

Workshop Summary Notes
Prepared by Triangle Associates for
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
SR 20 Skagit River O'Brian Reach Floodplain Feasibility Study
Stakeholder Workshop #2
June 1, 2023 5:30-7:30 PM

Workshop Purpose

1. Provide an overview and update of the SR 20 Skagit O'Brian Reach Feasibility Study.
2. Present the results of the alternatives analysis.
3. Get input on a feasible alternative concept, which will be incorporated into the final technical study report.

Technical Study Team

Jenni Dykstra, *Chronic Environmental Deficiencies Coordinator and Fish Biologist*, WSDOT Environmental Services Office. Project Role: Project Manager.

Jen O'Neal, *Senior Fisheries Biologist*, NSD. Project Role: Technical study Lead.

Tim Abbe, PhD, PEG, PHG, *Science Lead*, Natural Systems Design, Inc. (NSD), Project Role: Principal in Charge.

Shawn Higgins, *Senior Scientist*, NSD. Project Role: Technical lead for geomorphic analysis.

Cygnia Rapp, LG, *Geomorphologist*, WSDOT Hydraulics. Project Role: Technical Lead

Hilary Wilkinson, *Senior Associate*, Triangle Associates. Project Role: Stakeholder Engagement Lead.

Participants

See Appendix A.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Jenni Dykstra, WSDOT; Hilary Wilkinson, Triangle

- The study team introduced themselves and welcomed everyone to the workshop.
- Hilary Wilkinson reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda, and ground rules.

Study Background and Context

Jenni Dykstra, WSDOT; Jen O'Neal, NSD

This technical study is funded by a Salmon Recovery Funding Board Grant, which WSDOT applied for in spring 2020. Thus, our primary objective is to explore opportunities to improve fish habitat in the Skagit River floodplain per the mission and goals of the Salmon Recovery Board.

WSDOT's reason for pursuing the study is due to a highway problem. SR 20 near milepost 101 has a long history of flooding, erosion, and highway repairs since 1970. These events cause washouts, result in road closures and emergency repairs, are a risk to safety, and they burden WSDOT's maintenance resources. Recent events in 2017 and 2021 resulted in highway closures with detours up to 95 miles. Riprap applied to protect the embankment has had to be replaced and repaired multiple times. These repairs also damage fish habitat.

This site has a special regulatory status as a Chronic Environmental Deficiency (CED), which obligates WSDOT to repair this site using a fish friendly design and follow a special CED process. To address the highway problem, WSDOT began a technical study called a CED Site and Reach Assessment that evaluates the river processes and looks at several alternatives to address the flooding and erosion problem. While outlining potential alternatives, we identified a potential opportunity to enhance existing side channels in the Skagit River floodplain to improve habitat while also reducing flood and erosion risk to SR20.

This O'Brian Reach study will look in more depth at this one potential option (of four) to address flooding on SR20. This technical study will provide more information on hydraulic conditions in the O'Brian reach and evaluate this alternative. When the study and feasibility report are complete in December 2023, we will determine WSDOT's next steps based on whether we are able to meet our project goals. This is not the only option WSDOT is exploring, and this technical study will not directly lead to a project proposal from WSDOT.

Study purpose: Explore opportunities to increase floodplain storage in the undeveloped land across the river from SR 20 by spreading flows more broadly across the floodplain, reducing the speed that water leaves the area, and reducing pressure on SR 20. It would create and enhance areas that provide more access for fish and make more high-quality habitat available longer. The three goals include:

1. Improve salmon habitat in the floodplain and river margins
2. Reduce flood and erosion risk to SR 20
3. Do not increase flood or erosion risk to adjacent property or infrastructure

The technical study team developed three categories of [evaluation criteria](#) to determine what mix of actions could help achieve these three goals. They include:

1. Fish Habitat
2. Infrastructure
3. Other

The feasibility study began in late 2021 with study planning, initial outreach, and data collection. In mid to late 2022, existing conditions were assessed in three areas: geomorphic, hydraulic and habitat.

This is the second of two community workshops. The first was held in November 2022 and solicited input on the evaluation criteria and existing conditions report, which informed the next phase of the study (alternatives development and evaluation), the focus of tonight’s meeting.

Alternatives Analysis

Jen O’Neal and Shawn Higgins, Natural Systems Designs

Overview of Existing Conditions Analysis

- Three assessments were completed, including a geomorphic characterization, a hydraulic model development and analysis, and fish habitat quantification.
- Details about the methods and approach for each assessment were shared, as was information about assessment of fish habitat.

