

CIV. WKS. RECORD AREA

1505-22 SKAGIT RIVER, PUGET SOUND BASIN
UNPUBLISHED APPENDIX (EXHIBITS 1 thru 23)
TO PUBLIC HEARING ON F/C AND OTHER IMP.
Trf-RHA when inactive, PERM 1964

CONTENTS

Notice of public hearing on flood control and addition of recreation and fisheries as project purposes to Avon Bypass Skagit River Basin, Washington, Jan. 10, 1964.

Information bulletin for public hearing Nov. 22, 1963, re: ~~rehearing~~

<u>Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
---------------	-------------

EXHIBITS

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Letter of agreement by L. H. Johnson, Skagit County Engineer, on proposal of Avon Bypass. | 1 |
| 1a | Letter of support by J. Hulbert Sr., land owner and Dike Commissioner. | 3 |
| 2 | Letters from Washington State Highway Commission on reasons for not using motor vehicle funds to support the construction of Bypass. | 4 |
| 3 | Letter from H. I. Hanson, Mount Vernon Mayor, on support of project. | 7 |
| 4 | Letter by G. C. Kimble for action on flood control program as soon as possible. | 9 |
| 5 | Letter by Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, on public recreation facilities. | 14 |
| 6 | Letter by Washington Department of Game on hunting and fishing potential in Bypass. | 18 |
| 7 | Letter of support by Washington State Department of Commerce and Economic Development. | 21 |
| 7a | Letter from Dike District No. 2 giving unanimous approval of Bypass. | 22 |
| 8 | Letter from G. C. Nelson, farmer, favoring Bypass and channel widening and equalizing of levee system. | 23 |
| 9 | Letter from Dike and Drainage District No. 20 supporting the widening and strengthening of the Dikes on the Skagit River. | 24 |

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
10	Letter of support by Inland Empire Waterways Association on Avon Bypass.	26
11	Letter from Lawrence Boettcher on immediate needs for control of bank protection.	28
12	Letter from Pomona Grange No. 10 favoring present flood control program.	29
12a	Letter from Pomona Grange No. 10 favoring program concerning recreational facilities in conjunction with the Avon Bypass.	30
13	Letter of support for Avon Bypass by Skagit County Flood Control Council.	31
14	Letter of support for the Avon Bypass and the proposed project for channel and levee improvement by Dike District No. 3.	32
15	Letter from Dike District No. 12 opposed to Avon Bypass.	33
16	Letter by Fire Protection District No. 6 opposing the Avon Bypass.	35
17	Letter from organized group of citizens opposing Avon Bypass.	36
18	Letter from Washington State Grange showing complete agreement with proposed Avon Bypass.	39
19	Letter from Bay View - Padilla Civic Association, concerning the addition of recreation and fisheries project.	41
20	Letter from Swinomish Indian Tribal Community on dredging that might violate treaty.	43
21	Letter and petition from citizens group for protection now, rather than 'Aid to Disaster Area' later.	46
22	Letter of opposition by J. W. Bowers Sr., farmer, on Bypass and Features.	57
23	Letter from Dike District No. 1 endorsing the proposed project.	58
<u>Petition of opposition to Bypass signed by 742 people.</u>		59

PRESENTATION TO THE CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS'

Flood Control Hearing - January 10, 1964

The flood problems of the Skagit Valley date back to before the arrival of the earliest settler. The original dikes were a private and cooperative venture of these early settlers. Flood fighting and diking was a very real and constant threat to all the settlers. Moving out and upstairs was an expected procedure with the flooding of the Valley. Supplies of wood, groceries, feed for livestock, etc. were constantly lost which made early life disappointing.

Many settlers gave up and moved to areas less susceptible to flooding. The original farms and homes were built off the ground with some arrangements for flooding. The old Seven Cedars Ballroom, with its high steps was typical of the early buildings built with the anticipation of flooding.

