Control Zone District - Development of County Presentation/Message
Date: 3/30/2006 9:27:54 AM

Jacque,

Would you please look out into the near future and schedule a 1.5 hour meeting with the group above so we can jointly develop our message and presentation to support the implementation of a County Wide Flood Control Zone District.

All - in preparation of this meeting please be thinking about the various arguments for or against this endeavor so we can prepare a presentation package that addresses the main issues. Be thinking about the various stakeholders who would support or oppose the idea. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2006 7:59 AM
To: rboge RicBoge; GarySorensen
Cc: Janice Flagan
Subject: Senior staff items of interest

Ric, Gary, Jan,

Senior Staff items of interest include:

...

Flood Control Zone District - Tom Karsh to schedule meetings with Cities to promote FCZD. Several staff will be asked to present to share the workload. I have requested that we all get together to develop a canned powerpoint presentation and to develop a list of frequently asked questions.

...

From: DaveBrookings
To: ChalMartin; Gary Rowe
Subject: RE: Draft Resolution
Date: 4/3/2006 12:53:03 PM

Chal, Gary,

This looks good. How about adding something in here about implementation of the Flood Control Zone District so we can pursue a funding mechanism for actual flood control work (**not for continuing studies, research or legislative use**) to minimize flood damage.

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge; LornaEllestad; ToreyNelson
Subject: Flood Stuff
Date: 4/14/2006 7:52:43 AM

Ric, Lorna, Torey,

I see our County role slowly transitioning towards the following:

- * Morph the SRFS to focus on obtaining additional storage within the reservoirs at Baker and Skagit operations.
- * **Implement a Flood Control Zone District (when the incremental projects are more clearly identified) to support local efforts (diking districts and cities) to incrementally improve flood control in a way that is consistent with the future**

Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan.

- * Begin work on the development and adoption of a Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan
- * Maintain and look to improve CRS programming
- * Look for opportunities to preserve flood damage reduction alternatives for future generations by designating protected areas for flood conveyance. Likely areas would include Nookachamps, Sterling ?
- * Develop and maintain the best damn flood fight and emergency evacuation plan in the western region.

The other thing we cannot lose site of in our CFHMP is that while we are spending a great deal of money and research on the riverine options, we have a significant number of saltwater dikes that are in need of regular maintenance. Not to mention that no one is looking at the elevations of these saltwater dikes and looking ahead to the global warming trend and resulting sea level rise. At some point we may want to be thinking about a summer time intern project to set up a second survey crew (with gps units on quad runners) so we can get good profile info of these dikes. Ric - is this a project that WWU might want to explore as apart of their environmental programming? I could foresee an academic connection with this. Just a couple thoughts for consideration.

From: LornaEllestad
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Stuff
Date: 4/14/2006 10:07:45 AM

Dave,
Good comments.

Don't forget the River bend and Fir Island as areas to restrict development along the river. The County and the City are continuing to issue building permits in these areas. The UW is actively researching the impacts of climate change and professor Edward Miles may be more than interested in evaluating our sea dike elevations and the impact of sea level rise to the salt marsh areas.

Lorna

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: Don Munks Follow up
Date: 6/22/2006 8:49:03 AM

Ric,

Last week I met with Commissioner Munks and we got to talking about the possible future flood control actions here in the Skagit Valley. I mentioned the concept of a flood control zone district coupled with an incentive program such as a County Flood Control Grant program that would help make incremental flood control improvements to our current levee system. The thought here being that we cannot afford to achieve 100yr protection at this time but may be able to get to 50yr for some of our areas.

The concept sparked his interest and I told him that I would provide him with examples of what we did in the past with our Flood Control Grant program by pulling the grant guidelines, selection process and resolutions of grant award.

Can you please have staff pull this info together by looking back into Flood Control Committee files of the late 80's early 90's. Thanks

From: ChalMartin
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: Tukwila / King County Learning Opportunity
Date: 7/12/2006 12:23:20 PM

Dave

Gary stopped by and mentioned we might want to get smart on the Tukwila levee situation, how that is now dialed in to Ron Sims' **proposed flood control zone district**, and the particulars of how the Tukwila levees are coming to be decertified. Maybe we could set up a tour/meeting with our staff? Tukwila is beautiful in August. I think there is a MacDonald's at the mall. Thanks Chal

From: DaveBrookings [mailto:daveb@co.skagit.wa.us]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 11:17 AM
To: Knauer, Jennifer
Subject: Tukwila Levee Decertification

Jennifer,

We have been following this story with interest and would like to learn more about the thinking behind setting up a flood control zone district and to learn more about how the levees were decertified. Would it be possible for my Public Works Director Chal Martin and I to come down to your neck of the woods to have a site visit and discussion about this? We are involved with our own issues related to flood damage reduction and **have been considering a flood control zone district for our area as well**. Please give me a call or respond via e-mail. Thanks

From: Knauer, Jennifer [mailto:Jennifer.Knauer@METROKC.GOV]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 11:25 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Bleifuhs, Steve
Subject: RE: **Tukwila Levee Decertification**

Dave,

Thank you for your message. We would be happy to meet and discuss where King County is in the FCZD creation process, view some sites, and brainstorm. I am including Steve Bleifuhs as a cc to this message, given his role as Managing Supervisor for our River and Floodplain Management Unit. Either Steve or I will be in touch to set up a meeting. Have a nice day. Jennifer Knauer

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge; LornaEllestad; ToreyNelson
Subject: RE: contract
Date: 7/20/2006 3:54:07 PM

Gang - Anything come out of the meeting with Chal today that would impact or change how we would put together Fund 110 for the rest of 2006/2007? Using Chal's current budget directives and BCC Guidance:

Focus on Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan

Baker Storage - (Presumably through the Army Corps GI)

Here is what I'm thinking as far as key elements as I prepare Fund 110:

Flood Awareness Week - Status Quo

River Gages - Status Quo

Skagit River Feasibility Study - Focus all available \$\$ on Baker Storage. Need to come to terms with the Corps on PMP/scoping

...

FERC - Game over. Will budget zero.

...

New Items for consideration

Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan Formulation - What do we think? .5 FTE? (.25 Lorna/.25 Torey)

Continuation of NHC contract - Keep Torey as Project Manager - Torey what do you estimate your time commitment for this?

Map Modernization Project - Hmmm. Still thinking.

Flood Control Zone District Implementation - I'm going to anticipate that by the end of the first quarter or 2007 our BCC will be in a position to consider heading in this direction.

BNSF Debris Study - Should be completed in 2006 correct. May have some follow-up items. Thoughts.

Please give me your input by COB tomorrow. Thanks.

From: rboge RicBoge
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2006 9:00 AM
To: DaveBrookings; LornaEllestad; ToreyNelson
Cc: Janice Flagan
Subject: RE: contract

Dave - I heard nothing that would change the guidance below, with the exception of how exactly will we 'focus on the CFHMP'? Lorna reminded us that communicating with Chuck Steele is key to how we officially launch into this

focus. As you know, up til now we've been in this 'interim' category of sorts, where under FCAAP Ecology is able to fund 25% of costs for the SRFS. To 'focus' on the the CFHMP means we need to break away from that interim category in our next FCAAP application and officially enter the arena with Ecology where we develop a CFHMP. This is where Ecology funds 75% of costs to develop and approve a CFHMP. This also starts the clock ticking - I think there is a 3-year timeline to get the CFHMP approved.

Some thought needs to put in on how we accomplish the above next year while still focusing on Baker storage in SRFS. Also, for budgeting for next year does any further consideration need to be given to the Board's 'Policy Direction' resolution signed in April which includes this directive to the Public Works Director: "Support completion of the GI Study to identify additional flood control measures to be considered for implementation of an overall flood control strategy."

Other than that, see my comments below. R

From: DaveBrookings
To: ChalMartin
Subject: FW: SRFS Update
Date: 8/2/2006 2:54:07 PM

Chal,

We would like to offer this attachment as our update on the efforts with the SRFS. We recommend canceling the scheduled meeting unless you have items on your end to discuss. Please let us know.

Ric, Lorna, Torey - One bit of news that I will pass along is that Chal is now taking an initial stab at a BCC response letter to the SRIP letter received earlier - standby as he will be sharing his working draft for our input. Also, Don Munks told me today that he is scheduling a meeting with Bud Norris to discuss "issues". I have been pitching the concept of the Flood Control Zone District to Don and provided him with a working draft of what this would look like. I also provided him with examples of how we used to manage the old flood control grant program. We discussed the need of the County to support MV's efforts to protect downtown MV and also how the County may just end up having a differing approach than the cities on the FEMA issue. For instance, the City of MV and Burlington may very well want to challenge the technical merits of the Corps work on the FEMA floodmaps whereas the County may or may not want to enter this fight. The County obviously has money issues and needs to be selective in how and when it chooses to battle - not to mention that we have spent a large chunk of money developing information that could be used by others in such an appeal. The Cities however, may have much more at stake and should not be precluded from launching their own attack on their own nickel. We may just need to explain this better to our City partners and then be more sensitive to areas where our county actions, if not fully considered and discussed, may appear to undermine the cities ability to appeal.

