



**Draft Meeting Summary**  
**Skagit FCZD Dike and Drainage Technical Committee**  
**Tuesday, January 6, 2008; 4:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.**

**Location:** Dike District # 12 Flood Fight Headquarters

**Meeting Purpose:** To develop first and second tier criteria to effectively reduce the number of measures moving forward as requested at the December 15<sup>th</sup> Advisory Committee meeting.

**Attendees:** Chuck Bennett, Dike, Drainage and Irrigation District 12; Daryl Hamburg, Dike District 17; Dave Olson, Dike District 3; Dave Towne, Britt Slough SFCZ District; Jason Vanderkooy, Dike District 1; Leonard Eliason, DD # 17; David Hedlin, Dike District 9; Gary Jones, Dike District #3 & 22; Brian Olson, Drainage and Irrigation District 17; Tom Slocum, Skagit Conservation District; Mike Shelby, Western Washington Agricultural Association; Annie Lohman, Skagit County Ag. Advisory Board; Cathy Desjardin, for Linda Smith, USACE; John Shultz, Dike District # 1; Chal Martin, City of Burlington and Lorna Ellestad, County staff. Stan Nelson and Dean Flaig were excused.

**Absent:** Ronald Knutzen, Dike, Drainage and Irrigation District 5; Robert Swanson, Dike, Drainage and Irrigation District 20.

**Action Items**

- Next Meeting – February 3, 2009, 4:00 – 6:00 pm, Dike District # 12 Flood Fight Headquarters
  - Group will review first tier criteria and apply to list of measures.
- Review minute notes and draft “tiered” criteria and return comments to Lorna by Monday January 12<sup>th</sup> for submission to the AC.

**Committee Meeting Notes:**

- The sign-in sheet was passed around and roll call was taken. No public comments were offered
- Meeting notes from December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting were distributed and reviewed. Chuck Bennett made the motion that they be accepted; Dave Olson seconded and the motion was passed.
- Daryl provided a report out from the AC meeting. There was a discussion about the current task assignment.
- Lorna provided a copy of the task assignment and criteria document to everyone and the group began classifying existing Dike and Drainage TC criteria as either a 1 or 2 with much discussion during the process.
  - Discussion was centered on whether criteria was a design issue or paramount to maintaining a viable levee system that improved or maintained existing level of protection and effective interior drainage system that was affordable and sustainable within the current permitting atmosphere while maintain a viable agriculture economy. Increased risk to the existing levee system was also considered a fatal flaw.
- Dave Hedlin and Anne Lohman were going to review the soil conservation criteria and propose additional language if necessary to capture the intent of the group.

# Dike District Technical Committee Screening Criteria

As compiled by members at January 6, 2009 meeting:

## First Tier – Fatal Flaw criteria

1. Does the project maintain or improve Public Safety and critical infrastructure protection at existing level of flood risk?
2. Can the project maintenance and operations be sustained locally?
3. Does the project put the existing levee system and interior drainage system “at risk”?
4. Does the project address basic principals of soil conservation?
  - a. Erosion
  - b. Scour
  - c. Deposition of soils on to farmland or in to interior drainage system
5. Does the project reduce the potential for levee failures?
6. Does the project increase conveyance efficiency of the existing levee system?
7. Can the project be implemented without increasing the flood risk up and downstream of the project area? If no, can the increased risk be mitigated?

## Second Tier – Design criteria

8. Does the use of local vs Corps hydrology cause a significant difference in project effectiveness?
9. Does the project reduce peak flow?
  - a. Does the project increase conveyance and reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) throughout project location?
  - b. Does the project increase or decrease the WSE and or flood risk upstream of project location?
  - c. Does the project increase or decrease the WSE and or flood risk downstream of project location?
  - d. Does the project identify maximum conveyance through project area?
10. Is the project cost effective?
11. Does the project address safety valves where the excess flow will need to exit the system?
12. Does the project incorporate natural topographic features of the project location? i.e. natural swales and high ground, off channel storage etc?
13. Does the project identify overland pathways and locations for properly sized outlet structures? i.e. Gages, Joe Leary, Higgins sloughs?
14. Does the project require modification or relocation of infrastructure that may impede overland flow?
15. Does the project increase off-channel storage capacity?
16. Does the project increase debris conveyance, in-channel and through bridge structures?
17. Does the project provide for evacuation routes and early warning systems for high risk areas?

### 12/05/2008 Additions:

Does the project support Corps guidance preference for non-structural methods of flood control?

Does the project support preservation of existing rural land use designations?

Does the Public Safety flood risk reduction potential of the project outweigh the environmental costs?