



Draft Meeting Summary
Skagit FCZD Dike and Drainage Technical Committee
Tuesday, December 2, 2008; 4:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

Location: Dike District # 12 Flood Fight Headquarters

Meeting Purpose: To continue discussion on Measure Criteria per September 15th Advisory Committee request to Technical Committees

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; Stan Nelson, Dike District 22; Leonard Eliason, DD # 17; Dean Flaig, Drainage District 21; David Hedlin, Dike District 9; Brian Olson, Drainage and Irrigation District 17; Tom Slocum, Skagit Conservation District; Cathy Desjardin, for Linda Smith, USACE; John Shultz, Dike District # 1; Chal Martin, City of Burlington and Lorna Ellestad, County staff. Gary Jones, Dike District #3 & 22 was excused.

Absent: Ronald Knutzen, Dike, Drainage and Irrigation District 5; Robert Swanson, Dike, Drainage and Irrigation District 20; Mike Shelby, Western Washington Agricultural Association.

Action Items

- Next Meeting – January 8, 2008, 4:00 – 6:00 pm, Dike District # 12 Flood Fight Headquarters
- Group will review revisions and provide additional comments/criteria to Lorna by Friday the 5th.
- Additions will be incorporated into the document and redistributed by Monday, December 8th with the final review due by Wednesday December 10th 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 October 14th 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. A discussion ensued about the Corps meetings with the Swinomish being characterized as “Nation to Nation” when the Skagit GI is a public process funded with public funds. Issue of full disclosure was discussed. Group thought it was important that members of the FCZD were provided with the tribal comments on proposed measures and that it was in the best interest of everyone involved to have an open process. The Corps representative stated that the Corps was a transparent agency but the group requested follow-up. The issue is, if the Corps is meeting nation to nation and discussing other issues beyond the Skagit GI, maybe the nation to nation meetings should be kept separate if an argument could be supported for keeping them “secret”, and the content of all Skagit GI meetings should be open.
- Lorna provided a copy of the criteria document distributed to the AC and the group went to work restructuring earlier committee comments into the requested format of “Does the project.....”.
- Daryl reminded the DD Commissioners of the meeting with the Colonel on Thursday, December 4th from 1:30 – 3:00 pm at DD #12, to discuss the PL 84-99 levee maintenance program.
- Discussion on Corps proposed Levee Failure Analysis included request to the districts for existing information and access to district properties. Lorna to follow-up with Cathy.
- Chuck gave a demonstration of Pictometry software and its usefulness in identifying levee damage sites for funding requests and documentation of work performed etc.

Dike District Technical Committee Measure Criteria

As compiled by members at December 2, 2008 meeting:

1. Does the project maintain or improve overall Public Safety at existing level of flood risk?
2. Does the project maintain or improve flood protection to critical infrastructure?
3. Does the use of local vs Corps hydrology cause a significant difference in project effectiveness?
4. Does the project increase conveyance and reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) throughout project location?
5. Does the project put the existing levee system "at risk"?
6. Does the project increase or decrease the WSE and or flood risk upstream of project location?
7. Does the project increase or decrease the WSE and or flood risk downstream of project location?
8. Does the project identify maximum conveyance through project area?
9. Does the project increase conveyance efficiency of the existing levee system?
10. Can the project be implemented without increasing the flood risk up and downstream of the project area? If no, can the increased risk be mitigate?
11. Is the project cost effective?
12. Can the project maintenance and operational costs be sustained locally?
13. Does the project incorporate natural topographic features of the project location? i.e. natural swales and high ground, off channel storage etc?
14. Does the project identify overland pathways and locations for properly sized outlet structures? i.e. Gages, Joe Leary, Higgins sloughs?
15. Does the project require modification or relocation of infrastructure that may impede overland flow?
16. Does the project increase off-channel storage capacity?
17. Does the project reduce peak flow?
18. Does the project increase debris conveyance, in-channel and through bridge structures?
19. Does the project provide for evacuation routes and early warning systems for high risk areas?
20. Does the project reduce the potential for levee failures?
21. Does the project address safety valves where the excess flow will need to exit the system?

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?