From: ChalMartin
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: SRFS Update
Date: 8/2/2006 4:03:45 PM

Dave

Good points. I will use these recommendations in the response letter. Concur we can cancel the meeting.

Regarding the update:

- 1) How long is the Corps going to fiddle with the issue of how/whether/when a new/revised PMP is needed?
- 2) Regarding the real estate costs at the 10% level: an intern working with the Assessor's office should be able to work up a very solid estimate, complete with future projections, in a matter of days. In fact, maybe that is a task we could put one of our interns on.

From: LornaEllestad
To: ChalMartin
Subject: RE: SRFS Update
Date: 8/3/2006 8:56:01 AM

Chal,

1) The Corps has determined that we need a PMP amendment to complete the 10% measures economic evaluation task and then a new PMP to proceed with Baker Storage if we have faith that we can get there with them. Linda has promised a draft version "soon" but she has not yet replied to my inquiry earlier this week.

2) We have already submitted the County's "assessed and market value" information to the Corps. We are meeting with them and will also be conducting a sample "field review" with them to determine if this information is adequate for the 10% evaluation without performing property appraisals. I am strongly against spending any of our limited funding performing appraisals when we can use our assessor's information supplemented with a couple of strategic "market assessments" to evaluate recent comparative sales. There has been so much real estate activity up here that these market assessments are usually "right on the mark".

Thanks for the offer of an intern, while we still have them.
Please let me know if you have any other questions.

From: Bleifuhs, Steve [mailto:Steve.Bleifuhs@METROKC.GOV]
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2007 11:44 AM
To: DaveBrookings; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: king county mtg request

Thank you, Dave and Ric, for taking the time to meeting with us today. I'm quite

interested in following your successes and lessons learned through this process. I'd like to exchange information on the governance structure as both of our counties further define the various roles and responsibilities, as well as what your grant funding program might look like. I think we both can benefit from each other's objective to establish the funding mechanism for the district. Let's stay in touch!

From: DaveBrookings [mailto:daveb@co.skagit.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2007 2:21 PM
To: Knauer, Jennifer
Cc: Bleifuhs, Steve; rboge RicBoge; Stephen R. Fallquist
Subject: RE: king county mtg request

Jennifer,

Thanks for taking the time to meet with us on Monday and again congratulations on getting your County Council approval to implement your aggressive flood control capital improvement program. In preparation of our meeting on Monday and as you have suggested here are a few general questions for our discussion:

Topic - Flood Control Zone District

- 1) What were your steps for implementation of this FCZD and rate structure and what did you learn along the way that may help us as we consider the same?
- 2) Do you have existing diking districts and if yes will the FCZD impose a charge upon them as well?
- 3) If the answer to #2 is yes, how did you differentiate between the two assessments that a typical property owner would pay in this scenario?
- 4) What will the fee structure look like and will there be different levels of assessment/taxation for those who live on the floodplain vs. on the uplands?
- 5) How do you legally differentiate between the existing drainage utility fee and the flood control zone district tax?
- 6) I thought that the plan recommended dissolving the Green River Flood Control Zone district however the recent news article seemed to imply that this area will remain and be exempt from the new tax? What happened here? I ask because we have several sub flood control zones that we would likely dissolve.

Topic _ FEMA Floodplain Mapping Modernization Project

- 1) Where are you at with FEMA as it relates to this effort?
- 2) Did you see a significant increase in your BFE's? Did this lead to new areas being required to obtain flood insurance and will this change the way development will occur on the floodplain? Has this created a greater desire for your urban centers to support the above flood control zone district so funding can

be used to build federally certified levees? Did this effort lead to a new floodway designation?

3) Did anyone appeal the new FEMA BFE's?

Misc.

1) Other questions _ have you had much luck working feasibility studies with the Army Corps of Engineers _ we are currently working with the Corps but have struggled to make good progress.

2) Flood Hazard Management Plan _ I would like to have a quick discussion about your process for developing your plan.

There will just be two of us heading down and we hope to have a relatively speedy informal exchange of info so we can let you all get back to work. Thanks

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 11:22 AM
To: RobinLangston
Cc: rboge RicBoge; Gene Sampley; 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: FCS Contract

Robin,

I'm sensing that we are losing valuable time as we wait for this contract. Can you look ahead to when this contract is scheduled to be signed by the BCC and on that very same day please schedule Gene, Ric and I to meet with John Ghilarducci of FCS group to launch into our task of getting the flood control zone district financial framework in place. We would need about an hour to discuss this. Gene is optional if we cannot make it work with his part time schedule. Thanks Robin.

John, FYI - the flood control zone district is time sensitive and we need to lean forward on this. Please work with Robin on a date that works for you.

From: RobinLangston
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 1:26 PM
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: FCS Contract

Hi Dave,

I e-mailed Judy at the PA's Office this morning but haven't heard back from her yet. I'm not sure how the contract got through without Jean's signature; her name was on the Agenda Routing Sheet.

Thanks, Robin

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Follow-up Items
Date: 4/16/2007 8:16:04 AM

Dave - it's on my radar. Actually, I'm to draft responses to each entity that sent a letter. So far, I've only seen letters from Burlington and MV. I could see ccing SRIP on these responses.

In my opinion, it would be good for the County to state some of it's positions in these responses, such as corps H?

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2007 9:11 AM
To: rboge RicBoge
Cc: Gene Sampley
Subject: Follow-up Items

Ric,

Just a reminder that per the BCC's request, Gene is looking for your group to draft a letter for the BCC signature to SRIP that request's them to support the GI process and our planning efforts. Let's target getting this drafted before Wednesday so Gene can review it before he leaves.

Gene _ Are there other points of interest that we should point out in this letter? Corps H?

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2007 11:26 AM
To: KenDahlstedt
Cc: Gene Sampley; rboge RicBoge
Subject: Flood info in Layman's terms

Ken,

Gene Sampley mentioned to me that you were looking for a paper prepared in _ layman's terms that would best describe the county's findings from it's various studies. Can we discuss this in a little more detail before we get started on this so I can make sure we are hitting the areas of interest. I think we have a meeting tomorrow morning with you, Ric, Dan and Lorna so perhaps we can discuss it there. Thanks

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2007 3:04 PM
To: rboge RicBoge
Cc: Gene Sampley; Dan Berentson; LornaEllestad
Subject: RE: Flood info in Layman's terms

Ric,

Should we talk about the upcoming watershed council meeting presentation? Who will be giving it and what is our specific message? Keep in mind that our messages as of late are looking a little fuzzy because we just went before them on the Salmon Heritage Program and now we may be slowing that down a little due to recent changes in State Law. Also, the agenda is covering a lot of items for one hour. Someone will need to facilitate us moving through the agenda in order to stay on point. Please define who that is and let's stay on track. Thanks

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood info in Layman's terms
Date: 4/17/2007 2:19:00 PM

I'll facilitate the meeting.

Ted Perkins is the planned presenter to SWC, with Lorna following up. Ted's message: This is what the preliminary hydraulic analysis is showing. Lorna's follow-up: Based on these preliminary findings, where might there be opportunities for win/win projects?

I agree on the County's 'message' being fuzzy. Not sure how to 'fix' that. Dan?? R

-----Original Message-----

From: DaveBrookings [mailto:daveb@co.skagit.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 3:24 PM
To: DeloresMcLeod
Cc: Gene Sampley; John Ghilarducci
Subject: FW: Flood Control Zone District Memorandum - Confidential.

Dee,

Please schedule a meeting for next Wednesday with Gene, John, Ric, Dan, Steve F, Kelly B from the assessors, Katie J from the Treasurers office. I think we need 1 hour. Topic - Implementation of a Flood Control Zone District Rate Structure. Thanks

John - agenda for the meeting so we can stay on track?

From: John Ghilarducci <JohnG@fcsgroup.com>
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District Memorandum - Confidential.
Date: 4/24/2007 2:33:44 PM

Attachment N1: [Data Needs List 042507](#)
Attachment N2: [Agenda FCZD 042507](#)

Here's a proposed agenda for tomorrow, and an initial data needs list. We'll be around in the morning (until about 11) if you have any questions / comments.

- John

From: rboge RicBoge
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: FW: Measure cost est.
Date: 4/27/2007 2:16:23 PM

Attachment N1: [07 04 27 FCZD planning](#)

John - attached is a brief memo with some figures that can be used for preliminary planning purposes to generate revenues from a Flood Control Zone District. The table is what you'll want to focus on. Note that these are very rough estimates and there is some overlap. Note also that they do not include mitigation costs, if required. Some of these projects may not get built, but others may be added. All in all, I think these are about as good of numbers we can give you, at this point in time.

