

**Flood Authority Work Session
Veterans Memorial Museum
100 SW Veterans Way
Chehalis, WA**

**April 16, 2009 – 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Notes**

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called meeting to order at 9:06 A.M.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Disaster Assistance Programs

Mr. Mark Stewart, Washington State Emergency Management, presented a PowerPoint on mitigation grant programs. The PowerPoint included defining hazard mitigation, the grant program and application process, as well as types and amounts of funding and types of eligible projects.

Mr. Stewart stated mitigation must be cost effective for FEMA to fund.

Who is eligible: Local governments, special purpose districts, Indian tribes and private non profit organizations.

Project applicants must:

Participate in NFIP, be compliant with applicable GMA requirements and critical areas regulations, and must have adopted a FEMA approved Hazard Mitigation plan.

Mr. Stewart stated there is always more demand for the money than there is money available. Emergency Management reviews the applications for completeness and cost effectiveness and then the applications are forwarded to FEMA. A review committee ranks the applications if there are many applications, and makes recommendations of prioritized projects to FEMA. Programs do not buy equipment unless it is part of a larger construction project.

Q - Can a Tribe join in the plan of another group?

A - Yes, a stand alone plan or connect with a multi-jurisdictional plan.

Mr. Stewart invited phone calls to answer questions; application deadline: 5:00 P.M. May, 1, 2009. m.stewart@emd.wa.gov. He stated mitigation plans expire every five years; state plans are good for three years.

Lewis County includes incorporated districts and all taxing districts, ie cemetery, fire, etc. Lewis County's is one of the largest multi-jurisdictional plans in the State.

Mr. Stewart spoke of a property acquisition in Mt. Vernon that became a park.

Mr. Carlton encouraged jurisdictions to think about applying, stating pre-disaster applications are open every year.

Mr. Stewart stated if you can think ahead of the next disaster you will be ahead of the game.

In answer to a question about generators, Mr. Stewart stated the city of Snohomish was able to get generators. They are elevating three pump stations and because they are critical facilities, they could get generators but it was part of a mitigation package.

Mr. Stewart stated re-location of fire stations outside the flood plain could be done but new construction is not fundable. They can actually pick up a structure and physically move it.

5. Authority Processes

Chairman Averill stated Ms. Hoffman had sent out a paper on the Authority Process and it is included in the packet. He reminded everyone that the interlocal agreement signed in May is the agreement that 11 jurisdictions have made to work on goals, funding, etc. It is good to pull this out every once in awhile. We published Rules of Procedure for the CRBFA, or by-laws, and those set out certain provisions under which we operate. We are supposed to have terms for one year and that was not done in January so it should be done in May.

Commissioner Willis would like copies of the Rules of Procedure.

Dave Carlton explained the Facilitator's role in the processes. Please see bullets in memo

Chairman Averill stated sometimes the Chair receives letters the day before the meeting and those are distributed at the meeting.

Commissioner Willis asked if there is something on the agenda stating the agenda can be changed at the meeting. Chairman Averill stated that can be done during the approval of the agenda.

Chairman Averill suggested adding the Authority Process paper to the end of the Rules of Procedure as a guidance tool.

Commissioner Willis asked once the meeting of the sub committee is over does everything go out to everyone so everyone has all the information.

Mr. Carlton stated the paper went out to people at the meeting asking for comments.

Chairman Averill stated the resolution that we passed has the sub committee working with the PUD through the progress of the study. The sub committee will have more meetings.

Mr. Carlton stated the sub committee reports back to everyone before any actions are taken by the Flood Authority.

6. Ripe and Ready Basin-Wide Studies

The BAC Staff Report includes a list of studies and the BAC recommendations.

Mr. Carlton stated LiDAR is only mentioned on the mainstream of the Chehalis, South Fork Chehalis and Newaukum Rivers because everything else already has LiDAR.

Mr. White asked if these items are prioritized.

Mr. Carlton stated somewhat; #4 can't be done until #1, 2 and 3 are done.

Commissioner Willis suggested if one topic is dependent on another to sub-set it.

Chairman Averill stated the Corps' plan is running separately from the basin-wide study but we need to integrate it with other projects. There may be a decision that if it is not included in the Corps plan and we need additional capacity, where do we go?