The modern home, the dairy farm of today and the industry of our Valley are now relatively unprepared for flooding and would suffer extensive loss if a major flood should occur at this time. This extensive loss is apparent in the Corps of Engineers' report of expected damages.

We, of Skagit County, are pleased to have reached a point in our development where it is now possible to get cost-benefit-ratios that justify the Corps of Engineers' help with the flood problems of Skagit County.

The Willamette Valley in Oregon suffered great damage until the flood control structures were installed in the Valley. These justified Corps of Engineer projects in Oregon have now enabled Eugene, Oregon and vicinity to develop without fear of flood, and we hope that Skagit County may now prosper with these anticipated improvements as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

The proposal of the Corps of Engineers' to build the Bypass with the added recreational facilities presents a new era for the people of Skagit County. The prospect of an unused flood ditch has now been replaced with a recreational area of over 400 acres. The Washington State Association of County Planners at their annual meeting in Wenatchee stated, "obtaining parks and recreation areas is the most difficult of all county problems", and the Bypass would help Skagit County in this respect.

By the Corps of Engineers' project we are indirectly given a play ground that will be a very important and progressive step in the future of Skagit County. The tourist attraction of these proposed recreational facilities can well be an item of intense interest to the entire Northwest area of the State of Washington.

Skagit County and the Dike District Commissioners have long known the need of uniform dike protection from flooding for the various areas. The Corps of Engineers' proposal to unify dike protection with their downstream proposal is generally approved by most individuals affected. There is need locally to arrange the local participation on an equitable basis and modify some of the designs with the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers' so that the projects do the least damage possible to the local properties.

We would like to congratulate the Corps of Engineers' on their proposal; we believe it is not only practical but also very necessary to the future development of Skagit County.

Respectfully submitted,

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

By: *Lloyd M. Johnson*
Lloyd M. Johnson
Skagit County Engineer

LJJ/vy

P 001582

City of

MOUNT VERNON

HERMAN I. HANSON, MAYOR
THELMA F. ZAMZOW, CITY CLERK
RUTH E. BIOLUND, CITY TREASURER
GEORGE E. MCINTOSH, CITY ATTORNEY

Washington

November 22, 1963

FROM: **The City of Mount Vernon, State of Washington**

TO: Ernest L. Perry, Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

SUBJECT: Plans For Flood Control And The Addition Of Recreation And
Fisheries As Project Purposes To The Avon Bypass For The
Skagit River Basin.

Mount Vernon residents clearly remember the date of Feb. 10, 1951. The record book shows that on this date the Skagit River reached a flood flow peak of 150,000 c.f.s. But to Mount Vernon residents and the City of Mount Vernon's officials, the peak flood flow of 150,000 c.f.s. was of no immediate concern through that long night and the following early morning hours of the next day. What our Mount Vernon officials do remember is that the Skagit River filled their banks completely in Mount Vernon and that the flood crest rose until the water level had completely covered our revetment area and was lapping at the gutter line of Main Street at the Myrtle Street intersection. Another 6 or 9 inches would have required sand-bags to keep the Skagit River from spilling over into our downtown commercial area.

Watching the river crest at flood stage was not all our townspeople had on their minds, however. The City officials had serious problems with their sewer system - as our Park Street sewer main collapsed inside of our protective shut-off gates but outside of the dike and flooded back into the residential area in the Southwest section of our town, lifting manhole covers and flooding streets and homes, until the sewer break could be found and the sewer line sealed off by dumping truck loads of sand bags into a manhole to plug the sewer main.

And at our sewage treatment pumping station, City officials found it impossible to pump the resultant sewage and storm waters against the head of the raging Skagit River.

Neither will our store owners soon forget their preparatory efforts as they frantically elevated all of their stock in case the stores and storage rooms should be inundated.

Page 2.

Ernest L. Perry, Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer
November 22, 1963

With the memory of this 1951 flood and the 1949 flood of 140,000 c.f.s. fresh in our minds, it is not difficult for the City of Mount Vernon to evaluate its position as regards this hearing.