Part of our current work of planning flood projects with the Army Corps study is to define more specifically what needs to be considered for these and other flood control measures, which will go into a SOW for the next phase of the study and yield much more reliable estimates.

Hope this works for now. Let me know if you need additional info. Thanks, Ric

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 7:39 AM
To: rboge RicBoge; 'John Ghilarducci'; LornaEllestad
Cc: 'Michael Dean'; Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.

Does this include the Mount Vernon floodwall?

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.
Date: 4/30/2007 3:13:19 PM

Dave - no, the floodwall is not included. And, the Mount Vernon/Fir Island bypass also is not included.

However, we must keep in mind that if those are built, others won't likely be built, such as the Nookachamps project, etc.

So, for financial planning purposes, the total dollar estimate sent FCS may be in the 'ballpark'. We need to discuss. R

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 7:40 AM
To: rboge RicBoge
Cc: 'Michael Dean'; Gene Sampley; LornaEllestad; 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.

Thanks Ric. I think we need to include those projects being contemplated by other entities as they will want to see the benefit for being in the Zone. We need to be careful what we put on the list _ for instance, are we (County) really suggesting the Nookachamps project as a desired Flood Damage Reduction project?

From: Gene Sampley
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 7:55 AM
To: DaveBrookings; rboge RicBoge
Cc: 'Michael Dean'; LornaEllestad; 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.

All,

I don't want to see the Nookachamps project included in any list of County projects; it should be in the _ other measures being evaluated by the Corp_ category. I do believe we need to include the bypass alternatives somewhere even if we say the costs are included in the overall system measure dependant on which alternatives are selected.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.
Date: 5/2/2007 12:38:59 PM

Attachment N1: [07 05 01 FCZD planning only](#)

John - here's the latest draft of potential flood projects the County is supportive of. Ric

From: rboge RicBoge
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: Measure cost est.
Date: 5/3/2007 10:45:41 AM

Attachment N1: [07 05 03 FCZD planning only](#)

John - to better represent the estimate sent to you yesterday, the following should be added as the last sentence to the first paragraph:

Note: 1) no specific figure is included for ecosystem restoration, although there would likely be some overlap with acquisition, etc, and 2) no specific figure is included for modifications to Baker dams.

Or, just use the attached dated today, May 3. As this continues to evolve, I'll let you know. Thanks, R

From: John Doyle [mailto:planner@townoflaconner.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 12:51 PM
To: bhue461@ecy.wa.gov
Cc: LornaEllestad
Subject: FCAAP Application
Importance: High

Attached is La Conner's FCAAP grant application. I included a copy of our Flood Emergency Response Plan in the hardcopy that is in the mail. Please call if you have any questions.

From: DaveBrookings
To: LornaEllestad; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: FCAAP Application
Date: 5/9/2007 7:45:58 AM

We will want to make sure that this project is added to our list for potential FCZD funding.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: LornaEllestad
Subject: RE: Preliminary FCZD results
Date: 5/18/2007 10:30:12 AM

Dave and I can do the update. We will need your help getting ready for it. Let's be prepared to discuss at next Wednesday's RI meeting with Gene/Dave/Dan our recommendations for FCZD:

1. need and purpose statement for activating a rate structure for the FCZD
2. how much \$ is needed to accomplish the need and purpose
3. how revenues will be expended/allocated to accomplish the need/purpose (i.e. Capital Improvement Projects verses x% available as grant \$ to local DDs/cities)
4. overall governance structure with brief purpose/function statement for each component
5. make up of the committees
6. schedule to implement
7. other.....

R

From: rboge RicBoge
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2007 10:17 AM
To: LornaEllestad
Subject: FW: Preliminary FCZD results

Let's discuss sometime today or Monday.

By the way, I may be asking you to help present an update on preparing to activate the FCZD to the BCC at PW standalone on May 29. R

From: John Ghilarducci [mailto:JohnG@fcsgroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2007 11:54 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: rboge RicBoge; kbriggs@co.skagit.wa.us; Michael Dean
Subject: Preliminary FCZD results

I am attaching a summary of preliminary results looking at an FCZD tax. In one case, we look at the maximum \$.50 per thousand AV and estimate how long it would take to execute the capital plan (9-10 years), and in the 2nd case we assume 30-year execution and calculate the required tax rate (

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: Preliminary FCZD results
Date: 5/20/2007 10:19:59 AM

John,

Thanks for this initial analysis.

So, for .50 levy rate we could generate just over \$7 million annually .. .156 \$2 million annually

Say average home value in the valley is around \$350k so this would be an annual fee of \$175 and \$55 respectively.

Q _ So is it possible for the County to pass a resolution to _ bank_ the full .50 levy initially and then determine annually what is needed? Have you been able to talk with the folks at King County to see how they are approaching this?

Ric _

Can you please forward to me a description for each of the listed projects in this spreadsheet so I can make sure I understand what is included when we identify a project as _ SR-9 to BNSF_ levee alignment. Thanks

From: rboge RicBoge
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2007 12:15 PM
To: Gene Sampley
Cc: DaveBrookings
Subject: FW: Preliminary FCZD results

Gene - FYI, as this topic was raised at this morning's meeting with Commissioner Dahlstedt. I've not reviewed it yet. R

From: DaveBrookings
To: Gene Sampley; rboge RicBoge
Subject: Presentation outline for Flood Control Zone District
Date: 5/21/2007 6:47:21 AM

Attachment N1: [flood control zone district outline](#)

Gene, Ric,

This is the draft outline I was thinking about for the Flood Control Zone presentation to the BCC next week. Let me know what you think. Ric, we will need Lorna to compile some information for us.

From: Gene Sampley
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Presentation outline for Flood Control Zone District
Date: 5/21/2007 11:07:57 AM

Attachment N1: [FCZD Presentation outline](#)

My comments and suggested edits.

Gene

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: FW: Yakima Levee Certification
Date: 5/23/2007 1:27:15 PM

Attachment N1: [LeveeCertificationPolicyClarification12-11-06](#)

Attachment N2: [ER1105](#)

Attachment N3: [EM1110-2-1619](#)

Dave - I had a nice discussion this afternoon about 100-year certified levees with Terry Kennhan, Yakima County Surface Water Manager. My call to him was prompted by an article in Monday's Yakima Herald that I found linked to a notice in the May 23 edition of the Pacific Northwest Water News about Yakima County wanting to move a levee. The article was about the County wrapping up their CFHMP and made reference to Yakima County having a 100-year certified levee.

The short story from Mr. Kennhan on 100-year certified levees is yes, they have one, but that new requirements (not public yet) are looming (maybe as early as within 2-3 months) which he expects to be challenging to meet. He said their current 100-year levee certification is based on a 1998 agreement Yakima County signed with the Corps. He's going to send me a copy of that agreement.

In checking the Yakima County website, I found more on the FCZD they established in 1998. They charge 10 cents per thousand assessed land value. I printed off some information about the FCZD from their site and am routing

copies as an FYI to you and those cc'd this message. R

From: DaveBrookings
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: Flood Control Zone District Update
Date: 5/24/2007 7:53:17 AM

Gene,

I understand that my outline was discussed yesterday and that the consensus was that we had too much to talk about with too little time. Should we pull this for now and get a worksession scheduled? Given our new challenge of exploring the various funding options to pay for other programs within PW we may need to modify our approach. Please advise.

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 4:32 PM
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: flood control zone district draft presentation

Thanks Ric. Here is the latest. Please provide the level of flood protection and the spreadsheet showing our financial needs.

From: DaveBrookings [mailto:daveb@co.skagit.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 2:31 PM
To: John Ghilarducci
Subject: sales tax option

John,

I will be briefing the BCC early next week on the various options for flood control funding leading into a recommendation to consider the flood control zone district. As you know I have one citizen that is extremely interested in having the county consider a sales tax increase option. Can you tell me if this is possible and what the pro's and con's would be for this option. Thanks

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: flood control zone district draft presentation
Date: 5/25/2007 11:03:15 AM

Dave - FYI, Commissioner Dillon stopped by my office and chatted a bit about last night's FEMA mapping meeting in Burlington and gave me a copy of the PP handout at the meeting. (Dee spoke with me earlier and provided a one page hard copy synopsis of the meeting, from her perspective that's in your inbox, along with a copy of of the PP handout.)

Sharon's message to me was that the event, attended by her and Commissioner Munks, was designed to 'stir up the community' for support for challenging the FEMA maps due out soon. She said Ryan did ok, but only had a few minutes. She also said that a comment was made by an attendee during the meeting, "Where is the County on this?" There was no response at that time, but afterwards, Sharon said Commissioner Munks spoke to the person to say the County was not invited to participate in this forum.

