

**Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority Work Session
WSU Extension Conference Room**

**Thursday, February 18, 2010
Meeting Notes**

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 9:00.

2. Introductions

Introductions were made. Chairman Willis encouraged active participation and took the same stance as Commissioner Averill at the previous work session: Bruce Mackey will facilitate the meetings.

3. General Investigation Project Management Plan (PMP)

Ms. Lee Napier encouraged questions as she went through the PowerPoint that explained some of the elements of the plan. The draft PMP is not out yet for broad distribution as it is still in draft form. Copies are available if desired.

The Introduction to the PMP describes work to occur in the feasibility study of the Chehalis Basin project. Its purpose is ecosystem restoration and flood risk management. Ms. Napier described what the PMP will entail: cost, schedule of performance; how we resolve issues; etc. Grays Harbor County is the local sponsor but this is a basin wide project initiated in 1999. At that time we knew there was work going on in the Twin Cities area regarding flooding and Grays Harbor County wanted to coordinate with the Twin Cities project. This project has a long history in the watershed.

Commissioner Averill stated the Corps says it will deal with Grays Harbor County getting rights of ways condemning property and to put that into the PMP is unsatisfactory. The Corps must recognize that Grays Harbor County is the lead agent and they are dealing with the Chehalis Partnership. Until they recognize that they must coordinate with all of us or they will not get anywhere.

Ms. Napier stated if we need to acquire property, we will enter into an interlocal agreement and the appropriate party will assume more of a lead. Commissioner Averill stated that needs to be stated in the PMP.

Commissioner Averill stated this plan is full of Corps jargon. For example: with project conditions and without project conditions. No one is sure what that means and it should be explained up front.

Project description

Another purpose was added which is flood risk management as well as additional partnerships.

Section 3.0

We need local partners. Grays Harbor County is the local sponsor (that is a 50% cost share non-federal sponsor). We need the scope budget and schedule and an interlocal agreement. All stakeholders will need to enter into an agreement to establish cost sharing. In-kind credit services were discussed.

Project Objectives

There was discussion regarding the project objectives. Some transportation routes need to be added. Chairman Willis suggested stating "critical transportation corridors" rather than naming individual roads.

It was asked if the phrase "maximum extent practicable" is needed. Mr. Johnson asked how one measures what is practicable. Ms. Hempleman suggested "most economical". Ms. Powe reminded everyone that this is the Corps language.

Commissioner Averill spoke of section 3.3, the Executive Committee. He does not understand it and it should include the Tribe and others indicated here.

Section 4.0: Work Accomplished and Current Efforts.

The Flood Authority completed the first draft of the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan, it has gathered information in basin; summarized information about flooding, identified studies needed to analyze and mitigate flooding problems, identified potential projects to reduce flood damages. Ms. Napier asked for other suggestions that reflects the work of the Flood Authority.

Commissioner Averill stated the USGS support tool is not included. Ms. Napier stated that has been removed and added as a USGS project under a separate heading.

Commissioner Averill mentioned the evaluation of land use regulations that has been worked on. Dave Carlton stated all hazard mitigation planning for the counties and cities should be included. The Coordinated Study should be in there and also the move towards a permanent flood organization.

Project Scope

The PMP is in draft form and feasibility cost sharing will be updated. Grays Harbor County will execute the cost sharing agreement of the 50/50 match. Success of this project is contingent upon a willingness for stakeholders to partner with Grays Harbor County in the cost sharing agreement.

Section 6.0: Schedule

The updated PMP is due to be completed by May 2010. BAC has sent comments to the Corps and they will meet on the 25th at the Thurston County Health Bldg on Lilly Rd. It is critical to get peoples' input because there have been so many delays already. Our goal is to have it accepted by the Counties and the Corps as a final draft. We will then work on the feasibility cost sharing agreement, which does exist but needs to be amended.

It was stated that the Table 7, Page 26 needs explanation.

Section 7.0: Budget

The feasibility total project cost is \$12,100,000. Cost share is a 50% non-federal match which can be cash or work in kind.

Commissioner Averill stated we do have a 50/50 share in this process and we need to recognize the in-kind contribution. We need to ask jurisdictions to look at what they can include.

Ms. Napier stated it is important to talk to each other to come up with possibilities. Grays Harbor County is using the watershed planning process; we need to ask the Corps if we can count the LiDAR and other data collection projects. She asked if the work on the flood hazard management plan could be used.

Mr. Bob Johnson stated what is acceptable was the subject of discussion and Corps people who were there were not the ones to answer the question. They can't tell us since we don't have the PMP and if it is not included in the PMP their guidelines do now allow them to accept any local match that happened before the PMP is in place. Perhaps a place holder can be put in there but there is no legal opinion from the Corps if that can be included. The Corps ultimately determines what meets their guidelines. There is an uncertainty as to what they will accept and that needs to be addressed early on.

Ms. Napier stated she will work with the Corps as to what Grays Harbor County has done during the period of time when they did not report match and see if the Corps will allow additional credit towards cost sharing.

Dave stated LiDAR could be a benefit to the partnership

Mr. Ron Schillinger suggested retention facilities or ponds that go with development whether private or government-owned. This is a huge investment in flood reduction and ecosystem restoration.

Section 9: Communications

Commissioner Averill stated the Flood Authority understood we had the appropriation from Congress to fund this study. Do we create a new GI study or do we combine the GI with the Basin Partnership or let the Basin Partnership lead the study. Because the Basin Partnership study already exists, that would cut down processing time so we can get on with the study. The study has been going on for 11 years and the new PMP says we will not see anything new for 7 years. Much of the work has already been done and the Flood Authority has commissioned projects to pick off the shelf so we can make some progress. We need recognition from the Corps that this is there. Commissioner Averill will deliver that message to Bill Goss this afternoon but it needs to be in the text of the PMP. This is not business as usual; we may have to parse out what we work on, what is more important, and maybe that's what we need to tell the Corps.

Ms. Napier stated a project to restore the flood plain became a project that we worked with the Corps. Chairman Willis stated the hydraulic study has already started, too.

Section 9: Audiences

There was discussion about narrowing down all the audiences.

Section 10: Risk Management

The project and the study are related risks; i.e. Congress does not appropriate money for the Corps.

