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

May 20, 2010 – 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Notes

Board Members Present: Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County; Ron Averill, Lewis County; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano; Brandon Atoch, City of Oakville; Mark White, Chehalis Tribe
Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:
- Memo from ESA Adolfson re: Budget
- Memo from ESA Adolfson re: Peer Review and Fisheries Study
- Proposed Scope of Services: Flood District Formation
- Scope of Work: Chehalis River Flood Warning System
- Memo from ESA Adolfson re: Draft Scope and Budget for FY 2010-2011
- Draft ESA Adolfson Scope of Work

1. Convene Work Session
Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 9:13 A.M.

2. Introductions
Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Analysis and Discussion of Budget
Mr. Mackey stated the member packets included a memo with the interpretation of the budget and a copy of the budget language. The first subject is the budget and how to allocate it and within that are all the other items in the agenda. We will discuss the budget as it gives the overall picture and then come back to each item. You can revisit the budget decision after that. The budget was passed with timelines and funding constraints. If you want to meet those, decisions need to be made.

Section 1 of the Spreadsheet is money allocated for the Corps and is money that the Flood Authority is not concerned with. The budget for next year is a re-appropriation. It shows expenses for this year and the money left for next year.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 will be discussed today. After the budget was passed we met with OFM and the governor to see how they interpret allocations of expenditures.

Section 2: Governance and Finance, $1.2 million. OFM expects that amount to include money spent by local jurisdictions and ESA from June 30, 2009 to July 1, 2010. $582,000 has been expended or contracted, leaving $617,000 for forming a flood district and support work.

Most of the decisions that need to be made are in Section 3. The studies were provisioned in the legislation. The legislation provided $2 million and expects that to be used for past contracts as well as support staff, including facilitation from ESA. The contracted amount is $555,000. By law you have to pay those contracted amounts. That leaves estimated costs for studies which is $2,092,640. Peer Review is included in that at $50,000. These are place holders because we don't know what the numbers are going to be. Given those numbers and what you are currently funding, there is a shortfall of $647,000.

ESA recommends that you go forward with four or five projects and try to get those contracted so you know what the cost will be. If you do that and they are over or under budget you will have certainty. The others are being postponed until you know how the numbers will come out on the others. Action later today is a prioritization of studies and to pass a motion directing staff to go forward on a set of studies.

In the estimated cost column, start with the General Investigation, the peer review, Phase II fish studies, ESA Adolfson and administration. The Coordinated Study and Ecosystem Services are for $700,000 and that leaves the budget short by $647,000 and we do not recommend moving forward with those two.

Section 4 is the Early Warning System. There was a proviso in the legislation for $300,000 for this study. West Consultants has been paid $64,000 and the good news is that they revisited the scope and found software to implement the design and can use the remaining money for that. Later today you will look at the scope and contract and decide if you want to fund it.

4. Process for Peer Review and Fisheries Study

Mr. Mackey stated this part of the bill is complicated and issues are confusing and it is critical to get things done in a timely manner. ESA suggests appointing a committee made up of people listed in the bill and whoever you want to appoint and give them specific decisions to make. The committee would take on the tasks of peer review and the fisheries study so all the work can be coordinated by the time you go out for an RFP.

Commissioner Averill asked if there are two peer reviews required. He understands it was already completed on Phase IIA and the selection of the biological study cannot be done until the first phase is done.

Mr. Antonio Ginatta stated the language reads "completed hydrological and geotechnical study" and that will be on Phase IIA.

Mr. Plotz asked if the fisheries study requires a peer review as well. Mr. Mackey stated it requires selection and scope but not a peer review. Mr. Ginatta stated the PUD, WDFW and the Tribe will select a committee for that.

Mr. Mackey stated two people have said they can do the peer review on Phase IIA within thirty days and they can do it for less than the $50,000 budgeted. They also have a couple of other professionals to bring in so a two-person team will conduct that peer review.

Mr. Carter asked if the experts chosen by the PUD and Tribe are by consensus or how that is spelled out. Mr. Mackey stated it is not spelled out. We met with the Governor and the representatives will be DOE

and Mark White of the Tribe. Mark Bailey will represent WDFW. Whoever the PUD wants to put together with the Flood Authority will move forward.

Ms. Hempleman stated DOE considers the peer review done on the geotechnical aspect of Phase IIA.

Mr. Plotz asked the timeline required for the fish study and the RFP. Mr. Mackey stated it was not his place to do that. The Flood Authority will need to appoint a committee with technical expertise and that committee will tell you what can get done and the timeline required.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA recommends the Flood Authority select a peer review sub-committee and give it the authority to make decisions as to how the peer review will be conducted and select a qualified expert. If we are under $20,000 it can be a direct personal services contract. For the fish study the sub-committee can direct Lewis County to execute a contract for up to $50,000, review the documents and submit the completed review to OFM.

The legislation requires that you consult with WDFW, the Tribe and PUD to develop and agree to the scope of work. We have identified the individuals and we recommend that you pursue this with the peer review sub-committee and that sub-committee should consult with the Tribe, WDFW, and the PUD to approve the scope to determine if an RFP is required, put it together and issue the RFP and serve with those groups as a selection committee to negotiate a final scope and budget and execute a contract with a qualified expert for up to $900,000.

This is different from the way the Flood Authority has operated in the past. We are asking you to make a decision today and to give a lot of power to a sub-committee but you will be able to meet the time requirements.

Chairman Willis asked if the sub-committee can urge the expert to get the work done for under $900,000. Mr. Mackey stated the dollar amount is not given publicly; you only ask for a scope of work.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if there is money left over can it be used for something else. Mr. Mackey stated yes, it could be.

Legislation also requires the Flood Authority to submit new study proposals to the basin wide general investigation to the Corps of Engineers for review. This is to ensure to the extent possible that work will be eligible to serve as in-kind match for the GI. ESA recommends that the Flood Authority forms a peer review for fish study at the May meeting and authorize them to make all decisions and take actions listed in this memo. We will try to schedule a sub-committee meeting for the last week in May.

There was discussion regarding an opportunity for comment before the RFP is sent out. The draft document will be a public document, posted on the website but there may only be a couple of days for comments. There will not be time for a ten-day or longer review period. The Committee will have the discretion to use any comments received.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she would prefer a five-person review committee. Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority can make that decision. There are already three people involved and DOE is involved on the other side so anyone appointed will need to work with those entities. The smaller the group the quicker meetings can be scheduled.