Mr. Swartout referred to page 3 and suggested adding a fourth criterion: only projects that benefit the entire basin.

Mr. Carlton referred to page 11, which is the budget. He stated we can't match federal money with federal money, such as USGS and the Corps. It can be matched with non-federal funds.

Chairman Averill asked Ms. Napier if any of the money that the Chehalis Basin Partnership spent on their portion of the GI study is transferrable to flood damage reduction.

Ms. Napier stated the money is for the ecosystem study and a lot of the projects are for the ecosystem.

Chairman Averill stated the Corps money must be matched dollar for dollar. Flood Authority portions may be added to that. Ms. Napier stated we will need to increase the match.

Ms. Napier stated the CBP is looking for projects that will go with the recommended project. USGS is bringing in additional money; we may lose the \$50,000. She recommends that we recognize we are still working out the details; we need direction from the Flood Authority.

Commissioner Willis suggested taking the million dollar match and stretching it as far as we can. The Corps said that is the intent.

Mr. Johnson stated we tried to maximize the money we had and put down actual costs. Cost might be less if we can partner in some projects. We hope it will be less but we want authorization to move forward and we will try hard to get partnerships so it will cost the Flood Authority less.

Mr. MacReynolds stated this will be a shock to the community. Their position is: you have spent millions and not one thing has been done and now you are saying you will spend \$1.6 million on more studies. That is an issue – the media is going to publish this list and talk about more studies. That is a big concern.

Chairman Averill stated we need to acknowledge the upper basin has been studied to death but that is not the case in the lower basin.

Mr. Johnson stated we talked about that. This reflects the minimum that is necessary and we recognize that we must do the studies before we get federal funding. An environmental review must be done before federal dollars can be expended. These are studies and they are products that are necessary before funding.

Mr. Swartout stated the GI study identifies projects, ie flood mitigation; the WRDA bill gets established with what comes out of the GI study; and then comes the funding. Some of these are just lining up steps to get the work done. We need to be cautious to describe what the general investigation does.

Mr. Dan Thompson suggested the Flood Authority may need a public affairs person or someone who can channel information for accuracy.

Mr. Schillinger stated the Flood Authority is spending \$250,000 for early warning analysis; he thought we had good early warning during the 2009 event.

Mr. Thompson stated that money also put some gauges in the rivers.

Mr. Carlton stated he is waiting for comments from WDOT about warnings on creeks.

Mr. Schillinger suggested letting WDOT step up. Lewis County has warning systems. Whoever wants these things, let's partner with them.

Mr. Carlton stated warning information is not that well integrated. Warnings need to be continued.

Mr. Johnson stated early warning on the Wynoochee is terrible; we need to know the predicted flow. That is what this study will pay for.

Mr. Schillinger stated we should identify those spots and put in those gauges instead of spending the money on the studies.

Mr. Carlton stated that is what the money is for: identify the places and identify the partners.

7. Flood Plan Chapters

Mr. Carlton stated there is no Chapter 6 yet; ESA Adolfsen is still talking to people.

An item to add: Ensure that flood reduction strategies protect or enhance the Basin's natural resources.

8. Trans Alta Presentation

Mr. Tony Briggs presented a PowerPoint. It is important for Trans Alta as a silent participant to talk to Mayor Martin and others that there is a lack of understanding as to how the Skookumchuck Dam operates. The PowerPoint will provide information about what the dam is, what the capabilities are and flooding solutions.

Mr. Briggs highlighted some points about the dam:

- There are no flood gates on the Dam
- The biggest peak flow we have had is just shy of 8,000cfs but the dam will accommodate 28,000cfs.
- We have to manage the debris; by August it has to be cleaned out of the lake. It is stockpiled and currently it is being chipped.
- The Dam is owned by Trans Alta and modified by FERC approval.
- We have limited ability to control the lake level behind the dam.

Q – Was the reservoir low in 2007?

A – It was low; we won't drop below 477 and we continue to spill over until mid-May. We continue to drop until November, to about 430.

Q – Is there a minimum amount you keep behind the dam?

A – Yes, we must provide for fish and for the power plant use.

Mr. Carlton stated we would like to work with Trans Alta so this can be used during the winter. The 36" and 48" pipe could be increased to allow four times the capacity. We are not sure who would pay for it.