Development of Alternatives

- The scope of the technical study included developing two action alternatives and one no action alternative
- In developing alternatives, the team
 - focused on approaches that enhance habitat connectivity in floodplains.
 - evaluated 7 flow paths identified in assessment of existing reach conditions.
 - focused on restoration/enhancement opportunities that would reduce flooding and erosion at SR 20.
- A detailed overview of the seven flow paths evaluated in the study was provided and the results of the initial assessment of how well they met the evaluation criteria. A summary table from the PPT is included below. ([see slides 50-57 of the PowerPoint](#)).

Flow Path	Description
1	Existing flow paths with intermittent connectivity; Limited Access; Avulsion Risk
2	Existing flow path well connected with high quality habitat - Removed due to risk to high quality habitat
3	Hydraulic gradient directed from floodplain to channel at base flow; Risk of draining floodplain wetland - Removed due to risk to high quality habitat
4	Hydraulic gradient directed from floodplain to channel at base flow; Risk of draining floodplain wetland - Removed due to risk to high quality habitat
5	Hydraulic gradient directed from floodplain to channel at base flow; Risk of draining Illabot Channel - Removed due to risk to high quality habitat
6	Flow path crossed Private Property – Removed due to potential impacts to private property.
7	Existing flow path only connected at large floods; Road in easement

- Potential action types were described and include channel excavation, Engineered Log Jams (ELJs), Large Woody Debris (LWD) placement, and planting.
- A detailed overview of the two action alternatives, Alternatives 1 and 2, was presented. For a summary, see the workshop handout [Preliminary Summary of Findings and Alternatives](#). Highlights include:
 - Alternative 1
 - Flow path 1A and 1B
 - Channel Excavation: 57,000 CY
 - 3,600 feet of Channel Grading
 - 3 Large ELJs (mainstem/flow splitting)
 - 15-20 Small Wood Placement (side channels)
 - Planning level estimate: \$1.5 - \$2M
 - Alternative 2
 - Flow path 1A, 1B and 7
 - Channel Excavation: 119,000 CY
 - 5,600 feet of Channel Grading
 - 5 Large ELJs (mainstem/flow splitting)
 - 25-30 Small Wood Placement (side channels)
 - Planning level estimate: \$3 - \$3.5M

Modeling Results and Alternatives Evaluation

- A hydraulic model was applied to them to predict the potential future hydraulic conditions (flow depths and scour) and fish habitat within and near the study reach.
- The three categories of [evaluation criteria](#) used to compare the alternatives were provided again and include 1) fish habitat, 2) infrastructure and property risk, and 3) “other”.
- Within each category, the team applied the evaluation criteria to them and compared them to the no-action alternative.
- Details of each alternative compared to the evaluation criteria were presented and explained. For a summary, see the table below or the [Preliminary Summary of Findings and Alternatives](#) handout.

Alternative 1- Flow Paths 1A and 1B	Alternative 2 – Flow Paths 1A, 1B, and 7
<p><i>Fish Habitat – increase over existing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinook Juvenile: +5-6 acres • Steelhead Juvenile: +4-5 acres • No loss of diversity • Moderate reduction in stranding risk <p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor reduction in flood depth (.35 ft at Q10) • Minor reduction in erosion risk (.7 ft/s at Q10) • No effect on adjacent property or infrastructure • No effect on Barnaby Project <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability risk (avulsion at 1A) 	<p><i>Fish Habitat – increase over existing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinook Juvenile: +8-15 acres • Steelhead Juvenile: +9-18 acres • No loss of diversity • Moderate reduction in stranding risk <p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor reduction in flood depth (.4 ft at Q10) • Minor reduction in erosion risk (.7 ft/s at Q10) • Slight increase in flow depth on adjacent property (0.1 ft at Q10) • No effect on Barnaby Project <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher cost

Next Steps and Completion of the Technical Study

- The study team will receive input until the draft report is complete in October, and input will be incorporated into the final technical study report.
- The Feasibility Study Report will be available in December 2023 on the [study webpage](#).
- Meeting participants will be notified by email when the final report is available.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:33.

