

SKAGIT RIVER IMPACT PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes from August 17, 2006

Present: Bud Norris, Charles Bennett, Jana Hanson, Neil Hamburg, Kevin Rogerson, Scott Thomas, John Schultz, Bob Jungquist, Torey Nelson, Sharon Dillon.

Call to order:

Mayor Bud Norris called the meeting to order at 9:30 am.

1.0 Jana Hanson provided a brief overview of the issue regarding a response to Con. Larsen's recent draft legislation for flood control at Baker Dam. The County had requested that the SRIP send a written response thanking the Congressman for his efforts. Although this is a positive move in the right direction the issues still lies with the use of the Stewart flows. **Hanson** suggested a letter acknowledging the legislation as a positive effort by state clearly the biggest issue facing Skagit County in its efforts to provide flood protection is the use of the Stewart flows. **Scott Thomas** expressed his concern over the draft legislation. **Kevin Rogerson** offered that the legislation seems neutral but moves the decision making to a more political forum as opposed to the previous legislation drafted by the County which leaves the decision making in the hands of COE staff. **John Schultz** stated that the draft legislation is replacing the "3 evils" with 1.5 evils but does give the COE more flexibility and appears to give the jurisdictions the ability to provide input into the decision making process. **Bud Norris** asked whether flexibility will benefit us with an agency that is known to be inflexible. **Norris** suggested thanking the Congressman but requesting different language in the legislation.

Thomas suggested making a request to assist with funding flood control. There was general discussion regarding funding flood control projects. **Norris** requested the attorneys to draft a letter to thank Congressman Larsen and to include a statement and request regarding the Stewart flows. **Thomas** indicated that the letter should also state that we look forward to working collaboratively on funding for flood control.

2.0 Hanson discussed the changes to the revised inter-local agreement and requested everyone to review it and approve. The new agreement only adds SW and LC and changes dates as well as the formation of the executive committee and the number of members to make up a quorum.

3.0 Rogerson discussed chronology of events with FEMA and the draft 8 page letter to FEMA informing them of their responsibilities and requirements to engage the public and solicit local input before coming up with maps. Each jurisdiction was encouraged to send a letter to FEMA stating their position with respect to the process to date. There was general discussion about having the members join the upcoming FEMA meeting in Burlington.

Rogerson strongly expressed that we have received no information on the beginning of the FEMA process, FEMA has affirmatively denied us requested information, and they have already produced maps without consulting us.

4.0 Torey Nelson discussed the NHC scope of work and indicated that NHC intends to provide detailed information regarding cross section within the river that will add credibility to the work previously performed by PIE. **Nelson** indicated that NHC has said that Stewart's work cannot be excluded because there is good work behind his reports, however the work can be improved upon which is NHC's goal. **Schultz** asked how Stewart's work can be improved upon. There was general discussion regarding the investigation of homes in Hamilton that may still have silt marks from previous flood events. There was also concern expressed by the members present that NHC may not provide a thoroughly objective review so that they avoid any controversy with their largest client FEMA. There was not a consensus from the members present to endorse the scope of work from NHC.

The members discussed the upcoming trip to California that the County has arranged.

Sharon Dillon asked about the upcoming meeting that Burlington has with FEMA. **Hanson** stated the partnership should request that FEMA meet with all of us collectively. A letter will be drafted for membership approval to request the collective meeting. **Neil Hamburg** asked whether there has been any discussion regarding adding the dike districts to SCOG. **Norris** responded that this has been discussed and that efforts are underway to review the bylaws to determine what process is needed to add the dike districts.

Nelson restated the importance of the joint meeting with FEMA especially to review floodway maps.

Scott Thomas returned to the meeting after speaking on the phone with Carl Cook from FEMA. Cook confirmed that the maps that will be presented to the cities have been completed by the COE, and submitted to FEMA for review. Once FEMA's review has occurred, then FEMA will likely adopt the maps, triggering the statutory appeal period. Cook also indicated that if Burlington gives up its meeting with FEMA in response to the request from the Partnership to meet collectively, then Burlington may lose its opportunity to have a coordination meeting with FEMA. There was additional discussion regarding the FEMA process and the importance of insuring that the correct data is used to create the maps. Cook indicated that FEMA would consider any data provided by the cities or SRIP.

Members concurred that a letter signed by each of the attendees would go to FEMA requesting that they meet with the Partnership collectively before meeting individually with the cities.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:30 am.