Mr. Johnson asked if siphons could be put in and then no structural change needs to be made to the dam. That might be an alternative that is non-evasive and fairly inexpensive.

Commissioner Willis stated Trans Alta should brag that it cleans out the debris; you are keeping it from going down stream. There would be considerably more damage if it were not cleaned up.

Chairman Averill asked what it cost Trans Alta to provide this information.

Mr. Briggs stated about a week of part time work.

Glen Connelly asked if diving would be necessary to look at actual construction.

Mr. Briggs stated it could.

Chairman Averill thanked Mr. Briggs for the presentation.

9. Adjourn

As there was no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:46 A.M.

**Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
Lewis County Courthouse
351 NW North St.
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**April 16, 2009 – 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Notes**

Members Present: Kathy Martin, Town of Bucoda; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Mark White, Chehalis Tribe; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Bill Bates, City of Centralia; Chad Taylor, City of Chehalis; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County; Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano, Ron Averill, Lewis County

Others Present: Please see sign in sheets

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from March 19 work session and business meeting and April 2 work session
- Expenditure Review
- ESA Monthly Status Report No. 8
- BAC Staff Report on Ripe and Ready Studies
- Interlocal Agreement for Phase II between PUD and Lewis County, Lead Agency
- Resolution 2009-01
- Telephone Survey

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:34 P.M.

2. Introductions

Board Members, staff, consultants and State agency liaisons identified themselves.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda

Chairman Averill stated the agenda only shows meeting notes for the last regular meeting and there are other meeting notes included in the packet along with items respective to meeting notes. One of those items is the Resolution that was passed on March 19 setting up the sub-committee to work on the Interlocal Agreement for the PUD project. In that Resolution the last paragraph had not been finalized during the meeting and Chairman Averill asked that he and Pat Anderson could finalize the appropriate wording.

There are two work session meeting notes, one from March 19 and one from April 2. All of those will need to be approved.

There were no other changes to the agenda and it was approved.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

The Chair asked if there were comments on the Resolution. The paragraph that was finalized is on page 2, the second “Be it resolved” which reads: “The Flood Authority shall direct the Board Advisory Committee to work with Technical Staff and Authority consultants to review and refine scopes of work and cost estimates of any studies and subsequently provide recommendations to the Flood Authority”. The Chair pointed out that these are studies other than the PUD study for which we appointed a subcommittee.

There was some question whether the subcommittee was finished having provided the Flood Authority with an interlocal agreement and Chairman Averill pointed out that the subcommittee is to continue its work as that project goes along and the PUD will work with the subcommittee in terms of reporting back to the Authority.

Without objection, the meeting notes of March 19 regular meeting and work session and the meeting notes of the work session on April 2 and the Resolution were approved.

5. Public Comment

Ms. Marlene Hampton and her husband are residents of Rochester and operated a dairy for 25 years that has been flooded several times. When they learned of the retention project they were very enthused. For people who live in the flood plain this type of security is encouraging. The Hamptons started a petition in favor of the retention project and there is an overwhelming response of people who would be very happy with that type of project. She encouraged the representatives to go forward with the second phase of this project, disregard politics and work together to make something happen. Ms. Hampton thanked Senator Swecker for his diligence.

6. Reports

a) Chairman's Report

Chairman Averill stated at the last meeting there was a discussion regarding the money that was appropriated by the Congress for the Basin-wide study, \$574,000, and that money is being processed through the Corps of Engineers. There was initial discussion as to how the Authority would handle that money in terms of the Basin-wide study. As it turns out, the Corps already has a study they are conducting, the General Investigation Study that they have been working on since 2001 with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and Grays Harbor as lead agent. The three counties, the Tribe, and the Corps of Engineers met and discussed whether there would be another GI study which would be run by the Flood Authority. When we discovered that it would take six months to set that up we looked at other options and essentially agreed to use the existing GI study as a basis and the Flood Authority would have an interlocal agreement with Grays Harbor County and the Chehalis Basin Partnership so we can share information, data and funds to complete the study of the Basin. Since it is already in existence there has already been extensive work done on the eco-system side of the project. There will be other things we will want to add to that and at the present time Lewis County and Grays Harbor County are working together to come back with an interlocal for Flood Authority approval. The notes from that meeting are included in the Member packets with more details.

