Gary T. Jones

Gail R. Smith

July 15, 2014

Hannah Hadley, CENWS-EN-ER Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District PO Box 3755 Seattle, WA 98124-3755



Re: Skagit River GI Study Feasibility Report and EIS Comment

Dear Ms. Hadley:

This letter comments on the draft Feasibility Report & Environmental Impact Statement published June 6 and presented at a public meeting on Thursday, June 19, 2014 in Mount Vernon. The undersigned attended that meeting as a representative of Skagit County Consolidated Diking Improvement District No. 22, Skagit County Diking District No. 17 and Skagit County Diking District No. 3. Our office also advises Skagit County Drainage and Irrigation Improvement Districts No. 15 and No. 17.

These special purpose districts governed by Title 85 Revised Code of Washington provide benefits to particular land within geographic boundaries where landowners voted to approve an engineered set of improvements, taxed themselves to build, and thereafter annually to operate and maintain diking and drainage improvements. These districts rely on technical assistance and flood fighting personnel of the Seattle District Army Corps of Engineers in declared emergencies and to restore damage due to flooding. The diking districts participate in the USACE administered Rehabilitation and Inspection Program, have signed Cooperation Agreements under Public Law 84-99 and use the Engineering Manuals published for nonfederal flood control works as a guide. The Districts accept as valid the statement of the problem in the Feasibility Report, and welcome the opportunity to reduce flood risk from overland flow from October to March and year around. The districts generally agree with the Goal and the two Objectives stated in the Feasibility Report and Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) called Comprehensive Urban Levee Improvement (CULI).

The documentation of environmental constraints concerning three ESA listed species of salmon appear to be outdated in Appendix D because of reliance on U S Fish and Wildlife Service August 1997 Reconnaissance Study, and a cluster of letters received in 2001. There is no evidence of ESA consultation with NOAA NMFS or USFWS. This heading is left blank except the notation (pending). The Feasibility Report and EIS do not take account of the habitat restoration work that has been initiated and completed during the past 15 years. It also includes a list of threatened and endangered species as of 1997 and therefore omits Puget Sound Chinook salmon.

415 Pine Street · PO Box 1245 · Mount Vernon, WA 98273 Telephone (360) 336-6608 · Facsimile (360) 336-2094 The named Dike Districts plus District No. 1 and District No. 12 completed levee restoration to repair damage done in 2003 and 2006 floods during the "fish window" in 2011 under Cooperation Agreements with USACE. Accounting for delayed response to their damage survey reports that should have been remedied within one year, and for permit conditions, the Districts and USACE may have spent more money on mitigation of salmon habitat than was spent on restoring the levees. This statement is not made to discount the importance of environmental impact mitigation or the federal share of mitigation costs but to point out the risks to life and property which have occurred because of Endangered Species Act consultation, specifically about Puget Sound Chinook salmon habitat.

The Districts contend that the completed Skagit watershed projects and those which are in progress should be sufficient off site mitigation for CULI because of its focus on urban infrastructure. In support of this contention we offer the Three Year Implementation salmon plan for the Skagit Basin 2014-2016 following the 2010 strategic approach. See also the Strategies document prepared by Western Washington Agricultural Association for the preservation of the environment and the agricultural community, and the cover of the Skagit Delta Tidegates and Fish Initiative Implementation Agreement May 28, 2008, plus the Skagit Stream Team Annual Water Quality Report for 2012-2013. Readers of the Feasibility Study and EIS should not assume that the problems described in the letters attached to Appendix D accurately describe unmitigated habitat impacts on salmon that should be remedied in the implementation of the "Tentatively Selected Plan" or the pending ESA consultation.

The flood damage reduction plan set forth in the Feasibility Study does not recognize the steps that have been taken to implement the 2005 Chinook Recovery Plan approved by Skagit River System Cooperative and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. That Recovery Plan reset in 2010 has become the focal point of Skagit Watershed Council's vision of fish habitat. Significant partnerships have been developed in the Skagit watershed to achieve salmon habitat restoration. For example, Puget Sound Energy, Seattle City Light, The Nature Conservancy, North Cascades Institute and the Skagit River System Cooperative have all implemented substantial changes and invested in fish habitat. Wiley Slough Habitat Restoration Project in District No. 22 is one large example. The Fir Island Farm project is another example of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife converting public lands inside District No. 22 to fish habitat during the Study time frame. District No. 3 has setback levee on Dike Road and cooperated with The Nature Conservancy and Drainage District No. 17 to create the Fisher Slough Habitat Restoration Project.

The National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are consulting with the U S Forest Service, Washington Department of Natural Resources and Washington State Department of Ecology and the Federal Emergency Management Agency including its National Flood Insurance Program to mitigate loss to spawning habitat, incidents of mass wasting on steep slopes, forest road washouts and methods of operating dams on the Baker River and the Skagit River to protect fish habitat and lower the peak flow during flood events in the lower Skagit Valley. The future of forestry and fish can be made more secure by implementing the Tentatively Selected Plan when recognition is given to the fish habitat conservation efforts that have been made and the commitments already in place.

The Districts endorse the concept of preparing for a flood that exceeds the 1% chance standard. Rainfall and snowmelt vary widely year to year. The Chehalis River experience shows that our region can receive 20 inches of rain in a 48 hour period. Preparing for such an event increases the chance of surviving without loss of life and the chance of sustaining property damages that are manageable. It cannot eliminate all risk. Those who live on the floodplain and in particular those who operate diking and drainage facilities want those facilities to be resilient and capable of functioning in extreme circumstances to limit damages. The primary way of limiting property damage in such a flood is to limit the maximum rise and duration of high water surface elevation on the flood plain.

Reducing water surface elevation and flood water velocity through adequate interior drainage requires adding infrastructure at salt water outlets. Concurrently providing more capacity for overland flows through roads and other barriers is essential to this approach. Controlled release of flood water to receiving salt water through pumps, tidegates and floodgates could avoid breaching salt water dikes. This key challenge to the feasibility of the Tentatively Selected Plan is not adequately described in the document.

The 2014 feasibility study describes a Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) for a watershed at risk. Although there are risks of earthquake, fire, wind and dam failure, the most predictable and devastating hazard to the watershed is flooding. Flooding could destroy homes, businesses, city infrastructure, roads, bridges, utilities and disrupt the regional economy. The consequences of failure of the Skagit River Bridge recently brought into focus the dangers to the regional economy from cutting Interstate 5.