Questions and Responses

Study Background and Context

- What prevents you from just putting more armor on the vulnerable part of SR20, similar to the area mitigated in 2014?
 - **Response:** Nine years of monitoring has shown the dolotimber structure that WSDOT installed in 2014 has successfully protected SR20 from erosion and washouts and has improved fish habitat along the embankment. However, the site just upstream is at a slightly lower elevation and would still flood above a 10-year recurrence event. The highway would still be vulnerable to closures and potential damage. In its analysis of the SR20 CED, WSDOT is considering a bank revetment upstream of the dolotimber structure as one of several potential solutions. This O’Brian study intends to get more information on the hydrology on channel and floodplain processes to see if a floodplain enhancement alternative would reduce the flood and erosion risk, thereby offering both the benefit of flood protection and natural process restoration.

- I think you have a small section of highway that can be easily protected just like highway 530 and unless you want to make a dike to protect downriver landowners it is very risky since we are already feeling negative impacts from the Barnaby Slough project.
 - **Response:** Within the study reach the highway is below the 10-year flood elevation. Although installing a revetment, whether a log toe/cribwall or a dolotimber structure might prevent the highway from washing out at this location, it would not address flooding or the vulnerability to the structure associated with submersion of the road embankment. For example, the 2021 flood event did not wash out the highway, but submersion of the roadway caused significant pavement damage on both sides of the highway, which required an expensive repair and a temporary closure. Also, during and after the flood, the highway was impassable due to the flooding and debris.

- This is just a study. How long are you going to study before any excavation will begin?
 - **Response:** This is a feasibility study to gather information on the O’Brian Reach. It is not a planning study, nor a project proposal. WSDOT does not have discretionary funds to implement a planning study or project at this time and has not requested funds to do so. WSDOT conducts many technical studies such as this one to gather information that is needed to evaluate alternatives to address transportation issues.

- Why is WSDOT in salmon habitat?
 - **Response:** WSDOT is interested in salmon habitat for many reasons including the need to obtain permits to maintain our highways and construct projects, our obligations under the culvert injunction, and our commitment to be an environmental steward of our state resources in all that we do. The Skagit River is also a designated Wild and Scenic River with restrictive regulations on acceptable approaches to flood and erosion risk.

As described in the introduction, this site has a special status as a Chronic Environmental Deficiency. Because of this, WSDOT is held to a higher standard to develop a fish friendly solution to protect the highway that reduces repeated repairs and maintenance at this site. And finally, this study is an opportunity to see if we could address multiple problems with one solution. Many of our flooding issues are due to loss of floodplains and the decline in some fish populations is also due to a loss of floodplain habitat. If a floodplain enhancement alternative is feasible and meets the constraints of our study, this could be a practical solution to address multiple problems affecting all of us.

- Why is moving the highway not being considered as an alternative?
 - **Response:** This study is funded by a salmon recovery grant. The goal of the O’Brian Reach Study is to develop information on the feasibility of a floodplain enhancement option. WSDOT is considering several options to address the flooding and erosion problem on SR20 (moving the highway is one of them) separate from this feasibility study, but the goal of this O’Brian Reach Study and today’s presentation are to report the technical results of our analysis of a floodplain enhancement alternative.

- Have you mentioned what the 4 bigger alternatives are that are being looked at for the road? Such as road setback or not?
 - This presentation is to discuss the results of the O'Brian Reach Study. At WSDOT, we are working on a separate CED Site and Reach Assessment for the Skagit River CED but have not evaluated any of the alternatives or completed that study because we did not have complete information on the effects of flood hydrology on channel and floodplain processes in the reach.
- What material would be used to protect Hwy 20?
 - **Response:** This study is not about armoring SR20.
- (SRSC) We appreciate the effort of WSDOT to find a process-based fish-friendly approach to avoid erosional impacts to its highway at this location while also increasing habitat. We strongly caution against any alternative selection or suggestion in the upcoming report. To reiterate Devin Smith, the Director of SRSC's Restoration office, in an email dated May 13, 2020, SRSC strongly cautions WSDOT to avoid proposing a specific reconnection project that could affect property owners without consulting affected owners and gaining their support. Furthermore, SRSC has recently begun the Barnaby Reach phase 2 design directly downstream of the reach being examined here. SRSC's project proposes to connect Illabot Creek to a historic flow path into Harrison Pond. Any potential project upstream of SRSC's Barnaby Reach project must be extensively coordinated and properly planned to ensure unanticipated consequences or hazards that might result from two independently planned but hydraulically connected projects.
 - **Response:** We strongly agree with the idea of not proposing a specific approach at this stage. Our technical study is designed to get more information on the technical feasibility of potential actions and their potential outcomes. These actions would likely change and adapt with further public input in any potential planning or design phase. If in the future, there were design phase, we would also support coordinating the hydraulic modeling from the two adjacent project areas to better understand the interactions between the areas. We did not repeat the O'Brian Reach modeling in the Barnaby area to avoid confusion between differences in model outputs. We were striving to promote integration of the two project efforts to reduce potential for misunderstandings with landowners.