The City of Mount Vernon lies behind the protective dikes of four separate diking districts: Diking Districts No. 1, 3, 17 and 20. And we are certainly pleased that we can take this opportunity to support the diking district commissioners from these four diking districts in heartily endorsing their majority approval of these recommended flood control plans by the Corps of Engineers.

The City of Mount Vernon, with full knowledge of what a flood flow of 150,000 c.f.s. means to our city, hereby congratulate the Corps of Engineers for their comprehensive and forward-thinking flood prevention plan.

Assuming that the costs of these levee and channel improvements are economically feasible and that suitable and equitable financial arrangements can be achieved, this overall flood control plan calling for a total flood control capacity of 180,000 c.f.s. seems reasonable and practical.

One of the strong features of this program is to uniform the degree of levee protection along the entire length of the Skagit River. Many of us hope that once this degree of uniformity is achieved, that a centralized or coordinated control group can be set up to ensure that this uniformity does not once again disintegrate through the process of well-meaning but uncoordinated far-flung groups of concern. If this means redistricting at some future date - then we should approach this problem openly and without petty personal malice.

It would further appear that the possible modifications of the Avon Bypass structure to permit the additional purposes of fisheries and recreational facilities, do not endanger the overall comprehensive flood control plan, nor are material sums involved in the costs thereof. The City of Mount Vernon would therefore be favorable to the inclusion of this recommendation also in our approval.

And in conclusion, with the achievement of all the plans presently under consideration for flood control on the Skagit River, that the comprehensive development of upstream storages on the various tributaries of the Skagit River, can give our fertile valley a virtual freedom from the danger of floods - and possibly in our lifetime.

We think this plan has merit. We think it is reasonable. We think the people of Skagit County have the courage and ability to put it over.

FOR THE CITY OF MOUNT VERNON

Presented By: Gwynne D. Legro
Gwynne D. Legro
CITY ENGINEER

Herman I. Hanson
HERMAN I. HANSON, MAYOR

DIKING DISTRICT AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT #20

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON. Rte. #4, Box 246, Mt.
Vernon, Wash.

Colonel Ernest L. Perry,
District Engineer,
U.S. Army Engineer District, Seattle,
Seattle, Washington.

Dear Colonel Perry :

Pursuant to Notice of Public Hearing on Flood Control and Addition of Recreation and Fisheries as Project Purpose to the Avon ByPass, Skagit River Basin, Washington, the Commissioners of Dyke and Drainage District #20, Skagit County, Washington wishes to make the following Statement :

We the Commissioners of Dike District #20 and Drainage District #20 endorse and support the plans as presented in the Bulletin by the Corps of Engineers to widen and strengthen the Dikes on the Skagit River so when the Avon by-Pass is constructed these dual Projects will give the entire Skagit River Basin at least a 30 year protection from Floods.

We the Commissioners of Dike District #20 have hopes that with these projects completed we can expand our Dike District #20 so that the entire Nookchamp Valley can be Diked to give our farms protection from Floods that cover our farms land on an average of every three years, but realize that as off now we act as a reservoir for flood waters from the Skagit River so the lower parts of the Valley will have additional protection. If our areas were diked at this time it would be impossible for the Skagit River to carry even a normal high water.

Respectfully submitted,

Geo. M. Dynes
Geo. M. Dynes.

Commissioner Dike District #20

Virgil Fell, Commissioner

John Petter, Commissioner.

/2

Mount Vernon, Washington
November 22, 1963

U. S. Army Engineer-Seattle District
1519 Alaskan Way South
Seattle, Washington

Re: Plans for flood control & recreation improvements, including fisheries as added purposes for Avon By-pass.

Gentlemen:

The undersigned, Commissioners of Skagit County Dike District No. 12, do wish to file this written Memorandum of their recommendations concerning the proposed plan.