Skagit County and USACE made plans to flood proof Skagit County in earlier feasibility reports 1962 and 1979. Each time the people have been unwilling to vote local funding essential to implement the plan to reduce flood risks. Except for residents of Nookachamps and Fir Island, who suffered devastation in 1990 the majority of Skagit watershed residents have paid a low price for voting not to fund flood risk reduction. Whether events such as Katrina and the Chehalis flooding have changed public opinion remains to be seen. However, there is broad acceptance of the "Tentatively Selected Plan" because of the communication initiated by Skagit County government to inform citizens and the various municipal and special purpose district elected representatives serving locally.

The TSP is consistent with the essential elements of the Growth Management Act. The Act mandates population and public investment concentrated in urban areas. Natural resource lands and rural lands should be managed for low population density and high natural resource production. This vision of Skagit River watershed includes farms, forests, and fish as essential to a healthy community. The Districts urge the state and county government to align their plans for the Skagit watershed to reduce flood risk and realize a viable future with farms, forestry, and fish. In the short run the multijurisdictional hazard mitigation plan can do this. By building an early warning system, managing dams and keeping debris off bridges, coordinating the incident command structure, training leaders, including special purpose district commissioners and volunteers during annual flood awareness week drills, the Tentatively Selected Plan can reduce risk. The FEMA Community Rating System is implemented year round by Skagit County

Planning and community Development to reduce flood risk in those areas that do not receive urban protection.

Skagit County is required to adopt a Shoreline Master Plan update. RCW 90.58.100(1)(h) allows the Master Plan to approve measures to reduce flood risk of statewide interest. The Districts advocate a Shoreline Master Plan that incorporates future flood gates and added interior drainage to accommodate the statewide interest in flood damage reduction and coordinate the Tentatively Selected Plan with Skagit County Shoreline Management Master Program. This comment urges coordination of the measures in the Feasibility Study TSP and the Skagit Shoreline Master Program in the Skagit River and Skagit Bay, Joe Leary Slough and Padilla Bay, as well as Samish River and Samish Bay, and all of their special purpose district improvements.

There are dissenting voices who justly ask whether the risk reduction in the Skagit River Basin will increase the risk in the Samish River Basin including Thomas Creek. These questions should be answered by the representatives of Sedro Woolley, Burlington, Nookachamps and Clear Lake, who appear to be affected by measures at Sterling blocking Gages Slough, at Burlington Hill directing over bank water to Joe Leary Slough, and at the Hospital and Wastewater Treatment Plant "ring dikes" which displace Skagit River water.

One of the keys to understanding the Tentatively Selected Plan is to measure the impact of ring diking the Sedro-Woolley Wastewater Treatment Plant, the hospital complex on SR 20 and the Sterling cut off of Gages Slough for the benefit of the City of Burlington. These measures may direct flood water toward the Samish River. The risk increases in proportion to the volume and velocity of water that comes to Sedro-Woolley from the upper valley. Under certain extreme circumstances it appears to be unavoidable that flood water will reach the Samish River and earlier GI feasibility work by Noel Gilbrough of the USACE showed that even the "no action" alternative sent flood water to Thomas Creek and Samish River.. Consequently, the changes necessary to protect Old Highway 99, Interstate 5, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad track and other landowners whose damages would be increased by high water surface elevations north and east of Burlington should be part of anticipating how flood water will pass to Samish or Padilla Bay without damaging and impairing salt water dike and drainage infrastructure.

Each of these special purpose districts have a significant bridge or bridges that are a factor limiting downstream passage of flood water. Changing bridges is expensive. Changing one bridge may cause the next bridge downstream to be less safe. The Tentatively Selected Plan lacks details about the monitoring and removal of debris to reduce the risk to bridges at Division Street, Conway and Rexville as well as Interstate 5 and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad bridge. Debris management was studied in 2006 with funding from the State Department of Transportation and resulted in debris management protocols which are vaguely referenced in the EIS.

The diking districts and drainage districts aim to protect life and property by reducing flood damages in their limited jurisdictions and appreciate what has been done to articulate a practical plan for a comprehensive project with broad public support.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully yours,

JONES & SMITH

GARY T. JONES GTJ/lfd

cc: Commissioners District No. 3
Commissioners District No. 17
Commissioners District No. 22
Commissioners Drainage District No. 15
Commissioners Drainage District No. 17
Kara Symonds SCPW
Betsy Stevenson SCP&CD-Shorelines