Evaluation Criteria

- I am a first responder and even though I want more fish, I don't want to put my family and neighborhood at risk. Fish are important, but the last flood we had to use helicopters to save lives because we couldn't get to firehall at higher ground.
 - **Response:** Agreed. Keeping roads like SR 20 open is important to community safety and first response time. This this study aims to get more information on one potential approach to reducing flood impacts to roads that are important routes for emergency efforts and transportation.
- Explain what you mean by "adjacent property."

- **Response:** This study considers potential hydraulic impacts to all private property that intersects the floodplain and erosion hazard area upstream and downstream of the conceptual alternatives. Hydraulic model results used in the analysis extend from the tributary confluence with Illabot Creek near RM 71.8 to the floodplain areas adjacent to Pandora Circle near RM 75. "Adjacent property" evaluated in this study also includes the flood and erosion hazard area downstream of the model domain between Illabot Creek and the Sauk River confluence by integrating results from this study with findings developed in previous assessment of the Barnaby Reach Restoration Project.
- The criterion referring to flooding at adjacent properties is vague. The study should look at risk to folks living downstream of the study area.
 - **Response:** We are evaluating potential flood and erosion hazards using our hydraulic model to look at flood elevations and scour at the 10, 50 and 100-year recurrence events at all infrastructure and properties directly adjacent to the O'Brian study area. We will use the existing Barnaby model to determine the amount of flow entering Harrison to evaluate areas adjacent to and downstream of the Barnaby Reach.
- Flood or erosion risk downstream of the study area must be an evaluation criterion.
 - **Response:** Flood and erosion risk downstream of the study area were incorporated using the Barnaby Model to look at changes downstream of Illabot Creek. We chose this approach to remain consistent with the analysis approach used in the Barnaby project because the study/project areas are adjacent, and the models would need to interact with each other to be accurate.

Fish Habitat

- In changing the area's floodplain characteristics, does this change those affected areas into 'wetlands'?
 - **Response:** The areas targeted for habitat creation and enhancement will present as side channel habitat with appropriate velocities and depths for rearing salmonids rather than wetlands.
- How does the increase in area of fish habitat (+5-6 ac, +8-18 ac) compare to the area under existing conditions? Do you have a percent increase in the study reach or a comparison to the existing acreage?
 - **Response:** There is about 100 acres currently wetted in the existing conditions model. However, not all of that is easily accessed or used by fish. Since the area of the model was large to capture the hydraulic effects of potential actions, we recommend focusing on the area of fish habitat gained (acres of floodplain) rather than the percent change over the modeled area, since the modeled area was based on hydraulic factors rather than habitat quality.
- This seems like very marginal gains from a fish standpoint.
 - **Response:** Comment acknowledged

- Have you considered projected river flows with climate change? The river drops now substantially and although it may have “flows,” the water is too warm to sustain spawning in side channels. Study South Fork of the Nooksack river and salmon loss there because of warmer water.
 - **Response:** The Skagit River is not currently listed for temperature under the 303(d) listing like the South Fork Nooksack River is. However, there are several temperature loggers in habitat areas within the O’Brian Reach and we integrated that data into the alternatives development process. Since the Skagit River is controlled by the hydroelectric project upstream and relicensing is in process, we did not model the climate change flows because reservoir operations would affect the outcome substantially. We modeled at the low flow, spring flow, annual, 10-year and 100-year flows. We also installed thermal sensors in the area to look at temperatures. There is variability in the temperatures of the water in different areas of the floodplain, and we expect that would likely increase with climate change. The Skagit River is not currently listed for temperature as is the South Fork Nooksack, but we will look for the study of the South Fork Nooksack as well. Thanks for that suggestion.
- I have done two years of Salmon Spawner Surveys at Pressentin Creek at Marblemount. It had NO spawning fish this last year (2022) and only fish in the early October 2021 year. This is because during October to January the river didn’t flood or ever run at normal levels to fill the slough. The river didn’t even rise enough to provide flows to Marblemount and Marblegate Slough, which are naturally long existing fish spawning sloughs.
 - **Response:** Thanks for the information. There are spawner survey data for chum spawning in the vicinity of the Illabot Creek area. The November 2021 flood in the Skagit River was also modeled as part of our project alternatives analysis.
- Also, take a walk of Pressentin Slough and parallel to it Marblemount Slough then go across the river to Marblemount Slough. These sloughs need constant flows for the fish to enter and not be trapped by high water and predators. Pressentin runs fast at 7000 cfs. Marblemount gage is dry at 4000. It needs at least 5500 cfs to have a flow to sustain salmon.
 - **Response:** This is helpful information in terms of calibrating flows to ensure that planned channels can remain connected.