Chairman Willis asked for clarification: the three who the Flood Authority appoints must agree on the RFP. Mr. Mackey stated those three work on the fish studies and with DOE on the peer review. Decisions on the fish studies will be all six. Decisions on the peer review will be by whomever you appoint and they will consult with DOE.

Mr. Johnson stated Lewis County acts as the fiscal agent and does the notification for the RFP and the BOCC has to act on those. Whoever you choose needs to work closely with Mr. Johnson to make sure statutory timelines are met.

Ms. Julie Powe asked if the votes will be by consensus. Chairman Willis stated that had not been decided yet.

Mr. Mackey stated the strict interpretation is that the three people chosen by the Flood Authority will make the decisions, consulting with DOE, WDFW and the Tribe.

There was discussion about who should be on the committee. Mark White did not want politicians on the committee because this is a scientific study. Mr. Cook stated the people on this board have to be elected so it is political. Commissioner Averill stated he is not in favor of leaving anything out; we are looking for answers.

Chairman Willis stated we will not bend to get the right answers; this is political and has been political all along. We can also bring people with us.

Mr. Schillinger stated if the Commissioners are to make up the sub-committee, can they dedicate that kind of time? All the commissioners stated they could.

Mr. Schillinger stated with that said, as a Flood Authority member, he would like to see the numbers kept small and he has the confidence that there are no better people than the commissioners, plus we have another Flood Authority member who is on that committee and who is a scientist.

Commissioner Valenzuela suggested the commissioner or his/her designee. Mr. Mackey stated that would be okay but that designee must go through the entire process. Commissioner Valenzuela agreed.

Mr. Mackey asked if the members wanted to discuss the voting decision. Three commissioners can make a decision or it can be by consensus or a majority vote with the other three entities. Commissioner Valenzuela stated she would prefer to see a majority vote with the commissioners.

Mr. Mackey stated it could be a majority of the six, which would be four votes. That distributes the balance a little better. Both Commissioner Valenzuela and Mr. White agreed. Mr. Mackey stated this afternoon he will recommend that the group of six with four in favor will constitute the vote.

5. Break
The group recessed for ten minutes and reconvened at 10:35.

6. Flood District Scope
Phase 1

Mr. Mackey stated we started out with $900,000 and Ann worked through this and with the FCS Group. The BAC went through the scope of work and stated FCS is an outstanding group with extensive experience. The budget is on the last page of the handout. Given the time and research the assumptions in the RFP is that you are going to work towards a flood control zone district; however FCS realizes that you need people to understand the differences and that is their first task.

Commissioner Averill stated there are many ways a flood control zone can accumulate funds to conduct its business. Fees must be based on project structures and that won't happen until the zone is formed and there are activities. He asked about the benefit of looking at fee structure now.

Mr. Mackey stated FCS is setting up a basis for analysis and they know this is a rural county. They are looking at impacts on a community and they are cognizant of this being set up with funding to get it going until you have projects to set the tax.

Phase 2
The total budget is for $499,343. FCS understands the issues the Flood Authority needs to go through and that the proposal was beyond your expectations.

Commissioner Averill stated there was a discussion that the Flood Authority is providing the funding for this but the final decision model must be made by the three Boards of County Commissioners. Mr. Mackey stated that is correct and they also need to be in contact with all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Swartout stated once a district is formed the consultant will work with the flood district to get it up and running. Mr. Carter asked if that service is included in the budget and Mr. Swartout stated it is.

7. Early Warning Scope
Ms. Root stated Phase 1 is the needs assessment and Phase 2 is the design of the early warning system. West Consultants looked at the issues and because of our budget constraints they put together a preliminary early warning system with the money available. They can implement a number of things with this budget.

Ms. Root went through the tasks described in the handout.

Commissioner Averill asked about maintenance costs and who will maintain the gauges. He believed it should be the flood zone district rather than the counties. Ms. Root stated West Consulting will look at ways to fund the maintenance.

Ms. Root stated the budget came in at $234,636 which was considerably under what was expected.

Commissioner Averill stated the web-based data platform would end up in the emergency operations centers of all the counties.

8. ESA Adolfson Draft Scope
Mr. Mackey stated the items on the spreadsheet with the asterisks will be discussed.

The budget is based on proposed items and priorities. If those change, this budget can change and it is based on the kinds of things we have been asked to do in the past. The budget is smaller than in the

past and a good part of the money is for the district formation because FCS requested we play a larger role in the formation of the district. While we are putting forward a budget for ESA, it could be for ESA or another agency or for staff support.

Facilitation is about 20% of the budget. A larger piece is the staffing, responding to inquiries, technical support, study issues, preparing meeting materials and working with governmental agencies. We put in the types of things we thought we would be involved with such as the early warning system, the GI, peer review and fisheries which is all part of the staff work that you need to be successful. This came to about $70,000 and there is a lot of work to make sure everyone is communicating. A goal to success is anticipating being ahead of the game.

Task 5: Administrative Expenses. If you do not pursue LiDAR or the Coordinated Study the budget is one number. This is put together based on the assumption that you follow the recommendations we put forward.

Commissioner Averill stated during legislation Hans Dunshee submitted a bill that cut out the Flood Authority and further funding and set the HB 3374 and 3375 money aside for use when we got to the point of starting the Twin Cities project.

There were some things that hurt us because they were hard to defend. People who had made requests for travel reimbursement looked like they were getting a lot of money all at once when it actually covered a long period of time. As a result, Mr. Dunshee said the Flood Authority is not doing anything. We must be careful in pursuing business as normal or we may find ourselves back in trouble.

We received $45,000 to pay for the operation of the Flood Authority. Commissioner Averill recommended we could individually cover those expenses if we make some changes; for example, we do not have to meet in Lewis County. Staff support is coming from three counties and we need to look at how much staff support will come this year. We are required to form a flood district and we have a consultant to do that; we need an early warning system and we have a consultant for that. We will be able to do some other projects that are being done by consultants so perhaps we do not need to have a BAC meeting every month.

How much support do we need from ESA when it is predominately management of contracts which we have consultants to do. Do we need this large a budget to conduct the Flood Authority? ESA has done a tremendous job for us and it is comfortable to have that support but we are subject to public review and Commissioner Averill is not sure another $300,000 or 20% of the budget is advisable.