N:\JONES\Clients\DD Misc\Hadley, Hannah Ltr 2014-07-011.docx

				Plan for the Ska	git Basin 2014-2016, followin	g 201 0	Strategic A	pproach														
ear 2014	4 reflects currently	tunded pr	ojects											Project	Planning					Project Cost a	and Sponsor	1
Project Type	Status	PRISM#	recovery plan chapter	Project Name	Brief Project Description	Priority tier of project	Limiting Factors	Document Ref for limiting factors	HWS Habitat Type	Project Performance	Current Project Status	2014 Activity to be funded	2014 Estimated Cost	2015 Activity to be funded	2015 Estimated Cost	2016 Activity to be funded	2016 Estimated Cost	Likely End Date	Likely Sponsor	Total cost of project	Local share or other funding	fund (PSA) SRFE othe
	L PROJECTS Capital Project			為形態類													120					Othe
	//RIVERINE TIDAL		R 1)								H											
		04-1625,		McGlinn Island	Improve hydraulic connection between the N. Fork of the Skagit and Swinomish Channel to improve access by juveniles to estuarine rearing		Loss of	Skagit Chinook Recovery	Estuary river	% of improvement in freshwater connectivity and	Design 60%					Additional						SRFB, P
Rest'n	Design on-going Construction	07-1814	11.03.04	Causeway	habitat in Padilla Bay	1	habitat	Plan	delta	fish passage to	complete					Modeling	\$300,000	2020	SITC/ACOE	\$7,511,750	\$1,126,763	ACO
Rest'n	complete, planting and stewardship on- going	04-1620, 10-1455	11.03.02	Milltown Island	Additional phase of restoration on WDFW tidal delta island funded in 2010	1	2	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	4,668 ft channel + 30 Acres	Nearly complete	Planting & maintenance	\$55,000	Maintenance & monitoring	\$30,000			2017	SRSC	\$432,208	\$57,683	SRFB, PS
	Just under	42 4057	11.03	Dike District 3 Delta	AND STREET OF STREET STREET STREET, STREET		Loss of	Skagit Chinook Recovery	Estuary river		Moving to selct	Feasiblity and	4405.000			final design and	£200.000	2017	Skagit County,	¢225.000	\$30,000	SRFE
Rest'n	contract	13-1057	11.03	Channel Project	river flows on the project site.	1	habitat	Plan	delta	45 acres	consult	Prelmin Design	\$125,000			construction	\$200,000	2017	DD#3	\$325,000	\$30,000	SKFI
Rest'n	Design progressing; need final match	(13- 1051), 12- 1205, 09- 1444	11.03.07	Fir Island Farm Restoration (i.e. Dry Slough Tidegate, Goose Reserve)	Restoration of tidal marsh on WDFW property currently managed as a snow goose reserve	1	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	130 acres	In Design	60% and 100% design	\$1,734,009	construction	\$4,000,000	construction	\$10,602,846	2018	WDFW _	\$16,000,000	\$336,855	PSAR, SI
	Just under contract as Skagit Forks below	09-1443, 06-2211	11 07 00	Cottonwood Island	2 actions: assess sediment impacts of reconnecting relict side channel;		Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan		470	Feasibility	Remove sediment plug;	4453.000	Determine preferred alternative		5 10 :	,	2018	WDFW	\$1,500,000	\$200,000	SRFB, P
Rest'n	below	00-2211		Skagit Forks Off-	remove lower plug Investigate the feasibility of	1	Floodplain Connectivity & Function,	Skagit Chinook	Instream	170 acres	ongoing	assessment	\$162,000	alternative		Final Design		2018	WOIW	\$1,500,000	\$200,000	JAI D, I
Rest'n	Just under contract	13-1053	11.03	Channel Feasibility and Restoration	reconnecting a relict channel wetland on the left bank of the river	1	Loss of habitat	Recovery Plan	Instream	18.4 acres	Funded	Feasibility	included above	design	included above	and construction	?	2017	WDFW			SRFI
							Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of							On Going Feasibility/Ac								
Rest'n	Added in 2014		11.04.01	Blake's Bottleneck Estuarine Delta	Dike removal on NF right bank Restore habitat and water quality for Chinook salmon and other species by	1	habitat	?	Instream	20 acres	Proposed	Feasibility	\$250,000	quistion	\$396,000	Design	\$150,000	2020	SITC/SRSC	\$2,000,000	\$300,000	PSR, F
Rest'n	Added in 2014			Riparian Stewardship	actively restoring native estuarine riparian and wetland vegetation	1	2	?	Nearshore	15 acres	Proposed	Construction	\$100,000	Construction	\$100,000	maintenance	\$20,000	2019	SRSC	\$220,000	\$33,000	SRFB, P
		none +		North Fork Dike	Investigation into feasibility and design of dike setbacks along NF Skagit; First phase is 13-1059; coordinate with		Loss of	Skagit Chinook Recovery	Estuary river	3-	1st phase active; rest			Prelmin design and							1	P,ESRP, E, Ska Coun Transpo
	Phasing Phasing	13-1059 none + 00-1743	11.03	Deepwater Slough Phase 2+	HDM model Restore and reconnect 268 ac of estuarine habitat on South Fork Skagit	1	habitat Loss of habitat	Plan Skagit Chinook Recovery	Estuary river delta	400-600 acres	conceptual	Feasibility alternatives analysis	\$150,000	acquistion	\$325,000	Design	\$500,000	2020	Skagit Count WDFW	\$20,000,000	\$3,000,000	SRFB, P
				TOTAL ESTUARY/TIDAL DELTA CP		-							\$2,776,009		\$5,155,000		\$15,022,846			\$51,838,958		

