

*NOTE: Corrections to the meeting notes are on pages 6 and 19 and are shown in bold Italics.*

**Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority  
Special Meeting  
Veterans Memorial Museum  
100 SW Veterans Way  
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**April 21, 2011 – 9:00 a.m.  
Meeting Notes**

**Board Members Present:** Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Vickie Raines, City of Montesano; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor Commissioner; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Julie Balmelli-Powe, City of Chehalis

**Board Members Absent:** Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda

**Consultants Present:** John Ghilarducci and Pam Bissonnette, FCS Group

**Others Present:** Please see sign in sheet

**Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from March 17 and March 31
- Expenditure Review
- Legislative Outreach – Flood Authority Study and Project Expenditures
- Levee and fill information from Larry Karpack
- Lewis County Fill and Grade Permits 2007 - 2011
- Chapter 15.35 Lewis County Code (Flood Damage Prevention)
- Chapter 14.38 Thurston County Code (Development in Flood Hazard Areas)
- Chehalis Watershed Cooperative Interlocal Agreement
- Responses to Comments re: March 31 ILA Draft

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. She stated the agenda would be revised: Mr. Karpack would present at 9:15 and Item 7 would be a discussion on the Watershed Cooperative. Commissioner Averill stated that the watershed agreement was not included in the packet as required by Flood Authority policy.

**1. Approval of Meeting Notes**

Chairman Willis asked if there were any corrections or additions to the meeting notes from the business meeting on March 17, 2011. There were none and the notes were approved by consensus.

The Chair asked if there were corrections or additions to the meeting notes from the special meeting on March 31. Commissioner Valenzuela thanked Ms. Anderson for very thorough notes. There were no changes and the notes were approved by consensus.

The meeting notes from the work session on March 17 were also approved by consensus.

## **2. Expenditure Review**

Mr. Bob Johnson stated there is \$402,993.97 in unencumbered funds. The third column shows \$52,000 spent on governance, studies and the early warning system, or \$132,882.27 for the period.

Commissioner Averill stated the \$2.5 million funding for the Flood Authority came out of the 2008 legislature with the purpose of establishing money to pursue flood mitigation measures. These budgets are subject to the whim of the legislature and when we came through last year's legislation there was a reauthorization. All the money then goes back into the pot to be reallocated. The capital budget at this point is now in negotiations and sections 1050 and 1051 of the House and Senate Bills respectively will deal with funding for the current body or successor body.

Ms. Fund asked if FCS funding is also included in the governance column. Mr. Johnson stated it is; all studies include the consultants' fees.

Ms. Fund asked how much money is left in the FCS contract. Mr. Johnson stated he did not know. Mr. Ghilarducci did not know, either; the total contract was for \$400,000 and he said he would get that information.

Ms. Fund stated she was thinking of the next steps for the Flood Authority. It appears that FCS work has stopped because the legislation has stopped. The bill to form the regional Flood Control Zone District (FCZD) died in committee.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated that does not mean the Flood Authority's work has stopped. Ms. Fund asked what it will mean for what FCS can do for the Flood Authority.

Mr. Cook stated he understood that FCS was working on the formation of the FCZD and that the bill relates to that but each county would create its own FCZD. His mayor voiced an opinion against that as well as other mayors in his county. If it is an exercise in futility, why bother?

Ms. Powe stated there is a trust issue and it seems to have gotten worse. If we can't resolve it we can't go forward. She made a motion that the FCS contract should be dissolved until the Flood Authority could come to an agreement.

Mr. Mackey stated motions should be taken during the business meeting but this is an official meeting of the authority and the board can do it as it pleases.

Commissioner Valenzuela pointed out that this group can move forward in the absence of legislation allowing for a multi-county FCZD. There are different points of view as to how we move forward.

Mr. Thompson stated there is a motion to dissolve the contract with FCS if the trust issues cannot be worked out. If this is the case how are we going to know if we solve the trust issue?

Ms. Raines stated at the last meeting the Board asked for the trust issue to be put on the agenda for today's meeting. If we can't come to a resolution when we leave here the contract with FCS will then be dissolved.

After discussion, Ms. Powe withdrew her motion.

### **3. Legislative Outreach**

A Flood Authority study and project expenditure report was put together to ensure that Mr. Keith Phillips had the information he needed for the budget. The multi FCZD did not make it out of the Ways and Means Committee. The bill can be brought back next session. The majority says the first substitute bill is due to pass for a second reading on April 13. The substitute bill adds \$1.32 million of appropriations provided for the Flood Authority or other local districts. That is in both the House and Senate.

Commissioner Averill made a motion to recess the business meeting. Ms. Lee seconded. There was no objection and the motion passed.

The business meeting was recessed at 9:30 a.m.

## **WORK SESSION**

### **5. Discussion of Floodplain Development**

Mr. Larry Karpack stated he was formerly with NW Hydraulic Consultants and is currently with Watershed Science and Engineering. While he was at NW Hydraulic Consultants (NHC) he oversaw work for the Lewis County PUD to evaluate the effects of storage facilities which involved hydraulic modeling in the upper basin. Work done at NHC showed that dams upstream could reduce water levels but would not reduce them enough to not overtop the airport levee which could lead to flooding on I-5. He noted that everything he speaks to so far is at the existing levee. The levee is not built at 100 year flood level.

Mr. Muller had asked Mr. Karpack to look at the model and evaluate raising the airport levee. Mr. Karpack artificially raised the levee and looked at the impacts of flood locations at various levels with that situation. He looked at three locations: along the levee, at Mellen Street and at Grand Mound. At those three locations, depending on the hydraulic scenarios, along the levee was a .3 to .6 foot rise; Mellen Street was about .11 of a foot and at Grand Mound about .07 of a foot. The effect of raising the levee would be about the same as filling the floodplain. That has the potential of cutting off conveyance (backwater that goes upstream) and it could reduce the tenation of flows, or reducing storage of flood waters to increase flow downstream. The model used, an unsteady model, has the ability to look at both impacts upstream and downstream.

Mr. Karpack looked at the model to look at quantities of fill in the model or quantity of water displaced. In the baseline model for the 2007 event, without dams in place, the area around the storage area of the airport (inside the airport levee to I-5) contained 4800 acre feet of water. The area is about 400 acres, at 10 to 12 feet [deep] in that area. In general from that point upstream to Doty and Boistfort during that event there was 143,000 acre feet of storage in the model. To the extent that the model is not perfect, that is how much water was stored in the flood plain. 3% of storage is being taken away by raising the levee. Looking at retention facilities, the upper Chehalis facility has 80,000 acre feet of storage and would have decreased the water level by 3.11 feet at Mellen Street during the 2007 flood. Looking at upstream storage there was a 3' drop in storage. Putting the levee in would result in a rise of 3/10 of a foot.