Chairman Willis stated she had met several time with Mr. Dunshee and went over the budget with him. His perspective of what we are spending on travel was totally off; he was looking at a spreadsheet of what happened over the years and we discussed that. She thought he understood until the paper came out.

Chairman Willis has had this conversation about project managers or ESA because it came up with Mr. Dunshee. He said we need to remove the facilitator. She argued about where that burden goes without ESA. The counties and cities do not have the time or staff. We would not be nearly as productive without ESA. We cannot function without them, especially with the tasks which have been mandated.

Commissioner Valenzuela agreed with Commissioner Averill that there are questions we should ask as we look over our work plan. She also shares Chairman Willis' concerns. Commissioner Valenzuela thinks of herself as a Flood Authority member and staff, too. She is not sure how much more we can provide if we do not have project management services with ESA.

Mr. Cook stated without ESA's support we would not be where we are today. With their understanding of these issues, and our asking them to do certain tasks as things change, they have been very flexible and have done an exemplary job. To not have that help with the main push to expedience would totally hobble the Flood Authority at a critical time.

Commissioner Averill stated he is suggesting that through most of this year ESA has been providing deliverables. That is about to go on the shelf and we are at the point where it is more facilitation services than consultation services. We are limited to what we have out there and we are under contract. We need to look more closely at the numbers. Do we need ESA people at every meeting? The budget could be reduced by $177,000 without LiDAR. He asked if Mr. Mackey had other suggestions.

Mr. Mackey stated we know what our contracts are but the big ones are placeholders and we do not know how much the costs will be on those. We don't know what the Coordinated Study will cost; we suggest you do not go forward with Ecosystem Services, but that you do go ahead with the peer review, Phase II, staff support and who will do that.

Commissioner Valenzuela questioned how much support is needed. There is a lot of knowledge with ESA and it might not be a good time to make a change.

Chairman Willis asked how much can be taken away from ESA and still have them functional. If we take something away it may create problems for them, such as not attending a meeting may hamper their ability to help us with something else. She is all for reviewing and paring down but Mr. Dunshee said we do not need ESA.

Mr. Mackey stated there will be a discussion regarding staffing. He asked if this group of priorities is the one the Flood Authority would want to move forward or shall he present something different at the afternoon session.

Commissioner Averill stated we don't want to make a decision today. Mr. Mackey indicated that the FCS number was lower because they are anticipating that ESA will be there.

Ms. Root stated there is a great part of forming the work that must be done by the jurisdictions for the flood district and there will need to be help available to the jurisdictions. If the jurisdictions can take that on, that is great.

Chairman Willis stated we have been asked to make budget decisions on funding priorities which means checking off items on the budget.

Commissioner Averill stated he believed the Coordinated Study should be pursued. The concern is the PUD study is being pursued for a hydro project. Early on it was suggested that you don't necessarily need a hydro project and that a project that is smaller and only does water retention is considerably less

than building a hydro project. Alternatively there was a PUD study with hydro and retention and water quality, so you could have a project with both water retention and quality that would be less than putting in the hydro. If the hydro goes up the PUD picks up the cost but it will still be a much bigger dam. The reason for the Coordinated Study was to look at what the smaller project would have and how much it would cost. He foresees that if we do the unadulterated PUD study we are asking for the Cadillac. He asked how we can get a look at a smaller project.

Commissioner Willis stated when we started thinking about not doing the Coordinated Study she understood we could move it to the fisheries study. A fish study could look at a dam without hydro and what those affects would be. It may not come back to a dollar amount. Some of those parameters could move over without the Coordinated Study.

Mr. Plotz stated the conflict of hydro should be considered separately. Flood retention is different and throwing hydro in after the fact gives different benefits.

Mr. Mackey asked with the current work already done is there enough information for an 80,000 cubic foot dam. There has to be certain data before they can analyze impacts on fish and fish habitat. Does that exist for those three tiers? If not you are left with only one.

Mr. Carter asked whether we have the authority to consider this study with the lesser projects.

Mr. Ginatta stated the language is open.

Chairman Willis asked what else was going to be analyzed with the Coordinated Study.

Commissioner Averill stated if we have dams and levees, what combinations of those meet the cost ratio. Chairman Willis stated with the Corps looking at dam projects with the Twin Cities project, won't we get the same answers or similar answers, with or without projects.

Ms. Fund referred to the facilitation cost and stated every work session and Flood Authority meeting costs nearly $4,000. She was told by Mr. Easton and Ms. Root that the figure includes prep time, preparing agendas and meeting materials, arranging for speakers, etc. It is much more than physical time at the meetings.

Commissioner Averill stated monies not covered in that amount are expenses incurred by work done in Lewis County.

Ms. Fund asked if the meetings could be managed by two staffers rather than three. Ms. Root stated ESA tries to minimize meeting attendance and when it is possible they do limit the number of people who attend. She also stated they have not increased their rates since they took on this task.

Commissioner Averill stated on the afternoon's agenda is a discussion about the budget analysis. We need to decide if we all agree on Section 3, items 4, 5, 6 and ESA contract and administration.

9. Adjourn
The agenda at the work session concluded and adjournment was at 11:52 A.M.

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

May 20, 2010
Meeting Notes

Board Members Present: Mark White, Chehalis Tribe; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Ron Schillinger, Mayor of Montesano; Chad Taylor, City of Chehalis; Brandon Atoch, Mayor of Oakville; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor Commissioner
Members Excused: Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell
Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from April 15 and 16, 2010
- Ongoing Efforts
- Flood Plan Memo
- Budget Memo
- Peer Review and Fisheries Memo
- District Formation Scope
- Early Warning Scope
- ESA Scope Cover Memo
- ESA Adolfson Draft Scope
- May 25 Joint Work Session Agenda

1. Call to Order
Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 1:33 P.M.

2. Introductions
Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Approval of Agenda
The Chair asked if there were any objections to the agenda. Hearing none, the agenda was approved.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes from April 15 and 16, 2010
Chairman Willis asked if there were corrections or additions to the meeting notes. There were none and the meeting notes were approved.

