

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

DOCKET No. _____

In the Matter of _____ PUBLIC HEARING - _____

IMPROVEMENT DOWNSTREAM LEVEES
AND ADDING FISHERIES AND
RECREATION TO AVON BYPASS.

Place Mount Vernon, Washington

Date January 10, 1964

Pages 11 - 105

Cascade Reporting Company

5151 ARCADE BUILDING
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101

OFFICIAL REPORTERS

Telephone:
MA. 2-3548

1 U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

2 -----
3 In the Matter of:
4 IMPROVEMENT DOWNSTREAM LEVEES
5 AND ADDING FISHERIES AND
6 RECREATION TO AVON BYPASS.

7 Elks Lodge
8 Mount Vernon, Washington
9 10 January 1964

9 Pursuant to notice, the above-entitled matter came on
10 for hearing at 1:30 p.m.

11 BEFORE:

12 COLONEL ERNEST L. PERRY, District Engineer, U. S.
13 Army Engineer District, Seattle, Washington

14 APPEARANCES:

15 GREGORY HASTINGS, Supervisor of Flood Control,
16 Department of Conservation
17 appearing on behalf of the Governor of the State
18 of Washington

17 SCOTT RICHARDS, Chairman of the Board of County
18 Commissioners, Skagit County, Washington
19 appearing on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners

19 LLOYD JOHNSON, Skagit County Engineer
20 appearing on behalf of Skagit County, Washington

20 PAUL J. McKAY, District Engineer
21 appearing on behalf of the Washington State Highway
22 Department

22 GWYNNE D. LeGRO, City Engineer
23 appearing on behalf of the City of Mount Vernon,
24 Washington

24 GEORGE KIMBLE, Route 3, Mount Vernon, Washington
25 appearing on his own behalf

25 CHARLES SIMMONS
appearing on behalf of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1 and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

2 ROLF LARSEN

3 appearing on behalf of the Washington State Department
4 of Game and John A. Biggs, Director

5 RICHARD BEEBE

6 appearing on behalf of Robert E. Rose, Director,
7 Department of Commerce and Economic Development

8 VICTOR CRISSEY, Burlington, Washington
9 appearing on his own behalf

10 GRANT C. NELSON, Route 3, Box 382, Mount Vernon,
11 Washington
12 appearing on behalf of Skagit County Dike District
13 No. 2 and on his own behalf

14 GEORGE M. DYNES, Commissioner, Skagit County Dike
15 District #20 and Drainage District #20
16 appearing on behalf of Dike District #20 and Drainage
17 District #20 and on behalf of the Inland Empire
18 Waterways Association

19 LAWRENCE BOETTCHER, Burlington, Washington
20 appearing on his own behalf

21 EARL DANIELSON

22 appearing on behalf of Jack Alawine, Master, Skagit
23 County Pomona Grange No. 10

24 EARL HANSON

25 appearing on behalf of Dike District 17 and as president
of the Skagit County Flood Control Council

DANIEL SUNDQUIST, Commissioner, Skagit County Dike
District #3

appearing on behalf of Skagit County Dike District #3

WALTER GERLINE, Attorney at Law

appearing on behalf of Skagit County Dike District #12

FRED R. LUBBE, Attorney at Law, 404 Fairhaven Avenue,
Burlington, Washington

appearing on behalf of a citizens' group objecting to
the Avon Bypass Project and on behalf of Skagit County
Fire Protection District No. 6

MARION NEWKIRK, Special Research Deputy

appearing on behalf of the Washington State Grange

EDNA BREAZEALE

appearing on behalf of the Bay View - Padilla Civic
Association

P 001646

P R O C E E D I N G S

COLONEL PERRY: May I have your attention, please,
Ladies and Gentlemen. We will call our meeting to order.

I am Colonel Perry, the District Engineer for the
U. S. Army Engineer District in Seattle.

We're here for a public hearing which we will go
into in a little more detail later. Quite frankly, I'm
just amazed at the size of the turnout here today. I am
very pleased all of you have taken your time to come here
and pass on to me your viewpoints and your ideas.

I'm going to be a little bit more formal to start off
with than I usually am because I have material I want to
be sure gets into the record. If you will bear with me
for about ten minutes, I will give you a brief rundown on
the status of our planning and how we propose to conduct
our hearing.

The members of my staff with me here today are:
immediately on my right, Mr. Bob Gedney, who is Chief of
the Basin Planning Branch of our Engineering Division; and
on his right is Mr. Ray Skrinde, who heads the Puget Sound
Planning Section.

By Resolution of the Public Works Committee of the
United States Senate adopted on 4 January 1960, and the
Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives
adopted on 9 June 1960, the United States Corps of Engineers

P 001647

1 has been directed to study and report to Congress on the
2 advisability of Federal projects that will provide flood
3 control protection and allied improvements in the Skagit
4 River Basin. The resolution states, "Resolved by the
5 Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate"
6 this is the Senate version, and by the House of Representa-
7 tives in the House version," that the Board of Engineers
8 for Rivers and Harbors be and is hereby requested to review
9 the reports from Skagit River, Washington, published as
10 House and Senate documents Nos. 187, 73rd Congress Second
11 Session and other reports with a view of determining whether
12 any modification of the recommendations contained therein
13 is desirable at the present time, with particular reference
14 to providing flood control and allied improvements in the
15 basin." This basic study was assigned the Seattle District
16 for accomplishment.

17 The purpose of this hearing today is to hear your
18 views on the plans for levees and channel improvements
19 downstream from Mt. Vernon, and for adding fishery and
20 recreation as purposes of the authorized Avon Bypass. We're
21 to consider whether or not these additions should be
22 recommended to Congress.

23 These proposed plans have been outlined in the
24 "Information Bulletin" that we sent out some time ago. I
25 believe that we had a fairly wide distribution of the

1 Bulletin. I don't propose to take your time today in
2 reviewing the Bulletin. You'll probably get a pretty good
3 picture of this as we go through the hearing. There is one
4 correction I would like to make. At the time the Bulletin
5 was issued we had estimated the cost of local cooperation
6 for the downstream levee and channel improvements as about
7 \$370,000. Now after a more detailed review of estimates
8 for land, utilities and relocation costs, we believe that
9 we were high and that this cost from a local cooperation
10 standpoint would amount to about \$220,000. This might be
11 reduced still further as we get into planning and
12 construction.

13 At this time I would like to summarize rather quickly
14 just what our studies have entailed in the Skagit River
15 Basin. The studies started in about 1961 and to date have
16 shown that flood control is the most urgent water resource
17 requirement in the lower Skagit River, or in fact, in the
18 basin today. Our studies have progressed far enough to
19 show us that there are certain flood control projects that
20 can be initiated almost immediately which will fit into an
21 integral plan for basin development.

22 Now, one of the plans that we're discussing today is
23 the flood control project for the Avon Bypass. This project
24 was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936 and the
25 purpose of the plan was to divert a portion of the flood

P 001649

1 waters from the Skagit River into Padilla Bay. In other
2 words, reduce the total amount of water which would flow
3 through the lower Skagit River in the delta area.

4 Now, because this project is already authorized and
5 is not a formal part of today's hearing, which is to
6 discuss the new plans, we're not really concerned with
7 this project in the hearing today. However, I'll appreciate
8 any of the comments that you have to make concerning the
9 Avon Bypass as a separate project.

10 Levee and channel improvements downstream from the
11 Bypass in our opinion, have not much hope of being
12 recommended for construction without the Avon Bypass. Levee
13 and channel improvements would increase flood protection
14 that you now have in the lower valley from the three to
15 ten year frequency, to a minimum frequency of once in
16 seven years. With the criteria under which the Corps of
17 Engineers is required to operate, flood control projects
18 with less than a protection frequency of once in twenty to
19 twenty-five years is not acceptable for recommendation to
20 Congress. This is a criteria that we are faced with in all
21 of our planning. So, raising the levees, or increasing the
22 protection through levees to about seven year frequency
23 doesn't have much hope of authorization.

24 Now, the levees together with the Avon Bypass would
25 increase the flood protection to approximately a thirty

1 year frequency; in other words, protect the area from
2 floods that would occur, once in thirty years. With the
3 Avon Bypass, we have a lake approximately eight miles long
4 and three hundred forty to three hundred sixty feet wide.
5 What we are after today, is to find out what local interests
6 have in the way of a desire to develop recreational
7 benefits of the Avon Bypass. If this desire is strong
8 enough, we can recommend to Congress that recreation
9 facilities be put in as an added item.

10 Now, some of the things that I know are going through
11 the minds of all of you who live in the valley, are
12 solutions to the problems of eliminating the flooding that
13 occurs periodically in your area. One of the theories
14 that has been advanced to me is raising the height of the
15 levees. This is something that should be done, but only
16 to a certain level. The levees should be raised to a
17 level where you would get approximately 120,000 cubic feet
18 per second flow, but if you go much above that height in
19 order to protect -- say, against a flood once in every
20 thirty years, you are going to have to raise the levees
21 somewhere on the order of six to eight feet.

22 Now, to do this, from an engineering standpoint, we
23 create a problem of differential head that would increase
24 the height of water in the channel by another six to eight
25 feet. This would create problems of the water seeping out

1 underneath the levees and backing onto the land.

2 Now, the levees here are built on a silt and very
3 fine granular sand base. Prior experience in this type of
4 construction in other parts of the country shows problems
5 that you create when you have a situation with the high
6 head of water and the low land behind it, sand boils, water
7 seeping under the levee, and sometimes levee failures result.
8 Quite frequently the water will go completely under the
9 levee, leave the levee standing and flood the area behind
10 it as though there was no levee there. You then have the
11 increased problem of getting the water off of the land. We
12 have discounted this as a plan because we can't get the
13 levees high enough as a practical matter.

14 The other theory that I hear quite frequently is the
15 dredging of the channel. The idea is that dredging will
16 provide additional capacity in the river. Now, in theory,
17 this is correct. In practice, dredging would undercut the
18 base of the levees from the toe and, in all probability,
19 would cause the levee to fail by undercutting from the river
20 side.

21 Now, the other problem with respect to dredging is the
22 fact that the Skagit, in the lower area, carries something
23 on the order of five hundred thousand cubic yards of bed load
24 material on an annual basis. This material is carried down
25 from upstream, arriving in the delta area where the stream

1 velocity drops and, since the velocity drops, this
2 deposits the bed load. We would be faced with the problem
3 of something on the order of five hundred thousand cubic
4 yards of dredging annually in the lower basin and we can't
5 afford this from a practical standpoint.

6 The third thing that I hear as a theory, and it's a
7 practical one, is upstream storage. First, let's look at
8 what we have. There is some upstream storage right now in
9 Ross Dam. I believe the area that Ross Dam affects amounts
10 to about nine hundred square miles. There is a total of
11 about three thousand one hundred forty square miles of basin
12 area that drains into the Skagit. So Ross takes care of
13 about thirty per cent of the upstream runoff. Now, this
14 leaves the other two-thirds of the basin uncontrolled.
15 There doesn't seem to be any practical place on the main
16 stem of the Skagit River to put a reservoir, so this
17 eliminates the main stem of the Skagit.

18 Now, on the Sauk River there does appear to be a fairly
19 practical site that would provide quite a bit of highly
20 desirable storage. It is not economically justifiable to
21 build anything on the Sauk for flood control alone. Now,
22 if the Sauk were built for flood control, hydroelectric
23 power, water supply to the area when it is needed in the
24 future, possibly some irrigation in the basin, recreation
25 and the other features that go into a multi-purpose project,

1 it then has good prospects for justification, but it isn't
2 with us right now. So, we're faced with the problem of
3 trying to arrive at a plan that gives us something in the
4 order of immediate benefits.