Section 11: Acquisition Plan

These are developed on a case by case basis

Section 12: Change Management

Ms. Napier explained that if issues could not be resolved at the staff level the management team would become involved to develop a solution. The management team or Change Management as referred to in the PMP includes management representation from the Corps and Grays Harbor County.

Section 17: PMP approval

Ron Schillinger commented on acquisitions: DNR, Cascade Land Conservancy and Land Trust have been busy acquiring valuable lands for flooding and ecosystem restoration. Those should be included as they have been in progress and are on-going.

Ms. Napier stated the PMP is being reviewed by sponsors and the next step is to complete it in March for execution in May. If the public comments necessitate change, then it will need to be re-worked.

Bruce thanked Ms. Napier for taking her time and all of her input.

4. Flood Plan

Ms. Ann Root stated last June the draft CFHMP was distributed. She would like to schedule public meetings on this.

Ms. Root wrote a new section on funding options (section 8) and she will add regulatory regulations to Chapter 3 and an actions chapter; there were some miscellaneous updates and crediting.

A more formal review was conducted and the edited version was distributed to the BAC in December. They went through it and provided comments and corrections which were mostly minor corrections. There were a couple of issues that were more significant. First: Inconsistent detail. Solution: edit it down and reduce detail and move some to the appendix. Second: Some sections are more focused on Lewis County than on other areas in the Basin. There is a lot of information about flood problems and history. We will add information regarding FEMA changes in insurance policies and claims status. The best thing we can do is make it more obvious why some sections focus more on Lewis County than on other areas of the Basin.

Adoption process for the plan

Step 1: Conduct public meetings on the plan. Earlier information from the hearings was included in the plan and now the public needs to see what it looks like. Ms. Root would like to schedule meetings for early April and adopt in June. Last year there were two public meetings and perhaps we could do something comparable. She is looking for input.

Commissioner Averill asked how we characterize the plan.

Ms. Root stated it is a model plan and it is the responsibility of each jurisdiction to adopt their own. Mr. Carlton stated each jurisdiction may need to have its own meetings, too.

Ms. Root stated the Plan will be revised in response to public comment and the final copy will be ready in May and then we will ask the Flood Authority to adopt the plan as the Flood Authority plan and pass a resolution recommending the jurisdictions adopt the plan as a separate process. The details need to be worked out. We are open to suggestions but our budget limits us somewhat. To be consistent we should hold two meetings.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated there was a great attendance at Swede Hall in Rochester.

Mr. MacReynold stated the bigger players are the three counties so we should have one in each county.

Mr. Johnson suggested one location with three different times for the meetings.

Some topics of discussion that followed:

- Format of meeting; should everyone be allowed to speak
- Brainstorm sessions are more effective
- Are all problems recognized
- Changes to the recommendations
- Structure is needed on what is to be discussed

Ms. Root stated we can come back next month with a plan for structuring. We need to know when, where and how many meetings we will need.

It was determined there will be meetings at Swede Hall, Montesano City Hall and the Veterans Museum. Information will be available on line.

5. Break

The group took a break and reconvened at 10:38.

6. Coordinated Study

This afternoon the Flood Authority will make a decision on the RFP and RFQ. There is a cover memo and a copy of the RFP in the member packets.

In January the Flood Authority asked ESA to prepare an RFP to undertake the coordinated study. Its Objectives are on Page 2.

Commissioner Averill stated the governor's office asked us to sit in with ESA and others to figure out how to put these projects together. There is no supposition that we finish this process by looking at water retention. One aspect is PUD as the sponsor of the water retention project and it had a hydro component to it. The real issue is what do we want and is it cost effective - how do the levees and retention complement each other? Is there a lesser objective that accomplishes the reduction of the amount of water going down the river? There is a secondary and intermediate between the current PUD plans. Do we want to look at water retention and water quality? If we are to have a combination to this study it still needs to meet the Corps' cost benefits ratio which has to be a minimum of 1-1. We rely on work already in progress.

Chairman Willis stated this is a combination of looking at better protection with two projects and it addresses the cost analysis because one project may not be able to stand alone.

Mr. Mark White understood that PIE already did this.

Commissioner Averill stated the Corps will not accept the PIE data. When we got to the levee project, it was a process of narrowing down for costs. There had been water retention included in that project but it was ruled out. It was a reduced project from what was originally designed. Grays Harbor County's

participation was contingent on the Skookumchuck Dam being part of the solution. We can't hold enough water there and the Corps can only cost benefit 11,000 acre feet. Currently the only thing for help down river is if we can slow down the water so the river can absorb it. There are too many issues that are not being addressed, such as the Dillenbaugh, China Creek, and others. That is what the study is about-- to see what combinations will work.

Chairman Willis stated we should pull information we already have and asked why the Corps does not accept PIE's solutions.

Commissioner Averill stated PIE and the Corps have problems and the Corps will not explain why.

Mr. White asked at what point do we decide if the dams will benefit anyone besides Chehalis. Mr. Carlton stated that is the purpose of the study.

Mr. Johnson stated the Corps has a project in mind and work that supports that project. In the case of the Corps project, they already knew what they wanted to do and they did not look at upstream water retention. They need the opportunity to look at it because there is a downstream impact associated with the Twin Cities project. There may be something else that can be done, more than a cursory look at upstream. If we make that demand they may look at it seriously.

Mr. Mackey stated a decision to make later today is who you suggest for the selection committee. We think three reps from the Flood Authority and Dave Muller (PUD) since this must coordinate with his project; John Donahue, Marjorie Wolfe and Bruce Mackey. He asked for other suggestions.

Mr. MacReynold and Mr. Schillinger liked the selection of people. Mr. Bruce Treichler believes it is inappropriate to have Dave Muller on the committee. Mr. Mackey stated the purpose was for technical expertise. Mr. Treichler stated that is available without Mr. Muller.

John Penberth agreed with Mr. Treichler.

After discussion it was the consensus that the BAC, John Donahue, Marjorie Wolfe and Bruce Mackey would be the panel to review the RFP. The appearance of fairness needs to be considered when the PUD is involved.

Mr. Johnson stated he supports that idea. The BAC has already set the precedence for making recommendations. The BAC has acted on ESA's qualifications and has gone through a number of those processes. It is an open meeting but it eliminates that appearance of fairness issue. ESA has the people to provide technical information.

