

HISTORICAL NEWSPAPER ARTICLES ON SAUK RIVER DAM PROPOSALS

<p><u>3/11/37</u> <u>CT</u></p>	<p>ADVISES SAUK RIVER CONTROL At last week's conference on Skagit flood control problems held with U.S. army engineers, A. G. Mosier, prominent local civil engineer, submitted a report advising the construction of a reservoir at the Sauk river, rather than a huge spillway plan, which army men had recommended. Having an experience of 47 years with the actions of the Skagit river, it is my belief that channel control, or bank erosion control, is the most important element of the situation, said Mosier. The relief for surface drainage is also urgent. That flood control begins at the source and not at the mouth of a stream is common sense. Now that the Seattle project insures the building of the Ruby Creek dam, which insure 26 percent control of most floods, and with the enforcement of the operation of the Baker River dam for a reserve reservoir to handle emergency run off from that region, my contention that all floods could be controlled if a flood reservoir were built on the Sauk river. The estimate for such a dam given out by the U.S. engineer's office, is \$5,700,000, only about one million more than the Avon Cut Off, which, in my opinion, would be entirely unnecessary were this reservoir dam built.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Sauk River Dam Proposal</p> <p>%Common sense+proposal.</p> <p>%and with the enforcement of the operation of the Baker River dam for a reserve reservoir to handle emergency run off from that region +</p> <p>%All floods could be controlled if dam on Sauk allowed. %This is the same river that carried 3 volcanic lahars to the lower valley from Glacier Peak. There will never be a dam built on the Sauk.</p>
<p><u>2/9/61</u> <u>C.H.</u></p>	<p>FLOOD CONTROL HEARING DEVELOPS LITTLE DEMAND IN FABER HIGH DAM The large courtroom in the courthouse at Mount Vernon was filled to capacity yesterday morning as Col. R. P. Young, District Army Engineer, opened what was to have been an all-day hearing on flood control problems of the Skagit River. At the last moment, however, the Colonel decided to cut off hearing those present at noon. . . . During the morning session only one speaker, representing a diking district, favored the Faber dam as the only solution. Speakers against the dam included the state game department, fisheries department and commercial fishermen. Also a number of speakers from the upper valley. A short but vehement telegram from Senator Fred Martin calling a dam at Faber ridiculous. Most of the testimony heard was on need</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Faber, Sauk, Cascade Dams</p> <p>Dams not feasible due to cost and environmental impacts.</p> <p>%In view of the costs and distinct lack of profitable operation, it is not expected that any immediate move will be made to use any of the dam sites in the present flood control program. It would seem from listening in at the hearing that the concentration will be on diking, dredging and possibly a secondary channel for the river in the lower valley.+</p>

	<p>for better diking in the lower valley and projects to dredge the river on the lower reaches to give the water a better flow. . . . The 1951 estimate on a 300 foot dam at Faber was \$218 million, including only \$2 million for land purchase. At this height the dam would back water to Darrington and cover approximately 35,000 acres. Land in the lower valley considered threatened by floods was estimated at about 60,000 acres. Thus the cost of building the dam would far outweigh the benefits gained. On a per-basis the benefit cost ration is figured at 81 or a loss of about \$2.5 million per year. The upper Sauk dam site listed on the report is 9 miles above Darrington and would cost about \$48 million. Here again the balance of benefit makes the dam impractical. A site on the lower Sauk would come within the Faber dam reservoir and was not considered feasible as long as the Faber site is under consideration..</p>	
<p><u>8/24/66</u> <u>C.H.</u></p>	<p>SKAGIT IS BACK ON WILD RIVER LIST The Mount Vernon Argus, a weekly newspaper which does an unusually good job of covering all aspects of affairs concerning the county, last month went deeply into the %Wild River+, proposal now in Congress. Editor Steve Mergler's column on the subject gives a complete picture of the situation as it now stands and is herewith reprinted in full: %Those who viewed with concern the Skagit river and its tributaries as %wild rivers,+ whose use and development would be severely limited, breathed some relief when U.S. Senate deleted this basin from its %immediate+list in recently passing S. 1446. %But, left out of the Senate's list of six %wild+streams and instead consigned to future study, the Skagit is back in the %immediate+ picture in a new bill introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives. The House bill, H. R. 14922, by Rep. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, changes the name of the %long touch+streams to %national scenic rivers+and proposes to so classify the Skagit (and tributaries) and 15 others at once. The Columbia is to be studied within three years for possible addition to the %scenic+system and, within ten years, the Methow, to name only one of the Washington state waters in a long list.</p> <p>Those who thought they had saved the Skagit from immediate consignment to a federal deep freeze have a new battle on their hands.</p>	<p>Wild & Scenic River Designation For Skagit River</p> <p>%A special clause in the House bill would forbid the construction, operation or maintenance of any %dam or other project,+ except by special act of Congress, on not only the streams immediately designated as %scenic+, but also those in the listings for future study. It also would expand (from the Senate %wild rivers+ plan) from 300 feet to a mile either side the width of river lands that the federal government could condemn, and from one-quarter to two miles the width from either bank it could put under %scenic easements+.</p> <p>Designation would stop <u>any</u> Sauk River Dam.</p>