The Centralia City Manager asked Keith Phillips with the Governor's office to come down and give a report on the Twin Cities Project. In March Mr. Phillips was ill and could not make it and last week Mr. Phillips was directed to attend to a legislative issue. Mr. Phillips did provide an electronic update and there are a number of things Mr. Donahue will talk about.

The work session this morning was a good session and Chairman Averill summarized the highlights. The Department of Emergency Management, Military Department, presented a PowerPoint on the disaster assistance programs that are available to communities after flooding takes place. For those who could not attend the PowerPoint will be sent electronically.

The Facilitator presented a paper on administrative procedure so information is submitted on time. Chairman Averill suggested adding this paper to the Rules and Procedures as an appendix. Without objection, staff can append those Procedures. There was no objection.

Other topics at the work session included a report on Ripe and Ready studies, which will be presented again this afternoon; goals of the Authority in Chapter 7 were discussed and there was a PowerPoint presentation by TransAlta regarding the Skookumchuck Dam, its capacities and what can and cannot be done with it.

b) Flood District Formation Update

Chairman Averill stated substitute Senate Bill 5705, which was the change in statute that allows a vote in a flood district of three or more counties to be approved by registered voters as opposed to property owners, has passed both the House and the Senate unanimously. It is anticipated that the Governor will sign SSB5705 on April 20. House Bill 5704 is the document which would change the number of commissioners in a flood district. There has been some misunderstanding that the current legislation does not allow for the formation of a district of more than two counties, and that is not true. The legislation does not put any limitation on how many counties can form a flood control district. Our concern is when you get a district as large as the tri-county district there are only three commissioners allowed and we wanted to expand that to allow for five commissioners and subsequently to allow for participation by Tribal members who are adjacent to or in the flood district. That Bill made it through the Senate but got hung up in the House and as of today has not gotten out. If it does not get out today it is dead and the Commissioners of the three Counties, if we choose to go forward with the Flood Control District, will need to decide if we want to wait until legislation next year or form the District initially with the statutory three commissioners.

c) Member Reports

Mr. Bill Bates wished to make some clarifications. There have been some statements recently about where the City of Centralia stands on the retention plan. First, the Centralia City council passed a resolution stating it is in favor of the Phase II study. There are questions and concerns but the council feels these will be flushed out as the studies progress. Second, there has been no attempt on the City's behalf to set up any roadblocks to establishing of the Tri-County Flood District. Third, while the City feels

the retention facilities are a positive solution to the flooding problem, it also feels the ultimate answer is a multiple-pronged and cooperative approach. Fourth, the City will continue to support the ongoing research and studies in order to accomplish the objective of solving the flooding issue and the City will do its best to cooperate and expedite this process.

Mr. Schillinger, Montesano, stated that the City of Montesano voted unanimously to support the PUD study and to move on with the work. One of the items that is high on people's list, and costs a lot of money to accomplish, is the Doppler Radar station on the coast. That is being worked on by Senator Cantwell at the Federal level to provide funding and all of the cities, Westport, Ocean Shores, Hoquiam, Montesano, Aberdeen, as well as Grays Harbor County, are all pushing that and lending whatever political support we can to get that done. That is a project that is actually being worked on.

d) Correspondence

Chairman Averill stated there is a letter from USGS in the packets for the Members' information.

e) State Contingent Report

Mr. John Donahue reported on a meeting scheduled for April 30 of the USACE Project Coordination Team. This group is to provide guidance and oversight to the Corps of Engineers' Twin Cities project. The meeting will be from 9:00 A.M. to noon at the Veterans Museum. The Agenda will be sent out next week. Highlights of the meeting will be review of the team membership and responsibilities and the process by which the team will operate. Invitations have been sent to everyone who sits on the Authority and the Team would like to have a conversation as to how the Authority wants to interact with the Coordination Team or sit on the Coordination Team. The main topic is to get an update on the project management plan which Mr. Donahue and Ms. Orr have been working on very diligently. Incorporated into that plan are: scope of work, schedule and milestone dates, as well as accomplishments to date. We will want to review the results of the meeting with the Technical Staff at the end of 2008 and summarize that with project assumptions that we hope to consider and get your endorsement on.