Chairman Willis stated the facilitator needs to understand the differences between a flood district and a flood control zone district. Depending on which district is chosen there are other steps. We need a facilitator to help us get down that path.

Mr. Mackey stated the facilitator will also bring expert knowledge and experience to understand the two options to help the Flood Authority make a choice. Once a decision is made the people need to understand it. We recommend BAC review the RFQ also.

Commissioner Averill emphasized a sense of urgency. In 2008 the intent was that the Flood Authority was a temporary or interim body and another body would take over. We are in 2010 already and have not made a lot of progress. We tied ourselves to a flood district and we tried to get some legislation changed to a multi-county flood district. Most flood districts are small and the most successful zone districts cover a larger area but they are in a single county. We are still talking about including three counties. The problem is not the formation but how we put it together and we need consulting advice if that is the direction we want to go. He suggested we go beyond the way to do it and start the process of documentation. This body will need to make a recommendation to three counties and we need to include the Tribe.

Mr. Mackey stated this RFQ is designed to do that. We requested a supplemental budget for next year and it looks like it will be moving forward but he is getting clear messages that there will only be one more year of funding.

Mr. Glenn Carter explained the differences between the two districts. A Zone District is only for each county. The governance of the multi-county is easy; individual zones are more difficult. In a Flood Control District you can charge a tax; there are charges that can vary according to the benefit one receives.

Regarding governance, a zone district is controlled by the BOCC in each county. People who are paying may not want the commissioners to be their supervisors; they may want people who are living in the flood plain to be their supervisors. Flood control zone districts allow the right for an election for supervisors. Flood control districts have three commissioners and they are put together according to the legislative representative of each county and the ability to make sure there are not more than one representative from one county. The flood control zone district creation is different; it takes a resolution of the BOCC. The multi county flood control district has all the bells and whistles but when you go to the public you must state the project, whether it is a levee, a retention project, etc. That project has to be put on the ballot and if you don't know what the project is it doesn't go on the ballot. The financial issue is separate.

The Board will review the RFQ and discuss it at the afternoon meeting.

7. Flood Maps

Dave Carlton provided a FEMA PowerPoint and discussed it briefly. The NFIP (National Flood Insurance Plan) was created in 1968 and in the early 70's there was more involvement in risk management.

The PowerPoint offered Basic Reasons for NFIP and the Objectives of the NFIP. It is a voluntary program but if a jurisdiction does not participate, residents cannot be insured or qualify for disaster relief.

The Federal Role is to identify the risk; establish development/building standards and provide affordable flood insurance and coverage.

Study procedures

Preliminary maps will be available next month. FEMA will hold public meetings (with staff first) and the appeal period starts a 90 day period. During that time studies can be done to show that something has been done incorrectly. Errors must be in data or methodology, not "I have lived here 100 years and it never flooded."

Mr. Carter understands there is not a lot of public participation for this process.

Mr. Carlton explained the hydrology which is how much water will flow, the finalizing of the maps and the typical reasons for appeals.

FEMA has guidelines and specifications; how studies are done, particularly hydraulic modeling and how to treat levees. Don't expect flood applications to mimic reality or to mimic your experience. Unless those levees can be certified by the Corps FEMA will ignore them.

Mr. Johnson stated his biggest concern is the maps don't necessarily reflect reality; they are a model and the counties and cities are required to adopt regulatory measures to adopt the perception of reality that those maps represent.

8. Adjourn

Discussion was shortened on the flood maps due to the time and the meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

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

**February 18, 2010 – 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Notes**

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

Others Present: Please see sign in sheets

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from January 21 Work Session and Business Meeting
- Ripe and Ready Projects Update
- Memo re: Flood Plan
- Decision Support Tool
- Memo re: Coordinated Study RFP
- Memo re: Flood District RFQ
- Memo from the City of Chehalis
- Expenditure Review

1. Call to Order

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

2. Introductions

Self introductions were made by all attending

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Taylor asked to be put on the agenda to comment on the Chehalis City Council discussion. Chairman Willis stated his item would be added after Item 4. The agenda was approved with the addition.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes from January 21, 2010

Chairman Willis asked if there were any corrections or additions to the meeting notes. There were none and without objection the meeting notes were approved.

Mr. Taylor stated the Chehalis City Council met on Tuesday to discuss the Councilors' opinions of the direction the Flood Authority is taking. He read from a memorandum from Mr. MacReynold, Chehalis City Manager, supporting the next phase of the retention study, the coordinated study of the retention dam and levees, the reauthorization of a different USACE Twin Cities project, and moving towards a flood control district.

Chairman Willis stated most of these items are on today's agenda and they can be discussed during the meeting.

5. Public Comment

Ms. Lynn Davidson, 322 River Rd, Chehalis, stated they lost everything in the 2007 flood and have subsequently rebuilt. She strongly encouraged the Flood Authority to approve the PUD Phase IIB study and immediately begin the formation of the flood control district. She is concerned about the economic and environmental issues the County faces. Attempting to resolve the current flood issues with past proposed solutions will not be the answer.

Ms. Larissa Maughan, 123 Goff Rd., Adna, stated she was also flooded and the effects of both the 2007 and 2009 floods are still being felt by the people and the river system. River banks are caving in and large trees are falling. Ms. Maughan encouraged the formation of a flood control district and to continue with the upstream storage facility.

Mr. David Fenn, 1191 Wildwood Rd., Curtis, stated he appreciates the time and effort the members of the Flood Authority have put in. He believes, however, that things can move faster than they have been. He is frustrated about the money that has been spent on issues that are not substantive to what needs to be achieved, for example the phone survey, and the money to study the differences between flood districts and flood zones. From what he learned on the computer he believes he can tell the Flood Authority the differences. He would like not to see more money spent on studies.

He commented on the amount of water that can be stored in a retention area. Dams have the potential to protect everyone in the valley and not just part of an area. More water stored in the summer would benefit fish, farmers and municipal water systems.

Mr. Pete Dykstra, 7711 Curtis Hill Rd., Chehalis, lost his dairy herd in 2007. He stated everything is devoted to studies. People along the rivers and creeks are scared and something must be done and he believes that is water retention. He agrees fish are important but people are more important. He stated he believes the Howard Hanson Dam has benefited the fish.