	<p>Groups with special concerns include the North Cross-State Highway backers, flood control advocates who are interested in the U.S. Corps of Engineers' Step Three plan for a future dam on the Sauk river to give the Skagit Valley protection against a 100-year flood; Seattle City Light, that contemplates some day building a dam at Copper Creek, below Gorge Dam, and those interested in timber, mining and grazing.</p> <p>The Saylor bill would prohibit or restrict construction of dams, roads, and cutting of timber on, along or near its scenic rivers, in varying degree, accord to classifications that might be applied to them.</p> <p>H.R. 14922 would tie these strings at once to the Skagit, the Cascade, the Suiattle and the Sauk rivers, as follows: The Skagit from near the town of Sedro-Woolley upstream to the Gorge powerhouse . . . , the Cascade from its mouth to the junction with its north and south forks and up the South for to . . . the Glacier Peak wilderness area; the Suiattle from the mouth to the same area, at Mill Creek; the Sauk from its mouth to junction with Elliott Creek, and the Sauk's North Fork to the Glacier Peak wilderness area.</p>	
<p>12/19/78 SVH</p>	<p>Flood control hearing Wednesday – Nookachamps opposition to latest plan</p> <p>Nookachamps area residents opposed to the latest Army Corps of Engineers proposals for Skagit River levee improvements promise they will flood a public meeting scheduled Wednesday night by the Corps. . . .</p> <p>When Congress deleted a clause which could have allowed construction of a flood containment dam on the Sauk River from legislation designating the Skagit as part of the nation's Wild and Scenic Rivers system, the valley's best chance at flood prevention went with it, according to Nookachamps dairy farmer and county planning commission member Ken Johnson. Around 40 percent of the Skagit's floodwater comes from the Sauk, he stated. . . . Until about a month ago, I thought we would get flood prevention, Johnson told the commissioners. But our great senator (Henry M. Jackson) has dropped the ball on the Sauk flood containment dam. Now we have no</p>	<p>Nookachamp opposition, Sauk River Dam, Avon Bypass, Levees.</p> <p>By this point in time it was clear that higher levees meant additional flooding in the Nookachamp/Sterling/Clear Lake area.</p> <p>We will take the water nature gives us but we won't take the water that other dikes would give us,+</p> <p>Interesting from a personal perspective is that at the time this article was written I supported the building of the Dam on the Sauk River. That's because at the time, NO ONE, including the Corps of Engineers ever mentioned that the Sauk River drains the active volcano Glacier Peak.</p>

	<p>choice but to play catch-up. . . . We will take the water nature gives us but we won't take the water that other dikes would give us,+Johnson commented. Johnson said although he had opposed the Avon bypass in the past, he now favors the plan. . . . Recent public meetings on the bypass plan drew considerable opposition. County Public Works Director Gene Sampley commented, %t\$ my understanding the Corps got beat up pretty bad on the Avon bypass.+ %The cost of \$70 to \$90 million was what worked against the bypass,+commissioner Bud Norris recalled. . . . But commissioner Bud Norris had another view. %cand say that your statements are too harsh, Larry,+ Norris responded. %o don't see how a person could stay calm when he's threatened with flooding.+ %feel we owe it to you to reconsider and study the options to see if there might be another alternative,+he added.</p>	<p>Cost of Avon Bypass was 70 to 90 million dollars.</p>
<p>9/23/79 SVH</p>	<p>Proposed levee on Skagit River. . . brings variety of opinions (Part A)</p> <p>Skagit County residents will decide Nov. 6 whether they want to pay for the county's portion of the \$55 million Skagit River levee project. The project, to be paid for primarily by the federal government, is designed to provide 50- to 100-year flood protection in the Skagit Valley, and 500-year protection to Mount Vernon, said Don Nelson, director of flood control for the county's Public Works Department. Nelson said the county's portion of the project is about \$14 million. We have about half of that under our belt,+he said, adding that the county already owns land and rights-of-way for the proposed levee improvements.</p> <p>. . .</p> <p>Nelson said numerous residents proposed a dam on the Sauk River because the river accounts for about 40 percent of the flood waters. But building a dam on the Sauk is illegal because the Sauk-Suiattle River system was designated a Wild and Scenic River two years ago. Nelson said dams are expensive, time-consuming to build and environmentally troublesome. %t\$ 15 years before there are any benefits,+ Nelson said. %And the environmental struggle to get one would be awesome.+ He estimated a dam would cost more than \$100 million . twice as much as the proposed levee project.</p>	