


NPDPL (6 May 77) 1st Ind
SUBJECT: Skagit River Levees and Channel Improvements

DA, North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 2870,
Portland, Oregon 97208 24 June 1977

TO: District Engineer, Seattle

1. I concur with your views that we must be responsive to current needs which would include consideration of higher levels of protection. Assuming the Avon Bypass is not deauthorized, your report must include a "last added" analysis of each element of the overall protection plan of the basin.
2. Your proposal to extend the study scope upstream through the areas of Mount Vernon, Burlington and Sedro Woolley does create a separate set of problems. I have no doubt that extension of the project upstream is desirable and may be justified. However, based on a review of the authorizing document and assuming such extension is justified and desired by local interests, extension of the project that far via a phase 1 report would require a significant Post Authorization Change report requiring Congressional action. As the project would have to be considered in its entirety, such a procedure would not permit the development of two phase 1's as proposed.
3. An alternative course of action would be to proceed with a GDM report covering the general project area reconsidering the degree of protection to be provided. At the same time preauthorization studies could proceed on the area upstream under the authority of the PS&AW study or under Section 216. Such a procedure would permit early construction capability and at the same time cover the full flood control needs of the area.
4. Based on information you furnished me, in my FY 1978 Budget testimony, I expressed a capability to complete a combined phase 1 and 2 GDM. The House mark-up contains \$800,000 or full capability. Assuming we get the full capability I would propose that we complete the combined GDM as recorded in the Budget Testimony. Accordingly, I would propose that you proceed on the alternative course of action. Should additional funds be needed under the PS&AW authority, I would be receptive to such requests together with any recommended fund transfers within your district.


WESLEY E. PEEL
Major General, USA
Division Engineer

ROUTING SLIP

Never Use for Apprvls, Disapprvls, Concurrences, Similar Actions

This is: Action of Info of

30 June 77
(DATE)

Ernest L. Cow
(OFFICE OF RECORD)

1 cc/Hogan

TO TO CYS TO CYS TO
INFO ACT INFO ACT

EXECUTIVE, ADVISORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

EXECUTIVE OFC DIST ENGR DEP DIST ENGR EXEC ASST EEO VALUE ENGRG OFF				OF C OF ADM SERVICES GEN SERV BR LIBRARY MAIL & RECORDS BR REPRODUCTION BR	
COMPTROLLER BUDGET BR F & A BR PROP ACCTG SEC MGT ANALYSIS BR AUTO DATA PROCESS				PERSONNEL OFC TECH SVCS BR RECR & PL BR MGT-EMPL REL & TNG BR POS & PAY MGT BR	
OF C OF COUNSEL				SECURITY OFFICE	
SAFETY OFFICE				PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFC	

OK **TECHNICAL STAFF**

1 ENGINEERING DIV LIBBY PROJ MGR FLOOD PLAIN MGT DESIGN BR 3 PLANNING BR PROG DEV BR SERVICE BR F & M BR SURVEY BR		X		OPERATIONS DIV PROJECT OPERATIONS BR REGULATORY FUNC BR NAV & FLOOD CONTROL BR	
<i>RP Section</i> <i>plg</i> <i>Hogan a xerox</i> <i>for his info</i>				REAL ESTATE DIV ACQUISITION BR APPRAISAL BR MGT & DISP BR PLNG & CONTR BR	
CONSTRUCTION DIV CONTR ADM BR SUPV & INSP BR SPEC PROJ OFC				PROC & SUPPLY DIV CONTRACT SVC BR PROCUREMENT BR SUP CONTR & DISTR BR	

REMARKS:
Copy to Plng Br.

6-30-77