
MEMORANDUM

TO: SKAGIT COUNTY FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP
FROM: LARRY KUNZLER, HISTORIAN
SUBJ: GROUP MEETING MAY 22, 2001
DATE: MAY 20, 2001

Due to an extremely heavy workload I am currently experiencing I regret that I will be unable to attend the meeting on May 22nd, however would like to address two concerns I have and would have expressed had I been able to attend as well as give the Workgroup a historical perspective on the concept of diversion channels in Skagit County. I would respectfully request that this Memorandum be made part of the official record of the May 22nd meeting. Please take the time to review the historical record as I feel it will lay the ground work for subsequent discussions concerning any diversion proposal.

5/7/01 LETTER FROM FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

I have reviewed the documents provided to the Workgroup by Environmental International Ltd. and would like to compliment them on a job well done. I am very concerned about the comments made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in their letter dated 5/7/01. In that letter the allegation is made that Skagit County was "considering removal of the language that incorporates appropriate fish and wildlife habitat improvements as part of the project purpose." The allegation was made as a result of the last meeting of the Workgroup. I attended that meeting and I am unable to recall any discussion by the Workgroup on this matter. I have spoken with other Workgroup members and they do not recall any such discussion. Nothing in the "Draft Minutes" shows that any such discussion took place. If such a discussion did take place I apologize to the Workgroup for not paying close attention because that is a conversation I would have felt compelled to immediately become part of, however feel that the first action of business at the upcoming meeting would be to amend the minutes to show who said what with respect to the alleged comment. If the information was learned through a private off the record conversation with USFW then the official who made such comments should be identified and the justification for making such comments should be a topic of discussion at the upcoming meeting. I very strongly feel that removal of the language from the purpose of the project would certainly be a "show stopper" to any project proposed or endorsed by the committee. I just as strongly urge the Workgroup membership to demand that the language be left in the purpose of project.

MAY 19, 2001

PROJECT RECOMMENDATION

With respect to the Workgroup making a "formal" recommendation concerning which project the Corp should "zero in on" and "study in the most detail for the EIS" I strongly recommend to the Workgroup that Alternative #7, the North Diversion Channel to Swinomish Slough be the project that receives the endorsement of the Workgroup. As the historical data that follows supports as well as the Corp's recent "state-of-the-art million dollar" hydraulic analysis shows, the North Diversion Channel is where the main force of the river has flowed in the past and will flow today under existing conditions. It makes the most sense to utilize the power of Mother Nature, to work with Mother Nature rather than against her. I don't care and no Workgroup member should care what the political or economic ramifications would be on any land owner or government agency, you can't get past the fact that is where the water is going to go anyway. Past mistakes in land use planning, transportation planning, lack of enforcement of government regulations by all agencies involved, etc. should not be used as justification for denying this project, Alternative #7, to having its just deserve in a full and complete EIS of the impacts of this alternative.

It is my understanding that the Corp would prefer that 3 alternatives be selected. Having already stated my preference for Alternative #7 the only other two Alternatives that make any sense whatsoever to spend millions of dollars on further studies in my opinion would be Alternatives #1 (Southerly Diversion Channel to Swinhomish Slough and Alternative #2 (a smaller Diversion Channel to Swinhomish Slough coupled with levee setbacks in selected areas).

I would conclude by stating that I am the first to admit that there are going to be problems and concerns with any of the alternatives (among which what does the Corp consider a 25 year event in CFS and when will the diversion channel be opened). Having worked for 20 years with some of the best land use attorneys that have ever practiced in the State of Washington, I am convinced that there is no environmental or economic impact that cannot be mitigated. To do nothing as Skagit County has done for 107 years is unacceptable. There is no one member of the workgroup that is not without blame for the current conditions. Failure has been the only accomplishment to date by all the players. Whether it be by the farmers who diked and drained the largest single estuary and wetlands in the State of Washington; or by dike districts who have been told since 1895 to move their dikes off the edge of the river and failed to do so; or by local governments whose land use records are poster children for how not to responsibly plan; or by transportation agencies whose irresponsible location and maintenance of public roads fostered bad land use planning; or regulatory agencies whose lack of enforcement of governmental regulations allowed building to take place where no building should have been allowed; in this the 21st Century, **failure should not be an option.**

MAY 19, 2001

DIVERSION CHANNELS – A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

As the Workgroup's Historian I would like to offer you some historical data on the concept of diversion channels in Skagit County. As you will be able to quickly ascertain from the data, diversion channels are not exactly a new concept to flood control in Skagit County.