5. Public Comment
There was no public comment.

6. Reports
a. Chairman's Report

Chairman Willis stated she and Ms. Pat Anderson had discussed the process for recording motions made during the Flood Authority meetings. Ms. Anderson will type the motion into the FTR Recorder, record who made and seconded the motion, and read it back to the Board if necessary. This will eliminate any confusion or misunderstanding about the motion to be considered.

Chairman Willis reported that at the request of Ms. Dolores Lee, Mr. David Plotz, Lewis County PUD, took Commissioner Valenzuela, herself and Ms. Lee on a tour of the dam sites. The visit was very helpful to understand where the dams will go, observe the terrain, etc. Ms. Lee was an excellent host, travelling to Pe Ell and seeing what is going on out there.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated Pe Ell's sewage treatment plant was completely wiped out during the 2007 flood. When the plant was repaired, it was done in place, which is right next to the Chehalis River. The Tin Bridge crosses the Chehalis River and Pe Ell's main water line was attached to that. When the log jam took out the Tin Bridge during the 2007 flood, it also took out the water line. The community of Pe Ell was especially hard hit by the flood.

b. Member Reports
There were none.

c. Correspondence
Chairman Willis stated she received an e-mail from Commissioner Averill regarding his rationale for the rejection of the Project Management Plan.

On May 17 follow up material was received from the April 19 meeting with the Corps and the cities of Centralia and Chehalis.

The Northwest Steelhead Salmon Conservation Society is being formed and there is information as to who they are.

An e-mail was received from Jerry Bridenback from Grays Harbor County who is opposed to the Grays Harbor County Commissioners supporting the building of dams in Lewis County.

The Northwest Steelhead Salmon Conservation Society submitted a resolution titled Prevent Damage from Chehalis Basin Floods.

A letter was received from the governor's office regarding the peer review and fish study requirements which Chairman Willis read into the record.

All correspondence is available by request.

Commissioner Averill stated he had requested that Mr. Mackey distribute an alternate interlocal agreement between Grays Harbor and Lewis County. That will be a topic of discussion at the joint meeting on Tuesday, May 25.

d. State Team Report
Mr. John Donahue reported he has been sitting in with a team with State DOT regarding traffic mitigation on I-5 during floods. A plan is being proposed for short term improvements to help mitigate closures which include a by-pass system to prioritize freight loads on State Route 7, new electronic

information signs, traffic cameras for monitoring traffic during flooding and improvements to State Route 7 as it goes through Lewis and Pierce Counties. Some of these projects are funded and some will be part of a new budget proposal for the next legislative session. A more detailed report should be available by mid-summer.

Mr. Donahue has been following up on a list of priorities brought by the City of Chehalis and a meeting is scheduled for Friday with Mr. MacReynold. Other topics to be discussed with Mr. MacReynold is an initiative to provide jurisdictions with a way to show photographic displays of what the Twin Cities project will look like.

Mr. Donahue has been working with the Corps and there will be a scope of work developed for real estate services having to do with the Twin Cities project and the level of cost analysis that must take place for the 35% milestone. An important part of that cost is real estate and the impact on the community. During that process there will be visits to the community to assess property values, etc. Mr. Donahue would like to work with the jurisdictions' staff persons so the cities are aware of that activity. More information on this will be brought to the June meeting.

In January we talked about a roll-out of the 35% design results which would occur in September. It is not too early to talk about how those meeting should be conducted. Mr. Donahue will be looking for volunteers from the cities and Lewis County to help organize where those meetings might be held and how they are to be organized. The Corps will also help with those meetings. June is a good time to have the first meeting.

e. Corps of Engineers Report

i. Twin Cities Project

Mr. Bill Goss reported on the Twin Cities project stating there was a site visit to address some issues with the tributaries and meeting notes were distributed with the members' packets. The 206 program for ecosystem restoration would require a local sponsor to work on a letter of intent for those projects. If that is to get into the 2012 budget the letter of intent needs to be drafted in the next week or so. If there is interest in this, please let Mr. Goss know. If there is no interest at this time it can be addressed at a later time but it will not get into the 2012 budget.

Commissioner Averill stated the issue is not that there is no interest; there is. Many questions need to be answered, the least of which is whether mitigation of another sort might be a partner as you suggested in your response. Some things done with mitigation will be cheaper for us in the long run rather than providing the 50% for studies and the 65/35% for projects.

The other concern is the fact that 205 projects are out and all the projects we looked at, with the exception of the Dillenbaugh, were 205 and 206 combination projects which poses a dilemma for us.

Mr. Goss stated there are other ways to address those and when we get through the 35% we can see if there are adverse affects that aren't there now. If the project is put into the model and there are adverse affects then those can be included in the mitigation for the Twin Cities project.

Chairman Willis asked where that fits into the timeframe: does the Corps finish the Twin Cities project or do you mitigate while the Twin Cities project is going on.

Mr. Goss stated if you wanted to look at restoration under 206 that could be initiated now. If we have the 35% design and see adverse affects from the project it would go into the design and plan and will be implemented with the rest of the mitigation measures for the Twin Cities project. That would not start immediately; it would be part of the Twin Cities overall project.

Ms. Fund stated the report states there is a no new start policy for section 206 unless it is identified in Congressional legislation. It appears it would be fruitless to apply.

Mr. Goss stated the policy may change but at this time there are no new starts. He is unsure if that no new start policy will change.

Mr. Goss stated there will be a Twin Cities mitigation meeting on May 26 from 9:00 AM to 12:30 PM at US Fish and Wildlife Service office in Olympia. If anyone would like more information, please contact Mr. Goss after the meeting.

The Corps is working on a data gap analysis on economics for the Twin Cities project to ensure all the data has been collected and to identify any gaps. This will be used to update the benefit cost ratio for the 35% design.

ii. Basin-Wide General Investigation

There will be a meeting on May 25 from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM at the Veterans Memorial Museum on the Chehalis Basin GI to discuss the two without project conditions. Mr. Goss stated that monetarily it will be around $3 million and add two years to the process, assuming the current level of funding. He asked to defer questions on the two without projects to that meeting.

f. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. David Plotz stated Phase IIB is still on target to be completed as scheduled. Some of the updates on which Mr. Plotz was briefed were the transportation costs for the I-5 closure and the damage data base.