5 I realize, when we say immediate benefits that the
6 way the Federal Government operates, "immediate" may be
7 five or six years away and still be "immediate" in our
8 terminology. What we are trying to do is to come up with
9 flood control plans that will fit as integral parts of an
10 over-all basin project and that will at the same time
11 provide immediate benefits to the valley.

12 In our opinion, the Avon Bypass plus the improvements
13 of the downstream levee system and some channel improvement
14 are the first step of a basin development plan.

15 Now, I want to emphasize that what I am saying here
16 about planning is very much in a preliminary stage.
17 Alinements of such things as the Avon Bypass, areas of
18 channel improvements in the lower river and improvement of
19 levees that now look like they need strengthening or
20 improving, are all very preliminary. Until we have design
21 money and are actually in the design phase, none of us are
22 in a position to tell you that this is an alinement that
23 the river would take, or this is the alinement that the
24 Avon Bypass would have.

25 We are going to be pretty informal today as far as

1 the hearing goes. I would appreciate very much an open
2 discussion of your views, either pro or con, and as
3 complete a statement as you desire to make. When this
4 information is assembled in our final hearing record, it
5 will be given every consideration.

6 In the interest of conserving time, which I haven't
7 done, I would appreciate it, if you have long statements
8 that are already prepared, that you paraphrase them and
9 then give me the statement so it can be introduced into the
10 record verbatim. We have received several letters that
11 have expressed interest both pro and con and if these are
12 not covered by somebody here, as part of the hearing, I will
13 then paraphrase these a little later on.

14 I would like to have a complete attendance record, if
15 possible. If you have not prepared a card, I would
16 appreciate it if you would do so before you leave and then
17 leave the card with us.

18 As I was asked to announce earlier, the manager of the
19 Elks Club has asked that we have **no smoking in this room**
20 **today.**

21 Now, I have not made any attempt to segregate the
22 cards that have been submitted to me, with a couple of
23 exceptions. Mr. Greg Hastings has been designated by
24 Governor Rosellini as his representative here today to
25 make a statement, so I will call on him first.

1 I believe Mayor Hanson is here, but I understand
2 that he has designated his City Engineer, Mr. LeGro, to
3 speak for him today.

4 I will call some of the state and county representatives
5 whom I know to be present and after I have gotten through
6 those few, then we'll just take the cards in order.

7 When you make your statement, I would appreciate it if
8 you would come forward. You can use the microphone and the
9 lectern. Please tell the recorder your name and either
10 your occupation or whom you are representing so that this
11 can be made a part of our permanent record.

12 Before we close the meeting, I will ask for anyone
13 from the floor who desires to make a statement. Whether or
14 not you have submitted a card is immaterial. If you will
15 hold up your hand, you will be called upon to give whatever
16 statement you desire.

17 I have one other little item here. There was a
18 question that was written out. It is unsigned. It says:
19 "Dear Sir: I would like to know about 1,000 acres of land
20 in drainage district 19, north of Avon cutoff. Will it be
21 drained after the new channel is put in?" I assume that
22 this question is concerned with interior drainage and the
23 answer is yes, we will make provisions for interior
24 drainage, so that flood flows or water that falls on the
25 area outside of the channel can be drained into the Bypass

P 001656

1 or into the river. Did that answer the question of whoever
2 put this question forward? If not, you will have to ask me
3 separately and I will try my best to answer it.

4 I'd like to call on Mr. Greg Hastings, representing
5 Governor Rosellini. Greg Hastings is with the Department
6 of Conservation in the State of Washington.

7 **GREGORY HASTINGS**

8 appearing on behalf of the Governor of the State of
9 Washington, made the following statement:

10 I am Gregory Hastings, Supervisor of Flood Control,
11 Department of Conservation, headed by Earl Cole, Director.

12 I am going to be informal, Colonel Perry. This is an
13 opportunity that I have looked forward to for approximately
14 twelve and a half years now.

15 The magic number of twelve and a half is simply that
16 in April, 1951, you remember a young, wide-eyed, eager,
17 curly-headed fellow that followed a little Norwegian around
18 in the mud. Lars is dead, but I'm sure his vision, his --
19 I don't quite know how to say it -- I don't know many
20 Norwegians, but I'm sure they must all be like him. I have
21 met no one since who so deeply in his heart and with his
22 waking moments and with the disposal and dispatch of every
23 technical knowledge that had come his way as a young man did
24 he lend himself to the problem of flood control. The
25 cohabitation of that enemy with us people and our lands

1 because he acknowledged then and we do now and we always
2 will acknowledge, we must live together. Nothing was
3 impossible for Lars -- that simply was a little more
4 difficult to perform than the things that were hard to do,
5 or that were tasks tough to perform.

6 I don't match Lars' shoes in stature of the servant,
7 but it surely is a -- it's an emotional thing, in a way,
8 with me. I'm looking at the nicest crowd, the biggest
9 crowd of you dike men and district commissioners that I've
10 ever had the privilege of addressing.

11 Individually, over these 12-1/2 or 13 years I have
12 been with one and all of you at one or more times in
13 different places -- from being in a boat to being knee-deep,
14 to your home, at our public meetings that we have, at our
15 office in Olympia, at Colonel Perry's office. We've met
16 on many places, under many circumstances, for the same
17 purpose. We meet again today, in my mind, the place of
18 which the climax of this affair since you started some
19 70 years ago may be accomplished.

20 I do not bring any particular word from Governor
21 Rosellini and this may be a good thing in that he, as leader
22 of our political state and leader of all our people as an
23 administrative officer, has not directed in an arbitrary
24 way at any time the work of his various codepartments.
25 Sometimes as I was growing up in my work, I found fault with

1 him for that. Now the combination of probably being a
2 little smarter and a little older and having my head more
3 open to the air makes me think better. It probably is well
4 and right that he does not and did not, from time to time,
5 take a position of state attitude and otherwise dispose of
6 the tremendously complicated problem of water planning,
7 development and disposition.

8 He has left it with his departments to cooperate with
9 each other and out of the problem of water and the absolute
10 necessity of getting along with it on our lands at the same
11 time and in the same place. We departments have gotten
12 together and it pleases me to tell you, or report to you,
13 that this cooperation now shared and enjoyed by the
14 departments has also reached an apex in our affairs with
15 one another relating to the years gone by.

16 Different things have caused this, yes -- the Corps of
17 Engineers renewed activity at the direction of Congress,
18 backed up with funds from Congress, backed up with higher
19 quality men on the staff. In these years of mine, which are
20 young compared to the course and to the men I usually work
21 with, I have seen an upgrading in the quality of their men --
22 technically, emotionally, influentially. They have some
23 fine thinking men working in that department of government,
24 the Engineering Department of Army. If anybody's doubting
25 what I'm doing right now, it is a basket of roses I have in

1 mind, and with him sitting right here in front of us, it's
2 a good chance to hand it to him. So I thank them on behalf
3 of us in this beginning today at our meeting for helping
4 and having walked beside us to this point in our stewardship
5 of our soil, our homes, our families, and the future that
6 dad leaves son, who leaves to his son to go on.

7 On November the 14th, at the request of Colonel Perry
8 and with the complete agreement of Governor Rosellini, we
9 codepartments, having some interest in some way with water,
10 met in private session with the Colonel and his men in
11 Olympia and privately had a preview of this report that we
12 are now discussing, as has been opened for the public
13 inspection.

14 At that time frank and open discussion was had by the
15 Departments of Highway, Game, Fisheries, Commerce and
16 Economic Development, Parks, Pollution and Conservation.

17 All those departments have something to do with water, and
18 I doubt if all of you in the room knew that number existed.
19 You knew that some of them were involved, but I don't think
20 you knew they all were involved.

21 This in itself is complicated because in that
22 involvement there are separate, distinct and often
23 uncorrelated laws covering the administration of that
24 feature, that physical asset that I like to talk about as
25 our really general high thing we must live with and get

P 001660

1 along with.

2 Water is our greatest asset. In that same form, and
3 in the twinkling of an eye, it becomes our greatest enemy.

4 Ability to live with it, I think, has been confused and
5 clouded by our inability to recognize that it exists in the
6 same form all the time. Knowing that animal, or that
7 beast, or that thing is the first key to whipping it and
8 subjecting it to our will and to our use. It is controlable.

9 Our departments met on November the 14th, reviewed the
10 report and generally without, I believe, sacrificial
11 compromise in the area of these departments' responsibility,
12 agreed that the basic plan involved was a good one; that it
13 did not basically interfere, nor would it likely conflict
14 with the furtherance of those departments' individual
15 beliefs, nor was there any real reason why the eight of us
16 could not cooperate and further the state's full interest
17 here, by cooperating and coordinating the affairs of the
18 Corps, you local people, and our duties; that your
19 legislators, for you and at your insistence have set up laws.
20 We don't make laws; we only carry out the ones that as a
21 result of that action in Olympia every two years, your
22 extended officers, by their elected positions, direct we
23 hired servants to carry on your wishes.

24 Before the afternoon is through, I trust that the
25 various departments will step forward and summarize briefly

P 001661

1 their view as a result of our preliminary meeting.

2 I cannot tell you, nor will I try now to tell you
3 about the area, the river and its land that you know so
4 well because you live here. I consider myself a junior
5 to you and I always will be.

6 Even though we argue about the technique, or the
7 theory, or the plan that each district may have as to its
8 working program, we'll still make out. I want you to argue
9 with me and I think that you do not mind my arguing with
10 you. This is good.

11 I see so many faces in the room that I have argued
12 with, and they sit here smiling at me; I don't think we're
13 mad at each other -- it's not that type of a thing. We
14 must disagree because, out of disagreement, the man that
15 has an idea of the right attack must impress this point
16 in a debating situation. He wins his argument because of
17 its factual representation and its truth over an opinion
18 that may have come from not having the right facts.

19 I think I would like to remind you, then, of only a
20 few things, and I will do as Colonel Perry suggested.

21 You know what this plan proposes; you know what its
22 benefits likely will be. The State's interest as, or by
23 virtue of our department's duties and responsibilities to
24 you, specifically in the line of flood control, maintenance,
25 betterment, and improvement program, cooperating with the

P 001662

1 districts, other municipalities and the State of Washington,
2 with the Corps of Engineers standing on the side of both
3 of us as our helping technical partner and financial agent
4 in pursuing a program.

5 Since 1943 -- well, let me go back one more point,
6 From an unknown period, likely at the turn of the century,
7 when diking was first commenced for the private landowners'
8 immediate benefit to a group enterprise, up to 1947, the
9 districts and/or their individual landowners and farmers,
10 cooperating together, spent approximately two million
11 three hundred fifty, sixty thousand dollars on the dikes.

12 In 1943 the State Legislature authorized and provided
13 funds for the Department of Conservation to financially
14 assist you in furthering your protective program for your
15 land and industry on that land.

16 Since 1943 the State, helping Skagit County and these
17 some odd sixteen diking districts and some twenty-five
18 or so drainage districts, we together have spent a million
19 three hundred thousand dollars, making approximately a
20 total of three million six hundred sixty thousand dollars
21 together during this century on these levees from
22 approximately Sterling Bend at Burlington to the mouth of
23 both forks.

24 Yet, as Colonel Perry explained to you in his opening
25 remarks, that expenditure and those dikes have rebeded river

P 001663

1 banks and removed bars and debree dams cleared, have still
2 given us only approximately a nine year level of protection,
3 and for only ten per cent of the time are we protected
4 against floods. We may expect ninety per cent of the time
5 to have those floods exceed the capacity of those dikes.

