

From: Martin, Chal [mailto:cmartin@ci.burlington.wa.us]

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 12:13 PM

To: genes@co.skagit.wa.us

Cc: Harmon, Mike; Fleek, Margaret; Hanson, Jana; Bell, Esco; Rick Blair; Aarstad, Jon; dkdist12@cnw.com; dhamburgs@msn.com; dolson@clearwire.net; Gary Rowe; daveb@co.skagit.wa.us

Subject: Concern about BCC 23 April Letter

Gene, I am concerned about a couple of assertions in this letter:

- 1) Regarding the SRFS Executive Committee meeting: "It was agreed at that meeting that the local community will be best served by continuing this collaborative planning effort with the Army Corps and other project stakeholders." The City of Burlington, the City of Mount Vernon, and the City of Sedro-Woolley specifically did not agree, requesting instead to take this issued back to the respective Councils. That was done and what resulted was a formal request from these cities (and maybe some Dike Districts, I'm not sure) to insert specific language into the Project Management Plan acknowledging the disagreement over the hydrology and the historic flood estimates. Despite serious concerns over where the GI process is taking us, the cities in my view were looking for a way to move forward and this looked to be a reasonable way to do that. I think this could still be done and ask that you reconsider.
- 2) Regarding the subsequent meeting at the college: "It was agreed by all attending that the County should pursue the SRFS with the Corps and that this should not preclude the Cities and Dike Districts from pursuing their needed flood protection projects and actions during this process." I was not there and don't know exactly what was said, but I have heard different takes. It seems to me that if there was an agreement, it should be formalized in writing. This issue is too important to be left to an informal verbal exchange.

In addition as you know, my concern continues to be that the Corps GI process, if it continues to go forward using the current flawed data set, will be the cause of no additional flood storage ever being implemented in the Baker system. This letter asserts our elected officials agreed to support the County in continuing the GI study. But if the question had been: "Do you support continuing the process that is specifically precluding additional flood storage from being implemented in the Baker System?", then I think the response would have been different. Chal

Chal A. Martin, P.E.

Public Works Director / City Engineer

City of Burlington

900 East Fairhaven Avenue

Burlington, WA 98233

(360) 755-9715 Office (360) 755-0783 FAX

cmartin@ci.burlington.wa.us