The concept of a diversion channel, as first documented, was by a hydraulic engineer for the Great Northern Railroad in 1922. His name was Robert Herzog, Assistant Engineer. He authored a report entitled Proposed Flood Control – Skagit River. In his report he stated the following:

Before the dykes and the railroad were built, the country was covered with heavy timber and the floods spread slowly and more or less evenly over the whole area, depositing the silt, which is the cause of the fertility of the lower Skagit Valley. The water receded in the same manner and the land was none the worse for it as long as the buildings were put above high water mark. *(Page 4)*

A high water relief channel can be built from above bridge #36 (current BNSF Railroad bridge) to Padilla Bay capable of carrying 100,00 (cfs). This will require . . . a velocity of flow of 5 (cfs) or a cross section of 2,000 feet width with a depth of water of 10 feet. Such a high water channel would leave the land within the dykes in the same condition for farming purposes as it is at present but would effectively remove the danger of floods because, as soon as the discharge gets above a maximum of plus or minus 70,000 (cfs) the surplus water will flow into the high water relief channel to Padilla Bay. *(Page 5)*

As mentioned before, the waters flowing through the breaks in the dyke ahead of bridge #36 flow west to Swinomish Slough and Padilla Bay; they follow the Anacortes Branch of the Great Northern Railway. The relief channel should therefore follow approximately the same course, which would call for the relocation of some five miles of railroad. *(Page 6)*

The present location of bridge #36 is in a very unfavorable position on account of the right angle bend; the high-water mark is dangerously near the bottom chord, should the dykes ahead hold so that a high water mark one or two feet in excess of the present one be reached, the bridge is almost sure to go out. . . *(Page 7)*

The flood discharge of the Skagit River will increase in magnitude as the years pass, the demand for a solution to the problem cannot be

MAY 19, 2001

delayed much longer, and all the parties interested should combine for common action. *(Page 7)*

(Source: Proposed Flood Control – Skagit River, Robert Herzog, Hydraulic Engineer, GNRR, (1922))

The County Commissioners were very much interested in the Herzog Report and a copy of the report was sent to them. *(Source: 9/26/22 Letter to Hogeland, Chief Engineer, St. Paul, Minn. From Oscar Bowen, Asst Engineer)* The Herzog Report opened some eyes at the upper echelons of the management of the GNRR. For there was “no question that the breaking of the dykes above Bridge #36 is what has saved this bridge from being carried out by floods similar to those of December 1917 and December 1921.” However, the breaking of the dikes “causes the Railway Company great damage north of this bridge up to Burlington and westerly on the Anacortes Line and of course causes a great deal more damage to the landowners.” *(Source: 10/6/22 letter to President of GNRR from A.H. Hogeland)* However, the GNRR upper level management decided, “to leave bridge #36 as it is and provide an overflow channel, which would cross our track north of Bridge 36. The track at this point being placed low enough to let the floods pass over it, the track being protected, as far as possible, by heavy material.” *(Source: 10/11/22 letter to President of GNRR from the Vice-President)*

On November 30, 1923, Colonel Barden of the Corp of Engineers held a public hearing on flood control in Skagit County. At that time the Corp’s position was that the United States was primarily interested in “the navigation of the river, and would consider flood protection only in connection with the improvement of the river for purposes of navigation.” No immediate action was contemplated on Mr. Herzog’s proposal. *(Source: 12/20/23 letter to President of GNRR from L.C. Gilmore)*