Ms. Julie Powe, Chehalis, complimented the Flood Authority on a productive work session. She does not believe the Flood Authority has decided on a course of action that is better than another. She suggested an open discussion between the members as to what each likes or dislikes about retention dams or other options. If we all ask for the same thing, the Corps, the State and the Representatives would listen. With the mixed messages they are receiving, they are not listening. Send one message forward.

Ms. Powe stated the comments made earlier and in the newspaper makes One Voice appear to be an organization that is insulting the Flood Authority. That is not the case. One Voice is one voice of the public which comes from Lewis, Thurston, and Grays Harbor County. This voice is trying to tell the Flood Authority what the public wants. The people want a solution to flooding. If the Flood Authority and the people tell the Corps what they want then our representatives would get behind us and make the Corps move on it. We are not getting that and that is where the frustration is coming from.

Mr. Allyn Roe, Manager of the Chehalis-Centralia Airport, read a letter into the record stating the flooding of 2007 crippled the airport operations and listing support of flood control measures which were the same as the City of Chehalis.

Chairman Willis thanked everyone for their comments. Public participation is a very important part of what the Flood Authority processes are.

6. Reports

a. Chairman's report

Chairman Willis stated the work session that precedes the business meeting is to discuss issues coming before the Flood Authority and for issues that are on the business agenda. Today's was well attended and there was a candid conversation between the attendees on issues before the Board. She encouraged the board members to attend.

Chairman Willis stated the City of Centralia invited her, and she invited Vice Chair Averill, to its regular council meeting on March 3 to brief the council on the Flood Authority.

b. Member Reports

Commissioner Averill responded to the article in the Chronicle regarding his performance as the Flood Authority Chair.

Commissioner Averill spoke of his involvement with the Flood Authority since its inception and working with the Legislature to get funding to move forward with projects. He stated it is a slow process with many hurdles. There are requirements of DOE, WDFW, Department of Commerce, as well as the Tribes and local property owners.

Commissioner Averill stated the Chehalis River Basin is the second largest basin in the State of Washington. The river is over 100 miles long and the problems in the upper basin are different from the problems in the central basin and different again from the lower basin which is impacted by tidal flows which changes the problems. As a group we need the neighboring counties and jurisdictions and the Tribe to help solve the problems.

The Flood Authority cannot accomplish projects without money. All the counties are experiencing shortfalls. When federal and state dollars are given there are strings attached. If we are going to get a solution to the problems we must work under the conditions and priorities that are set by those institutions.

Commissioner Averill stated he may not have done everything right but he has given an honest effort and will continue to give an honest effort. He wants this issue solved; there have been flooding issues and attempts at solutions since the 1930's and we have a legacy of not accomplishing it. The issues cannot be solved without working together.

There are funding decisions being made in the legislature and part of what is at risk is money that is there to help us solve these problems. If the legislature thinks we are not concerned or committed to our flooding problems that money could go away.

Commissioner Averill stated he respects One Voice and acknowledges that there are some outstanding minds in that group and important issues that they have brought up. We do need to move faster, and Commissioner Averill wants the state agencies and the Corps to see the frustrations we have in the Basin. We want to solve these problems.

The Twin Cities project was stalled for several years because of funding issues in Congress, but we should not be talking about a 2020 completion date. The GI study, which was put together with an

existing GI study so we could make quick progress, was started in 1999 and we are now talking about adding 7 more years before completion. This body has taken criticism for studies but those studies were oriented toward solving economic, geologic and environmental problems.

Commissioner Averill stated all the things the Flood Authority has accomplished in the last two years and it is currently working on a program to improve our emergency management. He compared the dollar amounts of damage in 2007 to 2009. Because of people's awareness and action occurring at an earlier time a lot less damage occurred in 2009.

The Flood Authority or a Flood Control District cannot solve all the problems. We can only work on pieces; we can prepare ourselves for what we can do now, as individuals as well as a group.

Commissioner Averill stated he is in this fight and he will stay in it.

Mayor Schillinger stated a point made at the work session was that a lot of focus for this effort has been directed toward the Twin Cities and the upper basin. Mayor Schillinger stated that is okay. The more we solve the upper basin problems the better it will be all the way down to Montesano and Aberdeen. That is why we're here. We have all been here all along and we will continue to be here to work on the problem.

Chairman Willis stated this group has consistently looked at a basin solution. If there was contention it went away a long time ago partly through the participation of the cities of Aberdeen and Montesano, Oakville, the Tribe and others, and making sure the interests of those areas were brought forward.

c. Correspondence

There were two pieces of correspondence which were read into the record earlier in the meeting: a letter from the City of Chehalis city council and a letter from the Chehalis-Centralia Airport.

d. Facilitator's Report

Mr. Mackey stated he would speak on his issues as they appear on the agenda.

g. State Team Report

Mr. Antonio Ginatta stated on behalf of the governor he wanted to thank Commissioner Averill for his leadership in this Flood Authority and supports Commissioner Willis in her role as Chair. The governor supports a basin-wide solution, the Twin cities Project as part of that solution but not the whole solution, and she looks to the Flood Authority for guidance. She supports the studies that the Flood Authority is moving forward on and looking at addressing governance. Mr. Ginatta stated this is a tough budget year and there are people in the legislature who are looking to access the money that has been set aside by the State (\$50 million) that would be leveraged into \$120 million from Federal money to build the Twin Cities levee project. The governor is fighting against those efforts and will continue to do so. Mr. Ginatta will be meeting with the Chair of the House Capital Budget and that budget will be coming out next week. He will be working to ensure that the money remains there.

Mr. John Donahue reported that he met on January 28 with the Corps who had a presentation about the Twin Cities Project. Three topic areas were culled out and an agenda for those topics is being drafted. Those areas are hydraulic modeling, the Skookumchuck Dam improvements and a wetland mitigation review of the project. The agendas will be made available to everyone.

An e-mail will be going out thanking participants for a number of questions and answers that were generated by the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Donahue is trying to find places to post those questions and answers on the internet and he will be working with the Office of Financial Management which manages one of the State's websites and he will also work with the counties for links.

Mr. Donahue stated the State has met with the City of Chehalis regarding the questions in the resolution that was presented to the Flood Authority in December and the State has developed a number of follow-up items in cooperation with staff at the City and the Corps of Engineers.