In answer to a question, Mr. Karpack stated the levee was artificially raised 20 feet. It would have to be higher than the water levels were with the levee model.

Mr. Cook stated the conditions of the levees are not at a specific grade and asked how much variation there was. He also asked if the 100 year flood is at a fixed elevation.

Mr. Karpack stated the levees are not at a fixed height; they are on slopes with highs and lows. There are a couple of low spots in the levee so with the dams where we saw overtopping we did not see uniform overtopping. There was only overtopping at three or four locations, not what was seen in 2007 where most of the levee was over-topped. The 2007 hydrology and 100 year hydrology was used; some work was done before the FEMA work was done and the design was raised arbitrarily.

Commissioner Averill spoke to the fill behind the levee and stated it creates storage. He asked if Mr. Karpack considered fill. Mr. Karpack stated all models were from topography information; he does not have first-hand knowledge of data of topography. Generally buildings are not considered to be fill because buildings do not keep water out.

Chairman Willis stated the last fill was in 2003 so 1998 would not show the last fill. Mr. Karpack stated it would not show in the baseline model. Raising the levee is irrelevant to what is inside the levee. The baseline date model was taken from the 2002 LiDAR model. He used the existing location of the levee and an arbitrary measurement.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked how storage in the flood plain was measured. Mr. Karpack stated a baseline model is set up of cross sections across the river, generally where the river is flowing downstream, the storage and ponding areas. The airport was modeled as storage. The 142,000 acre feet include storage in all reaches and in all storage areas in the model. All cross sections would have been developed for the baseline model in the same way. The model was built off the topography to best reflect the topography. We went back to the model we ran for the 2007 flood to see how much water was stored in cross sections and storage areas.

Ms. Powe asked if the levees were removed would we gain the depths of the water or would it drop by an equal amount. Mr. Karpack stated no, the area fills with water in the model. If it is lowered, it will drop back down to the base line.

Ms. Powe stated the water levels of the 2007 flood would not be reduced if the levee comes out. Mr. Karpack stated no significant storage would be gained.

Ms. Mary Toole asked if the levee is built so it cannot be overtopped what happens to the water. Does it stay upriver? Mr. Karpack stated it goes both up and down river. By raising the levee there would be a 6/10 rise from the airport levee to the opposite side of the flood plain. The flood plain will store some water; more flow will go down stream. [In the model] storage has been taken away so more water goes downstream. At the peak of the 2007 event, had the levee been raised, it would be 6/10 of a foot higher at peak.

Ms. Toole stated in regards to Mellen Street, if a large volume of water comes down and is narrowed, there will be more back-up. If you cut the width of where the flood plain is the water will back up. Mr.

Karpack stated Ms. Toole is describing what is seen in the model. Mellen Street is a constriction and water will back up.

Ms. Powe asked if most of that water would have dispersed upstream because of the Mellen St. Bridge. Mr. Karpack stated at the airport there would be a 6/10 increase and the water would continue to go upstream for some distance; downstream you would see a rise of 2/10 of a foot and more storage. Downstream affect is due to loss of storage upstream. The model accounts for loss of storage and loss of conveyance (or where water would normally flow).

Mr. Fred Chapman stated after the 1996 flood there was a study done at Mellen St. If that restriction was removed it would take 3.2 feet from backwater affect and send water downstream to impact Galvin. The 3.2 feet would allow a project in place to be effective. In 2007 as levels increased there was 17 minutes of storage behind the airport levee. A major portion of that water was backed up into the Newaukum River. When you are talking about that much volume the model that is currently running has a degree of error of 16,000 cubic feet per second. At mile post 28 the blockage was inventoried and there was over 16,000 cubic feet per second stored behind the blockage. When the blockage blew that is what impacted the bridge, railroad, state park and other places. All of that was an accelerated flow; the terrain has not changed. A 1" or 6" increase is not anywhere near 16,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). The difference between 1998 and 2007 was only 6" at Grand Mound and 6" according to FEMA is a 500 year event. The numbers talked about are less than the margin of error that we are trying to work from.

Ms. Laura Gray asked how he defined the model limits of the upper watershed.

Mr. Karpack stated he was not involved with the FEMA study when he was at NHC. He believes the model came from the Corps and was built by PIE and he does not know why they stopped where they did. In a flood study you take the model to where there is significant concern. Ms. Gray asked if he used an artificial boundary, such as a county line. Mr. Karpack stated yes, in the south fork you see significant storage where the model started. If we wanted to capture storage in that part of the stem we should have gone farther upstream but the gages capture storage.

Mr. Treichler asked about the estimate of margin of error. Mr. Chapman stated USGS studies the topography and uses extreme high water volume. That was 16,200 cfs and there is a 15% margin of error. NHC is using that in the model and using 39,300 as the steady flow. The difference is in 1996 it was 27,000 cfs.

Mr. Karpak stated he didn't know the connection between the range and error in the model. He used available data and tried to calibrate it to observations to high water marks. The better high flows there are the better the model. In 1996 and 2007 the high water marks were collected and the model is well calibrated to the 2007 flood. Further upstream the gauges are problematic in that event due to sediment.

Mr. Treichler stated most modeling has margin of error. He asked how significant the results are. Mr. Karpack stated he did not want to mislead anyone in thinking the model is perfect. Hydrology is much more than hydraulics and the model we are using does not have as much hydrology information. In 1996 the flooding was more basin-wide; in 2007 it was more concentrated. We try to have high water marks calibrated to within ½ foot. We had 25 high water marks and calibrated the model to those. If we were within ½ foot of those and the results say the level went up ½ foot you can't argue that there

would be an impact. As we look at alternatives, such as raising the levee, we don't have data to calibrate with or without the levee. These are relative numbers; in terms of absolute values they are good because of the two large floods used to calibrate the model. In this model there is a fair bit more accuracy than with other conditions where there was a 5-year flood and you are trying to establish a 100 year flood.

Chairman Willis asked if someone else used the same model would they get the same result. Mr. Karpack stated yes, the results would be the same.