The preliminary drawings for the upper Chehalis and South Fork dams are coming along. Sections and elevations are still being worked on for the South Fork dam.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Ongoing Efforts/Ripe and Ready Projects Update

Mr. Mackey stated there is a paper in the packets with the ongoing efforts and status of projects. Most of these are already included in the agenda and will be discussed later in the meeting. What is not included in the agenda is the Ecosystem Services. They are in the process of putting together their final report and when that comes in it will be distributed.

8. Flood Plan and Public Meeting

Ms. Ann Root stated a report on the public meetings held in April was sent out to the Flood Authority and included the public comments received; since then other comments have been received and they are attached to the memo in the member packets.

Ms. Root recapped what has been done and what the next steps will be. Comments at the public meetings were geared more towards the PUD storage study or to the Corps Twin City Project. There were some relevant comments on the Plan and they have been incorporated into the revised Plan. The

summary of the meetings is now an appendix to the Plan and information summarizing the public comments has been added to Chapter 1.

Revisions made to the Plan were generally updates or corrections and the dates have been revised for the beginning and completion of the Twin Cities project. Added to Chapter 1 is the discussion of requirements for completing a SEPA review of the Flood Plan.

Updated information was added about flood events and flood damage from the 2007 and 2009 floods and now the most current information is included in the Plan. There were a few recommended projects that were brought to us at the public meetings and those have been added to Table 9 (1).

The public comments have been shared with the PUD and the Corps that were related to their respective projects.

Comments were received from various agencies and those were incorporated into the Plan.

The biggest change to the Plan is the information added to Chapter 1, which discusses adopting the Flood Plan by the three counties, an important step towards establishing a flood district. That will be a recommendation that will need to come from the Flood Authority next month.

Information was added about the SEPA process. The Flood Authority does not have the authority to conduct SEPA but SEPA will need to be done by the individual jurisdictions prior to adoption of the Plan. There are some recommendations on the process for doing that.

The next steps will be bringing a final Plan to the Flood Authority in June and it will need to be approved as the Flood Plan for the Chehalis Basin. The Flood Authority will then send a letter to member jurisdictions recommending that they adopt the Plan, either as a separate plan or as an addendum to their existing plan.

Ms. Fund stated the majority of the comments received did not relate directly to the Flood Plan and she would have anticipated that in the way in which the meetings were conducted. In the future if we are asking people to comment on a plan we need to have portions of the plan on which we would like comments rather than a scattered approach to comments about flooding. Ms. Fund hopes the public does not have increased expectations as a result of that.

Ms. Root stated it was an issue; ESA was struggling with limiting expenses to the budget by not printing copies.

Chairman Willis stated in ESA's defense, public meetings have been held before asking for comments on a specific topic only to find the audience has its own agenda. For a subject this sensitive it is difficult to stop someone from commenting on something outside the Plan. Chairman Willis is open to any suggestion or experience in planning other public meetings.

9. Budget Analysis and Prioritization

Chairman Willis stated the Flood Authority will be asked to make a decision determining which studies have priority for funding after Mr. Mackey's discussion.

Mr. Mackey referred to the Budget memo in the packet and attached language from the governor's supplemental budget. There is also a proposed Flood Authority budget spreadsheet.

The appropriation was a re-appropriation for this current biennium to June 2011. From this re-appropriation you have to subtract from the total amount given the money you have already expended or encumbered which will be the money you have left over for the next year.

The spreadsheet is divided into four sections. The first section is for the Corps of Engineers for which the Flood Authority has no control. Section two is a proviso for governance and finance with an appropriation of $1.2 million. One thing not included in the budget language was how to account for past staff and consulting services. OFM expects that type of staff work to be included in the budget and it is in two places in the spreadsheet; in the governance and finance administration cost of $45,000 and then in an estimated expenditure for ESA Adolfson and local jurisdictions to carry forward.

The spreadsheet is divided into what is budgeted for in the budget language and because it covers two years, we looked at what was expended and contracted and that leaves you with an estimated amount left over for the next year. That is where you will need to make some decisions.

In the governance and finance there is a budget and scope proposed from FCS for $499,000 and to carry out that work there is a proposed budget for ESA Adolfson and local jurisdictions. Looking at the last column, if you use all those expenditures you will have used the full amount under that first proviso.

Section 3 was a total of $2 million and it is to be spent for studies and the staffing to support those studies. The expended and contracted amount shows Phase IIA, Phase IIB and Earth Economics, which are contracts that will be ending June 30, 2010 for $555,000. In the estimated costs there is a cost for the Coordinated Study, Ecosystem Services, General Investigation, peer review work, Phase III (fish study), ESA Consulting services, and to support the continuing staff work from the counties and jurisdictions as well as potential LiDAR. Those add up to over $2 million and they cannot all be funded because they will put you over budget by $647,000.

The Flood Authority will need to prioritize and decide which projects to move forward with at this time. Some of the costs are known but we don't know what the fish study and the peer review will cost, nor do we know what the Ecosystems Services or Coordinated Study will cost. ESA's recommendation is to choose a set of projects to move forward. Once you do that and contracts and negotiations are finalized you will know how much money you will have expended and if they come in under budget there will be money left over to do other things in the future.

At the work session there was a discussion of the suggested projects to move forward. Those include the General Investigation, the peer review, the fish study, ESA Adolfson and the local jurisdiction administration and there would be enough money to move forward on those.

Section 4 has the proviso for the early warning system of $300,000 and to date $64,000 has been spent. This money can only be spent for the early warning system and it is recommended that the Flood Authority do that. The peer review, the flood district formation and the early warning contract are still to be discussed.

Commissioner Averill noted that the Phase IIB did not get started until March and is scheduled to end in September. It shows up because we authorized the contract and it is encumbered money. Three of

these sections are projects for which the money must be spent specifically for those projects. Those are the Corps project, the governance and the early warning system.

Chairman Willis asked Mr. Taylor if he had any questions since he was unable to attend the work session. Mr. Taylor asked what the $6640 does for the GI.

Mr. Mackey stated there are three asterisks in the Estimated Cost column. Those are in the budget and scope proposal that we are presenting today and the Flood Authority will make a decision on those at the next meeting. Those are the estimated costs from ESA's point of view for support.

Chairman Willis stated we will take action on this budget as proposed and then we will individually look at the other scopes of work to review for approval.