Commissioner Averill asked Mr. Donahue to work with Mr. Bob Johnson since the Flood Authority website is on the Lewis County website.

Chairman Willis stated she has spoken with Mr. Donahue regarding links on websites. That is an area of opportunity for outreach to the communities. She is hoping to link Grays Harbor County with Lewis County and with the Flood Authority.

f. Corps of Engineers Report

Mr. Bill Goss stated the Corps met with FEMA and state people via telecom this morning to discuss the new mapping. The data was reviewed so the Corps' levee design data will be as compatible as possible with what FEMA is looking at. Further discussions will continue through the coming months.

Mr. Goss stated the Corps will be contacting the City of Chehalis to set up another meeting and site visits to examine some issues the city has.

Regarding the Project Management Plan, there will be a meeting on February 25 when non-editorial type comments will be discussed. From the comments he has seen so far, there do not appear to be huge issues.

Commissioner Averill stated some issues came up during the work session this morning and Ms. Napier will work with Mr. Goss on those issues. Regarding the levee study, there was a request from the Corps regarding some data. He believes that has been provided.

Mr. Goss stated he will follow up with his economist to be sure it has been received.

Mr. Goss stated at last month's meeting a question came up regarding in-kind work and what can be accepted from the non-federal sponsor. The Corps counsel stated what needs to be looked at is the work in the current PMP, not the one that is being revised, and whether that work is described in the feasibility cost share agreement. He will be discussing projects on an individual basis to see if they fit that bill. He did talk further with counsel regarding work that has been done towards water retention. That work is not in the current PMP or feasibility cost share agreement and it cannot credit work that has been done already towards the cost share.

Commissioner Averill stated the work done by the Flood Authority is all applicable to what we are looking at in the basin-wide study. We have chosen contractors who have worked with the Corps in the past and are currently working with the Corps which he believes can be part of the basin-wide GI when

we get it done. He asked if the Corps is willing to look at these projects and adopt them and he would ask the Corps' lawyers if those projects would then qualify.

Mr. Goss stated the Corps would be interested in all the data and all the reports and use them but work that is completed to date will not be credited. He is willing to discuss this at another time and include the attorneys if desired.

Chairman Willis stated Mr. Goss said work completed to date and asked about proposals that we have to move forward from today.

Mr. Goss stated any proposals should be included in the PMP we are currently working on for the combined two-purpose study: ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, and they should be in the feasibility cost share agreement. If they start before that the office of counsel stated it is best not to start any of those projects until the feasibility cost share agreement is signed and the PMP is finalized.

Chairman Willis asked what is considered the start date of any project.

Mr. Goss stated the Corps would like to review what is being proposed as far as scope of work and what the Corps process is and what we would include and have an understanding between us. Do we believe 100% of this is covered and should be cost share or do we believe this portion of this project is 50% of what the Corps would do and the other 50% may be non-federally required? He would like an agreement that all this work is included and covered in the PMP 100% or whatever percentage prior to any of the work being done. He believes that would be money spent but he will get clarification from counsel.

Chairman Willis stated there is a big difference between the date the contract is signed and the date the money is spent.

Mr. Goss stated he can clarify that with Corps counsel.

Mr. Bates stated an article in the newspaper spoke of a 20% rate. He asked if the project has been compromised to the point of 20% and needs to be reviewed and cause another time delay. He asked Mr. Goss to clarify that.

Mr. Goss stated for the Twin Cities Project the Corps is required to conduct a post authorization change report. That document changes since the last 35% design; changes in cost, changes in benefits or changes to design will all be looked at and it will go to Headquarters. We cannot stay within that 20% cost until the change of scope. The scope needs to stay the same and the cost also. If it stays within that range there is no re-authorization required.

Mr. Goss stated that for the Twin Cities project the Corps is required to conduct a post authorization change report. That document contains changes since the last 35% design: changes in cost, changes in benefits and changes in design will all be looked at, and it will all go to headquarters. We are not impacted by the 20% range until after the change of scope. After that the scope needs to stay in the 20% range and the cost also. If it stays within the 20% range then there is no re-authorization required.

Mr. Taylor asked how long it will be before the Corps reviews those numbers.

Mr. Goss stated at the 35% in September we will have a cost estimate and that should give us an accurate picture if we are close or if there is some leeway. We refine that as we go along to the 65% and final percent. At the 35% we should have an idea if we are still in the ballpark.

Mr. Taylor asked when the cost estimates will be put in there, from when the project started to when changes need to be made.

Mr. Goss stated those are all in the PMP report and the 35% design.

Mr. Bates asked in September at the 35% if the cost or scope exceeds 20% will it need to go back for reauthorization.

Mr. Goss stated there is some leeway within a couple of percentage points.

Mr. Bates stated if there is a need for re-authorization then will the whole timeframe be delayed significantly?

Mr. Goss stated a higher level of authority than his district would be needed to move ahead with the 65% design. We may be able to continue to work on design while the reauthorization is being looked at but Mr. Goss was unable to answer that question.

Mr. Taylor stated the City of Chehalis believes the Corps project needs to be changed significantly to include water retention as a major part of the project. That would make the project change more than 20%.

Mr. Goss stated that would change the entire scope and authorization by adding water retention. Additional retention structures could not be added to the Twin Cities Project under its current authorization. You would have to go back to the feasibility study and lose a considerable number of years or stop that project and include it under the Chehalis feasibility study and complete that study.

Mr. Taylor stated knowing that the council and the people are interested in water retention and knowing that would require us to re-do the project, is it smart to go forward when we will probably need to re-do it anyway? If we continue going to the 35% and the 65% then we have wasted all that money.

Mr. Goss stated if the levee projects were to go through and you looked at water retention structure under the Twin Cities Project you would have levees and added protection. It needs to be decided at the local level what best fits. We can give you possibilities.

Mr. Taylor stated if water retention proves viable, then the levee heights, levee lengths, the number of houses that we have to buy or condemn go down, and that is a good thing. It does not make sense to continue going forward until we know fully which way we are going at all.

Commissioner Averill stated the intent of the basin-wide GI study was to be able to look at the other alternatives. We were not looking 18 years out but one or two years. The answer Mr. Taylor wants could be answered if we do not drag our heels. We have already started the process and we have many

answers and studies that were conducted by firms that the Corps uses. We need to shorten the process.