	Т	т		T	Restore function to 170 acres of side									1								
					channel and floodplain habitat in the			Skagit														
	Building				Skagit R downstream from Gilligan			Chinook			Conceptual		1						1 /			
	landowner				Creek by removing 550-1500 linear		1	Recovery	1		design		1					1				
est'n	support	06-2210	10.04.03	Gilligan Floodplain	feet of a rip-rap dike	1	1	Plan	Instream	170 acres	complete			Design	\$250,000	Construction	\$1,250,000	2017	SRSC, USFS	\$1,500,000	\$200,000	SRFB, PSAR
	In progress							Skagit									1					
	phased			S. Skagit Highway	Modify or realign 1.5 miles of S. Skagit			Chinook	1			Transportation										
	implementation			Floodplain	Highway to reconnect floodplain and			Recovery			Feasibility/	Feasbility &							SCL,SRSC,Sk			PSAR, SRFB,
Rest'n	and funding	12-1209	10.04	Restoration	reconnect habitat	1	1	Plan	Instream	120 acres	Design	prelim	\$200,000	Design	\$200,000	final Design	\$200,000	2018	agit County	\$12,336,208	\$1,108,575	SCL
	In progress phased				Restoration of floodplain and large			Skagit	1										1			
	implementation			Barnaby Reach	side channel in upper Skagit reach.			Chinook	1		Feasibility/	Feasibility and	1						SRSC,			
Rest'n	and funding	09-1440	10.05	Restoration	Feasibility study funded in 2009.	1	1	Recovery Plan	Instream	300+ acres	Design	preliminary	\$400,000	Final Design	\$300,000	Construction	2	2016	WDFW, SCL	\$1.885,010	\$250,000	PSAR
icot ii	and fariding	05 1110	10.03	Davis Slough	reasibility study runded in 2005.		Floodplain	riaii	mstream	300Facres	Design	preminary	3400,000	rinai Design	\$300,000	Construction		2010	WDI W, SCE	\$1,005,010	\$230,000	1 5/11
				hydrologic			Connectivity	Skagit										las.				
				connectivity/ Fish	Improve/restore hydrologic		& Function,	Chinook	1		Final	1		1	100	18.50		100	SFEG,			
	Constructing	1		Passage and Flow	connectivity of mainstem Skagit		Loss of	Recovery			Design							64	Skagit			SRFB, Skagit
Rest'n	2014	13-1052	10.04.01	Restoration	historic side channel	1	habitat	Plan	Instream	4.5 acres	complete	Construction	\$1,354,160	Monitoring	\$20,000			2015	County	\$2,060,140	\$260,354	Co.
										250 ft of												
								Skagit		hardened bank removal/~10			1									
				Robinson RD	Removal of riprap in mainstem side			Chinook		acres of			1				3					
	Construction				channel and riparian restoration.			Recovery	1	floodplain		Planting.							1 /		İ	
Rest'n	completed	11-1534			Funded 2011 SRFB round.	1	1	Plan	Instream	restoration	Active	maintenance	\$20,000					2013	Skagit County	\$137,000	\$21,000	SRFB
								Skagit				Construct,	1									
				Hobbit Corners				Chinook	1			maintenance,	1									
	Constructing			Floodplain	Riparian restoration and LWD			Recovery			Permits in	invasive										
Rest'n	2014	11-1555	10.09	Restoration	addition/beaver pond development	1	1	Plan	Riparian	20 acres; 30 logs	hand	control	\$60,000	-				2016	SFEG	\$162,308	\$24,346	SRFB
				Lower Day Creek				Skagit Chinook				C	1									
				Slough Habitat	Upgrade 2 farm access roads over		1	Recovery	1	1.7 ac habitat;	Design	Construct, planting,		Planting,								
Rest'n	Active	12-1207		Enhancement	slough chnls; riparian plantings	1	1	Plan	Riparian	28 acres riparian	complete	maintenance	??	maintenance	\$102,607			2016	SFEG	\$348,088	\$216,345	SRFB, PSE
test ii	1	12 1207		Limancomen	stought chinis, ripurion plantings		1	Skagit	Riparian	20 acres riparian	Permitting	maintenance	···	manitenance	\$102,007			2010	Sico	\$540,000	V210/0 is	
				Upper Skiyou Slough				Chinook			completed;					1871						
				floodplain	Riparian restoration of portion of 220			Recovery	1.		work	site prep,		site prep,	¥	site prep,			SRSC, USFS,			SRFB, PSE,
Rest'n	Active	12-211		restoration	ac USFS floodplain parcel;	1	1	Plan	Riparian	60 acres riparian	started	planting	\$194,100	planting	\$200,000	planting	\$200,000	2018	SFEG	\$600,000	\$38,007	USFS
					Restore habitat and water quality for Chinook salmon and other species by			Charit														
					actively restoring native riparian and			Skagit Chinook					1	Planting,		1						
	Added in 2013.			Skagit Riparian	floodplain forest vegetation;			Recovery	1			Planting,		maintenance,		Planting,			SFEG, SRSC,			
Rest'n	updated 2014	13-1054			watershed strategy development	1	1	Plan	Riparian	90 acres	Active	maintenance	\$100,000	strategy dev't	\$298,069	maintenance	\$200,000	2040	county	\$598,069	\$89,710	SRFB
					Side Channel Feasibility analysis and								1		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	complete	,					
				Pressentin Park	preliminary design project will			Skagit	1							final design;		18-				
					evaluate options for restoring and			Chinook	1				1			seek		165	SFEG,			
	Preliminary	40 4055		and Prelimary	enhancing historic and existing side			Recovery			l	Preliminary				construction			county	4	450.007	coro
Rest'n	design funded	13-1055		Design	channel habitat Restore floodplain function and	1	11	Plan	Riparian	40 acres	just funded	Design	\$199,913	Final Design	\$200,000	\$		2018	parks	\$399,913	\$59,987	SRFB
					riapiran habitat associated with bars			Skagit Chinook			Proposal	Acquisition of										
				Lower Baker Delta	and overflow channels on historic			Recovery	Riparian/Inst		developme	property (PSE	Up to	Planning/Desi		Initiatiate						SRFB, PSAR,
Rest'n	Added in 2014			Restoration	Baker River delta.	1	1	Plan	ream	40 acres	nt	process)	\$450,000	gn	\$150,000	Restoration	\$500,000	2018	SFEG	\$1,100,000	\$350,000	PSE
								Skagit														
								Chinook			Multi-year						8					
	Added in 2013,				Acquisition of floodplain properties for			Recovery			and										4.70.00	
Acq'n	updated 2014	13-1056		Habitat Protection	protection of habitat.	1	1	Plan	Riparian	300+ acres	ongoing	Acquisition	\$1,192,282	Acquisiton	\$1,000,000	Acquisiton	\$1,000,000	2020	SCL	\$3,192,282	\$478,842	SRFB
				TOTAL FLOODPLAIN							529282											
				TIER 1									\$3,720,455		\$2,720,676		\$3,350,000		7-1	\$24,319,018	\$3,097,167	
IF A DEL	ORE (TIER 2)				THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.					4												,
irak(di	OKE (HEKZ)	T		T T					Nearshore			ı	l			Ī						Ī
	In progress							Skagit	(Beaches),	1 .	1											
	phased		- 1		,			Chinook	Nearshore									100				
	implementation				Restore intertidal pocket estuary by			Recovery	(Embayment			Preliminary				permitting			SRSC, Skagit			
Restorat	and funding	13-1508	12.03.11	Restoration	replacing road fill w/bridge	2	2	Plan	s)	18 acres	Proposed	Design	\$305,000	Final Design	\$300,000	and funding		2017	County	\$2,605,000	\$390,750	SRFB