An unidentified speaker asked about other fill in the flood plain going back west of Adna. If each one is incremental one could argue that the airport alone is not significant but part of the whole progression. Mr. Karpack did not argue significance or non-significance. Taking away flood plain storage has the same affect: it causes backwater upstream and increased flows downstream. If the baseline model was built with fill at that time there would be differences. Mr. Karpack stated his job was to determine the impact of water levels to raise that levee to prevent I-5 from flooding; what would it take to prevent I-5 from flooding and what would the secondary impact be.

Mr. Swartout asked if an assumption was made that the buildings behind the levee would not displace water, or if any of those buildings are flood proof.

Mr. Karpack stated he did not know. In 2007 those building were relatively insignificant. That is a common model process. If buildings have been flood proofed they would be considered additional fill but in the greater landscape the buildings are a small percentage of land mass.

Ms. Toole stated when she saw the model it gave an idea of what the result would be by putting dirt or a bridge somewhere and the affect it would have all over. She did not think the Corps is going far enough up river with their plans. The 2007 flood backed water up for 8 to 10 miles. Modeling gives an idea of what would happen.

Mr. Vander Stoep stated the area behind the airport levee is 385 acres, and 70 acres are filled. Mr. Karpack stated it is not linear; it is reasonable to say that loss of less than the full storage has to have full impact downstream. Mr. Vander Stoep asked the estimate of measureable impact at Grays Harbor. Mr. Karpack stated the model is only refined to the Lewis County line. It goes as far as Porter but that area was not part of the flood study. As you get further away you will see less impact but the tributaries coming in will have an impact. Mr. Karpack stated he did not know the actual level at Grand Mound.

***Mr. Vander Stoep stated that Mr. Karpack's model estimates that filling the entire area behind the airport levee would increase the peak flow at Grand Mound by 1.2 inches in a 2007 size flood. Mr. Vander Stoep asked him that since his model assumes that the entire 385 acres behind the levee was filled when in fact only 70 acres are filled, is it safe to assume that the actual impact of fill at the airport in the 2007 flood was significantly less than an inch and he said "yes."***

Mr. Johnson stated even though fill has a visual impact it is only the fill below the base flood that displaces water. Everything above flood water has no effect on storage. Mr. Karpack stated that is correct; that is why things are built on stilts in some places.

Chairman Willis asked if there is data out there to run a model from the last century. Mr. Karpack stated there are older topographic maps but the complexity comes in with how the river has changed; the addition of new bridges, and elevations of the river channel. It could be done but it would be complicated and fraught with assumptions.

Chairman Willis thanked Mr. Karpack for his information.

Ms. Powe stated Mr. Karpack's information was invaluable. She made a motion to reimburse him for his time if no other agreement was made. Mr. Johnson stated a motion could not be made during the work session. Ms. Powe withdrew her motion.

Mr. Cook wished to acknowledge that Mr. White, Dr. Secena and Mr. Connolly from the Chehalis Tribe had arrived at the meeting.

## **6. Break**

The group took a break at 10:30, reconvening at 10:57.

## **7. Discussion of Trust**

Commissioner Averill stated at the last meeting he asked to have an opportunity to respond to the accusations of what Lewis County is doing for flood mitigation. He asked Mr. Fred Chapman to speak to this issue. Mr. Chapman manages the Cowlitz and Chehalis River for Lewis County.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if this is about development in the flood plan regardless if it is city or county. Commissioner Averill stated Mr. Chapman did not include Centralia or Chehalis, although he has information about development there. Up until 2006 the county managed UGAs but they had not been annexed. Winlock, Chehalis, Centralia or Napavine are not managed by Lewis County.

Ms. Fund introduced Mr. Emil Pierson from Centralia and Mr. Bob Nacht from Chehalis in case there are questions. Both gentlemen are the Community Development directors for their respective cities.

Mr. Chapman stated he started with Lewis County in 1999. At that time Lewis County was a 9 in the Community Rating System (CRS) and it is now a 7. He explained the CRS stating the lower the classification the lower the insurance rates for homeowners.

Mr. Chapman explained the Flood Hazard Management Plans (FHMP) for the counties and how they are different and similar, as well as each county's critical areas ordinance.

Mr. Johnson stated that Thurston County and Lewis County's development regulations are modeled after the same federal standards and while there are a few slight inconsistencies, mostly they are the same. Mr. Chapman stated Lewis County's regulations are more restrictive for substantial damage received; however Grays Harbor County's regulations are more restrictive for life of homes and credit points are given for these. Mr. Swartout explained in Thurston County this information is inter-departmental and it will be a few months before he has information from the other departments.

Mr. Chapman stated Lewis County has two major river systems. In 2006 the Cowlitz flooded and it exceeded the 1996 record by 2.6 feet. After that event the County started a process to capture high water data. In the Chehalis Basin there were areas not in the mapped flood plain. Thurston County

records to the flood of record; Lewis County goes to greatest height and surveys that data in. Lewis County discussed mapping the Cowlitz because the river system is so volatile and changes very fast. A channel migration study was done and that data was used to map out areas influenced by the braded river system. A big problem was bed loading – a lot of sediment that caused the river system to move back and forth, creating two systems. The lower systems are more meandering and there are flood plain areas. The dog legs reach about 2300 feet in length and then terminate themselves and start in another direction.

In 1933 there was discussion about flooding problems and how to prevent flooding. Since then I-5 was created and the Mellen St. Bridge. Since 2007 Lewis County has issued fill and grade permits, about 63,000 cubic yards, some of that at Trans Alta, and 10,000 cubic yards at Johnson Creek. The county tracks all fill and grade activities that exceed more than 50 cubic yards. Commissioner Averill stated of that 63,000 cubic yards about 20,000 is in the Cowlitz Basin, not in the Chehalis Basin.

Mr. Chapman stated 12,000 cubic feet is through Public Works for bridges, etc. This volume of fill would represent about 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the fill that went into the Long Road dike which was built by the Corps. The County does develop in the flood plain but it is permitted and mitigated.

Mr. Johnson stated after time damages and impacts [of flooding] are forgotten. People are less likely to do something about it as time goes by. In 1996 nothing got done; communities could not agree to do something together. He hoped the Flood Authority was on the right track and he hoped it could support a project that was worthwhile.

Mr. Johnson suggested thinking about restrictions, where the blockages are that slow down the water and cause the most impact and address those from the bottom up. If you address these from the top down people downstream suffer. The money available now is a one-time shot; you won't see it again.