There has been quite a bit of interest in putting together a public involvement event, possibly in June. Mr. Donahue would like to present a proposal to the Authority for its consideration and for the Team's consideration about where you think we ought to go with public involvement with the Twin Cities project.

Ms. Orr stated she and Mr. Donahue had been coordinating very closely. The Corps received the FEMA model recently and it is being updated now with the 2007 flood event data. It is a large model that goes upstream and downstream of the Centralia and Chehalis area. The Corps anticipates having that completed by September or October. Environmental work has begun and the Corps is looking for mitigation sites. If the project goes forward we need to be prepared to mitigate for the additional levees.

The Corps has also met with the Tribe, Grays Harbor County and Lewis County regarding the Chehalis Basin flood damage reduction which is a larger project still in the early stages to see how feasible it is. We received a letter from Grays Harbor County asking to be the sponsor for this. Grays Harbor County has been a sponsor for the eco system restoration for many years.

Chairman Averill wanted everyone to understand that this isn't just for Grays Harbor. The Flood Authority will also participate in that project and will ask for requirements and will have access to all data. It is also a way for the Corps to get money from the Flood Authority because Lewis County is the lead agent through which the Flood Authority money makes it into a project. That is the purpose of an interlocal between the Flood Authority and the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the two lead agents.

Commissioner Willis stated Grays Harbor considers this a basin project as opposed to a county project.

Ms. Orr stated as with all federal studies, once the data has been checked it is public information.

Ms. Orr stated that in mid-June the Corps will have a new project manager on both of these projects. His name is Bill Goss. Mr. Goss has a lot of construction expertise. Ms. Orr will be stepping down. She has worked on this project for seven years and has enjoyed working with everyone and hopes the project is successful.

Chairman Averill stated it has been a pleasure working with Laura. She has been on this project for many years.

Commissioner Willis stated Laura has been working with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and Grays Harbor for a very long time and she will be missed. Her work is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Schillinger stated Montesano's sentiments are the same.

Chairman Averill stated Congressman Baird has been very active in helping us to procure the money, as well as Senator Murray, for the GI study and for the flood control Twin Cities project. That had been un-appropriated since 2003 and it has just been appropriated in February. Congressman Baird stated he is there for us for additional support from the Congressional arena. Chairman Averill asked Mr. Murphy to pass the Flood Authority's appreciation on to the Congressman.

7. Approval of Agreement with Lewis County PUD

Mr. Dave Carlton stated a sub committee met on Tuesday, April 14. The sub committee members are Mark White, Bill Schulte and Terry Willis and other attendees were Dave Muller, PUD, Dave Carlton and Glenn Carter and Robbie Kessler, legal counsel for the Tribe. The committee amended the draft interlocal agreement and authorized Chairman Averill to sign as Chairman of the Flood Authority and Mr. Muller would sign for the

PUD. That interlocal becomes the mechanism for the Authority to give money to the PUD to follow up on the Phase II scope of work, which is the preliminary geotechnical work and preliminary coordination with all the environmental and permitting agencies.

Chairman Averill stated the Flood Authority is to look at the agreement to make sure it meets the Authority's needs and Lewis County as the Lead Agent will pass it at the meeting of the Lewis County Board of County Commissioners to meet the legal requirements so funds can be accessed.

Mr. White stated there were a couple of comments that did not make it into the copy distributed. Page 1, third "whereas" states Oakville is a town and should be changed to "city". Page 3, paragraph 5, addresses should be added.

Chairman Averill stated after discussions, Mr. Carter did go back and make corrections. The copies passed out by Commissioner Schulte are the corrected copies.

Mr. Carlton stated there is another significant change on the last page: the signatory for Lewis County should read F. Lee Grose, Chairman.

As there were no other corrections, Chairman Averill entertained a motion to accept the Interlocal Agreement. Ms. Dolores Lee made the motion, Jim Cook seconded. Without objection, the motion was adopted.

Chairman Averill thanked the sub committee and the PUD for the work put into this project, and to the Prosecutor's Office for the advice provided to the committee.

8. Ripe and Ready Basin-Wide Studies Package

Mr. Carlton provided a staff report in the packet recommending that in addition to the PUD study, seven other studies be undertaken. As it was pointed out at the work session that these are not just studies. Some of these involve implementation, in particular the first one which is the early warning system.