				TOTAL NEARSHORE TIER 2									\$305,000		\$300,000		\$0			\$2,605,000	\$390,750	
LOODPI	LAIN (single Chino	ok populat	ion rearing	areas) (TIER 2)	大型的内部					10000000	14.6%											
Rest'n	Implementing second year of LWD			Day Creek Habitat Restoration	Instream & floodplain restoration in lower Day Creek funded in two phases but designed & constructed simultaneoulsy. Includes design and installation of LWD jams in chinook tributary	2	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	.25 miles of stream	Active	Construction, maintenance	\$75,000					2015	SFEG	\$407,160	\$61,100	SRFB, PSAI
Rest'n	Added in 2014		?	Day Creek Habitat Restoration @ Kosbab	Install LWD structures at outlet of day Creek on SLT Kosbab property	2	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	.25 miles of	Proposed?	Design and permitting	\$80,000	Construction	\$250,000				SFEG	\$330,000	\$280,000	SRFB, PSAI
	Added in 2014	?	?	Goodell Creek Floodplain Restoration	Restore natural hydrogeomorphology within the 400+ acre floodplain by addressing hydromodifications in the campground and SR20	2	Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of habitat	?	Instream	400 acres	Active	Concept analysis	\$70,000	final design	\$400,000	construction	\$3,000,000	2018	USIT	\$3,470,000	\$520,500	NPS, SCL, PSAR, USIT
Combo	In progress phased implementation and funding	10-1856		Hansen Creek Reach 5 Acquisition & Restoration (previously titled Martinez Acquisition and Restoration)	Acquisition and restoration of key floodplain parcels on Hansen and Red Creeks and associated wetlands; potential for additional restoration in coordination with mgmt plan in area	2	Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	88.5 ac acquired; 10 ac riparian; 0.25 mi instream; 30% design	Active, funded 2013	Channel restoration and floodplain reconnection final design	\$475,000	Add'I acquisition, restoration	\$500,000	Construction		2019	SRSC	\$1,941,528	\$423,752	SRFB, Skag Co.,PSE
				Hansen Creek Reach 5 Restoration	Skagit County has completed a conceptual plan to move Hansen Creek from its currently occupied, straightened channel location, to a more meandering channel to the west		Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of	Skagit Chinook Recovery		Area encompassed 72 acres, steram impacted 2.46	Final Design and	illiai desigri	3473,000			Construction			Skagit County Public Works,			
	In progress phased implementation	13-1060			of the current location Remove dikes, restore Illabot Creek alluvial fan, and relocate Illabot Creek to historic channel; phase 1	2	habitat	Plan Skagit Chinook Recovery	Instream	acres 440' of channel	Active, funded			Final design Final design and construction Phase 2	\$288,400			2018	SRSC	\$288,400	\$43,260	SRFB SRFB, PSA
	and funding	11 1521	10.11.05	Downey Creek	construction funded 2011 Construction two new bridges over Downey Creek at Suiattle River road to restore historic channel and minimize impacts to 3 ac alluvial fan.	2	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	3 acres of alluvial fan	Active; funded	Construction	\$1,461,000	Filase 2	34,000,000	Construction		2014	SRSC/USFS	\$983,000	\$478,000	
	In progress In progress	11-1563		Suiattle Riprap	Removal of riprap to improve edge	2	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	600 feet	Active; funded 2011	Construction	\$250,000					2014	SRSC/USFS	\$292,675	\$43,091	
NESC II	in progress	11 1505		TOTAL FLOODPLAIN				. I will	iiideaii	000 1000	2011		\$2,411,000		\$5,438,400		\$3,000,000				\$1,699,203	
SEDIMEN	NT & HYDROLOGY	IMPAIRED	Watershed:	s (restoration actions	in spawning habitat) (Tier 3)								1338									
	Proposed for funding within inext 3 years			Lower Cascade Roads	Deconstruction of 1.1 miles of forest road in the Boulder Creek drainage	3	4	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Uplands	1.1 miles	Conceptua			Construction	\$50,000			2016	SCL	\$50,000	\$7,500	SRFB
	Proposed for funding within		4		Sediment reduction work on remaining 25/50 miles of USFS roads in Sauk Prarie and Dan Ck areas	3		Skagit Chinook Recovery		25 miles of												
	Proposed for funding within				identified in recovery plan Reduction of road sediment from USFS	3	4	Plan Skagit Chinook Recovery	Uplands	roads	Conceptua			Construction	\$500,000				SRSC/USFS		\$75,000	SRFB
Restorati	next 3 years			TOTAL IMPAIRED	road in upper Sauk R.	3	4	Plan	Uplands	7 Miles	Conceptua	L		Construction	\$400,000			2016	SRSC/USFS	\$400,000	\$60,000	SRFB

TOTAL	FUNDS CAPITAL PROJECTS	AND PROGRAMS			12	arde y		\$9,212,464		\$14,564,076	多数流流	\$21,372,846			\$87,425,739	\$10,991,420	
FUTURE	HABITAT PROJECT DEVELOPM	ENT							4 10				B 23 2				
Assessm	ents	国际经验 不会不会不			Just										生。法是是	es Bola	
Plan'g	Active	Acquisition Strategy Update	Updating watershed acquisition strategy	1	funded launchir team	d, ing	implement	\$47,100					2015	swc	\$47,100	\$7,100	SRFB, PSA
	Proposed for funding within next 3 years	Sediment Impaired Watersheds	Update of 10+ year old assessment of Skagit River sub-basins following road sediment reduction work and new road inventories/mngmt plans	3	Concept	tual	planning		implement	\$120,000			2016	swc	\$120,000	\$120,000	
Plan'g	Proposed for funding within next 3 years		Assessment completed July 2011. Assessment, identify restoration actions, develop reach-specific plans	1	Concept	tual	planning		implement	\$226,000			2016	swc	\$196,000	\$30,000	Skagit Co. SCL
	Proposed for funding 2014		Extend FVCOM 3D hydraulic modeling across the entire geomorphic delta of the Skagit River to evaluate synergy between proposed projects and their affects on geomorphic evolution across the delta, especially in relation to flood dynamics.	1	Propos	sed Da	ata Collection	\$50,000	Modeling and analysis	\$150,000			2015	3FI	\$200,000	\$30,000	
Plan'g	Nearly complete	Riprap inventory	Update 1998 inventory of hydromodifications; Cascade, Suiattle, and major tribs above floodplain remain	1	Active	e Da	ata Collection	\$60,000	Data Collection	\$60,000	move into feasibility	?	2015	USIT, USFS	\$50,000	\$0	
		TOTAL ASSESSMENTS						\$157,100		\$556,000		\$0			\$566,000	\$180,000	
Watersh	ed Plan Implementation and C	oordination											St. W.	2 46			
		Lead entity base grant (2011-2013)						\$80,000		\$80,000		\$80,000	Ongoing	swc	\$240,000		
		Lead entity capacity (PSAR) (2011-2013)						\$173,000		\$173,000		\$173,000	Ongoing	swc	\$519,000		
		IMPLEMENTATION &		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2. 1. XXX	37	63-4-1 I	\$253,000		\$253,000		\$253,000			\$759,000	A	