REGARDING LOWER SKAGIT RIVER PLAN

The undersigned do in general, approve and commend the Corp of Engineers for the plan to improve the levee and channel of the Skagit River from Mount Vernon to its mouth. The undersigned feel very strongly that levee and channel improvement is a proper method of flood control.

The undersigned feel that this plan does not go far enough. They feel that there should be some extention of the channel into salt water.

The undersigned violently object and oppose any attempt to fasten this project with the Avon By-Pass and make it an integral part of the Avon By-Pass, feeling that the two are not necessarily related or correlated.

REGARDING THE AVON BY-PASS

The undersigned object to the present plan concerning the Avon By-Pass feeling that the total expenditure for the project is too great to be borne by the area affected and that this burden would be oppressive.

The undersigned object to the Avon-By-Pass Project for the reason that it would not materially decrease the present

P 001586

expenditure for flood control and dike and drainage maintenance presently budgeted.

The undersigned object to the Avon By-Pass for the added reason that it increases the flood exposure, particularly in the area served by Dike District No. 12. All that area adjacent to the By-Pass will necessarily have to be protected against major flood danger.

The undersigned object to the attempt by the Engineers to link the flood control aspects of the Avon By-Pass to recreation improvement feeling that such a plan is so vague and general as not to be worth consideration. No definite plans are made nor any assurances given that this project will lend itself to fish and game preserves. Nor is there any showing that the necessary financing is available for this purpose.

The undersigned further object to the attempt to link flood control with recreation improvements because there is no attempt to deal with the problems of sanitation, maintenance of the preserve or orderly development. The idea is simply thrown out as an attraction to gain the support of the people in the area.

The undersigned would like these remarks incorporated into the records of this Hearing.

These expressions are the considered opinions of the undersigned and their experience in dealing with flood control and Dike District problems and after having discussed the program with a vast number of the people in the district.

Yours truly,

James Mays
Art Beek
Pete Walker Jr

17

FRED R. LUBBE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
404 FAIRHAVEN AVENUE
BURLINGTON, WASHINGTON
TELEPHONE PL 5-1185

January 8, 1964

DISTRICT ENGINEER
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE
1519 Alaska Way, South
Seattle, Washington 98134

Gentlemen:

I represent a group of citizens who have organized informally to object to the proposed Avon By-Pass Project. The group which I represent has circulated a petition, a copy of which is attached to this letter. We feel that the petition should be given great weight because it was originated in the Burlington area, an area most directly affected by the By-Pass project, and flood danger.

The group I represent objects to the By-Pass partly for the reason that they feel the project will do no more to protect the area from flood than a much smaller sum spent in continuation of the flood control projects done by the various dike districts, but they, of course, are not experts in flood control and will leave it to the dike commissioners to make a presentation of this factor. The group, in summary, objects to the By-Pass for the following reasons:

1. The cost of the By-Pass is out of portion to the cost of other flood control methods which the group feels would be more satisfactory.
2. Flood control of the river has been improved since the time of the most serious floods through dams built on the upper river and improved methods of dike construction.
3. All floods in recent years have resulted from some dike fault. It is believed that these faults have been corrected to a large extent and through the expenditure of much less then the Avon By-Pass can be eliminated. As an example in the 1951 flood in

P 001588

January 8, 1964

Burlington was caused by water working through the sand and undermining the dike but the dike district has since corrected this situation in its dikes.

4. The group feels that the original purpose of the project (flood control) has been forgotten to some extend by many proponents interested in recreational facilities, however, it is believed that the proposed facilities would not be developed or used to the extent that they would be maintained because the Skagit Valley area has many potential recreational facilities which are not developed or used for the reason that the population is not great enough to utilize the present facilities. Also the State Park's Commission has not shown wide interest in the project feeling that it lacks state wide interest and importance. This project would not be near as attractive as other natural lakes in the area and because of the abundance of natural facilities in the state can not itself be hoped to attract people from substantial distances.
5. According to the engineer's own statement the By-Pass would not give protection against a major flood such as the 1921 flood, as the expenditure of nineteen million dollars would not be sufficient to control the flow of 210 cubic feet of water per second which caused the 1921 flood.
6. The By-Pass would divide the county and would cause various transportation and communication problems; such as the taking of farm crops to market and individuals to commercial areas.