She said neither her nor Don spoke during the meeting. But afterwards, she said she spoke individually with people to say "we all need to just begin working on making flood control improvements - whatever the height of the flood is, flood control improvements will reduce damages". I mentioned, and she was pleased to hear that you have an agenda item on the PW slot on Tuesday that will touch upon this topic of 'community working together and taking action now to make flood control improvements'.

One other point Sharon made to me is that it does seem unfair that USGS will rely on 'estimated' flood peaks by Stewart based on, arguably, antidotal information, but that they won't accept new 'estimates' of these flood peaks by engineers utilizing the technology we have today (her intent, my words). R

From: Gene Sampley
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District Update
Date: 5/26/2007 5:23:02 AM

Dave,

Too little time was confirmed in my mind when I heard that one of the two public hearings is going to be controversial. I don't want to pull it, because it's an opportunity to spread the word. I think you'll need to be prepared to be flexible with how much you can tell them in the time available. Go ahead and schedule another time anyway; we need the exposure.

From: DaveBrookings
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District Update
Date: 5/28/2007 12:03:28 PM

Attachment N1: [Flood Control Funding Options 1a](#)

Okay. I have paired my presentation down. Here is a working draft.

To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District Update
Date: 5/29/2007 6:39:35 AM

Dave,

This looks fine. I don't know about the sales tax option. Have you checked to see if it's allowed by statute? The Legislature has to authorize local agency sales tax options and I don't know if this is currently allowed. Good luck.

From: DaveBrookings
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Flood Control Zone District Update
Date: 5/29/2007 7:46:52 AM

Thanks Gene. We will simply mention that this option has been raised but needs to be evaluated further. Get feeling better. Thanks for cranking out the solid waste memo to the BCC. I think this is the right move at this time. We need to light a fire under URS as we need this info sooner than later so people can look at the options.

From: John Ghilarducci [mailto:JohnG@fcsgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2007 9:36 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Michael Dean
Subject: FW: Preliminary FCZD results

Dave: Here's what we learned from Rick Bautista about the King County strategy. Still a work in progress.

- John

From: Michael Dean
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 11:07 AM
To: John Ghilarducci
Subject: RE: Preliminary FCZD results

I spoke with Rick Bautista, who was listed as the primary contact for one of King County's FCZD press releases. He said that the County does not yet know how it will decide the banking-vs.-annual authorization issue. First of all, this issue is currently out of the County's hands. The FCZ advisory group _ consisting of representatives from several cities _ is reviewing and will submit a recommended funding approach to Council by August 31st. However, this is only an advisory recommendation. The County Council will then make the ultimate decision on this.

In short, from his experience, Rick says that legislative members would prefer to do things only once if possible _ making it most likely that the

Council would authorize the full \$0.50. Also, per Rick's recollection, the County's flood control plan, which recommended the formation of a countywide FCZD, included a recommendation that the full \$0.50 per \$1,000 rate be authorized, with the assessed levy rate varying according to budget needs.

From: John Ghilarducci [mailto:JohnG@fcsgroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2007 5:00 PM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Michael Dean
Subject: FW: sales tax option

Hi Dave: I asked Michael to research the sales tax option for funding major flood control projects. Here's his preliminary analysis.- John

From: Michael Dean
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2007 11:24 AM
To: John Ghilarducci
Subject: RE: sales tax option

After a short review, I've found the following pros and cons to the sales tax option. I believe this is a pretty good summary, however I have to caution you that this is the first time that I've dealt with sales and use taxes, and so this list is only my layman's interpretation of my research findings.

Pros of Optional 0.5% Sales and Use Tax

- * Sales tax revenues are not restricted.

Cons of Optional 0.5% Sales and Use Tax

- * Sales tax revenues are subject to other County funding needs.

- * To fund the 30-year CIP cost of \$2,197,136 per year, the optional 0.5% sales and use tax would require a sales base of over \$439.4 million each year.

- * Since it appears that Skagit County already assesses part (or all) of the optional 0.5% sales and use tax, the County's sales base would need to be even higher than \$439.4 million annually to fund a 30-year capital implementation schedule, or the County would need to cut off funding to current recipients of the optional sales tax.

- * Sales tax revenues are less stable than property tax revenues. Thus, there would be a higher likelihood of construction projects being delayed due to lack of funding.

- * If a city chooses to assess the optional 0.5% sales and use tax, the overall tax rate does not increase, but rather the tax revenues are simply apportioned: 85% to the city, 15% to the county. This would further increase the required sales base to support a 30-year CIP.

* 1% of sales tax revenues are kept by the State Department of Revenue to cover administrative costs. If the County assesses the full 0.5% optional sales tax and none of the revenues need to be shared with cities, the sales base would need to be at least \$443.8 million per year to fund a 30-year capital implementation schedule.

* Referendum to repeal or alter the optional 0.5% sales tax will be held if petitioned by 15% of County voters.

After reviewing this list, do any questions come to mind that you'd like me to look into?

- Michael

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: sales tax option
Date: 5/31/2007 6:56:40 AM

Excellent. Thanks John and Micheal.

The Flood Control Zone District concept has been officially launched as it was presented to the BCC on Tuesday. The local paper is running news story's on this so our community will soon engage. Next step will be to reach out to the cities and diking districts.

John, do you have the assessed value in each city? I know that the city councils will want to know how much will be collected within their city and how will they see the return from the Flood Control Zone District. We can handle the second part of the question but would like to know the actual numbers.

Secondly, we are getting indications from the Commissioner's office that they would like us to address the potential for consolidating some of our approaches for obtaining revenue for our programs. As you know we currently have the following for revenue collection:

Drainage Utility

Clean Water Program

Lake Management Districts

(potential for a flood control zone district)

New unfunded expenses:

NPDES Phase II (we will use the DU for this however the rates do not reflect this new expense)

Bayview Ridge Capital Improvement Program (we will use the DU for this however the rates do not reflect this new expense)

Groundwater Monitoring and Management

Salmon Recovery Projects (the Clean Water Program was supposed to fund these

however our projected revenue was less than expected)

GMA Compliance Efforts (the Clean Water Program is currently funding our habitat and water quality (WQ is also grant supported) programs but this is set to expire in the next year or two)

They would like to see if it is possible to consolidate some of these approaches. I know that they took a lot of heat on the Clean Water Program and that it is scheduled to sunset at the end of next year or 2009? The Lake Management Districts are site specific and are not that big of a deal. **What options would we have for consolidation.** I should add that one area that is a new expense for us without revenue is the monitoring of our groundwater resources. The Skagit Instream flow rule that was recently adopted has many strings attached to it that will require us to staff up and manage. **We are looking at 300k-500k shortfall over the next several years as a result of this rule.** The administration has asked us to look into this. I have explained that it is not that easy as we are providing services to different geographical areas. I would like to discuss this further with you and ultimately have a technical memo that addresses this issue. Thanks John.

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: sales tax option
Date: 5/31/2007 9:57:25 AM

How would you implement this? Could this be implemented by Commissioner action or a vote of the people? Would the City Council's need to take action as well? What if one city chose to not participate? What is the current county sales base?

From: rboge RicBoge
To: 'Hanson, Jana'
Subject: RE: COE flood control projects
Date: 5/31/2007 8:40:17 AM

Attachment N1: [What Will Flood Control Cost.ppt](#)

Jana - see attached. We are emphasizing that this table is for illustrative purposes and meant to show the approximate level of funding it will take to achieve a reasonable level of flood control in Skagit County - including 100-year protection for the urbanized areas. The table shows conceptual projects coming out of the Corps study with very preliminary cost estimates. We know the projects and cost estimates will change as more information comes out of the Corps study.

FYI, Dave is going to discuss flood control funding options at next Monday evening's Flood Control Committee meeting. Ric

From: Larry Kunzler [mailto:Larry@hbsslaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 4:26 AM
To: Larry Kunzler
Subject: FW: Skagit Valley Herald: County may resurrect flood tax
Importance: High

Either the reporter got this wrong or Ric Boge totally misled the County Commissioners. The PENALTY TAX (a/k/a/ property tax) was never collected in the past. The County will have to pay between 35 and 40% not 25%. By the time the Corps is done (as if they are ever done) with their studies the price tag will soar to over 300 million dollars. Once again Skagit County seems destined to shoot itself in the foot by not thinking through the problem and coming to an amicable solution. Another property tax is not the answer and if the County Commissioners believe it is then they should, as at least two of them promised when they ran for election, put it to a vote of the people.