Mr. Goss stated the first step is the PMP which gets everyone on board with what we are going to look at.

Mr. Cook stated we partnered with the Chehalis River Basin Partnership in the hopes that some of those funds that they expended would help with the matching funds. Are you saying that none of that is viable?

Mr. Goss stated not with the water retention studies, which was not in the PMP or cost share feasibility agreement. Other work we will look at and talk about, such as LiDAR, the hydraulic model, the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan, and the development of the PMP.

Chairman Willis stated Mr. Cook is correct in that the Chehalis Basin Partnership had about \$1 million in match that they brought to the GI study and that is what is available to us.

g. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. Muller stated the PUD is prepared to move forward with Phase IIB. A proposal was submitted in November and hopefully the Flood Authority will approve that and go forward. He understands the issues with the local match but the public is supporting that we move forward. We have already lost three or four months of time. The PUD board has approved the interlocal agreement and Mr. Muller has the authority to sign it as soon as the Flood Authority gives him the authority to do so.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Ripe and Ready Report

Mr. Mackey referred to the paper in the member packets regarding ongoing efforts. This gives a brief description and status of all the activities in which the Flood Authority is involved. He summarized each of the efforts. The Public Involvement is an update which describes major efforts on issues that are ongoing and also updates on efforts that correspond to the major efforts. This paper can be put in mailers or posted to websites to help keep the public informed as to what the Flood Authority is doing.

Mr. Mackey summarized the Ripe and Ready studies. He asked Spencer Easton to update the group on the Decision Support Tool and a meeting he recently attended with Ms. Lee Napier.

Mr. Easton stated the Decision Support Tool (DST) is part of the ripe and ready studies package that was approved last April. The DST is a watershed characterization study that USGS is conducting for the Chehalis Basin Partnership. They hoped to include in the scope a run-off model for the Basin and that is what we are calling the DST. The Authority supports that project but it did not have funding for it. The study is currently being funded by USGS, the Department of Ecology and the Corps of Engineers and due to some funding constraints the scope does not include the run-off model. What has been done so far are well inventories for 350 wells, work on a hydro-geology characterization and seepage measurements for the Basin. It is a very valuable project for water in the Basin. As Mr. Spencer understands it the Partnership and USGS still would like to pursue the run-off model as an additional phase of the model that will come later. We will continue to follow that project and keep the Flood Authority informed.

8. Upstream Storage Analysis Phase 2B

This is a continuing discussion from the past couple of months. Chairman Willis referred to the meeting notes from January 21, 2010 which recorded the debate about moving on to Phase 2B and whether or not it would be a match for the Corps project. Mr. Goss spoke on this issue earlier today. During the meeting of January 21 Chairman Averill asked if the Flood Authority should go ahead and approve the Phase 2B pending the Corps response on the in-kind local share and answering the questions of the DOE report. The Flood Authority moved to go forward. We have not received a report back from the Corps that is 100% credible, whether this could be used as a match, and the question of when a contract actually starts.

The Board will need to take some sort of action. Chairman Willis opened the discussion.

Commissioner Averill stated there is an interlocal agreement in the member packets between Lewis County as lead agency of the Authority and the Public Utilities District regarding the funding of Phase 2B. There is also a Phase 2B feasibility study scope of work and estimated budget. Commissioner Averill pointed out that this is providing for both an economic analysis and scope of work and a biological analysis and scope of work. Mr. White asked that during the engineering concept that the issues are addressed that were raised in January 7, 2009 [sic] DOE letter. (The actual year was 2010). Commissioner Averill understands that we must start with the engineering concepts before we can move to the first part of the economic study. On page 12 of the Scope of Work the first task is the refinement of desired storage.

Commissioner Averill moved to authorize Lewis County to finish the interlocal agreement and scope of work despite the fact that our match questions have not been answered. Mr. Taylor seconded.

Mayor Schillinger stated a lot of the jurisdictions have done things internally and spent money, as well as private individuals. It has cost everyone a lot of money and there will be more spent. He agreed that the Flood Authority needs to move ahead on this.

Ms. Lee stated the Town of Pe Ell concurs.

Mr. Cook stated Aberdeen agrees.

Mr. White stated he has issues with the quality of data that was presented in Phase 2A but he will not stand in the way if the group wants to move forward.

Chairman Willis asked for other comments. There were none. The motion was, in spite of the fact that this project may not be considered a match, that the Board move ahead with Phase 2B with Lewis County PUD. She asked for objections. There were none. The motion passed.

9. Coordinated Study

ESA Adolfson was asked to draft a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Coordinated Study. The objective of the study is to develop timely, comparable data on the Corps of Engineers project and an upstream storage facility to examine the economic feasibility of those two projects. The RFP is in the member packets. Page 2 under Objectives states the goal of the study, which Mr. Mackey read.

Chairman Willis asked if “being consistent with the Corps” hasn’t been an issue with other studies done before this group. Previous studies done did not link well with what the Corps was doing, or meet their criteria.

Mr. Mackey stated he was not involved with those but the idea is if you are going to build an upstream storage facility the only real funding you will be eligible for is federal funding, i.e. the Corps of Engineers. Therefore you want to do this study working closely with their economists and hydrologists so the work you do is compatible. Also, this would be coordinated with the Phase 2 study you just approved so the same methodology works. Consistent and comparable information for all three of these is necessary.

Commissioner Averill stated he has been critical of how fast the Corps is moving on its projects. He knows the restrictions under which the Corps operates and there are consequences for disobeying orders. What we are dealing with here is not what the Corps can or cannot do but that what the Corps responds to is the law. The Twin Cities Project was approved in a 2007 Act of Congress called the WRDA bill. That bill may be changed and it will take another act of Congress to do it. We have talked with the governor’s office and asked how to move this around so we have the information and data to make a case to Congress so they can determine whether or not they can change the WRDA bill. The objective is to get water retention as part of the plan, which would be a basin solution to this problem. That is what this is all about. We have representatives from Congressman Baird’s office, from Senator Murray’s office and Senator Cantwell’s office here today. He is challenging these individuals to help us and he moved to approve the RFP. Mr. Schillinger seconded.

Mr. Taylor asked if there is a group or a committee who will choose the firm.