6 Yet, with the Corps plan, presented here in their
7 preliminary report, at no cash on our part -- county and
8 state and local people -- with only the obligation of
9 modifying and relocating broken utilities, they find
10 justified to come in, raise, widen, and strengthen the
11 existing dike system to a uniform grade and cross section
12 and to clear the channel of certain restricting elements
13 in cross section and triple that level of protection. That's
14 a pretty good deal.

15 Now there may be a great deal of disagreement now on
16 that, please do not form an opinion, Ladies and Gentlemen,
17 this afternoon if you can, but just listen to what is to
18 be said -- I don't mean don't express your opinion -- but
19 let's not form an opinion today without giving this thing
20 the thought it merits.

21 They are prepared to spend considerable federal funds
22 to do design planning for us. It will be then, I think,
23 too late if we commit them to that planning and then say
24 when it's done, "We're sorry, we've changed our minds, we'd
25 rather not have this." I can't believe that out of

1 intelligent, factual discussion, thinking and resolution
2 of the problem.

3 Bernard Baruch, of whom I am not particularly a great
4 lover of his writings, but he has said one thing that I
5 believe in deeply: "Every man is entitled to his own
6 opinion, but he is not entitled to form it on the basis of
7 wrong acts."

8 That's all I want to say -- so, for a cost of maybe
9 four hundred thousand dollars on the outside -- let's talk
10 rough figures -- to do modification of the utilities to
11 provide the required rights of way to hold the government
12 free and clear from damages and to assure them that we,
13 together, will maintain the work they leave us and no real
14 cash contribution to them for the support of the project.
15 Our present level of protection has cost us three and six
16 tenths million, giving us a nine year level of protection;
17 and all I have to offer that on behalf of my director, or
18 boss, Earl Cole, and the program which he and the Governor
19 do support in the lines of water resource management and
20 development, we continue our support to you in that program
21 and, particularly, in this program. This is what we have
22 wanted, but we have together, the districts and the state,
23 have not had the means, financially and technically, to do
24 this type of analysis and search into the facts and the
25 problem to come up with the resolution and conclusion they

1 have drawn for us at considerable expense thus far.

2 Lloyd and I have talked about this a great deal. Mr.
3 Gedney, Joel Walburg -- these are friends of yours that
4 have served you over the years. I have served all three
5 of them. This is what we have all talked about without
6 deviation, but we did not have the means of bringing the
7 facts before you folks that now are possible.

8 Please simply study those and digest them. Carry them
9 around with you, talk about them on the street corner and
10 at your small meetings; and while you're doing this, remember
11 that the support the state has been able to give you thus
12 far. I am privileged to hereby assure its continuance and
13 possibly because of this comprehensive program proposed now,
14 for the first time in the history of the valley there is no
15 reason to believe that the economic benefit derived herein
16 locally and to the state totally, does not justify some
17 increase, maybe, in the state's share in the picture.

18 As in all other state expenditures in its various areas
19 of service, the proof of the plea is in justifying why that
20 increase is needed and necessary. And that is, gentlemen,
21 your Legislature is simply going to want to know, is it good
22 business or isn't it good business from an economic
23 standpoint.

24 We're all businessmen -- you farmers, you men in the
25 stores downtown, motel operators, whoever it may be --

P 001666

1 anybody that deals in money and is not actively retired is
2 a businessman.

3 The worth of this soil, the support it gives the
4 community and is capable of continuing to give the community
5 merits the most serious, thought-provoking affair you've
6 ever run into here. And I challenge you only to make that
7 thought-provoking exercise individually and in your
8 meetings and in your districts before you finally say in
9 a short while, if it is different than you feel now, whether
10 this project should go forward or be stopped, whether you
11 do not want it, or feel it is not justified and cannot be
12 afforded.

13 We feel that it is necessary and that it can be
14 afforded. For this reason we are at a point of an airplane
15 with so much gasoline, having approached the point of no
16 return. We must soon decide here in the state, and
17 particularly in Skagit County, who is the greatest, the
18 number one user of state funds in flood control.

19 We are now at a time here when we must decide, do we
20 continue this ineffectual and inefficient method of
21 maintaining a substandard set of works, or stop that type
22 of a program and improve our worth and net assets by doing
23 something that's comprehensive and lasting and not be faced
24 with this annual fear that these substandard dikes are
25 going to be topped, your home lost. And I can't help but

1 remind you the inexcusable loss of a life, and it's
2 inexcusable in this respect.

3 Murray Walker, our Supervisor of Water Resources, has
4 placed a letter from his division in Colonel Perry's hands
5 generally agreeing with Mr. Cole and myself in the worth of
6 the project but pointing out one area of consideration not
7 officially represented so far by the Corps of Engineers'
8 work and that is, that by the virtue of the water storage
9 it's likely possible in the Avon Bypass channel -- he only
10 would like to have you and the Corps study the possibilities
11 and the benefits likely derived from irrigation from that
12 stored water and to dovetail it into the physics of that
13 program.

14 There is going to be a time soon, even in the Skagit
15 Valley that has God-blessing rains at the right time --
16 even though they are what cause our problem today -- there
17 will be a time when supplemental irrigation is essential to
18 the horticulture and other husbandry of that soil to its
19 fullest extent.

20 This is one area in which it is not possible, at least,
21 to consider irrigation and augmenting or improving the
22 existing municipal industrial supplies now being taken from
23 the Skagit River. We know they are turbid and often
24 undesirable for, particularly, chemical industry. That
25 channel might possess a little less turbid water and be

P 001668

1 less complicated and costly to use, and so Murray only
2 wanted me, Colonel Perry, to remind you of that point.

3 The chance to rise above this yoke of this nine year
4 level of protection lies before us. Give it the most
5 serious consideration you gentlemen have ever given
6 anything we have had to do with each other.

7 Thank you.

8 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Greg. Mr. Scott Richards,
9 please.

10 SCOTT RICHARDS

11 appearing on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners,
12 made the following statement:

13 My name is Scott Richards, Chairman of the Board of
14 County Commissioners.

15 Not being capricious, facetious, or loquacious as my
16 good friend, Greg Hastings, I am not going to attempt to
17 compete with his oratorical flow of words, so I will be
18 quite brief.

19 We received a letter from Colonel Dewey on December
20 16 -- I am speaking of the Board of County Commissioners --
21 asking for some affirmation concerning the lower levee
22 improvements. We felt it would be imperative to have the
23 voice of the districts involved in this work, so a meeting
24 was arranged on December 31 and this is the result of that
25 meeting. This is in a letter to the Corps of Engineers.

1 "This is in reply to your letter dated December 16,
2 1963. Your letter requests local cooperation requirements
3 on the levee improvements and recreation additions to the
4 Avon Bypass, which is scheduled for public hearing on
5 January 10, 1964.

6 A meeting was held on December 31 at 1:30 p.m. with the
7 effected dike district commissioners, who number 18, and of
8 which 16 were in attendance.

9 An affirmative vote was given by the attending dike
10 district commissioners for the Corps of Engineers' project
11 of improvements. The effected dike district commissioners
12 indicated their willingness to work with the county in
13 providing the necessary rights of way for the proposed
14 project; also, hold the United States free from damages
15 due to construction works and maintain and operate all the
16 works after the completion of construction in accordance
17 with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the
18 Army.

19 Skagit County dike districts have a high record of
20 quality maintenance on their system, so this item is not
21 a problem.

22 We, the Board of County Commissioners, wish to affirm
23 the intent of the county to provide local cooperation on
24 behalf of the dike districts and the people of Skagit
25 County, as set forth in your request." Signed by the Board

1 of County Commissioners.

2 There is one other item I'd like to get into the record
3 for the interest of the people and taxpayers of Skagit
4 County. This has been asked of the Corps, it's been asked
5 of the Board of Commissioners, and many other people.

6 This project needs a lot of study and consideration
7 on your part; but when the time comes for the raising of
8 money on a local participation, we want to assure you that
9 the people and taxpayers of Skagit County will have the
10 right to vote on this problem, so we urge you to study it
11 very thoroughly and make up your minds and then decide
12 whether you want to approve or reject this project when
13 the time comes.

14 At this time we would also like to thank the Corps,
15 compliment them on their continued efforts on the flood
16 control problems of Skagit County.

17 Thank you.

18 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you. Lloyd Johnson, please.

19 LLOYD JOHNSON

20 appearing on behalf of Skagit County, Washington, read the
21 following statement:

22 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
23 No. 1, attached hereto, read.)

24 The flood problems of the Skagit Valley date back to
25 before the arrival of the earliest settler. The original
dikes were a private and cooperative venture of these early

1 settlers. Flood fighting and diking was a very real and
2 constant threat to all the settlers. Moving out and
3 upstairs was an expected procedure with the flooding of
4 the Valley. Supplies of wood, groceries, feed for
5 livestock, etc. were constantly lost which made early life
6 disappointing.

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

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

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

22 The Willamette Valley in Oregon suffered great damage
23 until the flood control structures were installed in the
24 Valley. These justified Corps of Engineer projects in
25 Oregon have now enabled Eugene, Oregon and vicinity to

1 develop without fear of flood, and we hope that Skagit
2 County may now prosper with these anticipated improvements
3 as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

19 Skagit County and the Dike District Commissioners have
20 long known the need of uniform dike protection from flooding
21 for the various areas. The Corps of Engineers' proposal
22 to unify dike protection with their downstream proposal is
23 generally approved by most individuals affected. There is
24 need locally to arrange the local participation on an
25 equitable basis and modify some of the designs with the

P 001673

1 cooperation of the Corps of Engineers' so that the projects
2 do the least damage possible to the local properties.

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

6 Respectfully submitted,
7 SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON
8 By: /s/ LLOYD H. JOHNSON
9 Lloyd H. Johnson
10 Skagit County Engineer

11 I would now like to take the liberty of reading a
12 letter written by James Hulbert, Sr.

13 "Colonel E. L. Perry, District Engineer. Dear Sir:
14 The Corps of Army Engineers' have given considerable study
15 to the Skagit River and have arrived at the same answer,
16 which is basically the Avon Bypass. I agree with the
17 thinking of the Corps of Engineers' and support their
18 modifications as recommended at this Hearing relative to the
19 dike improvements and recreational use of this Bypass.

20 During my life time I have observed flooding of all the
21 towns of Skagit County, from Edison to Stanwood, and I feel
22 sure that history will repeat this disaster if steps are
23 not taken to prevent it.

24 I further believe it would be foolish to refuse this
25 offer of the Corps of Engineers. We should give very serious
26 consideration to this project before turning it down.

27 New developments and the potential increased population
28 in Skagit County certainly justifies the Bypass with its
29 accompanying improvements. Respectfully submitted, James
30 Hulbert, Sr., Land Owner and Dike Commissioner of Several

1 Dike Districts during the last Fifty Years."

2 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Lloyd, Paul McKay.

3 PAUL J. McKAY

4 appearing on behalf of the State Highway Department, made
5 the following statement:

6 Paul J. McKay, District Engineer for the Washington
7 State Highway Department.

8 The report which I have to offer is very brief. It
9 indicates the results of our review and investigation after
10 studying the plans for this proposed improvement; and I do
11 want to emphasize the fact that the members of the State
12 Highway Department and the members of the State Highway
13 Commission fully concur with the report and do not want
14 to in any way affect the approval of the plan.