Mr. Chapman presented a slide show of flooding in several areas in the Basin. He stated all development in the flood plain in Lewis County is consistent and legal under FEMA and other regulatory guidelines. Fill can take place and benefit an area and flood plain development is an economic engine for all of us.

Mr. Pierson stated the City of Centralia has the most stringent of regulations and is currently going through recertification. Centralia has gone above everyone else to limit development. Over 60% of the community is in the flood plain and with the new FEMA maps that will increase. Centralia has done a good job of protecting those areas.

Mr. Chapman distributed a handout that showed amounts of fill since 2007. Commissioner Averill stated while Lewis County has a history of filling in the flood plain, it has been greatly reduced since 2007. He laid out maps on the back tables that illustrate the flood plain in the I-5 corridor. He recognized that there are a lot of buildings, commercial, industrial and residential that are in the flood plain and noted that the building has been going on since 1843. The flooding issue was exacerbated by I-5 and the railroad and because people tend to build around those. Most buildings are in the flood plain but not on fill. Because of the nature of the river, flood plains extend naturally. One area that gets more attention is the area behind the airport dike. This was filled in behind the levee and built to 100 year standards but when the rivers cannot be dredged silt builds up and the original certification of the levee changes. That was the purpose of the Twin Cities project: restore existing levees to 100-year



protection, plus additional water retention at the Skookumchuck Dam that would provide protection. Fill behind the levee has had minimum impact or changing impact on the existing flood plain because the water has to go over the dike first and the dike is pushing that back.

Commissioner Averill provided pictures of the upper basin and stated historically there has been relatively little damage in the upper basin. In 2007 damage was extensive. Lewis County lost 3 bridges on Highway 6, and a total of 7 bridges in West County; miles and miles of roads were damaged; farms overrun and many cattle were lost to flood waters. Looking at the basin in 1948 and then in 2006 shows more trees and less building in the upper basin in 2006. People who tell us that we are building in the flood plain are mischaracterizing what we are doing. We have done little building and little filling. We are trying to protect what we have because it would cost billions to buy out buildings and restore the river; and, if we did that we would hurt Thurston County and the Tribe.

Mr. Vince Panesko spoke to the agricultural land case against Lewis County. In 2000 Lewis County had 130,000 of ag land and wanted 10,000 acres zoned ag. The case went to the Supreme Court and there is now 90,000 acres zoned ag, 40,000 acres unprotected and 2,000 acres in the flood plain.

Mr. Panesko went on to say that in 2000 from Thurston County to Mellen Street all the land in that section was zoned ag and in 2002 it was turned around to RDD-10 and RDD-20 which remains today. 800 acres is in Lewis County and Centralia expanded its UGA and the treatment plant there is on fill. The table of fill for Lewis County is misleading because it does not include Centralia and Chehalis. The Ticknor farm was zoned ag in 2002 and it is in the flood plain. Centralia bought that land and the land associated with it in Thurston County and zoned it ag in Thurston County and RDD in Lewis County. They are not allowing fill but their zoning does allow development. Thurston County has ag land zoned ag along the river to protect it. Lewis County has allowed development there. It is now zoned for development and he wanted to know what Centralia's plan is.

Mr. Pierson stated it is not in Centralia's UGA and based on new laws it never will be. Chairman Willis asked if that means that it can't be developed into something bigger. Mr. Pierson stated that was correct. He wrote the CAO, looked at wetlands, etc., and the template came from Thurston County. The flood plain overlay does not allow development at all and zero fill.

Commissioner Averill stated Mr. Panesko has made this claim before. For clarification: rural development districts by GMA include farms as a use. Just because it is RDD does not take out the farm. For the County's planning for ARL of long term commercial significance the average farm is about 49 acres and few of those are commercial. Only 10% draw more than \$10,000 a year off of the farms and that is not commercial. Mr. Panesko argues that someone making \$10,000 has a commercial farm. GMA and Lewis County have worked out that difference and we show 97,000 acres of ARL of long term commercial significance but that does not mean agricultural land in the RDD is not being protected under the open space agricultural tax rules.

Mr. White stated building in the flood plain hurts everything so why is building in the flood plain allowed. He asked if it is for economic development.

Mr. Johnson stated people have a right to do something on their property; the county or cities cannot afford to pay them for their property.

Mr. Chapman stated the county has been aggressive. The flood event in Packwood this year caused about \$800,000 in damages to infrastructure and roads and there were zero private claims. The county has eliminated high risk properties and condemned some of them.

Mr. White stated that Lewis County has improved tremendously and Centralia has done more, but if someone wanted to come in tomorrow and fill in 25 acres to build a Lowe's are you going to allow it?

Mr. Pierson stated in Centralia if someone brings in 300,000 yards of dirt it has to be removed from someplace else. If the property is zoned, all the requirements have to be met. Chances are they won't make it through the permitting process.

Mr. White stated rules can be changed. Things have gotten better but we must get to the point where we say no. When the Tribe put the gas station in it was put in the wrong place; they won't do it again. Let the feds and the FEMA maps say you can't build any more – it takes the weight off your backs.

Ms. Powe stated we are not finding a solution for the people who want to develop but for the people who live in the flood plain. Now the Tribe knows the gas station is in a bad place so you will work around it. The majority of the people were here and they need to be protected.

There was more discussion on peoples' rights and how to address development. Ms. Fund asked what success would look like. We have made progress and the constituents see we are responding. Have we moved from "people causing problems in Lewis County" to "look at what Lewis County has done?" Have we reached that point?

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:07.

### **Afternoon Session – 1:30 p.m.**

#### **9. Discussion of Agreement**

Chairman Willis asked if the topics [of trust] were covered earlier.

Ms. Raines stated at the last meeting she brought up the division between the group and she did not see a lot accomplished at that meeting. She asked Chairman Willis to respond to the Chehalis Watershed agreement that was approved by Thurston County, the Tribe and Grays Harbor County. Ms. Raines was informed by a county employee that the Grays Harbor Commissioners were made aware of the document last Friday and asked not to discuss it. She does not know if the open public meeting act was followed and she understood that the facilitator was asked not to discuss it but prepare it for today's meeting. Reviewing the mission statement and the reason Mayor Schillinger asked Ms. Raines to represent the City of Montesano, was to come to resolve problems and provide a basin-wide solution that helps property owners in all counties and the Tribe. She asked how we can move forward with that and she wanted to know if the statement about secrecy was accurate and how this document helps achieve the solution.