ear 2011 reflec	cts curre	ntly funded projects and those propsed in the c			I	s to the Recovery PJ					1	
Project Type		Project Name	Brief Project Description	Priority ties of	Limiting Factors	Document Ref for limiting factors	HWS Habitat Type	HW's Activity Type	Project Performance	Primary Species Benefiting	Secondary Species Benefiting	Current Project Statu
CAPITAL PRO	DJECTS			project						Benemang	} Benerating*	
labitat Capit	al Prole	ects										
	******	l al Delta (Tier 1)								-	-	ļ
Restoration	me ma	Wiley Slough Estuary Restoration	Restoration of 160 ac tidal marsh	1	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore	160.6 acres	Chinook		Near completion
Restoration		Swinomish Channel Restoration (i.e. Formsby or Smokehouse Floodplain)	intertidal at several locations	1	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore	50 acres	Chinook	Chum	Construction Completed 2009
Restoration		Swinomish Channel Fill Removal	Removal of dredge spoils from west side of Swinomish Channel to restors tidel marsh habital	1	2	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore		Chinook	Chum	Construction
Restoration		McGlinn Island Causeway	Improve hydraulic connection between the N. Fork of the Skagit and Swinomish Channel to improve access by juveniles to estuarine rearing habitat in Padilla Bay	1	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore		Chinook		Feasibity/90% Design
			Second phase of restoration on WDFW tidal		T LOSS OF HADRAIN	Skagit Chinook						Post- construction
Restoration		Milltown Island	delta Island Restores 50-80 acres of farmland within the riverine tidal zonea to channel, scrub-shrub,	1_	2	Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore		Chinook	Chum	monitoring
Restoration		Fisher Slough	forested wetland, and tributary junction habitats [Reconnection of riverne wetland in	1	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore	66 acres	Chinook	Coho	Design & Construction
Restoration		South Fork Off Channel	freshwater delta, Grant funding acquisition & restoration feasibility complete, Restoration not scheduled.	1	Loss of habital	Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore	40 acres	Chinook	Chum	Feasibility complete
Restoration		Fir Island Farm Restoration (i.e. Dry Slough Tidegate, Goose Reserve)	Restoration of tidal marsh on 264 acres of WDFW property currently managed as a snow goose reserve	1	Loss of habital	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or neasshore	120 acres	Chinoak	Chum	Feasibility
Restoration		Cottonwood Island	Reconnection of relict side channel for rearing habitat	,	Connectivity & Function, Loss o habitat	Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream	170 acres	Chinoak	Coho	Design & Permitting
Restoration		Deepwater Slough Phase 2	Restore and reconnect 268 ac of estuarine habitat on South Fork Skagit	1	Loss of habital	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Estuary river delta	Estuary or nearshore	268 acres	Chinook		Conceptual
		TOTAL ESTUARY/TIDAL DELTA CP	***************************************					***************************************		}	-	<u> </u>
Floodplain (m)	ultiple C	hinook population rearing areas) (Tier 1)				ļ				-		ļ
Acquisition for Protection/ Restoration		Snell Acquisition	Proposed to remove from list for 2011. Landowner sold to another party. Acquisition of 81 acres of floodway property along 3700 feet of the Skagit River on Cockreham is. Restore function to 170 acres of side channel.	1	Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss o habitat	Skagit Chlnook Recovery Plan		Land Protected/Aquired/ Leased	81 acres	Chinook		Incomplete
Restoration		Gilligan Floodplain	and floodplain habitat in the Skagit R downstream from Gilligan Creek by removing 170 linear meters of a flood control dike and riprap & replant	1		Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	İnsiream	Instream	170 acres	Chinook	Coho	Feasibility/30% design complete
Restoration		Skagit River Floodplain Restoration (Middle Skagit Floodplain Restoration)	Small scale restoration actions on properties permanently protected for conservation purposes in the Upper and Middle Skagii Floodplain areas; total 25 acres of riparian restoration	t	5	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	instream	Floodplain Restoration	25 acres	Chinook	Coho	Construction -
Restoration		Sktyou Staugg	Implementation date moved beyond 2013. Reconnection of mainstern side channel; project needs to follow the Gilligan dike removal not yet funded. Acquisition of 211 ac in middle Skagii W/3,450	1	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream		Chinook	Coho	Conceptual
Acquisition for Restoration		Savage Slough Acquisition & Restoration	R of fiver front, portion of Savage Ck., Isolated Savage Slough, and assoc. off-channel habitats	1	1	Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration	60 acres	Chinoak	Steelhead	Funded 2010; acqs complete
Restoration		Skagit Floodplain Riparian (Upper Skagit Floodplain Restoration)	Restore riparian area of 5 floodplain properties owned by the USFS along the Skagit R. and major trib junctions; will enhance 74 acres of protected riverine habital	1	.5	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration	74 acres	Chinook	Caho	Construction
Acquisition for Protection		Skagit Floodplain Habitat Acquisition Phase 2 (Upper Skagit Acquisitions)	protection of habitat	1	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Land Protected/Aquired/ Leased		Chinook	Steelhead	Funded 2010
Restoration		Barnaby Reach Restoration	Restoration of large side chnl complex at confluence of Skaqif & Sauk Rivers	1		Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration		Chinook	Steelhead	Feasibility/Des