Some criterion used for the selection of these projects was information needed to provide detailed analysis of potential construction projects that might come forward. There has been a lot of interest in bridges, roads, culverts, dams, but with all the work done throughout the Basin once you get out of the immediate Centralia/Chehalis area it is difficult to determine what the impacts are and how beneficial these things might be.

In the packet there is a one-page description of each project, including some that were not recommended. The description includes the benefits that might be provided to the Flood Authority, the relationship to other studies, and a potential cost and schedule. Some of the costs are very good numbers; others are best guess estimates for reserving funds.

These are the projects we would like to move forward and get under contract with someone. Some of these will come back to the Authority with a scope of work, a budget and an interlocal agreement, such as with the Puget Sound LiDAR consortium. Some are

with USGS and we could enter into an agreement with them. One is with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and may require an interlocal agreement.

The first project, the early warning system, comes out of the stream gauge study where we looked at where we have gauges, the quality of the gauges and data and where else do people think we need gauges and/or warning forecast points. The Department of Transportation would like gauges on creeks that flow into the Chehalis River to learn the timing on their flooding. We hope to implement whatever comes out of this study within this budget.

Chairman Averill stated one intention of the early warning program is to make sure there is greater cooperation and information passing from one emergency operation center to another as the flood crest moves downstream. Currently cooperation is not as good as it could be. In order for various jurisdictions to provide the warning to protect their citizens a system must be in place to work better for us. We will, in addition to looking at gauges and predicting what will happen, look to get that information out to the communities. The value of that is demonstrated between the 2007 and 2009 floods. In 2007 there was very little warning to the citizens and in 2009 there was four days warning.

Mr. Carlton stated that is the purpose of the study. There is a lot of institutional memory from the two floods but if we don't have another flood for ten years a lot of that institutional memory is gone and therefore we need to get it documented and get systems set up so we don't forget.

Mr. Schillinger had a concern that the project has not been fully scoped. Who is going to be involved to determine how the money will be spent.

Mr. Carlton stated the scoping will be flushed out with the Board Advisory Committee and the intent now is to hire a consultant to do this work. It is all preliminary at this point and final approval will be made by the Flood Authority.

Mr. Carlton skipped down to project #4 which is a basin-wide rainfall run-off model to determine where rain anywhere in the Basin impacts flooding throughout the Basin. This is such a large Basin that it may flood on the Wynoochee but not on the Newaukum. In order to develop this tool, items #2 and #3 must be implemented: collect more topographic data. We are building on what the LiDAR consortium has already done, which includes 80-90% of the flood plain. This would complete the rest of the Basin so there is continuous data of the same caliber throughout the watershed. We would like to extend the HEC-RAS model from FEMA all the way to Aberdeen which would enable us to better model the impacts of storage throughout the Basin.

Item #5: In partnership with the Chehalis Basin Partnership we would like to look at the storage options throughout the Basin. The CBP wants to look at it from a water quality summer low flow standpoint and we want to look at it from a storage standpoint. We may find a few sites where we may be able to do both at the same site which would make it more economical and more beneficial.

Item #6: The economic analysis of eco system services is something valuable to have when we go into the permit process and to understand the true benefits of any projects we might have. This is in cooperation with the Partnership which has almost \$1 million towards this project and we would contribute about \$75,000.

Item #7: There are several ideas of what could be done at the Skookumchuck Dam to improve its function both before and during flood events. One option would be an agreement with Puget Sound Energy for an interconnect to the dam generator which could then be used to draw the levels of the water down twice as fast as can be done currently. This work will be done with DOT as it has interest in this project also. We are not sure exactly what this project will entail but there is about \$25,000 set aside for this project.

Chairman Averill stated the Twin Cities project is known for the levees but that project also includes a component of water retention with the Skookumchuck Dam. The project we are working on could provide some alternatives as we progress forward and we will be working with the Corps.

Mr. Carlton referred to the budget on page 11 of the Ripe and Ready report. The second section shows the studies recommended. Some of the costs are accurate; some are estimates.

Mr. Schillinger thanked and complimented the sub committee and staff members who worked on this.

Mr. Carlton reminded the Authority that we cannot use Federal funds to cost share other federal funds.

Commissioner Willis stated there is a list of small projects, such as critter pads. She asked where those types of activities fall in the Flood Authority's work schedule.