15 However, the Department and Commission does want to
16 make one point clear at this time as a result of this
17 investigation. The results of this investigation indicate
18 that the Department feels that they would not be permitted
19 to use motor vehicle funds to support the construction
20 on this improvement.

21 The reason for that decision is that a review of our
22 repair work on our highways through this area during the
23 past years does not disclose that we have had any
24 appreciable costs in maintenance or repairs.

25 However, again, I do want to leave this thought: that

1 the Department and the Commission are favorable to the
2 report and we do want to compliment the Corps of Engineers
3 in the efficient manner in which the study has been made.

4 (Letters, Exhibit No. 2,
5 attached hereto, submitted
and read as follows.)

6 January 8, 1964, Colonel Ernest L. Perry, District
7 Engineer, Corps of Engineers, 1519 Alaskan Way South,
8 Seattle, Washington. Subject Avon Bypass, Skagit
9 River Flood Control Project. Dear Sir: In compliance with
10 your suggestion we are furnishing the following report on
11 the proposed Avon Bypass of the Skagit River in respect to
12 the anticipated effects on our highway system through the
13 Skagit County area.

14 As mentioned in our previous correspondence, this
15 Department does not, in any way, oppose the improvement as
16 outlined in your informational bulletin entitled "Plans for
17 Flood Control and Recreation Improvements for the Skagit
18 River". However, from the results of our thorough
19 investigation, the Department does not feel that motor
20 vehicle funds can be properly used for defraying any of the
21 costs of the proposed improvement. This opinion is based
22 on the fact that during the past years, we have experienced
23 a relatively low cost of repairs on our highway system
24 through this area due to flood water conditions. For your
25 convenience, we are enclosing copies of our previous

P 001676

1 correspondence dated November 20 and December 31, 1963.

2 Very truly yours, /s/ P. J. McKay, District Engineer.

3 (Following are the enclosures
4 above mentioned.)

5 November 20, 1963, Colonel Ernest L. Perry, District
6 Engineer, U. S. Army Engineer District, Corps of Engineers
7 1519 Alaskan Way South, Seattle, Washington 98134. Subject
8 P.S.H. No. 1, Skagit River, Avon By-Pass, NPSEN-PP. Dear
9 Colonel Perry: Reference is made to your letter of
10 November 7th in which you advise of the public meeting to
11 be held at 1:30 p.m. on November 22nd at the Elks Lodge in
12 Mt. Vernon. It is our understanding that this public hearing
13 has been scheduled for a discussion of the proposed Avon
14 By-pass of the Skagit River and for an explanation and
15 discussion of the additional proposed dike and levy work.

16 Please be advised that Mr. P. J. McKay, our District
17 Engineer in Seattle, will attend that hearing and will
18 officially represent the Highway Department. Mr. McKay is
19 authorized to use a copy of this letter as the official
20 position of the Highway Department regarding this proposal,
21 and if requested by you, will present at the hearing the
22 Department's position in this matter.

23 The State Highway Department does not, in any way,
24 oppose the improvement as outlined in your informational
25 bulletin entitled "Plans for Flood Control and Recreation
Improvements for the Skagit River." The Department does not

P 001677

1 feel, however, that motor vehicle funds can be properly
2 used for defraying any of the costs of this proposed
3 improvement because it has not been demonstrated that a
4 direct benefit will be derived by the Highway Department.

5 We would call your attention to the fact that one of
6 the highway crossings that would be made necessary by the
7 construction of the Avon by-pass would involve Interstate
8 Highway 5, which has been completed through this section to
9 Interstate standards and is presently carrying a large
10 volume of traffic. A suitable detour would be necessary
11 in order to construct structures across this facility.

12 Very truly yours, C. G. PRAHL, Director of Highways, By:

13 W. E. McKibben, Assistant Director.

14 December 31, 1963, Colonel Ernest L. Perry, District
15 Engineer, Corps of Engineers, 1519 Alaskan Way South,
16 Seattle, Washington 98134. [Subject] Avon Bypass, Skagit
17 River Flood Control Project. Dear Colonel Perry: Reference
18 is made to your letters of December 6th and December 16th
19 regarding the rescheduled public hearing date of January 10th
20 for the proposed Avon Bypass of the Skagit River and other
21 flood control proposals.

22 We have reviewed the location of the various sections
23 to which reference was made in your previous letters
24 concerning their susceptibility to floods from the Skagit
25 River. In all but one instance, we find that these highways

1 have either been reconstructed within the last six or
2 seven years or will be reconstructed within the next three
3 or four years. Plans for this reconstruction work provide
4 for elevation of the highways above the 1909 flood elevation.

5 In reviewing past maintenance records of these
6 highways which have previously been affected by flooding of
7 the Skagit River, we find that the relatively low cost of
8 repairs because of high water damage could not possibly
9 justify the proposed cost of the bridge structures as
10 outlined in your previous report. For this reason, we must
11 reiterate our position as expressed in our letter of
12 November 20th regarding the participation of this
13 department in the proposed flood control improvements.

14 Please be advised that Mr. P. J. McKay, District
15 Engineer in Seattle, will attend the public hearing on
16 January 10th. Very truly yours, C. G. PRAHL, Director
17 of Highways, By: W. E. McKIBBEN, Assistant Director.

18 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Paul. Mr. Gwynne LeGro,
19 please.

20 GWYNNE D. LEGRO
21 appearing on behalf of the City of Mount Vernon, made the
22 following statement:

23 I am Gwynne LeGro, City Engineer for the City of
24 Mount Vernon.

25 I would like to make this statement for the City of

1 Mount Vernon on behalf of the Mayor. He tells me some of
2 these terms are unknown to Mayor's office.

3 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
4 No. 3, attached hereto, read.)

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

20 Watching the river crest at flood stage was not all
21 our townspeople had on their minds, however. The City
22 officials had serious problems with their sewer system -
23 as our Park Street sewer main collapsed inside of our
24 protective shut-off gates but outside of the dike and
25 flooded back into the residential area in the Southwest
section of our town, lifting manhole covers and flooding

1 streets and homes, until the sewer break could be found and
2 the sewer line sealed off by dumping truck loads of sand
3 bags into a manhole to plug the sewer main.

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

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

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

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

23 The City of Mount Vernon, with full knowledge of what
24 a flood flow of 150,000 c.f.s. means to our city, hereby
25 congratulate the Corps of Engineers for their comprehensive

1 and forward-thinking flood prevention plan.

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

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

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

25 And in conclusion, with the achievement of all the plans

P 001682

1 presently under consideration for flood control on the
2 Skagit River, that the comprehensive development of
3 upstream storages on the various tributaries of the Skagit
4 River, can give our fertile valley a virtual freedom from
5 the danger of floods - and possibly in our lifetime.

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

9 FOR THE CITY OF MOUNT VERNON

10 /s/ HERMAN I. HANSON
HERMAN I. HANSON, MAYOR

11 Presented By: /s/ GWYNNE D. LEGRO
12 GWYNNE D. LEGRO
CITY ENGINEER

13 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. LeGro. Mr. George
14 Kimble, please.

15 **GEORGE KIMBLE**

16 appearing on his own behalf, read the following statement:

17 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
18 No. 4, attached hereto, read)

19 Dear Sirs: I was to one of the Avon Bypass Protest
20 meetings. There was a bunch giving their reasons why we
21 should not have it. I finally could not sit still anymore
22 and got up and asked them how many of them that were
23 against it ever went through a flood and not one person
24 raised their hand or answered me.

25 I came from the dust bowl and lived in this valley for

P 001683

1 15 years and never heard of the river being up.

2 Then in 1951 we got the report that we were in danger
3 of a flood. I worked for 37 hours without taking my boots
4 off working on the dikes and moving my cattle out to higher
5 ground before the water got so deep we could not get
6 anymore things.

7 We had from 3 to 4 feet of water on our place and
8 was out for 2 week.

9 When we came back everything that was loose had washed
10 away. Most of the cedar fence posts lifted right out of
11 the ground. Mud and silt was in all the buildings which
12 had to be cleaned out. Grain in the granery was so wet we
13 lost all it. If my wife had of been two feet closer to the
14 electric stove she would of gotten killed as the wires were
15 wet and shorted out and burnt up part of the stove when it
16 blew up.

17 When the water is in your house so deep that all you
18 can see is the key board on the piano and all the residue
19 from the septic tank floats back up in your house makes a
20 mess that when you have to clean up once you will never
21 forget.

22 So you can just figure that almost anyone that is
23 fighting this thing don't know what they are talking about.

24 Everybody keeps their fire insurance payed up and can
25 have a fire truck there in 10 minutes. But try to get flood

P 001684

1 insurance in this valley.

2 What extry our taxes will be is not a drop in the
3 bucket compared to the damage a flood will do.

4 Mother nature is one thing that we cannot tell ahead
5 what it is going to do or fight. Just do the best we can
6 and prepare all we can ahead of time. So lets get this
7 flood control program going just as SOON AS POSSIBLE before
8 we have any more floods.

9 Just let us have one more big flood and have 3 or 4
10 feet of water in one of these big housing projects like
11 west of Mt. Vernon and the people will be crying so loud
12 for federal help that this will be just a drop in the
13 bucket.

14 Most men that smoke spend more for smokes than their
15 extry taxes will be.

16 I am
17 Geo. C. Kimble
18 Rt. 3 Mt. Vernon Wash.

19 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Kimble. Mr. Charles
20 Simmons, please.

21 CHARLES SIMMONS

22 appearing on behalf of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and
23 Wildlife of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, read the
24 following statement:

25

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 5, attached hereto, read.)

P 001685

1 My name is Charles Simmons. I represent the Bureau of
2 Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife
3 Service.

4 The preservation, development, and administration of
5 the nation's fish and wildlife resources are responsibilities
6 of the state conservation agencies and the U. S. Fish and
7 Wildlife Service. Through the Fish and Wildlife Coordination
8 Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the
9 state agencies and the Fish and Wildlife Service have a
10 legal obligation to review proposed water development
11 projects and to ascertain effects such projects would have
12 on fish and wildlife. In meeting this obligation,
13 investigations are made to determine these effects and to
14 recommend measures for protection and improvement of fish
15 and wildlife resources in connection with project
16 development.

17 Increased leisure time, a high-level economy, and
18 rapidly increasing human population have vastly increased
19 the demand for, and use of, public recreation facilities
20 including those dependent on fish and wildlife for their
21 attractiveness. This demand and use is expected to
22 continue and to increase. Avon Bypass provides an
23 opportunity to greatly increase fish and wildlife and
24 recreation benefits with relatively small increases in
25 project costs.

P 001686

1 Washington Departments of Fisheries and Game and the
2 Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U. S. Fish
3 and Wildlife Service have cooperated in a plan for
4 enhancement of fish and wildlife resources in the bypass
5 area, and for prevention of damages to anadromous fish that
6 would result from construction of the project without regard
7 for these species. This plan is tentative. Many details
8 and problems, particularly in regard to anadromous fish
9 protection, are yet to be resolved.

10 In our interim report on Skagit Basin, now under review
11 in our Regional Office, we will recommend that enhancement
12 of both fish and wildlife resources become purposes of the
13 project; and that Washington Department of Game in
14 cooperation with other agencies manage Avon Bypass as a
15 public hunting and fishing area, except such portions as may
16 be reserved for other purposes. Washington Department of
17 Fisheries has expressed an interest in a portion of the
18 bypass as a salmon propagating or rearing area. If this
19 proves feasible, we will recommend that part of the west
20 end of the channel be reserved for their use.