On June 22, 1936, Congress passed the “Omnibus Flood Control Act.” Besides setting the standards for cost sharing on Public Projects the Act authorized the construction of the Avon By-Pass. On March 2, 1937 the Corp of Engineers held a public hearing in the City Fire Hall in Mt. Vernon. *(Source: Transcript of Public Hearing 3/2/37)* Some of the testimony of the hearing went as follows:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
T. G. Hasty, Asst. Engineer, GNRR	We have nothing particular to offer on this except that the railroad company will not oppose this project and expects they will not be subject to any expense.
Coit G. Utgard, Dike District #1	As for as I can find out from talking to the different people, they are against the Avon spillway. The feeling in Dike Dist 1 is that the flood control here is in straightening and dredging the river.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
J.T. Mason, County Commissioner	What we want more than anything else is the mouths of the rivers dredged, so our flood waters can run out. The general sentiment is opposed to Avon Cut-off. I don't know how we can raise that amount of money (\$1,800,000).
Carl P. Kloke, County Auditor	Under state law we are limited to 5% of our assessed valuation of our county. Our County is assessed at \$20,000,000. In order to exceed that amount, it would require a vote of the people carried by a 3/5 majority.
J.H. Hulbert, Farmer	The general opinion of the farmers seems to be against the Avon Cut-off and they don't understand how the channel will be, and probably at the present time turn it down. (Endorsed dredging the mouth of the river.)
Colonel Wild, Corp of Engineers	For the benefit of some of you who think it will not fill up afterward (the Skagit River), I might state that Swinomish was dug 12 feet deep last October and has already filled up from four to seven feet in that length of time near the "Hole in the Wall". It shows you how long the mouth of the river would probably stay dredged.
H. R. Abbott, Dike District #12	...all the people I talk to want the river dredged. One man wants a spillway at Ferry, another at Sterling and another at Sedro Woolley, no spillway at Avon. But every man was in favor of dredging the river.
John Wylie, Dike District #18	The dam on the Sauk would eliminate a lot of floods. The cost of the Avon Cut-off is what everyone is against. There should be some spillways.
Grant Sessions, Secretary Skagit County Planning Council	I have heard expressions of Avon Cut-off and from the standpoint of the farmers where I live they are most of them opposed to it, primarily because of the cost, feeling that it is impossible for the county to raise any such amount of money (\$1,800,000). I am satisfied in my own mind, living out on Padilla Bay that your best plan would be to go out through the Joe Leary Slough area.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Lars Langloe, Flood Engineer, Dept of Conservation (forerunner of Dept of Ecology)	Lengthy testimony. Denied forest practices contributed to large floods. "There is no particular evidence that deforestation causes any great increase in floods." Without using the term bio-engineering endorsed the concept. Wanted buffers along the river for vegetation to grow. "Until the farmers do that they will always have trouble. We have got to maintain and help nature in its own way, and we must quit being so greedy with respect to the land. Although I am not holding the farmer blameless, he has probably done it in ignorance."
R.V. Welts, Chairman, Skagit County Planning Council	When the settlers came into this valley, the individual realized that he was not financially powerful enough to protect his land against the elements, and banded together into diking and drainage districts. It is apparent that dredging a narrow channel in the bottom of the river will not handle any additional amount of water at flood time sufficient to be of great benefit. The farmers have tilled the soil up close to the banks of the river; the dikes are built there, and the problem of dredging presents a situation where there is no place adequate to waste the sand that is taken from the river bed. There is no lack of willingness on the part of the farmers, the County, the various entities, to help solve this problem. Primarily, it is their problem. They know it. But they must have aid from a higher source, either state or nation, or a combination of those two, if this farm land is to be saved.

The Great Northern Railroad notified its president about the hearing held on March 2, 1937. They stated, "the attitude of those present was quite unfavorable for the reason that the local people would be expected to assume an expense amounting to \$1,832,000 set up by the Government as their portion of the cost of this project. It is likely that this matter will be indefinitely postponed." (*Source: 3/10/37 letter to W.P. Kenny, President GNRR*)

On July 30, 1940 the Corp of Engineers prepared a Report on Survey for Flood Control of Skagit River and Tributaries. The report stated the following:

At a joint public hearing held by the Departments of War and Agriculture on March 2, 1937, County officials stated that the County's financial position was such that it would be impossible at that time for the county to furnish the local cooperation require for the construction of the Avon By-Pass as authorized under the existing project. The consensus of opinion was that the by-pass was not wanted but that

MAY 19, 2001

dedging in the lower river channel and bank revetment to prevent erosion of land was necessary. (*¶ 77. Desires of local interest.*)

The opposition of local interests to the construction of the Avon By-pass, as expressed at the public hearing, is caused largely by the desire to these interest t avoid or reduce the very heavy contribution required of them under the adopted project. It is probably utterly impossible for them at the present time to make the required contribution and it may continue to be impossible for many years to come unless the required contribution is lowered by Act of Congress. (*¶ 99.*)