From: Sharon D. Dillon
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 10:17 AM
To: 'Larry Kunzler'
Cc: DaveBrookings; DonMunks; KenDahlstedt
Subject: RE: Skagit Valley Herald: County may resurrect flood tax

Larry, it is my desire to always put this type of issue to a vote, anything that effects peoples property, they have the right to vote on. I am not sure property tax is the way to go but what options do we have to raise the needed money. Sales Tax? General fund at the expense of other departments. We need to move some of the smaller projects forward. So, how???

I believe that you also stated that to me last week. If we just keep talking about it the cost keep going up and nothing get done. Talk is cheap, but what ever we do it will be after town meetings, information gathering and various other way to get impute from the general public. The meeting mentioned in the article is one step in many, many steps. I hope you will be a part of the solution and work with the County for the betterment of Skagit County citizens.

From: rboge RicBoge
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 11:38 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Gene Sampley
Subject: FW: Skagit Valley Herald: County may resurrect flood tax

Dave - My concern, as we discussed earlier today, is that the County is way behind the PR effort needed to be successful with this by August. R

From: Gene Sampley
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 11:28 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Will W. Honea; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: Skagit Valley Herald: County may resurrect flood tax

Dave,

Thanks for sending this; it puts an additional step in the process I had not considered; e.g., Town Hall meetings. In order to get an August decision with Town Hall meetings factored in, we need to start planning for them now. Look at you overall schedule and see when it would be appropriate to start holding such meetings and let's talk about it next Wednesday at our fish/flood meeting.

Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 1:09 PM
To: DonMunks
Cc: Sharon D. Dillon; KenDahlstedt
Subject: FCZD

Don

Here are the bullet points re FCZD:

* No Final Decisions Have Been Made Yet

* The FCZD as presented and discussed on Tuesday was in the form of an update to the BCC and to share information gathered to date.

* BOCC has not made any final decisions

* The 14 projects are not a prioritized list but rather a list of identified flood damage reduction projects with preliminary estimates. The purpose of this list was to show the BCC the cost of various flood control measures. Within this list there are projects that are _ no brainers_ ie. Ring dikes for Laconner, SW Treatment Plant and MV Floodwall and there are others requiring further evaluation with the Corps modeling.

* Community needs to participate in the discussion

* We as a community need to take charge of our own destiny with regard to flood control. Yes, we need to stop relying on the Fed's to solve our problem and we have the strength of well organized diking districts with tremendous authority to help us implement the selected projects.

* Funding Issues

- * The Corps isn't going to come through any time soon with full funding solution
- * Right now we have _ balkanization_ of our flood control, i.e., many different players pulling in may different directions
- * We need a team effort to tackle a problem this big
- * Flood projects are like any other project: no funding, no project
- * We need a reliable funding source
- * There are three basic funding sources under the RCW 86.15 (the FCZD statute):
 - * Ad valorem property tax countywide by vote -- RCW 86.15160(1)
 - * **Special assessment based on benefited property -- RCW 86.15.160(2)**
 - * **Problematic b/c require parcel by parcel assessment**
 - * Ad valorem property tax countywide by resolution, up \$0.50 per \$1000 -- RCW 86.15.160(3)
- * Cannot impinge on assessment collected by other districts
- * Dave Brookings says we're OK here
- * Note _ this basic concept has been implemented in Whatcom and Yakima Counties. King County is soon to move forward with their district. (See E-mail)
- * Also **Larry Kunzler is advocating sales tax option**
 - * Hits cities harder
 - * Problems with this option _ see Dave Brookings' email (note _ we have a financial consultant working with us to explore all options including this one. **Early indications are that this is problematic.**
- * Basic Conceptualization of Plan
 - * FCZD will be like a flood project bank
 - * Advisory Body will be like a Bank Board of Directors, reviewing and approving projects for funding
- * Governance of FCZD
 - * _ Default setting_ is BOCC are ex officio Supervisors of FCZD
 - * Plan is to set up 15 member advisory body to prioritize and recommend projects
 - * Advisory body diverse but heavy on Dike / Drainage Dist ?
 - * Under statute BOCC can by resolution put measure on ballot to elect 3 independent Supervisors to run FCZD
 - * Also 15% of those voting in last election can do likewise by petition
 - * So this is not something totally under BOCC control and there is a mechanism to change governance if _ default setting_ doesn't work
 - * But _ default setting_ is cleanest and best to start out with

From: Ralph Schwartz [mailto:rschwartz@skagitvalleyherald.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 11:46 AM
To: rboge RicBoge
Cc: DaveBrookings
Subject: questions/flood zone district

Dave?

Several questions relating to the FCZD. Thanks so much for your helpfulness.

I understand several subzones are already in place, collecting taxes for flood control. (Is this accurate?)

How many subzone districts are there?

Who do they serve? Are they co-located with diking districts, or are they entirely separate from d.d's?

How much tax do they collect?

What do they pay for? Any recent projects you can point to?

Again, what might happen to the subzone districts if this countywide district is started again?

Re: Ric's presentation, and the "list of 14" projects, with the "25%" local match. Where did that 25% figure come from? If I'm right, the local matches are 50% for design and 35% for construction.

This last question is probably for Dave:

Will Honea told me using sales tax to collect funds for the FCZD rather than property tax has been considered but is problematic. He said you would be able to better explain why....

From: rboge RicBoge
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 12:46 PM
To: 'Ralph Schwartz'
Cc: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: questions/flood zone district

Ralph - the sub flood control zone questions are going to take some time to accurately respond to, as they are not on my list of current management responsibilities. But I do know there are about 1/2 dozen or so that are currently active. They serve and are financed by residents of specific geographic areas for localized flood/drainage control. Each sub flood zone has an Advisory Committee that meets annually to recommend to the County work to accomplish within their zone for the following year, generally to maintain functioning drainage conveyances. Expenditures for each sub flood zone work are paid from the fund established for each zone and that houses the revenues from assessments of landowners within the zone. A recent project I know of would be dredging last year a portion of Hansen Creek south of Highway 20.

Sub flood control zones are different from drainage districts, diking districts and the County Drainage Utility. Landowners that pay into a sub flood control zone do not also pay into a drainage district or the County Drainage Utility, and visa versa. It has been suggested that if funding the Flood Control Zone District were

to be pursued County-wide for helping fund regional flood control improvements, the drainage needs of sub flood control zones could be addressed by the County Drainage Utility.

I'll forward your list of questions to PW Accounting and others actively involved at this time in managing the zones. Ric

From: JimMartin
To: rboge RicBoge; DaveSheridan
Subject: RE: questions/flood zone district
Date: 6/1/2007 11:01:01 AM

There are ten sub-floods set-up, however, only 7 are active. As for the tax collected information, that info should probably come from the Assessors office, as they have all the taxing records. I could give a broad estimate of what we budget to collect in assessments, but the actual numbers would come from the Assessor.

As for recent projects, Dave Sheridan and/or Jan Flagan would be better suited to answer that question.

Other than that it looked to me like you covered the rest with your response, Ric. Please let me know if there is additional info that you need from Accounting specifically.

From: DaveBrookings
To: 'Larry Kunzler'
Subject: FW: sales tax option
Date: 6/1/2007 11:56:18 AM

Larry,

I know you have been and advocate for use of a sales tax option for funding flood control efforts. I want to make sure that we are communicating with each other as we explore the potential options. I did not share this option with the BCC earlier this week as I have asked our financial consultant to look into this and I'm still awaiting more info. Please read the e-mail string below and share your thoughts. Maybe we can talk Monday about this so we can fully determine the pro's and con's of this funding option. Thanks Larry.

From: TrishaLogue
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2007 12:15 PM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: 'John Ghilarducci'
Subject: RE: sales tax option

Dave,

The County has already implemented this optional tax, so the base doesn't really matter. The cities have also implemented their optional portion. I am not aware of any other optional sales taxes that the County could implement (with or without voter approval) for this purpose.

From: Larry Kunzler [mailto:Larry@hbsslaw.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 03, 2007 5:21 AM
To: DaveBrookings
Cc: Gene Sampley; Dan Berentson; Sharon D. Dillon; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: sales tax option

Dave,

Sorry I didn't respond before now but I got home Friday and didn't check my e-mail. Yesterday I got up at 3 a.m. and Jeff I hiked into Lake Ross. I got to find out who keeps making that trail a little longer each year. Anyway just saw your e-mail this morning. I would be happy to stop by on my way home from work tomorrow around 1 (12:45 if no traffic, 1:15 if there is a fender bender), and discuss my idea with you. If not we can talk at the flood meeting of which I will take another vacation day to attend.

"Plan B" (obviously for lack of a better name) is really a three part process with only the first element (the sales tax) necessary to go forward. The other two are solely dependent on what the local community wants to do. I obviously feel very strongly that the community needs to have the option of weighing in on the Plan. If they reject it then so be it. No hard feelings on my part, I'm just tired of going to meetings and nothing getting done. I'm tired of the animosity between the county and the cities and the dike districts. I view Plan B as a remedy to this problem and can work to bring us all back together.