21 To take full advantage of the hunting and fishing
22 enhancement possibilities provided by Avon Bypass, certain
23 features in addition to those provided for operation of the
24 area for flood control will be necessary. These include
25 boat ramps and public parking areas at each end of the bypass

P 001687

1 right-of-way; interior wiers to maintain water levels; fish
2 screens at inlet and outlet works; low-level water controls
3 to permit drainage of the channel for rough-fish control
4 and removal of trapped anadromous species, and to permit
5 introduction of water for freshening and cooling and other
6 management purposes. In addition to these facilities, most
7 of which have been accepted by your agency for inclusion in
8 project plans, the forthcoming report of the Bureau of
9 Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will recommend acquisition of
10 approximately 180 acres of land for public shooting and
11 access to Padilla Bay. Easements on private land along
12 the bypass right-of-way will be required to provide access
13 during the hunting season for retrieving birds killed from
14 the right-of-way. We will also recommend that water rights
15 be acquired for a minimum 100 second-feet to freshen and
16 cool water ponded in the bypass channel.

17 Skagit River is the most important producer of salmon
18 in the State of Washington outside the Columbia River, and
19 regularly ranks first in number of steelhead trout caught
20 in the state. It is of vital concern to the citizens of
21 Washington, and of the nation, that runs of these anadromous
22 species be maintained. Our interim report on Skagit River
23 Basin will recommend that in connection with channel
24 widening and levee improvement downstream from Mount Vernon,
25 disturbance or muddying of the stream be minimized as much

1 as possible and restricted to the period between June 1 and
2 August 15 of any year.

3 Management of Avon Bypass for public hunting and fishing,
4 as well as for other recreational purposes, with additions
5 to the planned flood control facilities as recommended by
6 Washington Departments of Fisheries and Game and the Bureau
7 of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, will add substantially to
8 the resource value of the region and will contribute to the
9 economy of the surrounding area.

10 Thank you.

11 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Simmons. Mr. Larsen.

12 ROLF LARSEN

13 appearing on behalf of the Washington State Department of
14 Game and John A. Biggs, Director, made the following
15 statement:

16 My name is Rolf Larsen, and I'm here representing the
17 Washington State Department of Game and Mr. John Biggs, the
18 Director.

19 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
20 No. 6, attached hereto, read.)

21 Fishing and hunting in the State of Washington is a
22 one hundred million dollar a year industry and therefore is
23 very vital to our economy. The Department of Game as a
24 conservation and wildlife management agency seeks to
25 preserve this economy by protecting our fish and wildlife

1 resources. We, therefore, are vitally interested in all
2 river projects that may have either a detrimental or
3 beneficial effect on these resources. If the project is
4 detrimental, we have an obligation to determine the best
5 method to limit the extent of damage and to recommend means
6 to mitigate the losses. If the project is deemed beneficial,
7 we lend our knowledge of the habits of fish and wildlife to
8 the constructing agency to make the benefits as worthwhile
9 as possible at the most reasonable cost. It is with these
10 thoughts in mind that we are here today to comment on the
11 projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers for flood
12 protection in the lower Skagit River.

13 The Skagit River is the most important producer of
14 winter run steelhead in the State of Washington. It
15 produces an average catch of 15,686 winter steelhead each
16 year with a record catch of 22,488 in the 1955-56 season.
17 The river provides an average of 84,700 man-days of fishing
18 each year during the winter season. The Skagit is also an
19 important producer of sea-run cutthroat, dolly varden,
20 whitefish and resident species of trout.

21 The fisheries resources of the Skagit River contribute
22 substantially to the economy of Skagit County. In addition
23 to the money spent in the area for lodging, meals, gas,
24 clothing and equipment by fishermen, there are 19
25 professional guides that operate on the river deriving an

1 income of nearly \$25,000.00 annually. The loss of any of
2 the fishery resources of the river will affect the economy
3 of this area, the degree of impact being dependent upon the
4 degree of damage to the fishery resource itself.

5 The area at the mouths of the North Fork and South
6 Fork of the Skagit River is very important as waterfowl
7 production and hunting lands. The Skagit Game Range, for
8 example, located between Freshwater and Steamboat Sloughs
9 provided a kill of 19,184 ducks, geese and pheasants in
10 1962 and provided 18,631 man-days of hunting. This game
11 range had a larger kill of waterfowl and provided a greater
12 number of man-days of waterfowl hunting than any other game
13 range in the state. We are therefore, vitally concerned
14 with any project that may affect the waterfowl production
15 of the lowland areas at the mouth of the Skagit River.

16 This Department has worked with the Corps of Engineers
17 in developing plans for safeguarding fish and wildlife in
18 the projects under discussion here today. We feel that
19 the proposed levee and channel widening project below
20 Mount Vernon and the Avon Bypass Project will provide a
21 great measure of flood protection for the lower Skagit
22 River area and also will cause minimum problems as far as
23 fish and wildlife are concerned. The channel widening
24 phase of the project may require some measures to
25 safeguard fish, depending upon the type of equipment used

P 001691

1 to accomplish the desired results, however, we do not feel
2 that the required safeguards will materially affect this
3 project.

4 The proposed inclusion of fish, wildlife and recreation
5 purposes to the Avon Bypass adds materially to the benefits
6 of this project. With proper management and fish stocking,
7 the Bypass could add materially to the economy of Skagit
8 County. The proper development of this area, however, will
9 be dependent upon proper screening of the inlet and outlet,
10 development of adequate boat launching facilities, parking
11 areas and an adequate year around water supply. This
12 Department will sincerely attempt to develop the fishing
13 potential in the Bypass.

14 The additional possibilities for developing upland
15 bird hunting and waterfowl hunting will also add to the
16 value of the Bypass as a recreational area. We feel,
17 therefore, that fish and wildlife benefits should be
18 included as a purpose of the Avon Bypass.

19 We wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity
20 to appear at this hearing and express our views relative to
21 the proposed Skagit River flood protection projects.

22 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Larsen. Mr. Richard
23 Beebe, please.

24 **RICHARD BEEBE**

25 appearing on behalf of Robert E. Rose, Director, Department of

1 Commerce and Economic Development, made the following
2 statement:

3 I am Dick Beebe. I am appearing today in behalf of
4 Director Rose of the Department of Commerce and Economic
5 Development.

6 The Department recognizes the benefits of flood
7 control to all land users, be they agricultural, residential,
8 commercial, industrial, or other. I think most of you
9 people also recognize these benefits.

10 Our Department is concerned with the total economic
11 development of all parts of the state, including
12 recreational and tourism. Mr. Rose has written this
13 statement for Colonel Perry:

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
14 No. 7, attached hereto, read.)

15 Dear Col. Perry: The Washington State Department of
16 Commerce and Economic Development supports the proposed
17 flood control project on the lower Skagit River including
18 the proposed Avon Bypass. This project would tend to benefit
19 present and future developments. The economic benefits from
20 the recreational uses would be felt immediately and the
21 scouring out from the Bypass should keep a commercial
22 channel open into Indian Slough.

23 Thank you for the opportunity to make this statement.
24 Sincerely, Robert E. Rose, Director.

25 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Beebe. Mr. Victor Crissey.

P 001693

VICTOR CRISSEY

1
2 appearing on his own behalf, made the following statement:

3 I want to make a few remarks. I am in favor of them
4 dredging the river and fixing the dikes in the lower part
5 of the river; but up around Burlington where I live I own
6 quite a lot of property and water frontage for a half mile.

7 When I came here in '89, I ran my boat on the river
8 when the bridges were out. I hauled piling logs down the
9 river.

10 Before I go any further, I will bring it to you now --
11 Deception Pass controls the river. It took the river
12 hundreds of years to find her course. She made all that
13 land up around Burlington, and it's very valuable land, that
14 silt.

15 We have the best kind of crops, the best kind of fruit;
16 and it's just wonderful and I think it's a wonderful
17 proposition for you to fix the river, dredge it; but the
18 bypass -- no.

19 If they have a petition they want us to sign, no, I
20 will make my mark on that. We don't need the river; we are
21 all setting pretty good up there.

22 The dike commissioners opened the span through the
23 Great Northern draw bridge where the Baker River could go
24 through it; and I have been around the Baker River a lot
25 before they had the dams in there.

P 001694

1 before and property values would increase as a result of
2 the higher degree of protection.

3 I am in favor of the above mentioned proposals.

4 Yours very truly
5 /s/ GRANT C. NELSON
6 Grant C. Nelson
7 Route 3, Box 382
8 Mount Vernon, Washington
9 98273

8 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Nelson. Mr. George Dynes.

9 GEORGE M. DYNES

10 appearing on behalf of Diking District and Drainage District
11 #20 and the Inland Empire Waterways Association, made the
12 following statement:

13 My name is George Dynes; I am a farmer. I'm also
14 Diking Commissioner of Diking and Drainage District #20.

15 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
16 No. 9, attached hereto, read.)

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

22 We the Commissioners of Dike District #20 and Drainage
23 District #20 endorse and support the plans as presented in
24 the Bulletin by the Corps of Engineers to widen and
25 strengthen the Dikes on the Skagit River so when the Avon

1 By-Pass is constructed these dual Projects will give the
2 entire Skagit River Basin at least a 30 year protection
3 from Floods.

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

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 /s/ GEO. M. DYNES

16 Geo. M. Dynes.

17 Commissioner Dike District #20

18 The three commissioners, Virgil Fell, John Petter,
19 and myself, concur in this statement.

20 I also have another statement, Colonel Perry. I
21 happen to be a Director of the Inland Empire Waterways
22 Association, representing Whatcom, Skagit and Snohomish
23 Counties, and here is a letter signed by Herbert G. West,
24 the Executive Vice President of the Inland Empire
25 Waterways Association, Walla Walla.

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 10, attached hereto, read.)

P 001697

1 Dear Colonel Perry,
2 Pursuant to Notice of Public Hearing on Flood Control
3 and Addition of Recreation and Fisheries as Project
4 Purposes to the Avon Bypass, Skagit River Basin, Washington,
5 the Inland Empire Waterways Association desires to make
6 the following statement:

7 The Inland Empire Waterways Association passed a
8 Resolution in support of the Avon Bypass at its recent
9 Convention held in Portland, Oregon, on November 5, 1963.

10 After thorough study of the information bulletin presented
11 by the United States Corps of Army Engineers, Seattle
12 District, entitled "Skagit River, Washington, Plans for
13 Flood Control and Recreation Improvements including
14 Fisheries as added purposes for Avon Bypass", the Inland
15 Empire Waterways Association endorses and supports the plans
16 as presented in said bulletin and concurs in the statement
17 as will be presented by the Avon Bypass Committee.

18 Respectfully submitted,
19 /s/ H. G. WEST
20 HERBERT G. WEST
21 Executive Vice President

21 Thank you.

22 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Dynes, Mr. Lawrence
23 Boettcher, please.

24 LAWRENCE BOETTCHER

25 appearing on his own behalf, made the following statement:

1 Colonel Perry, all the fors and against this program,
2 I think, have a dollar sign before them, so I just want
3 to ask several questions:

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
4 No. 11, attached hereto, read.)

5 1. Do you think some way could be found for county
6 and diking district participation in the agricultural
7 conservation program to receive payment for truly soil
8 conservation practices such as revetment work and
9 construction of needed dike facilities?

10 /And then I have another question: Everyone has been
11 speaking of the grand plan, and it seems to me very little
12 attention has been paid to the immediate needs and: /

13 2. Why has not more rock revetment work above Mount
14 Vernon for control of bank erosion and subsequent
15 prevention of channel silting been advocated?

16 /s/ LAWRENCE BOETTCHER
17 Burlington

18 Thank you.

19 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, sir. Mr. Earl Danielson.