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that **the only feasible method of providing flood control for the area downstream from Sedro-Woolley is by the Avon By-Pass**, augmented by reservation of top storage in future power reservoirs, but that there is no possibility that the required local cooperation for the by-pass can be secured at present and only a remote possibility that any of the proposed power reservoirs. (*¶ 118. Conclusion.*)

(Source: Report on Survey for Flood Control of Skagit River and Tributaries, 7/30/40)

Over a decade passed and there was little if any discussion about the Avon By-Pass. Following a bad flood in 1951, in 1952 the Corp of Engineers prepared an internal report on flooding in the Skagit River Valley. With respect to the Avon By-Pass the Corp report stated the following:

No work has been done on the project because local interests have not met the terms of local cooperation and a large group of local farmers are opposed to the project. (*¶ 87. Diversion*) *NOTE: The estimated cost of the By-Pass was \$9,600,000 and was designed to carry 110,000 cfs. (Page 37)*

Local interests have taken no action toward providing the required local cooperation for the existing flood diversion project adopted by the 1936 Flood Control Act. Studies made for this report indicate that the degree of protection contemplated by this adopted project can be obtained at less cost by improving the existing levee system, but even this work cannot be economically justified at this time. (*¶ 106*)

I therefore recommend that the existing project (Avon By-Pass) for flood control of Skagit River, Washington, be abandoned, and that no other project for control of floods be adopted at this time. (*¶ 108. Recommendation*)

Source: Report on Survey for Flood Control of Skagit River and Tributaries, Washington, 2/21/52

MAY 19, 2001

In August, 1952 the Avon By-Pass was declared "inactive" by the Seattle District. *(Source: 8/19/52 letter from Seattle District to North Pacific Division)*

Eight more years would go by until the resurrection of the diversion concept would begin again. In January 1960 a group of dike district commissioners and the Assistant County Engineer (Lloyd Johnson) met in the Corp of Engineers, Colonel Young's office in Seattle. While mostly concerned about slough closures by the Corp of Engineers on the South Fork of the Skagit River they also discussed the, "overall flood control problem of the entire river basin in which they expressed a considerable amount of interest." The Colonel informed the group that the Corp anticipated "a new Congressional resolution authorizing the Corps to make a restudy of the Skagit River flood control problem" and as soon as funds would be made available the Corp would begin. *(Source: COE Memorandum For Record 1/6/60)*