Chairman Willis distributed the document to the Board and assured everyone that proper protocol was followed. In Grays Harbor County there was a request to review the draft and provide feedback. A public meeting was held Wednesday morning which was advertised. The meeting lasted an hour and a half and the agreement was gone over and there was discussion on how to help move this organization

forward and get actual projects on the river. The document was approved, signed by two Grays Harbor commissioners. One abstained because he did not feel he had enough information to vote on it.

Ms. Raines asked if Mr. Mackey was asked to prepare the document. Chairman Willis stated she was not sure Mr. Mackey was in the loop – the document was worked on by Grays Harbor and Thurston County staff. Chairman Willis worked with Ms. Bissonnette at no cost to the Flood Authority. Ms. Bissonnette was asked to look at other ILAs and provide a more watered-down version.

Ms. Raines stated the mayors met last week and six of the nine mayors were in attendance, Westport included, and Randy Lewis stated they did not speak to Commissioner Willis. They have a resolution against a FCZD in the County and a multi-county FCZD. Ms. Raines wants to be supportive and not work behinds closed doors.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the Interlocal was a product of the willing and the motivated. It seemed like we were not coming to a way to move forward after the meeting on the 31<sup>st</sup>. An ILA only takes two parties and we talked between ourselves to see who the signatories would be. These are the willing. She is positive about this – it clarifies issues we stumbled over on the 31<sup>st</sup> and she sees it as a way to move forward. There is a way for additional counties to join and it was this group's vision that Lewis County would sign it.

Chairman Willis stated this agreement could not go forward until there was a document that was usable. There was no workable agreement before. At the last meeting there was discussion of not doing something after July 1. We asked for the money and the continuation of the Flood Authority and the legislature was for spending the money on fisheries, etc., as well as going on with the Flood Authority. The ILA was dismissed by some members; it was too cumbersome, there were too many details, but for an agreement with this size watershed it needs to be re-written to something simpler.

Commissioner Averill stated he had never seen anything so blatant and arrogant by one group that tried to take over the authorities of not only the Flood Authority but the Chehalis Basin Partnership as well. This is a perfidy of Machiavellian proportions! You are saying that you are creating a document for Lewis County to join and Lewis County has to accept this document that you wrote in order to get in. You are excluding cities and saying they are the advisory committee and that is not inclusive. We were going to have a discussion on trust. There is no trust.

Chairman Willis stated she disagreed that the cities were excluded. This document put in an advisory board for equal opportunity for all cities to participate. Commissioner Averill asked who gets to vote. Chairman Willis stated a smaller group gets to vote on it; there are other people who would like to vote such as the agricultural or business communities. If you pull one city out and allow one mayor to sit and have a bigger vote, such as ag, that is unfair also. They may have a bigger part at the table; it gives them a voice.

Commissioner Averill stated they were not invited to the conversation. The document says you cannot join unless you accept all of this agreement.

Ms. Powe stated there is talk about an advisory committee but people voting don't have to listen to the advisory committee. They can vote as they want. Your mayors advised you that they did not want this so you did not include them.

Chairman Willis asked if Ms. Powe was talking about the FCZD or the ILA. The mayors did approve water retention and putting the two GIs together; there was no conversation to advise against that.

Ms. Raines stated that was because the mayors did not know it existed. She was embarrassed about this. She thought the group could discuss issues and things could be repaired; now she does not think so. The City of Cosmopolis is interested in decisions that are made about the community.

Ms. Fund asked what the urgency was in moving this forward and why this new group decided to leave the Flood Authority to do this.

Chairman Willis stated the Tribe had stepped away from the table and the need to do this and create a mechanism to move forward was based on the last meeting. Comments were made that we either set ourselves up for a full year or three years and creating the next organization to carry forward was not happening. This was an attempt to come up with the organization to move forward with the studies and look at the whole basin.

Ms. Fund stated that we learned the Flood Authority did not have to go away, that it is still an option for us. She asked what Chairman Willis' reaction would be if the seven cities decided to put an agreement together.

Chairman Willis stated the Flood Authority stepped up to what the July 1 date meant. Part of the room was saying that date needed to be met and others said the date could come and go. July 1 does have merit and the legislators are asking us to do something by that date. You have the opportunity to create the mechanism that the state asks for.

Ms. Fund asked if this action built trust for us to move forward. She remembered when Mr. Phillips talked about the noise in the background; this is way beyond noise. What will [the state] think when they look for Lewis County and the cities. This verifies that there is a lot of noise in the background. This hurts the ability to put together an entity and a basin-wide solution.

Chairman Willis stated the business world does business without knowing who they can trust; therefore there are contracts. This group needed a good ILA as to who the players are and how to move forward. The trust issue is a feel good thing but when it comes to the actual business we can address that in an ILA.

Commissioner Averill stated when an RCW is written, a law is written. A capital budget improves a budget plan which may have strings. That was done in last year's legislation; this year's legislation, section 1050 states that \$3.2 million of this appropriation is solely for the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority. There can be a change since this is in the budget language, not the RCW. The new legislation is not finished; they agree the money is for the Chehalis Basin Flood Authority.

Ms. Powe stated there are 10 members on the Flood Authority. She does not feel that a three-party agreement should take the place of the Flood Authority. She wanted to make a motion that the Flood Authority should be able to vote on what takes its place.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated there were a lot of surprises at the last meeting. Lewis County asserted that it was up to Grays Harbor County to set people straight in Grays Harbor County regarding matters in Lewis County. Also, the Flood Authority was not going away as of June 30 like we thought. We did not learn that was the case; we heard people assert that and she does not agree with that assertion. We understood something else would happen on July 1, otherwise what was the point of the ILA.

The other surprise: our consultant went around to all the jurisdictions to hear comments, made the changes, and we thought we would put the final touches on the draft and then we heard all the other surprises. This is a trimmed down version of what we talked about, including why we are doing an ILA.

Ms. Fund stated it was a surprise talking about forming a FCZD and the ILA was to control Lewis County. When someone says something incorrectly about a Flood Authority member and it is not corrected that takes away the team. Mr. Carter looked at the ILA and said the Flood Authority could go on; Ms. Fund believes that is valid. She finds it hard to believe that drafting this document is a way to build teamwork and move along to solving flood issues, that this is a good process – blindsiding someone, no courtesy calls.