20 EARL DANIELSON

21 appearing on behalf of Jack Alawine, Master, Skagit County
22 Pomona Grange No. 10, made the following statement:

23 My name is Earl Danielson. I am appearing on behalf
24 of our Skagit County Pomona Master, Jack Alawine.

25 It was in February that our Skagit Pomona Grange --
that is, '63 -- went on record as being in favor of this Avon

P 001699

1 Bypass as it was written up in the Mount Vernon Herald.

2 Shortly after that they adopted a resolution. If I
3 may read this resolution:

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
4 No. 12, attached hereto, read.)

5 Whereas, Skagit County has suffered untold damage to
6 it's farms from floods, or fast run off of snow caused by
7 Chinook winds, and,

8 Whereas, Baker, Upper Baker Ross and Diablo Dams offer
9 some protection from floods, there is still need of a by-
10 pass to carry flood waters to the bay, and,

11 Whereas the Army Engineers in cooperation with Skagit
12 County engineers have submitted a plan for a by-pass eight
13 miles long by 500 feet wide to empty into Padilla Bay at
14 a cost of 19 million dollars, 15 million dollars from
15 federal financing, four million dollars from County
16 financing, and

17 Whereas, without the by-pass, flood damage would amount
18 to an estimated million dollars a year.

19 Therefore be it resolved that Skagit County Pomona
20 Grange number 10 go on record as favoring the present
21 flood control program and that a copy of this resolution
22 be sent to the Dairy Federation, Farm Bureau, Burlington,
23 Sedro Woolley and Mount Vernon Chamber of Commerce, and to
24 the Washington State Grange.

25 The above resolution passed by Skagit County Pomona

P 001700

1 Grange number 10 at its regular meeting held at Sanish
2 Valley Grange on February 6, 1963.

3 /s/ JACK ALAWINE
4 MASTER SKAGIT COUNTY POMONA GRANGE NO. 10

5 /s/ JEWELL FORTIN
6 SECRETARY SKAGIT COUNTY POMONA GRANGE
NO. 10

7 The above resolution was passed by Skagit County Pomona
8 and from there it went on over to Port Angeles at their
9 State Convention in June and it was sent to the Conservation
10 and Game Committee over there; and there were men who
11 are living in the eastern part of the state who didn't
12 understand our problems or conditions here.

13 We are quite in favor of it because it is a quite
14 necessary program.

15 Due to the fact that this was made before these later
16 plans were made to improve the dikes on the lower Skagit,
17 we wish to add this. This is from our Pomona Master.

18
19 Gentlemen:

20 The Skagit County Pomona Grange is already in favor of
21 the Flood Control Program. Also it has standing committees
22 in the Game and Fisheries.

23 As Pomona Master I hereby go on record as favoring
24 the program concerning the recreational facilities in
25 conjunction with the Avon By Pass.

P 001701

1 Signed,

2 /s/ JACK ALAWINE

Pomona Master (Skagit County)

3 Thank you.

4 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Daniel. Mr. Earl
5 Hanson, please.

6 EARL HANSON

7 appearing on behalf of Dike District 17 and as president of
8 the Skagit County Flood Control Council, made the following
9 statement:

10 I am Earl Hanson. I am a member of Dike District 17
11 which this building is in.

12 Some forty years ago, why, we had a flood December 13 --
13 forty-two years ago in 1921. The water, I would say, was
14 about this deep (indicating) in points; but I might also
15 add that while our dike in District 17 is probably one of
16 the better ones in the county, we still believe that there
17 is room for improvement in the downstream area because any
18 bank pressure from the river will make a marked improvement
19 in the upper reaches. So, anything we can do to the lower
20 reaches is certainly going to stand in our state up here.

21 Now, as president of the Skagit County Flood Control
22 Council, I have a statement to read:

23 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 13, attached hereto, read.)

24 A good majority of the Skagit County Dike Commissioners
25 are in favor of the Skagit River Avon Bypass and it's added

P 001702

1 features.

2 The downstream improvements are wished by most all Dike
3 District Commissioners with some minor modifications so
4 as to do the least possible damage to the existing
5 improvements.

6 An invitational meeting was held February 4, 1963 at
7 Max Dales. In attendance were Dike District Commissioners,
8 Representatives of the local Chamber of Commerce, Radio
9 Reporters, Newspaper Publishers, and other responsible
10 people of the area. Great favor was expressed by a majority
11 of the people in attendance for flood relief by the Avon
12 Bypass.

13 A meeting of the Washington State Flood Control Council
14 was held December 26, 1962 at Bellevue, Washington, where
15 the following Resolution was passed:

16 WASHINGTON STATE FLOOD CONTROL COUNCIL
17 ADOPTED RESOLUTION

18 The resolution presented by Skagit County, wherein
19 the Washington State Flood Control Council approves
20 and supports Skagit County's request for aid from
21 the State Legislature and State Highway Department
22 in connection with the construction of a structure
23 to divert flood waters of the Skagit River to
24 Padilla Bay, to be known as the Avon Bypass.

24 Respectfully Submitted,

25 Earl Hanson, President
Skagit County Flood Control Council

1 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. Mr. Daniel
2 Sundquist, please.

3 DANIEL SUNDQUIST

4 appearing on behalf of Dike District #3, Skagit County, made
5 the following statement:

6 I am presenting this letter on behalf of the Dike
7 District #3. I am Daniel Sundquist and the other
8 commissioners are Owen Tronsdal and Magnus Johnson.

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 14, attached hereto, read.)

10 We, the undersigned Commissioners of Dike District #3
11 of Skagit County, approve the proposed Avon by-pass project
12 for flood control and the proposed project for channel
13 improvement and levee improvement.

14 We would like to call to your attention a partial
15 rock dam that exists at approximately the head of Freshwater
16 Slough. We feel it is a restriction to the flow of water
17 and should be removed.

18 We also request that consideration should be given
19 to channel improvement in Tom Moore Slough.

20 Respectfully submitted,
21 DIKE DISTRICT #3, SKAGIT COUNTY
22 /s/ DANIEL SUNDQUIST
23 /s/ OWEN TRONSDAL
24 /s/ MAGNUS JOHNSON

24 Thank you.

25 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Sundquist. Mr. James

1 Mapes.

2 JAMES MAPES

3 appearing on behalf of Skagit County Dike District No. 12,

4 made the following statement:

5 To shorten this meeting up, I would like to call on
6 our attorney, Mr. Walter Gerline, Jr., to speak on behalf
7 of Dike District No. 12.

8 WALTER GERLINE, JR.

9 appearing on behalf of Skagit County Dike District No. 12,

10 made the following statement:

11 At the request of the Commissioners of Dike District
12 No. 12, I have prepared their statement which I have

13 presented in writing to Colonel Perry, as follows:

14 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 15, attached hereto, read.)

15 U. S. Army Engineer-Seattle District
16 1519 Alaskan Way South
Seattle, Washington

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

19 Gentlemen:

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

23 REGARDING LOWER SKAGIT RIVER PLAN

24 The undersigned do in general, approve and commend the
25 Corp of Engineers for the plan to improve the levee and

P 001705

1 channel of the Skagit River from Mount Vernon to its mouth,
2 The undersigned feel very strongly that levee and channel
3 improvement is a proper method of flood control.

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

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

11 REGARDING THE AVON BY-PASS

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

16 The undersigned object to the Avon-By-Pass Project for
17 the reason that it would not materially decrease the present
18 expenditure for flood control and dike and drainage
19 maintenance presently budgeted.

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

25 The undersigned object to the attempt by the Engineers

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

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

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

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

20 Yours truly,

21 /s/ JAMES MAPES

22 /a/ BERT BEEKS

23 /s/ PETE WALKER, JR.

24 Briefly, with respect to the widening and diking along
25 the lower Skagit River, Dike District 12 is in favor of the
study and the proposals set out in that plan.

P 001707

1 With respect to the Avon Bypass, however, which runs
2 directly through Dike District No. 12, the Commissioners
3 are not in favor of the plan as proposed, recognizing, of
4 course, that the same has been authorized previously, they
5 would like to go on record simply as stating that the
6 studies as they relate to fish and wildlife and game might
7 best be summarized or contained in further development of
8 the natural conditions as they now exist along the Skagit
9 River, without respect to the Avon Bypass.

10 They are not in favor of Avon Bypass.

11 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Gerline. Mr. Fred
12 Lubbe, please.

13 FRED R. LUBBE

14 appearing on behalf of a citizens' group objecting to the
15 Avon Bypass Project and on behalf of Skagit County Fire
16 Protection District No. 6, made the following statement:

17 I am Fred Lubbe, an attorney from Burlington, and I
18 represent a number of people in the Burlington area who
19 object to the Avon Bypass but are very interested that
20 other river flood control work be done.

21 These people are, of course, not engineers and cannot
22 be called experts and they leave it to the dike commissioners
23 to present that side of the problem. However, they are
24 very interested that the other work on the river will not
25 be too much tied in with the Avon Bypass for several reasons.

1 First, because of the quite-strenuous opposition
2 to the Bypass, at least in the Burlington area, where the
3 people are probably most directly affected by it. They
4 feel that it will be very difficult to obtain the money
5 necessary for local participation in the project, and for
6 that reason, aside from others, the project is quite
7 unlikely to ever come into being; and if other work on the
8 river is done in reliance on this Bypass, that all of the
9 flood control work on the river is threatened to a large
10 extent.

11 Some of the reasons that the people in this area
12 object to this Bypass are these:

13 One, they feel -- and I think they are supported, at
14 least, by dike commissioners and, I think, ditch
15 commissioners in the Burlington area -- that other flood
16 control work, which would be much less expensive than the
17 Avon Bypass, will do as much or more to prevent flood
18 control, widening dikes and things like this; and that the
19 great expense of this Avon Bypass is not justified.

20 Two, they feel that the Bypass will cut the county in
21 two and, of course, it definitely cuts the dike districts
22 in the Burlington area in two; it makes that much more
23 dike control, or that much more water frontage that can be
24 a danger to the Burlington area.

25 We feel that the project, to a certain extent, has been

1 sold on the basis of the recreational facilities offered
2 and the people in the Burlington area that I represent
3 do not feel that the recreational facilities that will be
4 placed there can compare with natural facilities in the
5 Skagit County area.

6 There are many natural facilities in the Skagit County
7 area, the northwest Washington area, for that matter, which
8 are not developed for the reason that there are just not
9 that many people in the area, there are not enough people
10 to use those facilities we have; and we do not feel that
11 the facilities can be used even to the extent that they
12 will be maintained.

13 We see pictures in the pamphlet that is presented of
14 fishing areas, nice park-like areas. Actually, most of the
15 Skagit River is lined with brush, black berries, alder,
16 things like this; and we feel that there will be more of
17 a maintenance problem just to keep the area looking somewhat
18 presentable.

19 I won't go into all of the letter that I have presented
20 because of the time involved. I would like to point out
21 that another, from the point of view of recreation, that
22 the State Parks Department apparently feels that this is
23 not a project of state-wide interest as far as the State
24 Parks Department is concerned, and I think that they are
25 right. That there are so many natural lakes, natural

1 facilities in the state of Washington, especially Western
2 Washington, that people from great distances will not come
3 to use this sort of thing; it will be only a matter of
4 local interest.

5 One other thing, I also represent the Skagit County
6 Fire Protection District No. 6, which is the fire
7 protection district in the Burlington area, and they have
8 asked me to notify you that:

9 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 16, attached hereto, read.)