Commissioner Averill moved that the Flood Authority approve the proposed budget as submitted by ESA Adolfson with the amounts listed in Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 with specific projects in Section 3 identified as the general investigation, the peer review, the Phase III fish study and the ESA administration. Mr. Cook seconded.

Commissioner Averill stated we need a starting point so we can move forward on some projects later in the meeting and it was he who suggested at the work session that some of these items need to be looked at in more detail. We will not make a decision on ESA's scope of work until the next meeting and that gives us time to look specifically where we are going in that area. In some preliminary discussions potential consultants have come in with figures lower than this budget and it may work out that we may be able to reconsider some other projects if the money is freed up. With those provisos, he supports these projects.

Commissioner Valenzuela did not object to the list of projects from Section 3. Some important work had to be taken off the table for the moment, in particular, the Coordinated Study and Ecosystems Services. Approving this list of projects leaves us shy of the $2 million and in the event we find ourselves in the position that Commissioner Averill described, where we are spending less money on the approved projects, that we look immediately to Ecosystems Services and the Coordinated Study to see how much of that work we can get done.

Commissioner Averill agreed, especially regarding the Coordinated Study. As discussed at the work session, some of the issues in the Coordinated Study may be able to be wrapped into the biological study and we may get some answers from a different source. The intent of the Coordinated Study was to help us learn how the levee system and water retention would work together and hopefully we can complete a good deal of that study in a different way.

Chairman Willis asked if there were any other comments. There were none. She asked if anyone disagreed with the motion. There was no disagreement and Chairman Willis stated this was the budget that would be moved forward.

Mr. Mackey clarified these are the budget items to be moved forward, they may not be the actual dollar amounts.

10. Peer Review and Fisheries Study

Mr. Mackey stated there are requirements to meet prior to doing certain things in this budget. There are three provisions required: the peer review process of current work; coordination with the Chehalis Tribe, WDFW and PUD on the scope for the fisheries study; and coordination with the Corps prior to funding those projects. To expedite this process, ESA recommends putting together a sub-committee made up of three people from the Flood Authority who would work with the DOE to do the peer review and with the Tribe, WDFW and the PUD to put together a scope.

We looked at the timelines and there are various constraints. To meet all of those with the intent of getting the fisheries study out as soon as possible, we are suggesting that the sub-committee should have some fairly broad powers to make decisions on how the peer review is to be conducted in consultation with the DOE and select a qualified expert, and to direct Lewis County to issue an RFP/RFQ if needed.

Mr. Mackey stated so far there are eight people who might be able to do peer review and e-mails have been sent to them with responses from two stating they would pair up with other professionals to conduct the peer review. If the Flood Authority approves of this process and timing, we asked if they could do it within thirty days and under $20,000 and the preliminary answer was "yes". This would avoid the RFP/RFQ process because we could ask Lewis County to contract directly for those personal services.

We would also ask the sub-committee to direct Lewis County to execute a contract with the qualified experts up to $50,000 to review those documents and submit the completed peer review to OFM.

Commissioner Averill asked for clarification on the subject of the peer review. Mr. Mackey stated the language in the bill is for geotechnical and hydrologic studies. In working with DOE, they feel they have already done the peer review on the geo technical aspect and are willing write a letter to that effect. The hydraulic study is on studies that have been completed and that is on Phase IIA reports that were put out by the PUD in November, 2009.

Mr. Mackey stated the language in the budget regarding the fisheries studies states that the Flood Authority will consult with WDFW, the Chehalis Tribe and the Lewis County PUD to develop a scope of work for and select a qualified expert to conduct the fish study.

ESA is recommending this same sub-committee should also be able to undertake this work with the specific authority to consult with those agencies to develop a scope of work and determine if an RFP is required. If so, it should direct Lewis County to issue the RFP and then serve as the selection committee for the respondents of the RFP to negotiate a final scope and budget and direct Lewis County to execute a contract up to $900,000.

It was discussed this morning who should serve on this sub-committee and it was suggested it should be three people from the Flood Authority. While the legislation stated that you will consult with these three entities, it was suggested that if decisions came to a vote it would be by four of the six people working on that issue.

The last piece is the requirement to submit the proposal to the Army Corps of Engineers for review. The purpose of this is to ensure to the extent possible that work done will be eligible to serve as in-kind match for the Basin-wide General Investigation. In the event that the Corps cannot respond in a timely

manner, the Governor's letter supports moving forward to developing the study and scope of work likely to qualify for the federal match.

ESA Adolfson's recommendation is to form the three-person peer review fisheries committee at this meeting and to authorize them to make all the decisions listed in the memo. We are recommending this because of the tight time schedule and the window in which to conduct the fisheries study. The committee could be formed today, hold the first meeting later this month; in early June the peer review and the fisheries proposal under way and sent to the Corps for review and the RFP issued, all of which would happen concurrently. Late in June the fisheries proposal would be due and come back to begin a selection process. In July we would expect feedback from the Corps as well as the peer review to be completed and in July we would contract with a firm to do the fisheries study. In August a contract can be approved to begin the fish study.

Chairman Willis stated this is a very aggressive timeline and it is asking the Board to do something out of the ordinary by giving authorities to the sub-committee that normally would come back to this Board for consideration.

Mr. Taylor asked if we are to consider a six or seven person board. Mr. Mackey stated the three person board from the Flood Authority would be the same people with three assignments and there would be six people doing the scoping for the fisheries study and those same three people working with DOE for the peer review and submitting materials to the Corps.

Mr. Taylor asked if they all vote. Mr. Mackey stated on the fisheries study the discussion was all six would have a vote; if there was not a unanimous decision, it would be four of the six making the decision.

Mr. Mackey stated the three people discussed from the Flood Authority would be the three County Commissioners or their designee. Chairman Willis stated all three commissioners promised to make the time to serve on this committee.

Ms. Fund understands we want consensus but we would go with a four-to-two vote if necessary. It is important to emphasize this. If there are two people saying the decision is flawed that can damage this and stressed that everything should be done to reach consensus.

Commissioner Valenzuela moved that the three county commissioners on the Flood Authority, Commissioners Averill, Willis and Valenzuela, form the three-person peer review committee and participate on the fisheries sub-committee with the three agencies. Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Chairman Willis asked for discussion.

Mr. Schillinger stated he sincerely appreciates and respects what it will take by these Commissioners to get this work done and thanked them.