Over a year later the Corp of Engineers held a public hearing in the Skagit County Courthouse in Mt. Vernon for the purpose of determining what if any project the local people wanted. "The authorized Avon Bypass to divert a portion of Skagit River flood water to Padilla Bay was favored by the Washington State Dept of Game and Fisheries and the Skagit County Engineer. The **Bypass project was favored by the Dept of Game and Fisheries because it would have no effect on the existing Skagit River fishery resources.**" *(Source: Summary of Public Hearing on Flood Control, 2/8/61)*_Some of the testimony of that hearing went as follows:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Gene Hopkins, Manager, Mt. Vernon Chamber of Commerce	We do not feel qualified to say that any one solution is the total answer. We expect the Engineers to provide this, they are the experts. The record will bear us out that the Mt. Vernon Chamber of Commerce has frequently and emphatically suggested that a thorough dredging of the Skagit River would go far toward a solution to this problem. The silt build up at the mouth continues at an alarming rate. ... floods themselves are a creeping paralysis that threatens the economic lifeblood and the growth of the entire Skagit River Basin.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Ralph W. Larson, Fishery Management Coordinator, Dept of Game	The Skagit River system has produced a catch of as high as 23,000 winter-run steelhead in one season. The Skagit River system is extremely important. The proposed Avon Bypass need not cause damages to the fish and wildlife resources of the area. The possibility of some fish being stranded in the by-pass after a high flow has passed through the channel does exist, however, and some type of salvage operation would probably be required after each use. The Dept of Game...would desire to offer no objections to the dredging of the Skagit River to Mt. Vernon, improvement of dikes, or the Avon Bypass.
Jess Knutson, Farmer, SCD supervisor	We believe that eventually, if not now, changes in our area will dictate that adequate flood control be provided for. It is our opinion that any delay would only complicate a sound choice as to the methods used and the cost of such structures.
Leo E. Sullivan, Skagit Economic Dev. Association	...we are very much interested in having the Skagit River dredged for six-foot shallow draft barging from the City of Concrete to the Sound.
Senator Fred Martin	I feel sure that the dredging of the river to make it navigable for shallow draft vessels and barges would have much flood control value.
Daniel Sundquist, Dike Dist #3	During last 10 years spent \$439,000 on dikes. I don't think it is advisable to <u>continue to increase the height of our dikes</u> , due to the underlying nature of the ground – sandy or porous material under the dikes.
Robert Schroeder, Dike Dist #12	The dike has been raised an over-all height of two feet for a distance of approximately nine miles. As they continue to build restrictions into the river below us (west Mt. Vernon dump), narrowing the stream flow, it will be necessary to raise the height of the dike. ... The new highway 99 will hold water in a pocket, which will flood Burlington and all the area above it. They have choked off Gages Slough with the new highway there and the water can't be released fast enough to leave it out. Had spent almost \$900,000 on dikes since 1950.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Lloyd Johnson, Associate County Engineer	The general feeling among people in our area that the diking system from the GNRR bridge (BNSF) on to Mt. Vernon should be built on a uniform basis, that is, the weak areas should be strengthened, and the narrow and close areas widened. There seems to be a general preference not to increase the capacity of the river channel to any extent. ... We believe some of the troubles now existing at the mouth of the south fork can be traced to the previous work done by the Corps of Engineers in behalf of navigation interest. (He suggested) moving dike on left bank of Fresh Water Slough back and removal of dam on Freshwater Slough built by Corp. We believe the people prefer a diking system as above described, together with upstream storage or a by-pass that will give the maximum protection obtainable to the people of Skagit County ... This dam (Upper Baker) has now been constructed by private interests for power use only with no provisions for flood control. ... As one of our Dike Commissioners stated, he would <u>like to see this problem solved in this generation rather than pass it on to his son to solve</u> . Time is of the essence for this control; and we hope a disaster is not necessary to secure our needed project.
Earl Hansen, Dike Dist #17	This river prompted a survey of the dike system, resulting in the raising of the dike to a uniform height – the total dike is now eighteen inches above the 1951 flood level. ... It would appear to me that small dams on the smaller tributaries would be of more value and less cost (then one at Faber).
Lowell Peterson, Concrete	45 people attended meeting in Concrete. All 45 residents of the upper Skagit Valley who were present at this meeting favored the dredging project (Concrete to Fir Island).

MAY 19, 2001

NAME

TESTIMONY

Ralph B. Anderson (Reading letter from Milo Moore, Director) ... The Skagit River is the most important valuable tributary of the Puget Sound area in sustaining and supporting commercial and sport fishing. ... Nearly 65% of the spring Chinook salmon spawning area is located on the main stem of the Skagit and in tributaries above the proposed Faber Dam site. A dam would nearly obliterate this run as well as silvers and other species. One method of flood control proposed has been the Avon Bypass or overflow channel, downstream. This Dept. wishes to emphasize the importance of this proposal, as a preventative to lower stream flood damages and save the important reproduction of spawning areas upstream from being inundated and obliterated by dams and reservoirs. Dept. did not have any objection to dredging from mouth to Mt. Vernon.

Greg Hastings, State Dept. of Conservation (forerunner to Dept of Ecology) Since 1943 the State ... expended \$858,563 in Skagit County (for flood control). Figure represented around 15% of total state budget since 1943 for flood control (\$5,630,000). He endorsed the concept of all the diking districts banding together into one district.

Honorable A.H. Ward Local Judge. Lived in Nookachamps. Served in Corp of Engineers in WW1. Corp recommended Avon Bypass in 1936. From engineering standpoint project seemed very feasible and good solution to problem. Economically it presented some problems because they had a cost sharing program. Had experience with condemnation actions. You could expect (to pay) \$1,000 an acre. ... The proposal to build the dikes higher and solve the problem is a snare and a delusion (due to sandy soils and boils). (Building dikes higher) people live with a false sense of security.