Let me know if 1sh is okay and I'll swing by.

From: DaveBrookings
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: Ken Dahlstedt - Flood Control Governance Structure
Date: 6/13/2007 10:40:51 AM

Ric,

Ken D called me this morning and he has been making his rounds with some of the Diking Districts and mayors talking about SRIP, Flood Control Committee and the Flood Control Zone District. Question being, how would all these come together or would they. After talking with folks Ken suggests that we consider forming the Committees as envisioned under the flood control zone district with broader representation at the technical committees and a 15 member advisory board of including the cities/others but couple this with the Flood Control Council.

The Flood Control Council is a combination of all Diking and Drainage Districts (Ric _ please pull info on this from our SWM files as I remember working with this group in the early 90's. You will want to see its structure). Ken is thinking and I agree, that the Diking and Drainage Districts need their own forum for working on Flood Control and drainage issues. I'm not convinced that the County needs to manage this group, it may be something that is handled by Western Washington Ag ? Anyway, **the idea is to eliminate the Flood Control Committee _ reenergize the flood control council, eliminate SRIP and create the flood control zone district committee structure.** Let's discuss

at your next fish and flood meeting or sooner. (*Emphasis added by srh.com*)

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Ken Dahlstedt - Flood Control Governance Structure
Date: 6/14/2007 2:50:03 PM

Dave - Here's what I've uncovered (not a lot) after spending a few hours researching the Flood Control Council:

According to 10-24-78 memo from Don Nelson on behalf of Gene to the BCC: "The Skagit County Flood Control Council was reactivated in February 1978 to coordinate the Lower Levee Project with the various Dike and Drainage Districts, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Dike and Drainage Districts, the Conservation District of Skagit County and the Skagit County Engineers." (The Lower Levee Project, as I'm sure you know, was a late 1970's Corps GI the County was involved in.)

Don Nelson was Secretary of this group and I've found the minutes from a November 1, 1978 meeting and a February 7, 1979 meeting.

*

Pete Walker was President of the Flood Control Council during this time period.

*

My suspicion is that the Flood Control Council largely replaced the Flood Control Committee until about the early 90's. That suspicion is based on a newspaper ad I found early in 1992 that includes this language, "Skagit County is re-establishing the Skagit River Flood Control Committee.....", combined with the most recent reference I've found to the Flood Control Council being in the April 16, 1991 BCC minutes regarding a Public Meeting they attended at the Rexville Grange on Drainage and Flood Control. Those minutes cite a statement by "Curt Johnson, vice-president of the Flood Control Council....."

It appears from the 2-sets of Flood Control Council minutes I've managed to locate that the Council was the County's local public forum at that time to discuss and evaluate the information coming from the GI and take questions/concerns that local citizens had about that information.

Let me know if you want to take a look at any of this, or if further research is warranted. (I did leave a message with Neil Hamburg to give me a call as he may be able to describe more of the Council's role.) R

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge; DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Ken Dahlstedt - Flood Control Governance Structure
Date: 6/15/2007 5:03:40 AM

Good _ snooping_ , Ric. When I came in 1978, there were two main issues; flood control and solid waste. I'm glad we were able to solve them then so we don't have to worry about them now:-)

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: FW: chart
Date: 6/15/2007 8:16:23 AM

Attachment N1: [Flood Control Organizational Structure0001](#)

Dave - Here's an org chart I found in the Flood Control Council file that may reflect or be similar to what Commissioner Dahlestedt envisions.

In screening the file, it appears the Council was most active in the late 70's (when it also included the Corps) 'coordinating' local aspects of the Lower Levee Project and in the early 90's (Corps no longer included) challenging threats to drainage and levee maintenance from WDFW, recreational groups, Ecology, etc.

Gene - we can discuss Commissioner Dahlstedt's vision more fully with him next Wednesday, as he is schedule to attend our food/fish meeting next week at 8:30. R

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Ken Dahlstedt - Flood Control Governance Structure
Date: 6/15/2007 10:53:44 AM

Dave - FYI, I did speak with Neil Hamburg today about the Council. His take on it's role and purpose included:

- * made up of only the dike and drainage districts
- * non-political
- * agenda topics/discussions included:
 - * how to finance improvements,
 - * technical aspects of dike and drainage facility improvements (what worked well, didn't work well),
 - * problems that affected all of them
 - * threats to maintenance from environmental and recreational requirements/concerns.

His recollection is that about the early 90's was when the transition was made to the Flood Control Committee, which he said used to get "specific assignments" from the BCC (such as a forum for the work done to form the Drainage Utility) and reviewed and advised the County on the allocation of grants from the Flood Control Fund.

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: draft - Strategy for Achieving Skagit River Flood Control.doc
Date: 7/5/2007 11:56:37 AM

Attachment N1: [draft Strategy for Skagit River Flood Control-Gene](#)

Great job, Ric. I have one suggestion on the strategy attached.

Gene

From: DaveBrookings
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 3:30 PM
To: Gene Sampley
Cc: rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: FCZD

Gene,

My take is that we are better off waiting a couple of years to develop a tighter plan and list of projects rather than jeopardize the whole issue by rushing to get something passed. There are pro's and con's to this issue but this is my 2-bit opinion. I'm excited to see us bring on a qualified consultant to help us formulate a CFHMP and it's associated committee framework. This will be a huge undertaking for our small staff to support. Trying to do both about the same time would be problematic from a staffing perspective (Ric _ weigh in here with your thoughts on this.).

From: rboge RicBoge
To: DaveBrookings; Gene Sampley; Dan Berentson; LornaEllestad
Subject: More massaged draft strategy/FCZD committee makeup
Date: 7/12/2007 9:52:23 AM

Attachment N1: [7-12-07 draft Strategy for Skagit River Flood Control](#)

Please review and comment back to me on the attached. R

From: Stephen R. Fallquist
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2007 5:52 PM
To: DaveBrookings; rboge RicBoge
Cc: Will W. Honea
Subject: County Wide Flood Control Zone District

Ric ?

What is the current status of our efforts to potentially revise the County-Wide Flood Control Zone District. This was a big issue a few months ago, but I haven't seen much about it lately. Is this proceeding as planned or is it tentatively on hold for now? If it is proceeding, where are we at? Talk to you soon. _ Steve

From: DaveBrookings
To: Stephen R. Fallquist; rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: County Wide Flood Control Zone District
Date: 7/20/2007 7:46:03 AM

Steve,

SWM is focusing their efforts on completing a Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan. This will be done in conjunction with a newly established 15 member policy committee (Cities, tribes, diking districts, salmon recovery advocates) and several technical committees feeding information into the policy group. The County will take the H?

From: rboge RicBoge
To: James E. Voetberg; Jeff M. Miller
Subject: Draft resolution
Date: 7/27/2007 2:21:14 PM

Attachment N1: [FCZD Resolution](#)
Attachment N2: [attachment 1 - district structure](#)
Attachment N3: [Attachment 2 - executive committee](#)
Attachment N4: [Attachment 3 - technical committees](#)

Jim, Jeff and Gene - attached is a draft resolution to implement the new flood control strategy as directed by the Board. It includes a few changes based on review and comment by Dave, Lorna and Dee. Now it's ready for your review and comment.

When presented to the Board, this needs to be followed at the same time by an additional resolution I have not had time to draft to formally eliminate the Flood Control Committee as established by prior resolutions AND formally acknowledge the hours of service by the members of this committee over the years for the cause of flood protection (with certificates of commendation and/or followed by letters to each member from the BCC thanking them). FYI, the next

scheduled meeting of the Flood Control Committee is early September so it would be good to take these actions by then if at all possible.

My contract specialist (Robin Langston) has told me we do not have to advertise for qualifications for consultants to work on developing our CFHMP. We can just pick 5 potential consultants from the roster to interview and choose from. Would it be useful to invite one entity from each Technical Committee, such as a dike district, a tribe and a realtor group to each send a rep to join with us in selecting our consultants, one for the technical work and another for plan development? R

> > >

I'll get back on this when I return on the 6th. R

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge; James E. Voetberg; Jeff M. Miller; DaveBrookings
Subject: RE: Draft resolution
Date: 7/30/2007 6:28:23 AM

Attachment N1: [FCZD Resolution-Gene](#)

Y'all,

My thoughts.

We need two resolutions. First, we need a policy resolution that focuses on Board direction to County Staff. The proposed resolution mixes the FCZD organization/setup with the approach to developing the Plan. Although we will use the FCZD in this process, we need to clearly establish policy regarding our approach to working with the Corps, defining the County's work and the Corps', i.e. the County accomplishes technical studies necessary for CFHMP coordinating with the Corps and using Corps guidelines; the Corps does _ without project_ analysis including environmental studies, the Baker Measure as a local preferred option, and completes the GI utilizing the County's technical work all in accordance with an executed agreement.