The primary concern of the group at the present time is that the Avon by-pass project be separated from other flood control project on the river. The petition attached hereto supports the group's feeling that the people in the county would never vote the necessary funds for local participation and for that reason alone, the Avon By-Pass is extremely unlikely to come into being, and to do other flood control work in reliance on it threatens all flood control work on the river. Further they feel that work on the river as proposed here and by the dike commissioners should be done as soon as possible, since the river is continuing to silt at all times.

P 001589

DISTRICT ENGINEER

-3-

January 8, 1964

and the flood danger will increase through neglect.

The group I represent can not claim to be experts in flood control but they are familiar with the Skagit County area and have obtained information from dike commissioners and other and feel that a better, less expensive and more feasible method of control would be the proposal of the engineers for improvement to the lower river along with the extending of existing dikes and levees and a deepening of the channel at the mouth of the river and for some distance into Skagit Bay. Also it is felt that a cleaning of the channel of some debris will improve the situation.

Very truly yours,

Fred R. Lubbe
Attorney at Law

FRL:mk

P 001590

1 **OBJECTIONS TO AVON BYPASS PROJECT AND RELATED PHASES THEREOF**2 **BY**3 **SWINOMISH INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITY**
 LaConner, Washington

4
5 This statement is submitted on behalf of the Swinomish Indian
6 Tribal Community and members of the Swinomish Reservation to the
7 Corps of Army Engineers in connection with the public hearing
8 held at the Elks Lodge, Mount Vernon, Washington, January 10,
9 1964, at 1:30 p.m.

10 **It is the position of the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community**
11 and the members of the Swinomish Reservation, Skagit County,
12 Washington, **that the Avon Bypass Project and other projects**
13 **related to dredging, widening or changing the natural channels and**
14 **water flow of the Skagit River may well affect the salmon runs.**
15 **If such occurs, then the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community and**
16 **the members of the Swinomish Reservation will consider this as a**
17 **violation and deprivation of the rights granted under the Treaty**
18 **of Point Elliott of 1855.**

19 Adequate information is not presently available to determine
20 the effect such projects would have on the salmon population in
21 the Skagit River. Such information will be accumulated and
22 furnished at a later time.

23 **In conclusion, objection is made to these projects insofar**
24 **as they, or any of them, may interfere with or affect the salmon**
25 **population.** Salmon fishing is the major source of livelihood
26 for the Swinomish Indians, and denial or deprivation thereof
27 would be a violation of the rights of the Swinomish Indians under
28 the Treaty of Point Elliott and would cause great hardship.

29 SWINOMISH INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITY

30 By BANNISTER, BRUHN & LUVERA

31 By *Harwood Bannister*
 Attorneys for Swinomish Indian
 Tribal Community.32
BANNISTER, BRUHN
& LUVERA
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
616 S. 2ND STREET
MOUNT VERNON, WASH.

January 10, 1964

Ernest L. Perry
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

Sir:

I and several friends passed a petition early in the spring of 1960, requesting flood control work in this area. This was following and because of the high water or flood on the Skagit River in November, 1959.

This high water, while nothing major as floods go, was still on the peoples minds and we were wondering why something couldn't be done about the situation.

At that time, we had no trouble getting practically everyone we could contact to sign, since the problem was still fresh in our minds. Conditions may be quite different today, because we tend to forget.

However, I would like to give you at this time this petition with accompanying signatures as evidence of the feelings of the people when confronted with flooding conditions.