Restoration	Sauk River Riparian Restoration	Restoration of 35 ac of riparian floodplain in Sauk R		3	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Riparian	Floodplain Restoration				Construction
				Floodplain Connectivity &							Fessibility/90
Restoration	Davis Slough hydrologic connectivity	Improve/restore hydrologic connectivity of mainstern Skagit historic side channel	- 1	Function, Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration				design
Restoration	Howard Miller Steelhead Park off channel enhancement	Improve/restore hydrologic connectivity of mainstem Skagit historic side channel	1	Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Resteration				Constructio
Acquisition	Skagit Watershed Tier 1 and Tier 2 Floodplain Acquisitions	Acquisitions in Tier 1 and 2 floodplain area targeting properties identified in previous benefit/cost assessment work.	1	,	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Land Protected/Aquired/ Leased				Acquisition
	Skagit Watershed Tier 1 and Tier 2 Floodplain	Acquisitions in Tier 1 and 2 floodplain area targeting properties identified in previous	1		Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Land Protected/Aquired/ Leased		Chinook		Proposed
Acquisition	Acquisitions Phase 2	Removal of riprap in mainstern side channel and riparian restoration			Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	instream/Floodplain Restoration	250 ft of hardened bank removal/~10 acres of floodplain restoration	Chinook		Proposed
Restoration	Robinson Road rock removal				Skagit Chinook	-	COLUMN TO THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PERTY OF	College Parts			1
Restoration	Hobbit Corners Floodplain Restoration	Riparian restoration of Removal of rip rap and restoration of ripairan		1	Recovery Plan	Riparian	Floodplain Restoration	20 acres; 30 logs	Chinook		Proposed
Restoration	Ross Island Inlet Side Channel Restoration	vegetation on ~40 acres of floodplain between Kosbab Slough and an unamed Slough. Project identfled in middle Skagit assmt.		,	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration	40 acres	Chinook		Conceptua
Nearshore (Tier 2											-
Restoration	Lone Tree lagoon	Procket estuary restoration	2	2	***************************************	Nearshore embayments	Estuary or nearshore		Chinook	Bull Trout	Monitoring
	•	Restore connectivity to pocket estuary by	2	-	Skagit Chinook	Nearshore				1	Design & Permitting
Restoration	Turners Bay	removing road fill		Loss of habitat	Recovery Plan	embayments Nearshore (Beaches),	Estuary or nearshore	8.7 acres	Chinook	Bull Trout	Permiun
Acquisition for Protection	Kiket Island Conservator Acquisition	Protection of 2+ miles of shoreline, 96 ac upland peninsula island, 3.4 ac pocket estuary	2	Loss of habitat	Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	Nearshore (Embayments), Nearshore (Rocky Coast)	Nearshore or Estuarine Areas Protected	44.9 acres	Chingok	Bull Trout	Acquisitio complete
Restoration	Similk Bay	Restore intertidal pocket estuary by replacing road fill w/bridge & constructing channels	2	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chineek Recovery Plan	Nearshore (Beaches). Nearshore (Embayments)	Estuary or nearshore	23.5 acres	Chinook		Conceptu
Restoration	Dugualla Heights Lagoon Restoration	Restore fidal lagoon to provide access for juvenile Chinook in WRIA 5; joint WRIA funding considered, Feasibility & design work funded through WRIA 6	2	Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Nearshore (Beaches), Nearshore (Embayments)	Estuary or nearshore	25 acres	Chinook		30% desi
				1	***************************************						1
	e Chinook population rearing areas) Tier 2	Instream & floodplain restoration in lower Day Creek funded in two phases but designed & constructed simultaneoulsy. Includes design and installation of LWD jams in chinook			Skagit Chinook			3 miles stream;			
Restoration	Day Creek Habitat Restoration Lower Finney Supplemental Instream (LWD)	Design and installation of LWD Jams in	2	1	Recovery Plan Skagit Chinook	Instream	Instream	21 ac riparian	Chinook	-	Constructi
Restoration	treatment)	Restoration project completed in 2010.	2	5	Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream	ļ	Chinook	Steelhead	Constructi
Restoration	Hansen Creek Alluvial Fan (Reaches 3 & 4)	Restored aluvial fan and wetland function to dredged and diked tributary Acquisition and restoration of key floodplain	2	1	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration	145 acres	Chinoak	Coho	Completed 2010
Combination	Hansen Creek Reach 5 Acquisition & Restoration (previously titled Martinez Acquisition and Restoration)	parcels on Hansen and Red Creeks and associated wetlands; potential for additional restoration in coordination with memt plan in area	1	Floodplain Connectivity & Function, Loss of habitat	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Floodplain Restoration		Coho	Chinook	Proposed
Restoration	Illabot Creek alluvial fan restoration	Relocate Illapot Creek to historic channel	2	1	Skagil Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream	440° of channel bank	Chinook	Steelhead	Design &
Restoration	Finney Riparian	Conifer plantings in hardwood dominated riparian in important chinook tributary	2	3	Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Riparian	Riparian		Chinook	Steelhead	Conceptu
		Closing or expanding Sulatile River road crossing at Downey Cr to minimize impacts to 3 ac alluvial fan. Pushed out beyond 3 yr window last year, added back in this year as			Skagit Chinook			3 acres of alluvial	Sulattle Spring		Proposed/d
Restoration	Downey Creek Grossing	schedule accelerated Proposed to remove from 2011 list as barner overtopped per Brett Barkdull. Removal of	2	1	Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream	fen	Chinook	Bull Trout	gn comple

Restoration	Sulattle Riprap Removal	Removal of riprap to improve edge habitat	2	1	Skagif Chinook Recovery Plan	Instream	Instream	900 feet	Chinook		Propos
	TOTAL FLOODPLAIN TIER 2									ļ	ļ
Daries	The second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second secon		************	***************************************			-	-		-	ļ
Sediment & Hyd	rology Impaired Watersheds (restoration actions	Road sediment reduction project in Chinopk			Skagil Chinook			-	***************************************	-	Comple
Restoration	Diobsud Roads Erosion Control	Inbutary completed in 2010	3	4	Recovery Plan	Uplands	Sediment Reduction		Chinook	Steelhead	201
Restoration	Illabot Creek Road decommissioning	Permanently closing 14 mi of USFS rd to protect intact habitat in Illabol Ck	3		Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan	Uplands	Sediment Reduction		Chinook	Steelhead	Design/F
***************************************	*****	Road sediment reduction project completed in	***************************************				J	1		1	
1	2.00	2010 in important refuge tributaries to the			Skagil Chinook						Comple
Restoration	Sulattle Roads	glacially sediment rich Suiattle R.	3	4	Recovery Plan Skagit Chinook	Uplands	Sediment Reduction		Chinook	Steelhead	201
Destruction 1	Lower Cascade Roads	Deconstruction of 1.1 miles of forest road in the Boulder Creek drainage	3	4	Recovery Plan	Uplands	Sediment Reduction	1.1 miles	Chinook	Steelhead	Concer
Restoration	Lower Cascade Roads	Sediment reduction work on remaining 25/50			Merokely Light	Uplanus	Scotlien regulation	1.1111101		-	1
		miles of USFS roads in Sauk Prarie and Dan			Skagil Chinook						1
Restoration	Sauk Roads	Ck areas identified in recovery plan	3	4	Recovery Plan	Uplands	Sediment Reduction	25 miles of roads	Chinook	Steelhead	Conce
		Reduction of road sediment from USFS road			Skagit Chinook				Tank Siv		
Restoration	Upper Sauk Erosion Control	in upper Sauk R.	3	4	Recovery Plan	Uplands	Sediment Reduction	7 Miles	Chinook	Steelhead	Conce
	TOTAL IMPAIRED WATERSHEDS (T3)				<u></u>		J			<u> </u>	ţ
							-		***************************************	1	-
TOTAL CAPITAL	PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS						·	1			1
***************************************		†					7	1		1	I
KEY FOR										I	1
Habital Capital P	rojects							1		J	J
*IA	mount of LE SRFB/PSAR funds uded in 2010							-		-	ļ
	emoved from 2010 list for reasons described	·			<u> </u>					-	}
	progress phased implementation and funding				·····					4	1
	osi-project monitoring phase				1	·	————	1			1
T I							<u> </u>		***************************************	1	1
Primary Limiting								1	***************************************	1	1
1 - Degraded floo	odplain and in-river channel structure arshore and estuarine conditions and loss of associat	<u> </u>					J			<u> </u>	-
	degradation and loss of in-river large woody debris	eo nabitat						-		-	-
	diments in spawning gravels	<u> </u>	-				-	1		-	4
	ter quality and temperature	·			}		1	1		-	+
6 - Impaired instr	ream flows				1			1		1	1
7 - Barriers to fis	h passage						1				1
											-
Acquisition AP- Acquisition for					ļ		-				4
AR-Acquisition fo					}			·		·	-
R -Restoration		†			·		·	1		1	+
		<u> </u>			1	1	1			1	1
Restoration Type	& Performance						1			1	
	tat projects (stream miles treated)									4	-
	ital projects (acres created/treated)			-			-	-		-	-
	on projects (acres/ miles acquired for protection and/	or restoration)			{	ļ	·			-	-
R - Riparian habi	fat projects (stream miles/acres freated)				ŧ			·			+
	at projects (acres treated)		-	ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABATA ARABAT	1		-	1		1	1
P - Fish passage	projects (barriers removed/stream miles opened/fish	screens installed)			1		1			1	1
M - Marine shore	line projects (miles/acres) (pocket estuaries and sho	relines outside of natal delta areas and tributaries	s to Puget S	ound)				1		1	
	connection projects (miles/acres)				The second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second secon						-