The attached with slight modification, particularly the title, can serve as the 2nd resolution to establish the FCZD organization and purpose. (Note, my edits won't do this.)

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: Resolutions re FCZD
Date: 8/7/2007 6:17:29 AM

Attachment N1: [FCZD Resolution-Gene](#)
Attachment N2: [FCZD Org Resolution-Gene](#)

Ric,

I reviewed your initial resolution for the establishment of the FCZD and policy direction with the Corps process. I believe I commented earlier that these should

be three separate resolutions. Attached are two resolutions for your review. I know you are swamped; so, I will work on the policy resolution and send it for review as well. I want to get at least these two on stand alone for 8/21. We need to get legal review on these and prepare agenda routing/submittal forms.

The Colonel is rattling his saber a bit over this issue after the congressional reps met with him. He called Commissioner Dahlstedt; he's telling a different story than Linda Smith about when they could deliver. There are a series of meetings taking place and we'll have to see what shakes out. If we are comfortable with the policy direction after our meeting with Larsen, we'll go with that resolution as well on the 21st.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: FCZD Resolution - Directive
Date: 8/9/2007 2:43:02 PM

Gene - attached are my suggestions to the two draft resolutions you sent me, plus a third resolution I drafted thanking the flood control committee members. They are all yours to move forward for further review and comment as you see fit. R

From: rboge RicBoge
To: LornaEllestad
Subject: Priority tasks
Date: 8/13/2007 7:54:36 AM

Lorna - we need to get the request for qualifications and associated resolutions drafted for the two consultants we've talked about for flood planning:

- * One for the technical work and development of alternatives
- * One for the planning work that utilizes the soon-to-be formed FCZD committees, fulfills the public process and incorporates the above technical work into a CFHMP.

I was hoping to have this paperwork ready for BCC signatures next Tuesday, the same target time for BCC signatures on the resolutions setting a new course for flood planning, but, we've all been busy?

When can you have drafts of the RFQs and associated resolutions to Gene and I?
R

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Gary Rowe
Subject: FW: Two things
Date: 8/13/2007 2:26:45 PM

Attachment N1: [GI goals](#)

Gary - The attachment is the information you asked about that was prepared for the 'Larsen' briefing. Let me know if you need anything else. FYI, I was largely speaking from this information with my comments on the County's behalf at lunch with the Corps today.

Gene - FYI, folks need to huddle internally and discuss the County's 'strategy' after the lunch meeting today. (The Resolutions to implement the new strategy utilizing the FCZD structure, etc, are on hold for now.) Commissioner Dahlstedt, Gary, Jeff and I attended from the County. Bottom line was that the Colonel argued the merits for the County not altering it's flood planning approach at this time, at least not until the measures are completed at the 10% level, which he 'promised' that the Corps would accomplish by March - Commissioner D said that would be great. Next main point discussed was the importance for the County to continue to 'make amends'/'build a trusting relationship with the tribes and resource agencies. R

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge; Gary Rowe
Subject: RE: Two things
Date: 8/13/2007 2:40:47 PM

Ric,

Whatever the call, we'll work with it. I hope they deliver. Even so, it seems like it would be good to get the FCZD Executive and Technical Committees established to work on funding and other issues. It will take two or three months to get them up and running. However, we don't have to have it all ironed out by tomorrow. Let's set these two resolutions up for September.

From: LornaEllestad
To: rboge RicBoge
Subject: RE: Two things
Date: 8/13/2007 2:47:39 PM

So in a nutshell, the diversion from "completing the Measures" to complete the feasibility scoping will cost the community one year.

From: Jacqueline Jonas
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 7:53 AM
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Two things

Gene,
So my interest at this point is to know that this is tabled for a bit more while under construction and is no longer targeting the August 21st agenda, correct?

From: Gene Sampley
To: Jacqueline Jonas
Subject: RE: Two things
Date: 8/14/2007 6:54:42 AM

Yep:-)

From: Gene Sampley
To: DeloresMcLeod
Subject: FW: FCZD Advisory Committee Resolution
Date: 8/21/2007 2:28:40 PM

Attachment N1: [FCZDOrgResolution 082007](#)
Attachment N2: [Attachment 1 FCZDstructure 082007](#)

Dee,

Please make 6 color copies of the attached for our 8:30 a.m. Flood/Fish meeting tomorrow.

From: James E. Voetberg
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: FCZD Advisory Committee Resolution
Date: 8/31/2007 7:41:17 AM

Gene,

As I'm learning more about how the County works, districts and zones for example, **is there an actual identified Flood Control Zone District with legal boundaries and powers to levy taxes or fees?** If so, maybe the Resolution should reference this District. If it is not an established District, should we call it something else. My only concern is that when I think of a District, I think of the ability to levy taxes or fees for the purpose of constructing improvements within the powers of that District. James E. Voetberg, P.E. **NOTE: Was answered by County Attorney---privileged communication.**

From: Gene Sampley
To: Stephen R. Fallquist; James E. Voetberg
Subject: RE: FCZD Advisory Committee Resolution
Date: 8/31/2007 6:20:00 PM

Thanks, Steve,

Jim,

The district is the entire County. It has been established since the 70's. We're O.K.

Gene

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge; Stephen R. Fallquist
Subject: RE: FCZD Advisory Committee Resolution
Date: 9/4/2007 10:20:51 AM

Ric,

We have a meeting with the fish folks, including the Tribes, on Sept 18th to discuss fish passage and the County's strategy on flood/fish issues (SFCZ/CFHMP development). We should meet before that to discuss how we want to present it.

From: Gene Sampley
To: 'Perry, Randel J NWS'
Subject: RE: Tentative: Updated: Flood Issues & Fish Culverts
Date: 9/4/2007 11:29:12 AM

Randel,

I requested the meeting to discuss (1) fish passage issues and (2) the County's strategy in completing its comprehensive flood hazard management plan (CFHMP) consistent with the Corps guidelines, within the Flood Control Zone District (FCZD) organization.

* The fish passage issues relates to the recent Federal District Court decision regarding the state's obligation to replace culverts that impede fish passage and is a follow-up to previous discussions regarding obtaining a common prioritized list (WDFW, Tribes, County) of projects and how to fund them.

* The purpose of the second item is to discuss how the environmental interests (fish habitat/salmon restoration) will be addressed in the County's development of its CFHMP utilizing a 15 member Advisory Committee and technical committees of the FCZD rather than the County Flood Control Committee (similar to King County).

From: Gene Sampley
To: James E. Voetberg
Subject: FCZD Resolutions
Date: 9/11/2007 11:19:11 AM

Jim,

The Flood Control Zone District organizational concept was received well at the Flood Control Committee last night. I recommend that we put the FCZD resolutions on the October 2 Stand Alone agenda. The timing would be good (just before Flood Awareness Week) and after our meeting with the agencies next week, I believe we will have communicated with the major stakeholders by then.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: resolutions
Date: 9/12/2007 11:44:00 AM

Gene - per your request, I've 'dusted off' the most recent versions of Resolutions regarding the FCZD. I did make a couple minor changes, including the addition of a bullet under Committee member responsibilities to 'be respectful of and willing to consider the views of others'. To simplify, at least for me, I saved all the changes previously made by yourself, Steve and my few recent ones in a 'clean' format.

Here's what we have:

- 1) Resolution dissolving the Flood Control Committee and authorizing the org structure for FCZD, including the Advisory Committee.
- 2) Attachments to the Resolution showing the org structure and describing the roles and responsibilities for each element of the structure.
- 3) Resolution thanking the Flood Control Committee and its members for service to the Community.
- 4) Resolution setting policy for staff to develop a CFHMP within the context of the GI. (Gene - do we still need this? If yes, with the upcoming BCC signature next week of amendment #4 to the FCSA with the Corps, we could add a 'whereas' amendment #4 to the FCSA with the Corps has been signed and executed.)

Gene - As we ask the BCC to implement the FCZD, I'd like to inform the BCC of the estimated costs of doing so: lots of staff time necessary to coordinate the committees, plus the contracts for consultants to do the technical work, lots of public outreach and write our CFHMP. It seems like most of the public outreach can be accomplished within the committee structure established for the FCZD, but probably not all. I foresee lots of reliable and efficient clerical staff assistance necessary to schedule meetings, mail out agendas, publish newspaper notices, set up meetings, take minutes, finalize the minutes, and etc. This scares me, especially as I sense our (NRD's/SWM's) clerical and admin staff possibly shrinking?

From: James E. Voetberg
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: resolutions
Date: 9/12/2007 12:00:49 PM

Does Ric have the estimated costs and staff time figured out? If so, what are they.