10 Gentlemen:

11 The Fire Commissioners of Fire District Six of Skagit
12 County, at their regular meeting January 6, 1964 voted to
13 go on record as opposing the Avon By-Pass Project for the
14 reason that it would divide the fire district and make it
15 more difficult to give adequate fire protection to the
16 people south of the By-Pass.

17 Very truly yours,

18 /s/ FRED R. LUBBE

19 Fred R. Lubbe
Secretary

20 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
21 No. 17, attached hereto, reads
as follows.)

22 Gentlemen:

23 I represent a group of citizens who have organized
24 informally to object to the proposed Avon By-Pass Project.
25 The group which I represent has circulated a petition, a

P 001711

1 copy of which is attached to this letter. We feel that
2 the petition should be given great weight because it was
3 originated in the Burlington area, an area most directly
4 affected by the By-Pass project, and flood danger.

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

14 1. The cost of the By-Pass is out of portion to
15 the cost of other flood control methods which the group
16 feels would be more satisfactory.

17 2. Flood control of the river has been improved
18 since the time of the most serious floods through dams
19 built on the upper river and improved methods of dike
20 construction.

21 3. All floods in recent years have resulted from some
22 dike fault. It is believed that these faults have been
23 corrected to a large extent and through the expenditure
24 of much less than the Avon By-Pass can be eliminated. As
25 an example in the 1951 flood in Burlington was caused by

1 water working through the sand and undermining the dike but
2 the dike district has since corrected this situation in
3 its dikes.

4 4. The group feels that the original purpose of the
5 project (flood control) has been forgotten to some extent
6 by many propoents (sic) interested in recreational
7 facilities, however, it is believed that the proposed
8 facilities would not be developed or used to the extent
9 that they would be maintained because the Skagit Valley
10 area has many potential recreational facilities which are
11 not developed or used for the reason that the population
12 is not great enough to utilize the present facilities. Also
13 the State Park's Commission has not shown wide interest in
14 the project feeling that it lacks state wide interest and
15 importance. This project would not be near as attractive
16 as other natural lakes in the area and because of the
17 abundance of natural facilities in the state can not itself
18 be hoped to attract people from substantial distances.

19 5. According to the engineer's own statement the
20 By-Pass would not give protection against a major flood
21 such as the 1921 flood, as the expenditure of nineteen
22 million dollars would not be sufficient to control the flow
23 of 210 cubic feet of water per second which caused the
24 1921 flood.

25 6. The By-Pass would divide the county and would

1 cause various transportation and communication problems;
2 such as the taking of farm crops to market and individuals
3 to commercial areas.

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

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

P 001714

1 cleaning of the channel of some debris will improve the
2 situation.

3 Very truly yours,

4 Fred R. Lubbe
5 Attorney at Law

6 COLONEL PERRY: Would everyone like to stand up and
7 take a stretch at this point?

8 (Short recess.)

9 COLONEL PERRY: May we continue with the hearing,
10 please. Is Mr. Newkirk here, please?

11 **MARION NEWKIRK**

12 appearing on behalf of the Washington State Grange, read
13 the following statement:

14 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
15 No. 18, attached hereto, read.)

16 I am Marion Newkirk, Special Research Deputy for the
17 Washington State Grange. Our State Master, Mr. A. Lars
18 Nelson, is unable to be present today and has asked me to
19 present this statement in favor of the proposed Avon By-
20 pass.

21 At the 1963 Annual Session of the Washington State
22 Grante, held at Port Angeles, Washington, June 10-14, the
23 delegates passed the following resolution:

24 No. 3 - Skagit River By-Pass

25 Whereas, Skagit County has suffered untold damage to
its farms from floods or fast run-off of snow caused by

P 001715

1 Chinook winds; and

2 Whereas, Baker, Upper Baker, Ross and Diablo Dams offer
3 some protection from floods; and

4 Whereas, there is still need of a by-pass to carry
5 flood waters to the bay; and

6 Whereas, the army engineers in cooperation with Skagit
7 County Engineers have submitted a plan for a by-pass eight
8 miles in length by five hundred feet in which to empty into
9 Padilla Bay at a cost of nineteen million dollars; and

10 Whereas, the cost is to be paid fifteen million dollars
11 from federal financing and four million dollars from County
12 financing; and

13 Whereas, without the by-pass, flood damage would amount
14 to an estimated million dollars a year; therefore be it

15 Resolved, (1) that the Washington State Grange favor
16 the present flood control program for the construction of
17 this by-pass; and

18 (2) that a copy of this resolution be sent to the
19 Corps of Engineers, Governor Rosellini and to our
20 Congressional Delegation.

21 Committee Report favorable. Report adopted.

22 The Washington State Grange has traditionally favored
23 conservation policies which prevent or attempt to prevent
24 the damage or destruction of our resources by the elements
25 and has always supported comprehensive flood control

P 001716

1 programs. In our estimation, the proposed Lower Skagit
2 Flood Control Program, including the Avon By-pass, is
3 essential to the future development and protection.

4 While we are primarily interested in the flood control
5 aspects of this program, we are also cognizant of the
6 pressing need for more and more recreation facilities for
7 our growing population. We have always favored multi-
8 purpose use of our natural resources wholeheartedly and
9 support the recreation and fish propagation aspects of the
10 proposed plan.

11 We believe that the Army Engineers, working with the
12 local agencies, have developed a very comprehensive plan
13 for the protection of the Lower Skagit delta area and that
14 the proposed Avon By-pass is a very necessary part of this
15 plan. It seems quite feasible from an engineering standpoint
16 and we urge the adoption and completion of this project.

17 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Newkirk. Edna
18 Breazeale -- did I pronounce that correctly?

19 EDNA BREAZEALE
20 appearing on behalf of the Bay View- Padilla Civic
21 Association, made the following statement:

22 Colonel Perry, friends of Skaget County, I represent
23 the Bay View - Padilla Civic Association, and you may wonder
24 why a woman is here among all these men expressing a point
25 of view. But I think that we people over there have a

P 001717

1 very honest point of view concerning one aspect of this
2 proposition, and that is concerning the addition of
3 recreation and fisheries as project purposes to the
4 Avon Bypass, Skagit River Basin, Washington.

5 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
6 No. 19, attached hereto, read.)

7 In compliance with the request for arguments to be
8 submitted in writing for the public hearing 22 November
9 1963, Mount Vernon, Washington, we herewith present our
10 points of view and pose a number of questions which we
11 would like to have answered. As a preface to our remarks
12 we wish to state that we are not opposed to flood control;
13 our primary purpose relates to the modification of "structures
14 in the Avon Bypass to permit the addition of recreation and
15 fisheries as additional purposes of the Bypass."

16 1. We question the need for additional recreational
17 resources in Skagit County of this particular type and
18 at this time. Skagit County has within a short distance of
19 metropolitan centers an outstanding array of lakes, rivers,
20 creeks, and bays to provide ample recreation and fishing
21 facilities. The existing county, state, and national
22 resources are in need of development. Reports state that
23 county fresh water lake resorts have not had sufficient
24 patronage in 1963.

25 2. We would ask who are the initiators of the
recreation and fishing plan since we note on Page 12 of

1 the Information Bulletin for Public Hearing, Nov. 22, 1963,
2 that the plans set forth in this bulletin do " not constitute
3 either a concurrence or non-concurrence " on the part of
4 the organizations there set forth. Recently the Parks and
5 Recreation Commission has been quoted in the Skagit Valley
6 Herald as saying that they do not consider that the project
7 has a statewide appeal. (Tuesday, November 19, 1963.)

8 3. No estimated cost is given for the recreation and
9 fisheries aspects of the Bypass. In comparison to the cost
10 of development of already existing recreational areas, we
11 would question the cost of the proposed additions. Even
12 though recreational facilities are provided by private
13 enterprise, the taxpayers would be capitalizing the initial
14 venture. Recently the Board of County Commissioners of
15 Skagit County ordered the sale of County owned tidelands
16 already providing hunting, crabbing, and tons of herring.
17 Since the Board considered it necessary for financial
18 reasons to allow the public auction of these lands at an
19 initial bid of a mere \$7,000, and they sold that for a
20 mere pittance of \$7,100.00 because, said several of the
21 commissioners, "We needed the money." It would seem that
22 it is, indeed, to quote the old saying " penny wise and
23 pound foolish" to expend tens of thousands, or perhaps
24 hundreds of thousands, and in the last analysis millions of
25 dollars to provide a recreational area which we do not know

1 about while they are practically giving away an established
2 area. Skagit County cannot afford this kind of financing.

3 4. On Page 10 of the Information Bulletin the following
4 statement is made: " Project plans include boat access to
5 Padilla Bay, which could give the public further access to
6 waterfowl hunting." We would inquire by what means access
7 is to be made in winter when the Avon Bypass would be
8 needed for drainage and high water control and the tide is
9 in on the Bay almost all day. We are not engineers, but we
10 have no doubt that hydraulic lifts or bypass chutes of some
11 sort could be provided, at what cost we can only conjecture.
12 And one would also inquire of what value it would be to have
13 access to the Bay if it is all silted up.

14 5. If this plan is followed, does the Corps of
15 Engineers contemplate the dredging of Indian Slough to a
16 depth of 60 feet out to the Swinomish Channel as has been
17 rumored? If so, how is the dredged earth to be disposed
18 of? What would be the additional cost to the taxpayers, or
19 would the Corps of Engineers be paid by private individuals?
20 If so, by whom?

21 6. Is the ultimate plan then to make the southern
22 portion of Padilla Bay as far north as the Bay View State
23 Park a settling basin for the Bypass? It could not then
24 provide the recreational opportunities which it presently
25 provides. We would be changing the expansive area of

1 Padilla Bay for 340 acres [or thereabouts -- I've heard the
2 number 400 mentioned this afternoon] of honky-tonk
3 possibilities. We would cite the tens of thousands of
4 persons who use Bay View State Park every year, the numerous
5 hunting clubs on the Bay, the public access to bathing,
6 boating, and water-skiing, the fact that at little cost to
7 taxpayers the County could provide boat-launching ramps at
8 the road ends fronting the Bay. We would also point out
9 the crab-spawning areas in the south end of Padilla Bay.

10 7. Is the conclusion of such a project then to be,
11 in addition to the upkeep of the Avon Bypass itself, another
12 Swinomish Channel with yearly dredging at constant expense
13 to the County, the Federal Government, and naturally to the
14 individuals?

15 Summing up our points of view, we would state that the
16 recreational and fishing aspects are not needed; that they
17 would prove costly, and that the Avon Bypass itself may
18 prove detrimental to the best recreational interests of the
19 County.

20 Respectfully yours,

21 /s/ Edna Breazeale

22 Miss Edna Breazeale
23 Bay View- Padilla Civic Association
R. F. D. 2, Box 123
Mount Vernon, Washington.

24 I thank you very much.

25 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Miss Breazeale. Albert

1 Goodrich, please.

2 AUDIENCE: He had to go home.

3 COLONEL PERRY: Mr. John Slater.

4 MR. SLATER: Well, I relinquish my time. Edna
5 Breazeale here expressed my opinion very much to the point.

6 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, sir.

7 I have a card from Mr. Harwood Bannister; he presented
8 a written statement then departed.

9 Mr. Bannister, in his written statement, was concerned
10 with the interests of the Indians and wanted to question
11 the Corps in the event any dredging was done in the river
12 or any changes of channel, that we might be in violation
13 of the treaty with the Swinomish Indians. That is a
14 generalization of the statement.

15 **HARWOOD BANNISTER**

16 appearing on behalf of the Swinomish Indian Tribal
17 Community, left the following statement with Colonel Perry.