Mr. Mackey requested a correction to the motion which did not include "and/or their designee". Commissioner Valenzuela added that statement.

Commissioner Averill stated the Board is giving some authority to the sub-committee that would normally come before the Flood Authority but it is not totally without controls. The sub-committee will

be reporting back as it progresses and there are contracts involved so there will be an opportunity to put them before hearings at Lewis County as it acts as fiscal agent. Also, the amounts of money mentioned in the budget are budget amounts and hopefully we will come under those amounts if at all possible.

We are working on the biological study with impacts on water retention and we want that study to include water retention only, water retention and water quality, and water retention, water quality and hydro so it is not just the big project and nothing else.

Mr. Taylor is uneasy about the "and/or designee" stipulation in the motion. Staff people could be designated to make decisions for elected officials and he is not in favor of that. Decisions that need to be made include money to be spent and he believes elected officials need to make those decisions.

Chairman Willis asked Commissioner Valenzuela to reiterate her comments from the work session conversation.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the designee would be whoever she said it would be and she would expect that designee to do or say whatever Commissioner Valenzuela would do or say in her absence. The choice of being a Commissioner or designee is mostly about the problem of facing the expedited time frame. We cannot afford to have any of the meetings slip because of the lack of availability of one or two of the county commissioners. The insurance is to send the designee with instructions of what Commissioner Valenzuela would like to see happen at that meeting.

Mr. Taylor suggested a designee could be another person from the Flood Authority. Mr. Taylor stated he would go if Commissioner Valenzuela could not. Commissioner Valenzuela did not see how that could work. She cannot instruct Mr. Taylor since he is another member of the Flood Authority; she can only instruct someone who works for her.

Mr. Taylor would like to have representation from either Centralia or Chehalis on the sub-committee.

Mr. Cook understood the designee would be put into place only under unforeseen circumstances. He does not take lightly the three people taking all the responsibility but through our earlier discussion this is the only option we have. The more people on the committee the more difficult it will be to make decisions.

Ms. Fund asked if these will be public meetings and if anyone can attend. Chairman Willis stated they would be open public meetings through the process of advertising. Mr. Easton asked what the requirements are for advertising ahead of time for a public meeting. Mr. Mackey stated all the meetings are open meetings, noticed on the web, and we need to move ahead as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Johnson said 24 hours notice on the web and through media releases is enough notification.

Chairman Willis stated Chehalis and Centralia will be represented through the Lewis County Commissioner.

Mr. Taylor asked if Ms. Fund could be on the committee which would give four votes as opposed to three.

Chairman Willis asked when these meetings might take place taking into consideration Mondays and Tuesdays which will not work for the Commissioners.

Commissioner Averill asked if Ms. Fund has the time to devote to these meetings. Ms. Fund stated she would make it work.

Mr. Taylor amended the motion to include Ms. Fund on the sub-committee. Commissioner Averill seconded the motion.

Chairman Willis asked if there were objections to the amendment. There were none and the amendment passed.

Chairman Willis asked if there was objection to the motion on the table and asked Ms. Anderson to read the motion. The motion was: Commissioner Valenzuela moved that the three county commissioners on the Flood Authority, and/or designee, Commissioners Averill, Willis and Valenzuela, form the three-person peer review committee and participate on the fisheries sub-committee with the three agencies.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the motion is now an amended motion that would include representation by the City of Centralia.

There was no objection and the motion passed.

Mr. Mackey stated two more decisions need to be made: To give the explicit authority that is listed in the memo for each of their three tasks, and go back to the voting issue since there are now 7 people on the fisheries study. Mr. Mackey suggested 5 votes in favor or at least a majority vote, which is 4.

Commissioner Averill moved that we accept the task as presented by ESA Adolfson in the memo on the peer review and fisheries study. Motion seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cook stated the Flood Authority was designed to come to consensus or have a 2/3 majority or 5 votes in this case. The sub-committee should be bound by the same rules. Commissioner Averill concurred as the maker of the motion. Mr. Taylor seconded. There was no disagreement with the motion and was approved.

11. Flood District Contract

Mr. Mackey stated a proposal was received last month from FCS Group and since then ESA has reviewed their scope and made it tighter and the original proposed cost has come down considerably. Observations from the BAC and others indicate that the FCS Group is very highly trained and competent and understands the issues that it takes to form multiple-county flood districts. They have put together people who understand that as well as a public outreach team.

In the member packet is the scope of services divided by tasks and a budget to accomplish those services and tasks. Mr. Mackey is asking that the Flood Authority approve this so it can move forward.

The first phase is to look at putting together a flood control zone district. Originally a lot of time was going to be spent to decide between a flood control district and a flood control zone district but FCS has done a lot of legal work and partly because of timing, they believe the flood control zone district is the best choice. People do need to understand the differences, however, and that is shown as Task 4. The

rest of the tasks and budget is making that assumption. If you decide to go through another type of structure, FCS's scope and budget would change.

Phase 2, Task 1 is an important task. The proposal on page 3 talks about drafting up to 8 policy issues presenting alternative solutions or analyzing alternatives, making some recommendations on how to proceed. Those things could include options for cost recovery, how to make decisions, how to have representation, financial participation and governance, how to include the Chehalis Tribe or other governmental agencies and many more. Going through all this work will allow you to go through the other tasks rather quickly.

In terms of the district boundaries, we asked FCS to look specifically at the Chehalis River Basin, the three Counties and the Tribe and they are open to starting there but are also open to other counties coming into this if necessary.

The economic analysis does two things: it sets a way of setting your charges and rates in the future and it looks at the economic benefits of the whole region so people understand why a flood district is important. Mr. Mackey went through the other objectives of FCS.

Commissioner Averill asked if Mr. Mackey is looking for approval from the Flood Authority so that Lewis County as fiscal agent can move toward a contract award.

Mr. Taylor asked why we need to spend the time exploring the flood control district if we are already planning on going with the flood control zone district.

Chairman Willis stated Mr. Taylor understands the differences because he has been involved in all the discussions. Other commissioners need to be involved with this process and they do not understand all the ramifications of the two districts.

Mr. Mackey stated they did pose that question to FCS and they will provide the pros and cons but the emphasis is on a public workshop and getting the educational work done.