Let's have protection now, rather than 'Aid to a Disaster Area' later--

Yours

Zell A. Young
Zell A. Young

Washington State Congressional Delegation

The Skagit River is the largest stream in Western Washington. A major flood in this area would seriously effect the economy of this region, the State, and Nation-- Therefore--

We, the undersigned Property Owners, Business Men, and/or Citizens of Skagit County, Washington, respectfully request that the Army Engineer Corps be directed to start an immediate and continuing program of Skagit Valley Flood Control Work--that the Congress shall pass the necessary Bills and Appropriations to allow the work and that the Washington State Congressional Members shall work for enactment of this program.

Let's have protection now, rather than 'Aid to a Disaster Area' later--

Name	Address	Remarks
John L Johnson	829 N. Barker Mt Vernon, Wa.	
Carl El Strom	808 333 (W. Main) Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
Frank Halligan	203 N. Barker St. Mt. Vernon	
Tom Key	P.O. 1 Mt. Vernon	
Ernest Anderson	217 Front St. Mt. Vernon	
C. Chastenier	118 So. Barker Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
Paul C. Anderson	118 So. Barker Mt. Vernon	
May Howell	P.O. 5 Mt. Vernon	
W. Howell	121-5 Mt. Vernon	
James T. Johnson	829 N. Barker Mount Vernon Wash.	
W. Penny	North Barker Street Mount Vernon	
W. S. Parker	512 North Wall	
W. Hamilton	525 N. Barker St. Mt. Vernon - Washington	
Howard Andrew	421 N. Barker, Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
Hageman	408 Barker Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
Hageman	408 Barker Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
W. D. Tschwilliger	317 Barker Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
W. J. Tschwilliger	317 Barker Mt. Vernon, Wa.	
Dr. W. Baxter	315 N. Barker	Wash.
M. Baxter	315 N. Barker	Wash.
Peterson	316 N. Barker	Wash.
Peterson	316 N. Barker	Wash.
Albert H. Johnson	1019 Lincoln Ave.	Mt. Vernon Wash.
Bethie Salathier	809 Lincoln St.,	Mt. Vernon Wash.

P 001593

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any change to modify the structure of the Avon Bypass for any purpose other than flood control and are in fact opposed to the Bypass itself because as presented to us it will not provide protection from major floods. The cost of construction and maintenance is beyond Skagit County's means, and the project would endanger a new area to flood hazard and eventual silting up of shallow Padilla Bay.

NAME

NAME	ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
R. J. Pfeifer Perry	297 Telegraph	farmer
Bon Lowery	635 Orange	Gardener, stat
Floyd Gardner	West Hotel	Burlington
Tom Swanson	1001 Chuckle	Burlington
Dr. H. McDonald	Orange & Spruce	Burlington
Richard M. Meyer	16750 1 st Mount Vernon	far
Ermine Butterfield	606 Fair Haven	Burlington
Sera M. Butterfield	606 Fairhaven	Burlington
Donald F. Wade	1340 E. 2nd st	Burlington
A. A. Cotton	1272	
M. B. Johnson	Rt 2	M. Johnson
Patrick Sullivan	Rt 1	Bow
Doug Ploeg	1224 Sherman Wash.	
Roland Delahunt	1724 East River Vista Farm	
The Roland Delahunt	1724 E. River Vista, Burl.	
Val. Raymond	1000 E. Victoria, Burlington	
Dick McDonald	WS Country Lane, Burlington	
C. W. Bennett	229 S. Holly	
J. D. Robertson	1710 1 st Street E. Bow	
W. B. Hamel	1216 Lincoln Ave. Bow	
T. H. Hartley	1109 Victoria	Burl
Elder Petty	1116 So 16 th	Mount Vernon
Ted Lyle	127 Avon	Burlington
Sam Koman	401 Lester St.	Burlington, Wash
Sara R. Mapes	Rt 1 Box 261	Burlington