In 1962 the Corp began low level meetings with local officials concerning a new concept of the Avon Bypass proposal. In a meeting held in Max Dales Restaurant with the Skagit County Flood Control Council, Skagit County Engineers and the Skagit County Commissioners the Corp unveiled their new Bypass proposal. Mr. Ray Skrinde, Project Engineer "told of the old proposed Avon Bypass with its sixteen hundred foot width and compared it with the new proposed three hundred and forty foot bottom width and its new entrance location upstream from the GNRR bridge. Dikes would be 25 feet wide on either side of the bypass. Would require 7 million cubic yards of excavation and would be 7 to 8 miles long from the Skagit

MAY 19, 2001

River to Padilla Bay. Project showed annual benefit of over 1 million dollars. Bottom elevation of Bypass would be 10 to 15 feet below current ground elevations. No rock rip-rap was proposed through the Bypass. Local share estimated at \$3,900,000. Flood Control Council voted to work with County Commissioners and Corp to construct the project. *(Source: Minutes of Skagit County Flood Control Council dated 7/12/62)*

By September 1962 the County Commissioners had formed an "Avon Bypass Committee." The group actively solicited the support of the elected officials. *(Source: 9/5/62 letter to Corp from County Commissioners)* In October 1962 the Seattle District Corp of Engineers notified its superiors at the North Pacific Headquarters, that "Local interest are keenly aware of favorable prospects for economic growth and recognize the importance of the bypass to provide flood protection to the entire lower Skagit River Basin." Total construction cost were estimated to be \$19,000,000 with a \$4,000,000 local share. *(Source: 10/2/62 letter to Division Engineer, North Pacific from Colonel Perry, Seattle District)*

A year later the Corp attended a meeting in Burlington with approximately 50 residents owning property in the vicinity of the proposed Bypass. The State Dept of Fisheries, State Highway Dept. and the County Engineer also attended the meeting. Opposition to the project was based on cost, considered it a "pork barrel project" and that it would not eliminate flooding. Fisheries were making a study on the possibility of adding recreation to the project. The consensus of the meeting was that the Bypass was very desirable even though some of those present may be adversely affected. *(Source: COE Memorandum for the Record, Ray Skrinde, 9/17/63)*

In October 1963 the Corp advises Representative Jack Westland that the Corp had not encountered any outstanding opposition to the Avon Bypass in the Burlington area except on an isolated basis. The Corp further advised that the Bypass would lower the floodwaters in the Burlington by 3 to 4 feet. This would provide 30 year flood protection to the area. *(Source: Letter to Jack Westland from Major General Jackson Graham, 10/21/63)* By October 31, 1963 the total cost of the Avon Bypass project was estimated at \$23,202,000 with a local share of \$4,141,000. *(Source: Internal Corp memorandum dated 10/31/63)*

The Corp of Engineers scheduled a public hearing on the Avon Bypass proposal for November 22, 1963. Due to the assignation of President Kennedy the meeting was cancelled and rescheduled for January 10, 1964. *(Source: Letter to GNRR headquarters from GNRR Assistant Chief Engineer, 9/7/65)* The purpose of the hearing was to obtain the views of all interested parties on the proposed Avon Bypass plan. The Bypass was to carry 60,000 cfs, create 340 acres of water surface and 440 acres of adjacent land available to the public for recreational pursuits. Proposal could attract 60,000 people annually. Plan would create a 8 mile long cold clear lake. U.S. Fish and Wildlife developed resident trout fisheries in Bypass. Minimum flow of 100 cfs required. Lower section of Bypass would be used for migratory fish rearing. *(Source: COE Informational Bulletin 11/22/63)*