Flow Paths and Alternatives Development

- Developing Alternatives, Channel 1A and 1B appear as straight lines. 1A you mentioned has its own path and meander. 1B is not so clear. Will 1A and 1B follow the bow at the affected area; or will they have more of oxbow pattern?
 - **Response:** The alignment of 1A and 1B are intended to follow existing channel scars that are present in the LiDAR, so the idea would be to reoccupy historical channels.
- Who owns the land where 1A, 1B channels will be excavated?
 - **Response:** The land is owned by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Skagit Land Trust.

- What soil types exist where 1A and 1B channels will be excavated?
 - **Response:** The soils in the floodplain area are composed of alluvium transported there by river flows and older channel pathways. The subsurface material is a mixture of sand, gravel, and cobble. The upper layer nearest the surface has additional organic material incorporated from floodplain vegetation and biologic processes.
- Where will the excavated material be dumped?
 - **Response:** Implementation details have not been determined as this is a conceptual design approach. There may be opportunities to use gravels and cobbles in other restoration projects, but these details have not been evaluated yet or finalized.
- What is an ELJ?
 - **Response:** Engineered Log Jam.
- Can you control the flow during a flood?
 - **Response:** Floodplains are dynamic landscapes, and we expect channels to adjust over time in response to natural processes including sediment deposition, erosion, and lateral channel migration. Engineered log jams can be used to increase bank stability at key junctions and moderate the flows into side channels. Over time however, the relative amount of flow conveyed by constructed channel features would be expected to change in response to geomorphic adjustments in both the mainstem Skagit River and in the floodplain channels themselves.
- Why do you need channel 7?
 - **Response:** Since the primary objective of the SRFB funding is to develop concepts that provide additional and improved fish habitat, flow path 7 was included because of its potential to provide 8-18 acres of additional high-quality side channel and off-channel habitat for steelhead, Chinook and chum salmon.
- Does flow path 7 direct flow into Illabot Creek?
 - **Response:** Yes, flow from path 7 drains through O'Brian wetland complex and into the Illabot Ck alluvial fan area. That flow splits at the alluvial fan and a portion of that flow results in a slight increase in flow into Illabot Creek. At the 10-year flood, there is a small increase in flow into Illabot Creek and slight increase (less than 0.1 ft, or 1 inch) in depth in the overbank flow area toward Harrison Slough.
- I have a cabin at mile 75. I have never seen the river over top the river and flow over the river at Number 7 flow. There is a low spot to the east of Number 7 which might be impacted by opening flow into number 7.
 - **Response:** This is useful information. We will include in the Summary Report under landowner provided information.

Alternatives Analysis

- Have you run any modeling about channel migration on the new proposed channels? What will these look like in 50 years?

- **Response:** The study is using model results of the concept alternatives to evaluate changes in the hydraulic parameters that control channel migration processes. Additional details of anticipated channel response will be included as part of the feasibility study report. The presentation shared results showing the historical observations of bend migration upstream of the SR 20 CED site at an average rate of 18 ft/year based on existing data.

The modeling results for concept alternatives showed a minor reduction in flow velocity and shear stress acting on the bend. However, this erosion is expected to continue at similar rates under Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and a no action alternative. A likely scenario under any of the alternatives is that the main channel will continue to erode the left bank and shorten the remaining section of flow path 1A. If implemented, channel widening within flow path 1A would be likely as additional flow is routed along the inside of the bend.

The findings shared in the presentation show a potential increase in avulsion potential on the inside of the bend across from the CED site associated with the channel excavation at flow path 1A. If such an avulsion occurred, the mainstem would cut off the existing meander bend that is impacting SR 20 at the CED site, the side channel habitat in flow path 1A would be converted to mainstem habitat, and the existing channel adjacent to the roadway embankment would likely be converted to a backwater area in the floodplain.