Chairman Willis stated she expected a reaction. This group has been together since 2008. At last month's meeting a lot of work got derailed. Grays Harbor County's workshop was a time for its constituents to talk about their issues. She stated it is her responsibility to get something done by the date we said we would get it done. The invitation for Lewis County to work with this new group is what she hoped for. This is the ability to do something and she hopes it inspires the Flood Authority to do something.

Mr. Cook noted that the document does not say "draft". He stated the Flood Authority was put together by 11 jurisdictions and the general feeling of all those people was to work together to get something done; they were tired of studying. He agreed. Since its inception the chair has been a county commissioner, even though the counties and the Tribe were in the minority we tried to work on basin-wide solutions. This document is not in keeping with openness and transparency.

Commissioner Averill stated had you really been concerned about where we were going, even as you understood the budget directions from last year, it would have been better to present this document as a draft as a point of discussion so some of us could challenge the content rather than provide a complete document and conditions to which we have to agree.

Chairman Willis stated the Flood Authority could not get through the last ILA. To go out and do it this way was a hard act because it is without the boundaries that were talked about and the reaction is: the Flood Authority is not doing what it should and there are capabilities by others to do this.

Ms. Raines stated she understands Ms. Fund's conception of the control issue and she understands Chairman Willis' perspective. Ms. Raines' surprise was the ability for the commissioners to form an ILA without any input from the cities. If that is possible, why are the cities here? We were told the cities were to be part of this and then we learn about this. Ms. Raines believes that most of the cities would like to work together to come to a decision.

Ms. Lee asked why the members of the Flood Authority were not given some notice that this meeting [with the Tribe, Thurston County and Grays Harbor County] was being held. If we wanted to attend we would have.

Chairman Willis stated there was no collective meeting of these jurisdictions. This is an interlocal agreement that anyone can go into. The draft was made up and signed at a regular commissioner's meeting. It was worked on by several people and by the signatories and it was based on the original ILA. There was no collective meeting. It went through regular meetings or special meetings to either approve or disapprove.

Ms. Lee asked if there were phone calls or e-mails. Chairman Willis stated there were several e-mails regarding spelling, etc. Ms. Lee stated the purpose of the Flood Authority, the eleven who have been together, was to straighten out our problems in the Basin. She asked why the Tribe, Grays Harbor County and Thurston County think that they can collectively do what the eleven cannot do. Chairman Willis stated the indicator was that we would not get to an ILA within the Flood Authority before July 1 because we were not going down that path at the last meeting.

Ms. Powe stated she did not buy that explanation. Chairman Willis stated this new group is a party of the willing. Ms. Powe thinks everyone is willing. You were the party who agreed with your approach – you know better so you go with your own approach. We ended [the last meeting] with a discussion on trust and this was done behind our backs. Who wrote this? Who are the people who put this together? Chairman Willis stated the original draft came from Ms. Bissonnette after a conversation about what Chairman Willis thought was a better idea. That draft went through Commissioner Willis' staff, Commissioner Valenzuela and her staff and the Tribe. The original never went anywhere else.

Ms. Powe stated you decided to leave out the cities.

Chairman Willis stated we would have a strong advisory board including cities, even cities that have been left out, to have an equal voice, as well as the agricultural community and others involved in the flood plain.

Ms. Powe stated Chairman Willis was told how city representation is and how the cities didn't feel being on an advisory committee was enough. Ms. Powe did not think everyone should have to agree with the paper.

Ms. Lee stated she understood that Ms. Bissonnette is under contract with the Flood Authority and asked if that is not where her loyalty should lie. Chairman Willis stated Ms. Bissonnette did this on her own time, outside of the contract with the Flood Authority. She has other contracts out there; she is not obligated to only the Flood Authority.

Ms. Bissonnette stated she was asked to take the last ILA and strip it down to something simpler. She took comments from Mr. Carter, regarding bonding and allocation, and it only took a couple of hours and there was no charge. The directive did not come out of the last meeting so it had to be free. It was to start with the original ILA and Ms. Bissonnette stated she read it for the first time today. It evolved after she stripped it down and she did not feel comfortable with what the Flood Authority would want but hoped something good would come out of it.

Chairman Willis stated the Flood Authority lost the Tribe and the Tribe was specific as to why it could not work with us. The good thing is that we were able to build a document that reassured them that we would look at things more in their perspective than what we had been conveying over the last months. The ILA has been worked on since last fall and during that course we lost the Tribe. We have created something that they felt comfortable with; this is something that could be agreed to and people went out of their way to make it happen.

Mr. Thompson stated the Tribe chose to leave the Flood Authority for reasons we all understood. They had the same vote as the rest of us and none of the rest of us walked away. One bad meeting does not mean you throw the whole thing out.

Mr. White stated the Tribe left the Flood Authority because it was tasked with basin-wide solutions. The Flood Authority has never looked at anything other than dams as a solution – no discussion, no study. It built something that is threatening the Tribe's culture and way of life. The Tribe is not giving up its sovereignty and when the Flood Authority starts looking at other solutions the Tribe will come back to the table. The Tribe signed this document because it states other ideas will be looked at – the citizens have other ideas and we need to listen to other people. All ideas deserve to be talked about for five minutes.

Ms. Powe agreed with Mr. White to look at every possible solution. She asked if the Tribe had suggested something. The Flood Hazard Management Plan has a list of projects to see if a combination would create a solution. No one has offered suggestions. The public has given a lot of good ideas but we need to stop fighting over regulations that are not working. Give us some suggestions.

Commissioner Averill stated the Flood Authority is a mitigation group, not a group to do what the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) is doing. This document refers to you being responsible for doing the watershed management plan and that is the purpose of the CBP. The documentation, by RCW, explains things that need to take place for watershed management. Agreements must include all counties within the WRIA and must include the largest city in the WRIA and any public utility which is drawing the largest amount of water in the WRIA. None of these are part of this document.

Ms. Lee commented on Mr. White's statement. We have not come up with a viable solution. She brought up dredging as a possible solution and it was never discussed. There have been different ideas brought out and she thinks there are other options out there. Maybe we should go through the list again and get information, get the science that we need to make decisions. Our public is who we represent and she did not think that three can do what eleven cannot. It is not just our thoughts; we have to consider their thoughts and a lot of people have good ideas that we need to look at.