MAY 19, 2001

Examples of the testimony at the public hearing at the Mt. Vernon Elks Lodge, included the following:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Colonel Ernest Perry, COE	Purpose of hearing today is to hear your views on the plans for levees and channel improvements downstream from Mt. Vernon and for adding fishery and recreation a purposes of the authorized Avon Bypass. Levee improvements don't stand much of a chance without approval of the Bypass. Levees and Bypass would increase flood protection to 30 year protection. Bypass would be an 8 mile lake 360 feet wide. The idea that dredging will provide additional capacity is in theory correct. In practice dredging would undercut the base of the levees from the toe and would cause the levee to fail by undercutting from the river side ... and we would be faced with the problem of something on the order of 500,000 cubic yards of dredging annually in the lower basin.
Greg Hastings, WA Dept of Conservation	Our agencies met (Dept of Highways, Dept of Game, Dept of Fisheries, Dept of Economic Development, Parks Dept., Pollution and Conversation) on November 14, 1965 and reviewed the report. Agreed basic plan is a good one. Up to 1943 State, County and Dike Districts spent \$2,350,060 on the dikes. Since 1943 spent another \$1,300,000. Dikes in 1966 only provided 9 year level of protection.
Scott Richards, County Commissioner	A meeting was held on December 31 st at 1:30 p.m. with dike district commissioners from 18 districts. An affirmative vote was given by the attending dike district commissioners for the Corp project. "We want to assure you that the people and taxpayers of Skagit County will have the right to vote on this problem."
Lloyd Johnson, County Engineer	The proposal of the Corps of Engineers to build the Bypass with the added recreational facilities presents a new era for the people of Skagit County. ...we are indirectly given a playground that will be a very important and progressive step in the future of Skagit County.
James Hulbert, Sr.	By letter stated, "I agree with the thinking of the Corp of Engineers and support their modifications as recommended at this hearing relative to the dike improvements and recreational use of this Bypass.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Paul J. McKay, State Highway Dept.	State Highway Dept. and Highway Commission fully concur with the Corp report however Dept feels that no highway funds could be used in project.
Gwynne Legro, City Engineer, Mt. Vernon	We think the plan has merit. We think it is reasonable. We think the people of Skagit County have the courage and ability to put it over.
George Kimble, Citizen	Mother Nature is one thing that we cannot tell ahead what it is going to do or fight. ... So lets get this flood control program going just as soon as possible before we have any more floods.
Charles Simons, USFW	Avon Bypass provides an opportunity to greatly increase fish and wildlife and recreation benefits with relatively small increases in project cost. ... USFW and Wash Dept of Fish and Game have cooperated in a plan for enhancement of fish and wildlife resources in the bypass area. ... Proposal included boat ramps and parking lots.
Rolf Larson, Wa. Dept of Game	We feel that the proposed levee and channel widening project below Mt. Vernon and the Avon Bypass Project will provide a great measure of flood protection for the lower Skagit River area and also will cause minimum problems as far as fish and wildlife are concerned. ... The proposed inclusion of fish, wildlife and recreation purposes to the Avon Bypass adds materially to the benefits of this project.
Victor Crissey, Citizen	...I think it's a wonderful proposition for you to fix the river, dredge it; but the bypass – no.
Grant Nelson, Dike District 2	Unanimous approval of the diversion of the flood waters of the Skagit River through the Avon Bypass proposal.
George Dynes, Dike District 20	...DD 20 supports the plans as presented ... (We) realize that as of now we act as a reservoir for flood waters from the Skagit River so the lower parts of the Valley will have additional protection. If our areas were diked at this time it would be impossible for the Skagit River to carry even a normal high water.
Earl Hanson, Dike District 17	Majority of Skagit County Dike Commissioners are in favor of the project.

MAY 19, 2001

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TESTIMONY</u>
Daniel Sundquist, Dike District 3	DD 3 approve the proposed Avon Bypass project for flood control and the proposed project for channel improvement and levee improvement.
James Mapes, Dike District 12	Jerry brought his attorney and introduced him. Walter Gerline, Jr. read a statement into the record. "The undersigned violently object and oppose any attempt to fasten this project with the Avon Bypass ... feeling that the total expenditure for the project is too great to be borne by the area affected and that this burden would be oppressive." Objected to the Bypass for the added reason that it increases the flood exposure particularly in the area served by DD 12. Also objected to recreational improvement feeling that such a plan is so vague and general as not to be worth consideration.
Fred Lubbe, Attorney for Fire District #6 and citizens opposed to Bypass	They felt "other flood control work" such as widening the levees would be more cost effective. Felt Bypass would cut the County in two and that much more water frontage that can be a danger to the Burlington area. Felt project was being sold on recreational benefits not flood control benefits. Fire District also submitted letter as being opposed to project.
Edna Breazeale, Padilla Bay	Opposed to recreational facets of Bypass. Wanted to know if Indian Slough would have to be dredged to a depth of 60 feet as rumored. Thought the Bypass could "prove detrimental to the best recreational interests of the County."
Harwood Bannister, Attorney for Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	Tribe felt the Avon Bypass could have affects on the Salmon runs. "If such occurs, then the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community and the members of the Swinomish reservation will consider this as a violation and deprivation of the rights granted under the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855."
Zell Young, Mt. Vernon Welder	"Lets have protection now, rather than Aid to a Disaster Area later."
Norman Dahlstedt, Farmer	Introduced a petition, which was against the use of the Bypass for any purposes other than flood control and was opposed to the Bypass because it would not provide enough protection.