Chairman Willis stated that discussion took place at the morning’s work session. There is a recommendation on the paperwork in the member packets. It has not been decided yet if that will be the group of people to choose the firm.

Mr. Mackey stated when the memo was drafted ESA was trying to consider technical representatives that would be able to review the proposals and make a recommendation to the Flood Authority. There was a lot of discussion at the morning work session and the consensus at that time was to recommend that the Board Advisory Committee (BAC) looks at this. The BAC consists of Lee Napier, Bob Johnson, Mark White, Glen Connelly, Kahle Jennings. Chris Hempleman and John Donahue are non-voting members but bring technical expertise and Marjorie Wolfe and Mr. Mackey would also offer technical advice.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated Mark Swartout is also on the BAC.

Commissioner Averill pointed out that Mark White is not on the BAC. Mark White confirmed that Glen Connelly represents the Tribe on the BAC.

Mr. Taylor requested that Dave Muller from the PUD be on the committee.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated it was the consensus of the group at the work session that putting Mr. Muller on the committee might be a conflict of interest and thought it best not to include him.

Mr. Taylor stated the consensus of the group at the work session has no power to choose what the Board does.

Chairman Willis stated since not all the board members were at the work session the discussion should be brought up again.

Mr. Muller stated he was not in attendance at the work session and did not hear the discussion regarding the conflict of interest. He stated the way the coordinated study is proposed hydro is not a piece of it, if that was the issue of conflict.

Chairman Willis stated the statement that came up was the "appearance of fairness". She asked Mr. Mackey what that would mean as far as this process is concerned.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA was looking for technical expertise since the group would need to coordinate with the Corps of Engineers and the PUD experts. It was pointed out that the same PUD consultants could apply for this job. With the PUD on the panel there could be an appearance of not being fair or unbiased. There was no question about whether Mr. Muller would do a good job or not; it was always about the appearance of fairness.

Chairman Willis stated another aspect of the panel is there are members who can vote and those who cannot vote and that the PUD could provide technical service within the conversation.

Commissioner Averill stated the PUD could be an ex officio member. He would push strongly to open the panel to the PUD operating in an ex officio capacity because they bring an expertise to this discussion. They were one of the last PUD's to build a dam in the state of Washington. They would know who is best qualified to do this type of project.

Ms. Lee agreed.

Chairman Willis stated during the morning's discussion it was obvious that the PUD is held in very high regard by this Board for its work and the contributions it has made. The appearance of fairness was the only issue.

Ms. Lee asked if we could get legal counsel's opinion.

Mr. Michael Golden, Lewis County Prosecuting Attorney, stated the issue of conflict of interest is not a legal issue because there is no direct financial benefit.

Mr. Cook stated the comments were not regarding the legality but the appearance of impropriety.

Mr. Golden stated this is a legislative body and the committee that is being discussed about is an eight-vote body, so potentially it would be one vote out of eight. It sounds like this would be a non-voting position; there is no direct financial interest to the PUD so the legal theories that lie behind the conflict of interest do not apply here. Regarding the appearance of fairness, that does not apply to this body either. The appearance of fairness that you are concerned about may apply to someone who is reading the newspaper; but there is no legal appearance of fairness doctrine here.

Mr. Taylor stated the BAC is an advisory group and hopes it will stay away from making any policy decisions. Policy decisions are made by the Flood Authority board.

Commissioner Averill stated there will be a recommendation made by the BAC. The decision rests with this Board.

Commissioner Averill amended the motion to add Dave Muller as an ex-officio member of the committee. Mr. Schillinger seconded.

Chairman Willis stated the motion to consider is: Amend the RFP motion so the committee members consist of the BAC and Dave Muller is added as an ex-officio member. She asked for objections. There were none and the amendment passed.

Commissioner Averill stated the Board still needed to vote on the main motion which is to pass the RFP for the Phase 2B study without regard to in-kind match for the Corps.

Chairman Willis asked for objections. There were none and the motion passed.

10. Flood Districts

Mr. Mackey stated ESA was asked to prepare a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to a consulting firm to help the Board look at the two options for governance and finance for a permanent flood district. The two considerations would be a Flood Control District and a Flood Control Zone District. The RFQ requests the consultants to bring together stakeholders in the Basin and help the Flood Authority make the decision of which type of district to pursue and to assist in the formation of the district. There is some urgency to this because if the supplemental budget passes there will be funds for another year but there is no guarantee that there will be funding after that.

Mr. Mackey explained what the RFQ asks of the applicants, which are found in the memo in the member packets. It is suggested that the BAC also reviews these applications and bring a recommendation to the board members.

Commissioner Averill moved to approve this recommendation. Mr. Schillinger seconded.

Commissioner Averill asked to speak to the motion. He asked that a short string be put on the study and that the concentration of the actual formation be the focus. Commissioner Averill has asked Mr. Carter to study the options and advise us as this is not a simple process. We need the expertise to advise us and he strongly recommends approval of the RFQ.

Mr. Bill Bates stated this is a cut and dried issue that we should proceed with a flood control zone district. We could have a workshop to go over the pros and cons and approve it at a subsequent meeting. It seems simple to move ahead and he is not in favor of spending more money on a study.

Mr. Mackey stated the first part is not a study at all. The Flood Authority expressed discomfort in understanding the differences between the two options and being able to explain to their constituents why they made the choice. That information will come from the consultant and move us quickly in the direction you decide.

Chairman Willis stated this conversation has come up outside this circle. People perceive this as being a study and it is not a study; it is the facilitation of the particular act of forming a district or zone district. Mr. Carter did a very good job this morning explaining the differences between the two, the steps we need to take to get to an answer and to forming either of them. We want to get the facilitator to help us move through that. Depending on which district we choose, the other County Commissioners need to make a decision on it as well. We do have the funds to move forward on this and it is one of our obligations under the RCW that formed the Flood Authority to get to the formation of a flood district.

Commissioner Averill stated there are about eight different options. Will the supervisors be the county commissioners or will they be elected; will there be a property tax to pay for the district; will fees be levied for those who receive the greatest benefit; how can we operate through the entire basin with three separately formed districts. Those are some of the questions that need to be answered. The flood district that exists currently is a very simple structure and it cannot do what the new body will need to do when it is formed.