Ms. Fund stated the Flood Hazard Management Plan identifies alternatives. We should go through this to see what projects can go forward and what can be taken off. The mission statement says the Flood Authority is to study and analyze flood control projects to protect the Chehalis River Basin.

Ms. Lee stated dams are only one part of this to see if they are feasible. No one has said that is the only thing we want.

Chairman Willis stated a list and moving forward is a good idea but the first task is to form an ILA to move us forward to the next entity. That was the task at hand since last fall. Until we take care of that working on the projects will be tougher to do.

Mr. Cook stated early in the formation of the Flood Authority there was concern of how to handle the business – by 2/3 majority or consensus. By doing this with three members we don't meet the minimum for voting. Ms. Bissonnette worked on this on her own time and it was based on a document created for the Flood Authority. We are not even close to a consensus with this document.

Ms. Powe stated we understood that the Flood Authority did not have to go away; we did not have to leap to this new document. Let's base decisions on facts and science. We don't have the decision yet from Anchor. We can't condemn a dam until we get the facts.

Chairman Willis stated she spoke with Mr. Phillips regarding funding and the July 1 date. He could not guarantee that July 1 was a completion date. His impression was that there would be consequences to missing the date.

Ms. Powe reminded Chairman Willis that the Flood Authority asked to be informed of conversations with the state or consultants. The Flood Authority should have known what he said; Chairman Willis made a hasty decision without the Flood Authority knowing.

Ms. Bonnie Canaday asked if Mr. Phillips had seen the document. Chairman Willis stated it had been given to the governor and Mr. Phillips wants to talk about it with other people.

Ms. Toole stated if the cities or Commissioners from Lewis County get involved with this they won't be around to be in your agreement – the people of Lewis County will not stand for this. If you want to move forward you would not do something behind the backs of a third of your entity. You have made excuses as you go along and that is not working together; it is undermining the whole Authority.

Chairman Willis stated this does not keep anything from happening in Lewis County. Lewis County can sign on to it and the door has been left open to sign onto the agreement.

Ms. Fund asked who delivered this to Mr. Phillips. She was told Mr. White delivered it. Ms. Fund stated Article 20 indicates it will go for the appropriation of the \$1.3 million. That means that two counties and the Tribe would take over.

Chairman Willis stated it continues all projects, including the fisheries study and the early warning program. The ILA that the Flood Authority was working on was derailed and would not be completed by July 1. This was a route to go along with what we talked about.

Ms. Fund asked if two groups are going for the same money. Chairman Willis stated yes, there is a request for the Flood Authority money.

Ms. Powe stated Article 9, Advisory Committee, is disturbing. Who can be on the advisory committee? Sub section (iii) states remaining members to be appointed. Section (e) states a citizen can be removed for cause by the Board. That is a huge administrative move.



Ms. Bissonnette stated this was in the original ILA. She only took out pieces that did not apply to this group, such as bonding.

Commissioner Averill stated the Board said the first ILA was too complicated and that we would address those issues; instead we are given this finished product.

Ms. Bissonnette stated she followed Mr. Carter's comments. What we started would have been done for the whole group.

Commissioner Averill stated had this come to us as an alternate document without a decision already made we would not be having this conversation.

Discussion on other issues included whether or not the signatories saw the changes that had been made and a word change regarding the electorate.

Mr. Bob Berg stated his copy has signatures, but without initials, which indicates that changes were made after copies were made. If this was done in session there would have to be amendments made to the document. It is interesting that copies of a signed document are different. When were the differences made?

Commissioner Averill referred to Article 5.5. This board is going to create something called an Executive Officer and give him/her all the powers of the board and the board declines its ability to question that officer on what he/she does.

Chairman Willis stated an Executive Officer restricts board members from directing employees. It is not equated to a city manager; rather it is similar to other co-ops that let the manager direct employees so there are not too many bosses.

Chairman Willis stated she wants the Flood Authority to finish the ILA and make a decision by July 1 in order to meet its obligations. The Flood Authority has failed to do its mission. This document was not an attempt to do something without someone's permission.

Ms. Powe stated the [Watershed Cooperative] does not want to include Lewis County or the cities in the ILA but it wants us to work with you on a project. This was thrown in our laps before we could have a discussion on trust.

Mr. Cook stated the state has given us numerous deadlines and it appears July 1 is incorrect. He asked how [the Watershed Cooperative] got around that deadline. Chairman Willis stated it was based on a conversation with Mr. Phillips. She disagreed with Mr. Carter on the July 1 deadline; we were not in agreement about that date.

Mr. Cook stated when Chairman Willis learned that date was in effect she should have shared it with the Flood Authority.

Mr. Johnson stated he is a resident of Thurston County and he has worked in Lewis County for 12 years trying to make it a better place to live. He is embarrassed that a member of the Thurston County Commission could be proud to eviscerate this committee and say they are proud of it. To go behind

everyone's back and create a mechanism to get the money is appalling. It is beyond what Thurston County professes about open government and transparency and a consensus-based government. This is the worst form of government.

Ms. Fund asked why the hurry for the ILA. Chairman Willis stated she thinks it has to be done; there is a chance we will lose the money. She wants to get to projects and get the Tribe back to the table.

Ms. Fund heard this discussion was counter-productive. She felt the same about the new ILA – it could jeopardize the Flood Authority. We need to start to work together – no back door deals – and support one another and have discussions when there are issues.

Ms. Lee agreed with Ms. Fund. She had no objection to an ILA but cities need to be represented and cannot be left out. She recommended that information that is received or sought out that pertains to what the Flood Authority is trying to do is shared with the Board. The idea of cooperation and trying to accomplish things is what everyone wants but back door politics don't work. We all want to accomplish something.

Ms. Powe stated the ILA was not the problem. Since we did not have a plan we didn't want to spend tax dollars on staff. Regarding the conversation with Mr. Phillips, we elected Ms. Willis and Valenzuela as Chair and Vice Chair to run the Authority. If there was a miscommunication with the state, their mission should have been to get the facts. This was handled poorly by them.

Mr. Thompson asked to reconvene the business meeting.

Chairman Willis adjourned the work session and called for a break at 3:23 p.m., reconvening at 3:30.

Ms. Powe made a motion to continue with the Flood Authority until we are directed that we cannot and to not recognize the cooperative agreement with the Tribe, Grays Harbor County and Thurston County. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lee.

Commissioner Averill stated Mr. White still has 25 days to vote as he is technically still a member.