18 (Prepared Statement, Exhibit
19 No. 20, attached hereto,
reads as follows.)

20 OBJECTIONS TO AVON BYPASS PROJECT AND RELATED PHASES THEREOF
21 BY
22 SWINOMISH INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITY
LaConner, Washington

23 This statement is submitted on behalf of the Swinomish
24 Indian Tribal Community and members of the Swinomish
25 Reservation to the Corps of Army Engineers in connection with

p 001722

1 the public hearing held at the Elks Lodge, Mount Vernon,
2 Washington, January 10, 1964, at 1:30 p.m.

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

13 Adequate information is not presently available to
14 determine the effect such projects would have on the
15 salmon population in the Skagit River. Such information
16 will be accumulated and furnished at a later time.

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

24 SWINOMISH INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITY

25 By BANNISTER, BRUHN & LUVERA

P 001723

1 By /s/ HARWOOD BANNISTER
2 Attorneys for Swinomish Indian Tribal
Community.

3 COLONEL PERRY: Mr. Zell Young, please.

4 ZELL A. YOUNG

5 appearing on behalf of a citizens' group petitioning for a
6 flood control program, made the following statement:

7 My name is Zell Young; I run a welding machine work in
8 West Mount Vernon.

9 Back in 1960, early Spring, several friends and I
10 passed a petition in this area concerned with flood control
11 work. That was directly following the -- I believe it was
12 November, 1959 -- flood which didn't really amount to very
13 much in this area, but everybody had flood on their mind
14 at that time.

15 We had no trouble getting signatures -- anybody that we
16 contacted it seemed like signed this petition. Well, years
17 have come and gone and I think things have changed since
18 then, but I would like to present this petition at this
19 present time to the Corps of Engineers.

20 My final statement is: "Let's have protection now,
21 rather than 'Aid to a Disaster Area' later."

(Prepared Statement, Exhibit
No. 21, attached hereto, reads
as follows.)

23 Enrest L. Perry
24 Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

25 Sir:

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

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

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

12 However, I would like to give you at this time this
13 petition with accompanying sibnatures [sic] as evidence of
14 the feelings of the people when confronted with flooding
15 conditions.

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

18 Yours

19 /s/ ZELL A. YOUNG
20 Zell A. Young

(Following is the text of the
above-mentioned petition.)

21 Washington State Congressional Delegation

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

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

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

11 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Young. I have a card
12 from Mable Lillenthal who said, "maybe yes, maybe no." Do
13 you want to make a statement now?

14 (No response.)

15 COLONEL PERRY: Mr. Robert Yale.

16 **ROBERT YALE**

17 appearing on behalf of Public Utility District No. 1,
18 Skagit County, Washington, made the following statement:

19 We have presented you with a letter of earlier date
20 and a map, and the Public Utility District does not have
21 any objection whatsoever to the improvements on the river.

22 Our sole purpose is to make the Corps of Engineers
23 and Skagit County Engineering Department, those who have to
24 figure their estimates of the extent of the Public Utility
25 District water distribution plant. This district is

1 serving Sedro Woolley, Mount Vernon and Burlington, as well
2 as more than three thousand customers in the rural area
3 between these cities and surrounding them, and our prime
4 concern is, at the moment it would appear that on the Avon
5 Bypass we would have four pipelines that would have to be
6 relocated and resized. There is little question but what
7 there would be four other locations that pipelines are due
8 in the near future. The map we submitted shows where these
9 are likely to be located.

10 We are concerned with the physical size and condition
11 of these lines because any waterway that we have to cross
12 we have learned from experience on the Skagit River it's a
13 costly procedure and being a utility the size we are, we
14 have got to look at these things first.

15 It would be well if these pipelines could be installed
16 before the Avon Bypass were constructed.

17 The scheduling for the construction or turning over
18 would have to be carefully planned because there are times
19 of the year some of these pipelines cannot be shut down
20 since they are essential to transmission of large amounts of
21 water to food processing plants in the valley that are
22 operating twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

23 In addition to the physical problems of construction
24 and the scheduling of the same, the financial costs involved
25 for such a program are sizeable, and due to the growth in

P 001727

1 water demands the district has been hard pressed financially
2 to provide the adequate facilities required in recent years.

3 There is also an accumulation of replacement needs in
4 the existing system which presents a very real problem for
5 the district to meet within the framework of its
6 capabilities.

7 If it becomes the decision of the county and the
8 government to proceed with this project, the district would
9 do all it can to cooperate with the program in matters of
10 arranging and scheduling needed construction.

11 It appears evident, however, that the financial burden
12 of this would far exceed the ability of the district, the
13 public utility district, so that funds to cover its cost
14 would, of necessity, have to be provided as part of the
15 total project cost.

16 We sincerely thank you for the opportunity of presenting
17 this information. We realize that this has nothing to do
18 with the recreational use, and I don't think the district's
19 in a position to make too much of a statement one way or
20 the other on that.

21 Thank you.

22 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Yale. Gerald Ward,
23 please. Is Mr. Ward here from the State Department of
24 Fisheries?

25 (No response.)

P 001728

1 COLONEL PERRY: Mr. James Bowers, Jr.

2 (No response.)

3 COLONEL PERRY: Apparently we lost another one by the
4 wayside.

5 That concludes the cards I have from people who have
6 indicated they wanted to make a statement. Is there anyone --
7 well, first, an oversight omission on my part which I would
8 like to apologize for, Mr. Jack Hill was here as
9 representative of Congressman Jack Westland. Mr. Hill, are
10 you still here and do you have anything you would like to
11 say?

12 MR. HILL: I am here, sir, but I am really listening for
13 Jack today.

14 COLONEL HILL: My apologies for not recognizing you
15 sooner, sir.

16 Is there anyone here now who has not submitted a
17 statement that desires to do so?

18 NORMAN DAHLSTEDT
19 appearing on behalf of a citizens' group, made the following
20 statement:

21 I am Norman Dahlstedt.

22 It seems to me considerable time has already been taken
23 up with the various speakers, so I'll make this very brief.

24 I am Norman Dahlstedt, farmer, and I merely wish to
25 read a petition, a photostatic copy of which, with all the

P 001729

1 undersigned names, will be forwarded to all parties
2 concerned and all parties interested. We are not going to
3 surrender the original petition today, but we will be very
4 glad to forward photostatic copies.

5 We would like to ask that the record be held open
6 until those photostatic copies can be turned in.

7 May I read the petition:

8 "We, the undersigned, are opposed to any plans to
9 modify the structure of the Avon Bypass for any purpose
10 other than flood control and are, in fact, opposed to the
11 bypass itself because, as presented to us, it will not
12 provide protection from major floods.

13 The cost of construction and maintenance is beyond
14 Skagit County's means and the project would endanger a new
15 area to flood hazard and eventual silting up of shallow
16 Padilla Bay."

17 I would like to make one other personal comment with
18 regard to the various people who have spoke here today, the
19 various groups. We have people from the Fisheries and
20 Wildlife Departments, many other departments of government.

21 No one has any opposition to the project insomuch as
22 to say that it will not be of any benefit as far as
23 recreation and so on; it would benefit recreation according
24 to these people, but none of these people have come forth
25 with any offers of financial participation.

1 other proposition and I haven't heard any opposition to
2 improving the outlet of the North Fork or the South Fork
3 and the levees and the turns and the narrow places in the
4 lower river, so I wonder why can't a program along that
5 line be started.

6 That's all. Thank you.

7 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Hughes. Is there anyone
8 else?

9 **FANNY SUMMERS**

10 appearing on her own behalf, made the following statement:

11 I am Fanny Summers, a widow and a farmer, and I own
12 the last farm on the south side of the Skagit River, the
13 North Fork of the Skagit River, right at what they say is
14 the mouth of the river, but the mouth of the river is quite
15 a ways below me.

16 And these designs that they have made up, they will take
17 or cut out about ten acres of my farm. I have lived there
18 since 1906 and have watched the river with great interest
19 and I think the way the cut is to be made, it goes right
20 out against land that is much higher than it is on the farm.
21 It will be just like the river is butting its head up against
22 a wall, and I think it will just silt up more land.

23 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mrs. Summers. Is there
24 anyone else?

25

FERD NIST

P 001731

1 appearing on behalf of the Washington State Sportsmen's
2 Council, made the following statement:

3 My name is Ferd Nist, Chairman of the Migratory Bird
4 Committee of the Washington State Sports Council.

5 I see by the drawing here -- I haven't been paying
6 too much interest in this because I wasn't notified of it
7 at all until today, so I came up -- but I see from the
8 plans that you have drawn here, or the outline you've given
9 here of the lower part of the Skagit River that you are
10 going to ruin the best hunting in the state of Washington
11 of the Skagit Flats.

12 You've got your dikes all around the biggest part of
13 the Skagit Range. Now that has brought into this county,
14 I bet you, four to five hundred thousand dollars every
15 year. I am interested there -- I've been down there now
16 on that lower part next to Milltown for over thirty-five
17 years. I don't look like a very old fellow, but I've
18 passed my seventy-fifth birthday, and I blame that all on
19 to the recreation I have had on the Lower Skagit River; and
20 I would hate to see nothing done to protect that game
21 range on the South Fork of the Skagit of about twelve or
22 thirteen thousand acres.

23 Thank you.

24 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Ferd Nist. Is there
25 anyone else?

P 001732

MARTIN BALM

1
2 appearing on his own behalf, made the following statement:

3 My name is Martin Balm, farmer, Burlington.

4 Some of my friends encouraged me to come down and ask
5 two questions.

6 One is that if the present dikes were widened twenty
7 feet on each side and some of the crooks taken out of the
8 river, would it not carry more water than over the Avon
9 Bypass and at much less cost?

10 The second question I have been asked to ask is do not
11 these Army Engineers get promoted in rank by the amount of
12 money they can spend on a certain project (applause).

13 COLONEL PERRY: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else?

14 Well, I must say that we closed on a pretty good note there.

15 The following statements were presented at this hearing
16 without oral testimony: (Letter dated 1/10/64 Exhibit
No. 22, attached hereto, read.)

17 In regard to the Avon By Pass for flood control I think
18 that the money that it will cost should be used too dredge
19 the original water course below Mt. Vernon. According too
20 diagram I have seen it would cause quite convenage /sic/7
21 to farms that it would cut through. It would spoil three
22 places entirely close to me. Mine included. If for fishing
23 and Boating etc I am opposed to. There would be trespassing.
24 I am opposed to the idea as my farm would be split and
25 damaged bad

P 001733

1 /s/ JAMES W. BOWERS, SR.
Route 1, Burlington
2 Box 42

(Letter dated 1/9/64, Exhibit
No. 23, attached hereto, read)

3 U. S. Army
Corps of Engineers
4 Seattle, Washington

5 Colonel Perry:

6 Residents of Diking District One, voted endorsement
7 of levee improvements on the lower Skagit River and
8 recreational additions to the Avon Bypass project, by a
9 show of hands, following explanations by Corps of Engineer
10 speakers at a special district meeting held January 6, 1964.

11 sincerely

12 /s/ OSCAR B. HELDE
Oscar Helde
13 Chairman, Dike Dist. 1

14 COLONEL PERRY: If there is no one else that desires
15 to make a statement today, I would like to thank each and
16 every one of you for coming in and giving us your frank
17 appraisal of the plan that we have proposed and we
18 appreciate very much your taking this time to inform us.

19 The meeting is now closed. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon the hearing in the above-entitled matter was
21 closed.)

22
23
24
25
P 001734