Jim

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Gene Sampley; James E. Voetberg
Subject: RE: resolutions
Date: 9/12/2007 1:44:49 PM

Gene - My initial estimate of clerical support staff time, based on monthly advisory committee meetings and bi-monthly (every-other month) meetings of each technical committee is an average of 36 hours per month, or .2 fte.

For 2008, the technical consultant estimate is \$500K and the planning consultant estimate is \$200K. (These consultant estimates are shown in the 2008 SWM budget submittal.) Admin Assistant total time estimated for these is about 18 hours per month, or .1 fte.

The clerical and admin staff estimates shown in the 2008 SWM budget submittal are .2 fte and .1 fte, respectively. However, there will be some clerical and admin time necessary for the SRFS/GI, separate from that for the CFHMP work (shown above). Bottom line - at this point in time I estimate the total 2008 clerical and admin staff need for SRFS/GI and CFHMP to be:

- * .3 fte for general clerical staff assistance
- * .15 for general admin staff assistance.

Hope this makes sense. R

From: Gene Sampley
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 4:09 PM
To: rboge RicBoge; James E. Voetberg
Subject: RE: Flood Resolutions - Clerical/Admin Support

Thanks, Ric.

Jim, I recommend we plan on 0.5 FTE clerical/admin support for SRFS/GI and CFHMP and related activities. If I'm reading this right, this will be in addition to the proposed 2008 SWM budget. Is that right, Ric?

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Flood Resolutions - Clerical/Admin Support
Date: 9/13/2007 6:52:53 AM

Gene - after rambling a bit below, let me clarify:
* 2008 budget request submitted for clerical/admin help for SRFS/GI and CFHMP was .3 fte
* My new estimate, at this point in time is .45 fte.

So. I concur with your request for .5 fte clerical and admin support for SRFS/GI and CFHMP for 2008. However, this is not in addition to, but replaces the .3 fte request submitted on the budget forms several weeks ago.

Keep in mind this is only for the SRFS/GI and CFHMP project next year in fund 110. R

From: Perry, Randel J NWS [mailto:Randel.J.Perry@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 1:59 PM
To: Gene Sampley
Cc: James E. Voetberg; rboge RicBoge; JeffMcGowan
Subject: RE: Tentative: Updated: Flood Issues ?

Gene:

I regret to say that, do to workload issues, I will be unable to attend the meeting on the 18th. I would be available to join in via conference call if that is acceptable.

From: Gene Sampley
To: 'Perry, Randel J NWS'
Subject: RE: Tentative: Updated: Flood Issues & Fish Culverts
Date: 9/12/2007 2:51:53 PM

Randel,

If you would like to participate, considering the issues, I will try to get you conferenced in and you're certainly welcome. I don't know if we'll have specific items of interest other than our desire to assure the resource agencies (tribes, in particular) that we are very sensitive about addressing fish passage and salmon habitat restoration as we move forward on these issues. Also, we will emphasize staying within the Corps' GI process and guidelines as we develop the program for our comprehensive flood hazard management plan.

From: Perry, Randel J NWS <Randel.J.Perry@usace.army.mil>
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: Tentative: Updated: Flood Issues & Fish Culverts
Date: 9/14/2007 6:36:39 AM

That's the correct number.

I believe the Tribes and agencies know the Corps' permit process and our consultation requirements for impacts to fisheries. The Regulatory Branch is not involved in the Corps' GI process, so I would be no help there.

I can try to be at my desk during the meeting time, that way you can call if a specific question arises.

From: rboge RicBoge
To: Jacqueline Jonas
Subject: meetings
Date: 9/19/2007 1:07:53 PM

Jacque - Commissioner Dahlstedt has requested that Jim and Gene, or Jim and I, depending on availability, meet individually with Commissioner Dillon and Munks to brief them on our intent to implement via a Resolution a re-structured Flood Control Zone District. You may recall that we have had numerous discussions on this topic with the Board and Flood Control Committee.

I've attached for reference purposes what I could find in this regard - for Gene, Jim and I to have relevant background information heading into these meetings. This begins with emails with attachments and ends with the proposed Resolution now under consideration, with its attachments.

From: Jacqueline Jonas
To: Gene Sampley; rboge RicBoge
Subject: Schedule of Commissioner Meetings - Flood Control Zone Districts
Date: 9/20/2007 3:21:48 PM

Gentlemen:

This was ALL I could schedule which changes the targeted Stand Alone for the resolutions FROM October 2nd TO October 16th:

Scheduled to be conducted by Jim and Gene; placed on their calendars:

Wednesday, September 26th:

9:45 - 10:30: Commissioner Munks
10:30 - 11:15: Commissioner Dahlstedt
11:15 - Noon: Commissioner Dillon

Jim is holding the resolutions until the meetings above are held to ensure nothing needs changed prior to forwarding to the PA for signature.

From: Gene Sampley
To: James E. Voetberg; Stephen R. Fallquist
Subject: FCZD Reso and Tech Committee
Date: 9/26/2007 3:51:59 PM

Jim,

Attached is the FCZD resolution and Technical Committee attachment in _ Track Changes_ reflecting comments from this morning's meetings. As you will see, I had difficulty trying to categorize the various representatives on the Tech Committees. I think we can go forward with a good list, although I have not contacted Carolyn Kelley at SCS to check the list. Look it over and see if these will work.

Steve,

Because we won't be filling the positions on the Advisory Committee right away, we want to keep the Flood Control Committee active until the FCZD is fully implemented. Please check the language in the resolution to see if it works.

Thanks, Gene

From: James E. Voetberg
To: Gene Sampley
Subject: RE: FCZD Reso and Tech Committee
Date: 9/27/2007 7:11:17 AM

Gene,

Scary, but I had a thought. How about going back to your original resolution and then adding something that says the existing Flood Committee members will become the Advisory Committee until replaced by the BCC. During the interim period of switching from the old structure to the new structure, the old Flood Committee members, who are the new Advisory Committee, could continue to operate as they always have. Jim

From: Gene Sampley
To: LornaEllestad
Subject: Review of PMP
Date: 10/8/2007 12:22:49 PM

Lorna,

I just had a call from Larry Wasserman as a follow-up to Jim's and my recent meeting with him during which we discussed the Tribe's lack of opportunity to review the PMP prior to execution of the funding agreement. We discussed our sincere desire to have the Tribes as active participants in our FCZD Advisory Committee for development of our flood control/fish project and agreed that their PMP comments are still welcome. Larry contacted Linda Smith and they agreed to a meeting between the Corps, the Tribe and the County to discuss the Tribe's comments and possible changes.

Larry is available to meet anytime on Oct. 15, 24, 31, Nov. 1, ? he is available Oct 30 in the afternoon only. Please contact Linda and see when we can get the three parties together, i.e. Larry, Linda, you, and me. I am available any of these days but prefer the October days. Please schedule place ? Thanks, Gene

From: Larry Wasserman [mailto:lwasserman@skagitcoop.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Smith, Linda S NWS; LornaEllestad
Cc: Stan Walsh
Subject: RE: Review of PMP

It appears that we have varying expectations. We have some concerns with the PMP, and we are unsure about what some of it means. Our expectation is to go through the document, understand it better, and talk about changes that we would like to see.

-----Original Message-----

From: Smith, Linda S NWS [mailto:Linda.S.Smith@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2007 11:52 AM
To: Larry Wasserman; LornaEllestad
Subject: RE: Review of PMP

What presentation? I think Larry was going to tell us his concerns, and we were going to respond. Pretty informal

From: Stan Walsh [mailto:swalsh@skagitcoop.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2007 2:43 PM
To: LornaEllestad
Subject: RE: Review of PMP

Lorna,

I will be there tomorrow but just listening in, filling in for Larry who can't make it because of the extremely short notice. I will primarily leave this issue up to Larry to cover but will need to be somewhat engaged to brief Sauk-Suiattle. For that reason the 24th will be a good meeting for me to attend.

From: LornaEllestad
To: 'Stan Walsh'
Subject: RE: Review of PMP
Date: 10/10/2007 4:16:09 PM

Stan,

I actually sent out the meeting notice on September 11th with the PMP. This most recent notice was just the follow-up with the agenda attached. We will have to make sure that your name is included on the contact list even if you are only planning on being Larry's back-up.

Please let me know if there are other materials that you think you would like copies of after the meeting tomorrow and we will try to catch you up. There maybe information that will help prepare you for the 24th as well.

Thanks for coming,
Lorna

From: Gene Sampley
To: rboge RicBoge; James E. Voetberg; LornaEllestad; Dan Berentson
Subject: RE: Flood-Fish Meeting
Date: 10/23/2007 3:53:13 PM

Y'all,

I think we need to meet. The agenda is fine; we could include some discussion about where we go with consultant services for appeal prep and technical studies. It's not too soon to get things rolling.

Gene