Mr. Schillinger agreed that Mr. Carter did a very good job this morning. Perhaps an alternative to a consultant would be to have Mr. Carter act as the facilitator.

Chairman Willis stated that Mr. Carter stated a lawyer would not fit this position because the expertise required would need to come from someone who has already formed one of these districts.

Mr. Cook stated the Flood Authority spent an entire work session a couple of months ago specifically on this subject. While it clarified a lot of things it brought more questions than answers. We need the right answers to move forward and he is in favor of the RFQ.

Chairman Willis asked if there was opposition to the RFQ. There was none and the motion passed.

11. Memo from the City of Chehalis

Chairman Willis referred to the meeting notes from December 17 and the conversation regarding new items being put under the GI study and the Twin Cities project. At that time Commissioner Willis suggested changing the resolution to read "...support from the Authority for consideration of the projects listed" as opposed to "for inclusion of the projects." She opened the discussion.

Mr. Taylor stated the City of Chehalis believes this is an important issue to consider. No matter what happens with the levees or retention project, the tributaries still need to be addressed. There is no objection to the amendment made.

Commissioner Averill made a motion to adopt the proposal by the City of Chehalis. Mr. Taylor seconded.

Mr. MacReynold stated the initial request was that the Flood Authority considers the inclusion of the projects listed as part of the Twin Cities project. Those identified projects were the primary and secondary access to Providence Hospital, China Creek flood control, levee location and maintenance responsibilities, flood control levee protection at the Chehalis-Central Airport property, the Dillenbaugh Creek improvements, SW 20th Street storm drainage improvements, Coal Creek improvements, Kresky Avenue improvements, and upstream mitigation of the Chehalis River. The information the city received was that unless there is some formal action by this body it makes it more difficult for our Federal

partners as part of the Corps project to consider those things. There has been a great deal of discussion since that meeting and we feel we are having on-going communication but as Mr. Taylor identifies we still are looking to this body to support us in this request. If the Corps projects proceed at any level those things need to be addressed.

Commissioner Averill asked that this message get to Mr. Goss, who had left the room. When the original Twin Cities project was completed the cost benefit analysis left some things out. The cost benefit analysis did not permit the Corps to work on the China Creek problem. The Corps said they are limited by a certain amount of funds and there are some things that will get done and others that will not get done. What does not get done will be the responsibility of the local sponsor.

When we looked at the Skookumchuck Dam we thought that 20,000 additional acre feet of storage was what we needed to help our neighbors down river to prevent a rise in the river. The Corps stated they could only fund 11,000 acre feet and they would provide us the data but we would need to pay for the additional 9,000 acre feet.

In summary, the Twin Cities Project as originally designed was not going to solve all the problems. Commissioner Averill's concern is not whether the problems are solved or not, but what will and will not be solved because then we have to face it. If there are areas left unprotected we need to know so we can evacuate people, animals and equipment before they are flooded.

Chairman Willis asked if Commissioner Averill is suggesting that the Flood Authority supports the items that are on the list.

Commissioner Averill stated that is correct.

Chairman Willis asked if there was any opposition to the motion. There were two opposed. Chairman Willis stated we are a consensus board and asked if there was any discussion that can rectify the opposition.

Mr. White stated one of the requests is for Dillenbaugh Creek and yet the City continues to fill the creek and alter the creek. Do we keep making changes because the City continues to fill or will the City not issue any more permits until the situation is resolved?

Mr. Taylor stated Mr. White's statement is inaccurate.

Mr. Bob Nacht, Chehalis Community Development Director, stated that the City of Chehalis permits activity in the flood plain consistent with the national, state and federal requirements. We do not permit filling in the flood ways. The flood plain currently under all regulatory environments allows development in the flood plain and we are consistent with those requirements. Our permit activity is posted on the city's website each week.

Commissioner Averill stated specifically to Dillenbaugh Creek, modifications were made with concurrence with the Corps and DOE and some of those modifications will not be completed until Phase 2 or Phase 3 of the project gets going. It was not the City of Chehalis being in violation of what was done on the Dillenbaugh. It worked with the appropriate authorities to ensure appropriate mitigation took place.

Mr. Nacht stated when the City of Chehalis receives an application for development in the flood plain or any sensitive area, all the agencies, resource agencies, and the Tribes are allowed to comment on them when we process the application. In this particular case the amount of work that was done on the Liberty Plaza site was approved by the DOE and the filling of the flood plain is consistent with local state and federal laws and was run through SEPA, etc. All comments received were taken under consideration when the permitting activity was done.

Ms. Fowler asked why it is on the "fix it" list now.

Commissioner Averill stated that has nothing to do with what took place. In the 2009 flood the Newaukum and the Dillenbaugh Creek were the two that caused the closing of the freeway. While we closed the freeway for three or four days the actual obstruction by water was about 6 hours. The City is saying it wants Dillenbaugh Creek improvements included and that was the reference to "fix it."

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if this conversation could be held during a work session.

Commissioner Averill had no objection to delaying this decision for another month.

Chairman Willis asked to table this discussion and put it on a work session agenda rather than take it to a 60% vote which is the alternative to a consensus.

Mr. Schillinger wanted to make sure Mr. Nacht and Mr. MacReynold are invited to that work session so they can provide information.

NEW BUSINESS

12. Expenditure Review

Mr. Johnson summarized the expenditures and budget status. There were two pages, one containing the breakdown of the expenditure by line item requested by the Board and the second shows the expenditures as they relate to the budget amount. He specifically mentioned column two which is the adjusted budget amount. It reflects the new agreement with the Office of Financial Management and Lewis County with respect to the changes within the line items. It does not affect the bottom line. About \$64,000 was spent last period, the majority of which went to consulting and studies. There is \$1,196 million still encumbered and a balance of \$141,887.

Mr. Johnson confirmed that the \$1,162 million on the detailed report is a running balance from 2009.

13. Confirm Next Meeting and Board Requested Topics

The next meeting will be March 18 at 1:30 at the Lewis County Courthouse. There will be a morning work session beginning at 9:00 and the location is to be determined. Mr. Easton stated it is anticipated it will be at the Veterans Museum and the members will be advised.

Mr. White asked if there could be a discussion regarding the new FEMA maps at the next work session. The Chair agreed.

14. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.