If design elements in Alternative 2 were advanced to implementation, channel evolution at flow path 7 would likely include a future adjustment over time as part of Alternative 2. The existing bank height near flow path 7 would require a relatively deep channel excavation at flow path 7 to maintain connectivity at lower flows. As such, there is potential for future bank scour to result in undercutting and bank slumping within the constructed floodplain channel.

Preliminary results of the Alternative 2 concept suggest that channel would have sufficient gradient and velocity to maintain sediment transport initially, Sediment transported from upstream and brought into the channel through localized erosion would be expected to deposit and form bars within the channel where it drains into the existing wetland complex between O'Brian Creek and the transmission line.

- For how many years will this habitat be available before sediment fills it up?
 - **Response:** Floodplain channels are part of a dynamic landscape and expected to adjust over time. Sedimentation occurs at the upstream portions of side channels when changes in flow and/or channel alignment alter the floodplain hydraulics such that flood flows no longer have capacity to transport sediment delivered from upstream. Model results of the action alternatives were compared with flow depth, velocity, and shear

stress in existing functional side channels, and the data suggest it is feasible to construct channels that have sufficient capacity to transport sediment and limit sedimentation. However, over time changes in the main channel alignment will shift and the floodplain hydraulics will change resulting in increased potential for sedimentation. The specific timeline for the sedimentation risk is highly uncertain, but likely on the order of a few years to a few decades.

- A participant questioned the conclusion that only an addition 130 CFS would flow into Illabot Creek from alternative 2.
 - **Response:** Comment acknowledged.
- Is there any threat to Rockport-Cascade Road in the O’Brian slough complex in alternative 2?
 - **Response:** The road at the nearest point to the ponds is 10 ft in elevation higher than the existing wetland complex. The modeling did not show a change in effects to Rockport Cascade Road.
- How will WSDOT ensure that the alternatives are not transferring risk from SR 20 to local roads and private property?
 - **Response:** The hydraulic modeling and risk assessment is intended and designed to evaluate changes in flood and erosion risk to local roads and private property.
- It is unfortunate that this study does not extend analyses downstream to the large community at Martin Road that have been intimately involved in the Barnaby Planning efforts. This is a complicated network of channels, and any project will require extensive coordination in the early planning and feasibility phases and far more than has occurred thus far.
 - **Approach:** This effort is an early technical feasibility study with specific objectives and constraints. The goal of the study is to see if there is an option that meets all the project objectives within those constraints, as summarized by the [evaluation criteria](#). We agree that any next steps to design or implement a project would involve more detailed modeling of areas downstream in coordination with the Barnaby Planning efforts to decrease potential confusion between two different models of the same area.

APPENDIX A. Participant List

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation (if applicable)
*Brady	Florence	
*Brady	Richard	
Brocksmith	Richard	Skagit Watershed Council
Damitio	Chris	WSDOT
Derenne	Emily	Skagit County
Dykstra	Jenni	WSDOT
Fenley	Lee	Landowner downriver
Fenley	Lisa	Landowner
Hallock	Dave	
Higgins	Shawn	Natural Systems Design
Janicki	Lisa	Skagit County Commissioner
Johnson	Jenn	Skagit County
Kammer	Nora	Skagit River Systems Cooperative
Kanzler	Susan	WSDOT
Krownbell	Denise	Seattle City Light
*Lovely	Chazlyn	Upper Skagit Library
Low	Sam	State Representative, 39 th District
*Lowery	Erin	Seattle City Light
*Magrane	April	WSDOT
*Matthews	Erin	WSDOT
McBride	Aundrea	Skagit Watershed Council
*Miller	Jason	Concrete Herald
*Moore	Sue	
*Moore	Don	
Moore	Dan	
Moore	Jessica	Resident downriver
Nihart	Mark	Landowner near RM 75
Nizam	Ahmer	WSDOT
O'Neal	Jen	Natural Systems Design
Rapp	Cygnia	WSDOT
Richard	Alex	
S	Mike	
Seaforth	Kayla	Skagit Land Trust
Sehlike	Madison	WSDOT
Sippel	Gary	Landowner at Martin Road
Stafford	Howard	

Theodoratus	Lisa	Landowner at Rocky Creek Lane
Vinberg	Sander	
Wahl	Colin	Skagit River Systems Cooperative
Wesen	Ron	Skagit County Commissioner
Wilkinson	Hilary	Triangle Associates (Facilitator)

*Participated at Upper Skagit Library