

9/25 draft

Meeting Summary
Skagit Flood Control Zone District Land Use Technical Committee
Monday, September 22, 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Location: Skagit Room, County Continental Building, 1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon.

Meeting Purpose: 1) To conduct normal business and 2) Respond to a request from the FCZD Advisory Committee (AC) to provide input from the perspective of folks with expertise on land use, on criteria to be considered for screening CFHMP recommended projects or measures.

Attendees: Esco Bell, Todd Carlson, Margaret Fleek, Mark Watkinson, Dan O'Donnell, Mark Freiburger, Dave Chamberlain, Liz McNett Crowl, Blaine Chesterfield, Chuck Steele, and Tom Karsh (staff support),

Action Items: Screening criteria developed by Land Use Technical Committee (LUTC) will be presented at the October 20, 2008 meeting of the FCZD Advisory Committee by Margaret Fleek, Chair (Esco Bell and Todd Carlson offered to be backup if needed).

Public Comment: None

Previous Meeting Summary: It was moved by Esco Bell, seconded by Mark Watkinson, to accept the May 5, 2008 meeting summary. Meeting summary accepted by consensus.

Report out from AC representatives: Those who attended the Advisory Committee meeting stated that it was a vigorous discussion, and that the AC has decided to take charge of developing policy related elements of the CFHMP (such as goals/objectives) while the charge to the Technical Committees is to provide input of a more technical nature, such as making recommendations on project evaluation criteria and eventually recommendations on specific projects or measures.

Background Discussion: There was discussion and general consensus that if there is going to be a successful comprehensive flood hazard program, with projects on the ground, a critical component of the project is to correct the existing hydrology. Resolving the hydrology controversy is essential for long term flood management. This should be afforded the highest priority by the FCZD if it is expected to have an impact on the future of the valley with regard to flood control projects. The experts in the field, from PIE, NHC, USGS, the USACE (Corps), following detailed field investigations and research in the Crofoot's Addition in Concrete, are seeing merit in the scientific approach. The Corps has already lowered their hydrology assumptions in a very minor way, and additional adjustments are likely once USGS evaluates the latest information from PIE and NHC who are coming much closer in their estimates using somewhat different methodologies. The current Corps model of "No Action" with existing conditions shows clearly that it will be quite difficult to manage the floodwater that gets out of the River between Sedro-Woolley and Burlington, as well containing the water that gets past Mount Vernon and likely to get out of the river downstream in the Avon Bend or Fir Island area.

The LUTC members think it important to move forward to complete the CFHMP and to work to reduce flood risk now (whatever the hydrology), but to also work to correct the hydrology to make projects doable. We need to get a plan with the most cost-effective measures based on fish, farm, habitat and public safety. If it is a 50 year plan, then we must collaborate to phase the projects in 5-10 year increments that fit together as they are completed. Prioritizing projects

9/25 draft

so that they can be completed in phases that fit together in a collaborative approach among those affected is critical. Discussion included the question of whether the LUTC should incorporate in its recommendations that projects should provide based flood evaluation protection in developable land and meet the USACE's (Army Corp's) three E's criteria [engineering, economic (cost/benefit), and environmental].

Screening Criteria: The following recommendations on the criteria to be considered for screening were discussed and approved to be forwarded to the Advisory Committee:

- Projects/Measures should:
 - Be consistent with CFHMP mission/goals/objectives.
 - Protect existing infrastructure and essential public facilities (wastewater and water treatment plants, transportation hubs, fire/police stations, etc).
 - Be consistent with adopted Comprehensive Plans and regulations (or as they may need to be amended).
 - Recognize impacts to entire river system and mitigate where possible.
 - Encourage maintenance and preservation of existing flood protection infrastructure before consideration of new or expanded projects.
 - Demonstrate effectiveness in reducing flood risk.
 - Be economically feasible and cost effective. Cost effective needs to address a broader community interest.
 - Acknowledge and encourage those projects that can be implemented in a short time frame.
 - Be consistent with the National Flood Insurance Program and Community Rating System.
 - Reduce the number of properties that experience repetitive flood damage.
 - Have multi-jurisdictional cooperation including broad-based support from the public and elected officials.
 - Provide the greatest good for the greatest number.
 - Fast track projects for which funding has already been secured, can be matched or for which funding is not required.

Other items: None discussed.

Next steps and meeting schedule: To be determined by assignment from AC.

Meeting adjourned at 6:15