Mr. Carlton stated some of those will be coming to the Flood Authority in the next month or two. Part of the presentation heard by Mark Stewart from Emergency Management was we are in a cycle for the hazard mitigation grant program from FEMA, which is primarily used for acquisition of flood-prone properties or elevations. It all comes with a local cost share and some communities are having a hard time coming up with that cost share. That might be something the Authority would want to reserve money for. Critter pads could be entirely funded or there could be a cost share.

Commissioner Willis stated those small projects the Authority must still work on as a group to decide whether we can actually fund them or how they fit in.

Chairman Averill stated there is recognition among all the members of the Authority that we are looking for some projects where we are making progress and doing something and not just studying. Under this emergency management system are some actual purchases

of gauges and work that is being done to make that system work better. A problem is the high cost of many projects and when we have finished our analysis of what needs to be done and where we want to put our priorities the next step is to find the money to actually complete the project. There is great resolve in the community and there is great support on the part of our Congressional delegation to help us get there.

9. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson briefly reviewed the expenditure report. Some of the nearly \$100,000 in expenditures went to Elway Research for the telephone survey which will be summarized later in this meeting. Mr. Johnson stated he has been in contact with OFM regarding the allocation of the \$2.4 million and it appears that this Flood Authority will be continuing through the next year at least, and the money has been re-appropriated if the Governor signs the re-appropriation. Lewis County will be working on an amendment to the agreement to set up a continuing budget.

10. Public Values Survey Final Report

Mr. Stuart Elway thanked the Authority for the opportunity to conduct this survey. The purpose of the survey was to look at what the public in the Basin values and its opinions of flood mitigation. The report is organized into four major sections: description of the respondent (demographics); description of the problem (causes of floods); response to potential mitigations (how do people see the problems and solutions); support for potential actions.

The voter precincts were used to formulate the boundaries and 600 people were interviewed by telephone on March 5-9. About 3 in 10 people know they live in the Basin. Mr. Elway believes this means some education is needed to help people understand what the Basin and the watershed is.

Mr. Elway summarized the results of the survey questions.

Mr. Swartout asked how this survey can be used by the Flood Authority.

Mr. Elway stated the survey is to show what the attitudinal terrain is. Any decisions that are made will need public support. The public is going to need to buy into this idea. The purpose of the survey is to bring to you the perspective of the people you represent and with whom you need to communicate. Mr. Elway believes communication is more about listening than talking. As you go through the full report there will be some guidance about how to communicate with the variety of individuals interviewed. The differences between upstream and downstream residents were not significantly different.

Any development of strategy must take into account your goals and objectives, your constraints and imperatives, and the attitudinal environment. The latter consists of ideas that other people have about what you are doing, which is what the survey has done.

Chairman Averill asked that the full report be made available to all the County Commissioners and to the Tribe.

11. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting will be May 21 at 1:30 P.M. Chairman Averill stated a couple of months back it was suggested that the meeting be held somewhere other than Lewis County. He stated that option is still open. The new seating pattern and the accessibility of recording equipment have determined if the meeting is in Lewis County it will be at the Courthouse. If the members wish to meet elsewhere this would be the time to propose that. There were no suggestions.

The chair stated there will be a work session on May 21 from 9:00 A.M. at the Veterans Memorial Museum. The BAC will be meeting April 17 and May 7.

Mr. White stated the Authority is behind in its elections and Chairman Averill stated this would go on the Agenda for May.

Mr. Schillinger stated page 9 of Mr. Elway's report states 85% of those interviewed would be willing to support limits on the amount of development in a flood plain and some would be willing to support prohibition on the flood plain. He would like each Flood Authority member to express his/her opinion at the next meeting.

Chairman Averill stated the BAC is working on a flood model with that type of information that can be discussed also.

Commissioner Willis stated the lower basin is more in favor of restrictions than the upper basin and she believes this is because the lower basin considers more of the development to be in the upper basin. She suggested the Authority members look at the full report to see the breakdown on that.

Mr. Carlton stated all the flood plain management ordinances and critical areas ordinances have been collected within the watershed and put into a table to see the similarities and differences. There are quite a few differences. We may need to get that information to the Authority again.

12. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:26 P.M.