Commissioner Averill stated the formation of a flood control zone district, by law, is in the purview of the county commissioners of the three counties and while we are in the process for getting the funding from OFM the study will be for the Flood Authority in terms of the preparation. But, eventually it must be presented to the three county commissions as they will be making the final decision. This group will be working with both the Flood Authority and the respective counties.

Commissioner Averill moved to approve the proposed scope of services and authorize Lewis County to prepare a contract. Mr. Taylor seconded.

Commissioner Averill, speaking to the motion, stated Lewis County has had some exposure to the FCS Group and they are truly professionals. They helped King County and Snohomish County form their flood districts and have considerable experience in this area, albeit those were only single county processes. We were briefed some time ago by John Ghilarducci when we discussed the merits of the districts and he pointed out that in King County a group was formed as a water district under this provision of the law. They do have experience working with multiple jurisdictions. While we only had one group apply, it is fortunate that it was this group.

Chairman Willis asked if there were other comments or questions. There were none. The Chair asked if there was any disagreement with the decision. There was no disagreement and the decision was approved.

12. Early Warning Contract
Ms. Root stated this contract is a continuation of West Consultant's contract. Phase I was the needs analysis for early warning in the Basin. Phase II was originally envisioned as a design of an early warning system and after rethinking their concept of the early warning system they could implement what was requested with the remaining budget. This is in the handout in the packets as well as their task list which Ms. Root summarized.

Throughout Phase II West Consultants will be working with local jurisdictions and with the federal agencies, such as NWS and USGS.

Commissioner Averill stated there was a contract for Phase I and he stated the Board is being asked to approve this in concept and allow Lewis County to finalize the contract.

Commissioner Averill made a motion to approve this approach and authorize Lewis County to finalize the details. Commissioner Valenzuela seconded the motion. There was no objection and the motion was approved.

NEW BUSINESS

13. ESA Adolfson Draft Scope
Mr. Mackey stated the breakdown of the budget was in the overall budget. ESA looked at the proposed budget that the Flood Authority approved and the tasks and scope of work follow the budget outline that was approved. We looked at what we've done in the past and tried to anticipate the kind of work you will need for projects in the future. This is considerably less than it has been in the past and a good portion of the budget is associated with forming the flood district. There will be a tremendous amount of joint work with the consultant to ensure they have the support they need, which they asked for specifically. Some jurisdictions have also asked for our assistance in this matter.

Mr. Mackey reiterated that he is doing this work because he thinks the Flood Authority is doing a great job and he is proud to be involved with it and believes the work has made a difference. The issue here is what ESA believes the Flood Authority will need in terms of staff work to get its work done and it could be by ESA Adolfson or someone else or you could decide you do not need this level of support.

The budget amount came in at $281,120 and as Commissioner Valenzuela pointed out, depending on how the budget comes back, if there are other potential studies, the budget could be amended to include those as well. We looked at LiDAR and the Coordinated Study as possibilities.

Mr. Mackey stated this scope of work is for the Flood Authority's consideration and a decision will be requested at the meeting in June.

Ms. Fund stated it is costing $3800 for ESA staff to attend each meeting, which seems like a lot of money. A possibility discussed at the work session was how to cut down this cost.

Ms. Fowler stated she would like to see a breakdown of those costs.

Chairman Willis stated this topic would be on the work session agenda for June and asked the members to come prepared with any questions.

14. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the West Consulting contract was originally proposed with phases and Phase I has been initiated and completed, and Phase II was pending for money to do that. Showing that we have the money, Mr. Johnson believes the only thing that is necessary is to prepare a supplemental contract to complete Phase II and have that authorized by the Lewis County Commissioners. He and Mr. Carter will discuss that to be sure.

Mr. Johnson stated even though ESA Adolfson charges for their work based on the number of meetings we have, they actually do more. The money charged per meeting has to do with preparation, research, meetings they hold previous to the formal meetings, as well as conducting the Board Advisory Committee meetings. There is a lot more to that budget amount than meets the eye.

Mr. Johnson stated the itemized budget is in the member packets. There will be some money left over from the first year of the biennium that we will roll over into the working package. We have extrapolated the employee benefits, supplies, etc. that we anticipate will be used from the original OFM budget.

Commissioner Averill confirmed that this is not the new budget discussed earlier but the budget we had previously for the $2.5 million.

Mr. Johnson stated that is correct. The second page of the handout shows a breakdown of the detailed expenditures and those are from the Flood Authority inception, or from the 2007 to 2008 biennium. It has been difficult to determine exactly how much money has been spent during a state fiscal year because we did not start during the state's fiscal year. We received the $2.5 million during the last biennium and it was rolled over and ahead of the fiscal year.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the Flood Authority does not have an attorney but we have paid nearly $15,000 to the Lewis County Prosecuting Attorney. She asked for clarification.

Mr. Johnson stated many things approved by the Flood Authority have to go through Lewis County as the fiscal agent. Since those things need to go through our BOCC they must be reviewed by legal staff.

Chairman Willis stated that the money spent is from the inception of the Flood Authority.

15. Announcement of Special Meeting

Mr. Mackey stated because of our full agenda today we could not discuss the issues on the Basin-wide General Investigation with the Corps of Engineers. There was a proposal that the Flood Authority and the Chehalis Basin Partnership get together with the Corps to look at the possibility of both the with and without project conditions to look at the basin-wide General Investigation project either assuming the Twin Cities Project is there or assuming it is not. The Corps has stated they would come to a meeting to present those alternatives with time frames. We have scheduled this meeting so there is time to have a discussion between the two groups on whether they wish to do that if they want to move forward with the General Investigation. That meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 25, at 9:00 at the Veterans Museum.

Commissioner Averill stated, regarding the meeting on Tuesday, there has been a lot of discussion about this topic with the Partnership and with the Flood Authority. At the last meeting, Commissioner Averill provided an outline of some concerns that we in Lewis County have with the PMP. If you still have that document, he asked that everyone review it as it will be part of the discussion.

16. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 17. There will be a morning work session from 9:00 to 11:30 AM at the Veterans Museum and the business meeting will be from 1:30 to 3:00 PM at the Lewis County Courthouse.

Commissioner Averill stated that meeting happens to coincide with the Washington Association of Counties summer meeting and Commissioner Averill will not be able to attend the Flood Authority work session.

17. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 PM.