		Project PI	saning	,				Project Cost	and Sponsor	-
2011 Activity to be funded	2011 Estimated Cost			2013 Activity to be funded	2013 Estimated Cost	Likely End Date	Likely Sponsor	-Total cost of project	Local share or other funding	Source of fur (PSAR, SRF other)
										i and
Monitoring	\$75,000	Monitoring	\$75,000	Monitoring		2015	SRSC	\$4,305,197	\$2,284,954	SRFB, PSNE
Monitoring		Monitoring				2012	SRSC			
Construction		Monitoring				2012	SRSC	\$953,600	\$90,000	PSAR, PSC
Feasibility/Design			\$3,000,000	Permitting		2015	SRSC	\$3,511,754	\$544.861	SRFB, PSA
Construction		Construction				2012	SRSC	\$432,208	\$57,683	SRFB, PSC
Construction and monitoring	\$354,470	Monitoring	\$180,000	Monitoring		2011	TNC	\$7,700,000	\$2,800,000	SRFB, PSAI
			\$300,000	Design/Permittin		2011		\$195,000	\$20,000	
Design	\$25,000		\$10,000,000	Construction		2015	WDFW	\$10,276,900	\$50,000	PSAR, SRF ESRP
90% Design	\$1,400,000	Permitting		Construction		2012	SCD	\$1,500.000	\$200,000	SRFB, PSA
			\$300,000	Feasibility/ Design		2017	WDFW	\$4,000,000		SRFB, FSA PSNER
***************************************	\$1,854,470		\$13,855,000		\$0			\$32,874,659	\$6,047,498	
***************************************								**********		†
							Skagit County	\$516,000	\$85,000	PSAR
				Design/ Permitting/ Construction	\$2,000,000	2016	SRSC	\$2,060,000	\$309,000	SRFB, PSA
Planting maintenance						2011	SFEG	\$234,055	\$34,000	SRFB
										
Further design & riparian restoration		Restoration			\$1,000,000	2014	SCL, SRSC, Skagit Co.	\$3,497,500	\$1,437,125	PSAR
Planting maintenance						2011	SFEG	\$357,850	\$53,678	PSAR
Acquisition		Acquisition		Acquisition		2012	SLTL/SCL	\$1,509,218	\$226,383	SRFB, PSA
Feasibility/Design		Feasibility				2012	SRSC	\$285,010	\$42,750	PSAR

Construction		Construction		Planting maintenance		2013	SRSC	\$191,000	\$28,650	PSAR
Feasibility/Design			\$500,000	Construction		2014	SFEG	\$800,000	\$71,250	SRFB
Construction		Construction				2013	SFEG	\$163,000	\$24,450	Skagit County
		Acquisition					SLTUSCL			
Acquisition	\$1,176,500	Phase 3 Acquistions	\$1,000,000	Phase 4 Acquisitions	\$1,000,000	2016	SLTL/SCL	\$3,176,500	\$476,475	SRFB, PSAF
	\$120,000	Construction		Construction		2012	Skagit County	\$120,000	\$18,000	SRFB
	\$162,308	Construction		Construction		2014	SFEG	\$162,308	\$24,346	SRFB
	\$1,456,808	Feasibility assessment	\$150,000 \$1,650,000	Restoration	\$400,000 \$4,400,000	2017	SFEG	\$550,000 \$13,622,441	\$60,000 \$2,892,107	SRFB
						2040	5000	*20.000	*20.000	-
Monitoring Construction		Monitoring				2010	SRSC SRSC	\$30,000 \$904,394	\$20,000 \$144,384	SRFB, PSNEF
Stewardship Planning		Stewardship Planning				2012	WSP	\$15,050,000	\$1,000,000	CELCP, NCWCG, WWRP, ESR SRFB
				Feasibility	\$150,000	2015	SRSC	not evaluated		-
Design/Permitting	\$843,716 \$843,716	Construction	\$0		\$150,000	2015	WCLT	\$1,755,716 \$17,750,110	\$241,557 \$1,405,941	SRFB, PSA
						2015	PEEC	\$407,160	804.100	SRFB, PSAF
Riparian plantings Construction	~~~~	Construction Construction		Construction		2012	SFEG SFEG	\$283,200	\$61,100 \$42,480	SRFB, PSA
Constitution		John Marie				2011	USIT	\$3,758,000	\$2,758,000	SRFB, NOA
Acquisition	\$333,500	Restoration design				2015	SRSC	\$333,500	\$50,025	SRFB
***************************************	\$460,000	Construction		Construction	\$950,000	2015	SRSC	\$1,558,572	\$248,966	SRFB, PSAF
		Site Planning	\$175,000			2013	SFEG	\$175,000	\$0	PSAR
	\$983,000	Construction				2012	SRSC/USFS	\$983,000	\$478,000	SRFB, PSAI

	\$248,744 \$2,025,244	Construction	\$175,000	Construction	\$950,000	2014	SRSC/USFS	\$292,675 \$7,791,107	\$43,091 \$3,681,662	SRFB, PSAR
	32,023,244									ļ
					***************************************	2010	SCD/USFS	\$395,000	\$60,000	SRFB
Design/Permitting						2012	SCD/USFS	\$190,000		PSAR
				1		2010	SRSC/USFS	\$395,000	\$60,000	PSAR
			\$50,000	Construction		2014	SCL	\$50,000	\$7,500	SRFB
		Data Collection	\$300,000	Construction		2015	SRSC/USFS	\$300,000	\$45,000	SRFB
	\$0		\$400,000 \$750,000	Construction	\$0	2015	SRSC/USFS	\$400,000 \$1,730,000	\$60,000 \$232,500	SRFB
***************************************			\$150,000		30				4202,000	1
	\$6,182,238		\$16,430,000		\$5,500,000			\$73,768,317	\$14,259,708	
******										***************************************
					***************************************			······		
										
							ļ			
**********	***************************************		**************				***************************************	***************************************	<u></u>	
										
***************************************			***************************************					*****		

							†		·	·
								*************	ļ	
							<u> </u>	~~~~		
										
	***************************************								1	1
					************	**********			ļ	-

							1		·	1