Ms. Raines suggested everyone bring examples of projects and then determine the vehicle that will drive the plan. Frustrations were aired and good points were made. She wants to create a plan to move forward and the Tribe should be at the table.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she would vote against the motion because it is beyond our purview to decide the fate of the Flood Authority. The legislature is the definer of the Flood Authority and they expect the Flood Authority to cease on July 1. The ILA presented today was to do that.

Commissioner Averill stated Lewis County has been involved in flood mitigation since the 1930s. Lewis County has had more than its share of flooding. Previous solutions always fell apart because there was not agreement. When we sat with the legislature and talked about basin-wide solutions we pointed out that whatever water starts at the top will make it to the bottom. The impact involves the entire river – some areas worse than others but we need to work together.

Commissioner Averill continued to say that two things made our trip difficult: there was already a project on the books that preceded the organization, which was the Twin Cities Project. That project had money in it, approval of Congress and the appropriation process had begun. That project is not enough for a basin-wide solution. At best it protects I-5 with some protection to Centralia and Chehalis with little protection to the lower basin. The intent was to talk about not just projects in Lewis County but in Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties. We had to get help from the Corps to look at basin-wide solutions which meant we were dealing with other entities. There have been disagreements. We recognized that it will take 10-20 years to build something, hence the early warning system. We have come a long way and there is much more we need to do. Commissioner Averill was devastated that the Flood Authority has come to this point and has forgotten the original intent. He appreciates the work done by the CBP and it was known early on that restoration was their project and flood mitigation work was the Flood Authority's. If we are going to empower all the people who have a stake in what goes on in the Basin we need to change our attitude. He believes the cities as independent incorporated jurisdictions have a stake as to what goes on in their area and that the County Commissioners have proven they do not necessarily represent the incorporated areas, and they need a vote. He stated he cannot endorse a proposal that puts it in the hands of two County Commissioners and the Tribe. He favors the motion that was made.

Chairman Willis stated she questions the motion that was made. The Flood Authority can't keep moving forward the way it has been. There is a threat against it and that is if it doesn't fulfill its duties by July 1 there is the possibility that the funds will go away and all the work we have done will be in jeopardy. This ILA is something to deal with and it has the ability to continue with the Flood Authority work. If you are saying we will continue in the same manner we have been and let the legislators determine whether or not we exit, she is not willing to do that and will vote against it. It is too vague.

Ms. Raines asked if the three entities thought about their plan if the state doesn't recognize it. Chairman Willis stated there is language in it stating it will go away or it can be dissolved in 60 days, the same as any other ILA.

Ms. Raines asked if that agreement does not have the support do the rest of us go home. Chairman Willis stated it doesn't mean it goes away in 60 days but that any entity can pull out in 60 days.

Ms. Raines called for the question.

Chairman Willis asked for a show of hands. All were in favor with the exception of Mr. White and Commissioner Valenzuela. ~~The Chair did not vote.~~ **The Chair abstained.** The motion passed.

Commissioner Averill proposed that Keith Phillips come to the May meeting as there should be a budget by then. The Flood Authority needs to sit down with the governor and talk about what the governor's office sees as the future and the options of how to get there.

Mr. Thompson directed a question to Chairman Willis asking if there was a conflict of interest and how the Flood Authority can get out of this if she is bent on the new agreement. In the meantime, FCS was not fired today and someone has to direct FCS to work on the ILA. He asked if the Chair is willing to work with FCS and other contractors to move forward to get through this.

Chairman Willis stated yes; she wants the Flood Authority to be successful and challenged it by action. When we get to that agenda we will work on the ILA, not anything else.

Ms. Lee asked if there is any draft or correspondence that can be sent to the Board so it can look it over and come to an agreement to act upon.

Ms. Bissonnette stated that included in the packet for today's meeting was a summary of all the comments. She was willing to create a new draft to send out.

Commissioner Averill stated he would like to look again at the comments before Ms. Bissonnette does that. The Board should look at the comments and get back to FCS in a week or so. Mr. Mackey asked to have comments by May 2.

Ms. Fund stated she is not convinced about the ILA, with reservations about who is on it, voting issues and trust issues and doesn't want to spend time on it. She wants the Tribe at the table and wants to get going on projects. She commented on Mr. Thompson's question about Chairman Willis' position: is she talking as a Flood Authority member or as a Commissioner?

Chairman Willis stated a commissioner wears many hats. She stated the Flood Authority is going down the right path but the focus needs to be on the ILA. We do have projects and she does not want to get side tracked by projects at this time. The ILA has to be the focus.

Mr. Cook asked if Mr. Phillips could not attend the next meeting would he be able to write a comment reflecting the governor's position as to the longevity of the Flood Authority. Chairman Willis stated she believed he would do one or the other.

There was more discussion about projects versus the ILA. Mr. Mackey stated projects were identified in the FHMP and criterion was worked on to rank those plans. The difficulty was not having enough information about most of the projects. There were only one or two with engineering, costs, benefits, and other information. While that was a good intention it became obvious that resources are needed to spend time to do research to make some real decisions to pursue further study. A cursory cut could be made if they have basin-wide impacts but asked the Board to remember the effort it went through. It was difficult to rank and put money to those without all the information. As soon as the ILA is formed you can spend resources on those projects.

Commissioner Averill stated there is some merit in walking through and providing background on a project and decide where the money is coming from.

Mr. Treichler stated there is no staff – no one to give preliminary information on these projects. The Board can't begin to prioritize these projects unless it has someone doing the work. The work is detailed and you have no way of getting the information. The reason for the ILA is so the Board can hire staff – not consultants, but staff. Staff can then go through the project list to bring back information. The Board needs the ability to move forward and it needs staff. Lack of staff working full time means you don't have information about projects. He has seen the list of projects but he can't tell the benefits from reading the list. He urged the Board to get an ILA and move on because it needs the ability to hire staff and set taxes.

Mr. Lyle Hojem asked the Flood Authority to think about restrictor structures. His idea was to build 125 small dams that would not block fish or hurt the environment. A 1000 foot dam that is 6' deep in the center will cost about \$25,000, or about \$5 million for 125 dams. You won't stop high water but you will stop the crest of the flood. Engineering can be done locally and the work can be done by farmers and local contractors. Permitting will be simple fill and grade permits and it will take only three days to build a dam that size. These dams would block water for 2 or 3 days and wouldn't interfere with any activity or result in a loss to a farmer.

**10. Adjourn**

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.