

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

**July 15, 2010
Meeting Notes**

Flood Authority Members Present: Terry Willis, Grays Harbor Commissioner; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Julie Balmelli-Powe, City of Chehalis; Edna Fund, City of Centralia, Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda

Consultants Present: Chris Hoffman, John Ghilarducci, Pam Bissonnette and Hugh Spitzer, FCS Group

Others Present: Bruce Treichler, Ric Abbett, Northwest Steelhead and Salmon Conservation Society; Davit Plotz, Lewis County PUD; Mark Swartout, Thurston County; Tony Briggs, Trans Alta; Bob Johnson, Lewis County; John Donahue, DOT; Glenn Carter, Lewis County; Merlin MacReynold, City of Chehalis; Marqise Allen, The Chronicle

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 9:06 A.M. Self-introductions were made by all attending.

Welcome and Meeting Overview

Mr. Chris Hoffman summarized the goals for this morning's meeting: to select the approach for the initial formation of a flood entity; to present an entity formation schedule; to define key issues; to discuss next steps.

He reviewed the Flood Control District (FCD) versus the Flood Control Zone District (FCZD). The Chehalis River Basin draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan analyzed seven organization and funding structures. It is recommended that either a FCD or a FCZD be selected by the Flood Authority and a final decision made by the fall of 2010 by the Boards of County Commissioners.

Summary of June 24 Workshop

Mr. Hoffman summarized the June 24 workshop where the Flood Authority discussed the pros and cons of the FCD and FCZD and the policy choices available for both. The Flood Authority provided feedback on the desirability of phasing the governance structure and financing. The consultant agreed to provide a phasing recommendation at the July 15 meeting. A complete summary of the workshop was included in the member packets and is available to anyone who requests it.

Mr. Bob Johnson stated he is part of a group that is looking at potential changes to state statutes as they relate to special purpose districts. If that group is successful in getting a change in the legislation and it is a good match for what the Flood Authority is trying to do in the basin for flood control, then any decision in the fall of this year would be premature.

Mr. Hugh Spitzer stated that may make sense when we talk about the interlocal entity. The process sponsored by DOE and DOH is to spruce up statutes formed for utility purposes such as this. Anything that happens in that process will only complement what we are doing. The process is looking at ways to improve the interlocal cooperative act to make it more user-friendly so jurisdictions can form interlocal entities that have more drive and they better understand what they are doing. It can be a loose joint board such as a non-profit corporation or an LCC or partnership. Under non-profit corporations you

organize under certain acts which are set up for private non-profits, not municipal non-profits. Statutes need to be cleaned up so the municipal interlocals are public, not private.

Purpose of Flood District

Mr. Bruce Mackey referred to the memo in the packet regarding the purpose of flood districts and reviewed what has been discussed previously, such as the type of entity that should be formed, rates and charges, what a flood district is intended to do. The statute that established the Flood Authority also mandates a permanent district and it must be formed by July 2011. A District can undertake big and small projects and look at structural objects, etc. Right now we need to determine what the District will do in the first three or four years and think about things that affect people basin-wide, such as the early warning system, stream gauges, etc.

The Flood District could work with current projects and it could become the local sponsor for those projects. In the Plan are the various projects and two things emerged: that there is not enough information about some of those projects for engineering and the early formation of the District to take over those activities, and the funding for the projects. You could wait until later to have rates and charges for various zones. We need to put together a technical staff to spend time on flood mitigation. There are some things that could be organized and more focused on in the near term and in the long term look at capital projects and then look at rates, taxes and assessments to pay for them.

Chairman Willis stated there is some angst that we are not going out to the public with the formation of the District. By putting off some of those things the public will be able to have a voice as to whether they are taxed or how much they want to see done.

Formation Approach and Schedule

Ms. Pam Bissonnette spoke about the formation approach and schedule of the District. The Flood Control Zone District is recommended as the ultimate mechanism. She summarized the Power Point which included governance, the parties to be included, interlocal agreements to determine allocation of costs, revenues raised by each party and initial boundaries.

Mr. Spitzer stated cities could be members of this type of entity especially if they have a drainage utility. The concept is having entities which can do things separately.

Commissioner Averill stated we need to determine how large the governing body should be.

Mr. John Ghilarducci stated if you do this with a new or existing FCZD and impose a tax within each sub zone in the basin boundary it is a policy question as to how the cities participate. The subzones could overlay the tax on top of what the cities are charging. There is nothing that states that a county could not overlay a tax on top of the city's tax.

Mr. Jim Cook stated the County Commissioners could set up a board and tweak the rules to reflect what we are doing and designate people from the jurisdictions. Commissioner Averill stated the FCZD does allow for an advisory board. Mr. Cook believes everyone should have a voice; Commissioner Averill agreed, stating that cities are important.

Mr. Johnson stated if the statutory decisions rest with supervisors and through the interlocal cooperation act you form another entity, how is the governance set up without having unwieldy governance? Mr. Spitzer stated that is a policy issue that you will have to work out. Legally if you form

a type of intergovernmental flood entity you can add tribes or cities. Decisions are driven by the interlocal agreement; one entity, one vote, or you can do tiered voting mechanisms which a number of entities are doing. There is both tiered and weighted voting and it can get complicated.

Mr. Johnson understands that if a group is formed under the interlocal cooperation act there is no bond capacity for that group. Mr. Spitzer stated if it is a watershed partnership it is permitted to borrow money. To do so effectively it must have strong binding promises that they pay back the debt service.

Mr. Mark Swartout asked where the county engineers come into that. Mr. Spitzer stated he had not thought about that. They are obviously players. The question was asked if the engineering work could be delegated to someone who is hired.

Ms. Bissonnette stated under this structure you are still talking about three counties; therefore there are three county engineers. Mr. Swartout stated the role must be determined through the interlocal.

Mr. Merlin MacReynold asked if cities could opt in or opt out of the District. There was discussion about the boundaries and opting out. Ms. Bissonnette concluded that if a city is within the flood boundary it cannot opt out.

Questions were raised about taxes. The District will have the right to set the rates and fees. There can be a tax and there can be fees for special projects. A tax can only be imposed by the FCZD. Mr. Spitzer explained that a tax is a property tax; charges are imposed on special projects; and assessments are special benefits to properties.

Ms. Julie Powe asked if each flood district can do its own project or would it have to be in conjunction with all the others. Ms. Bissonnette stated a sub-zone can be formed within the FCZD and it can do its own project.

Ms. Bissonnette stated the final step today would be the decision on the Flood Authority provisional decision. There are three issues to be determined:

1. Should an interim entity be formed by an interlocal agreement?
2. Should a Watershed Management Partnership be the focus of the interim entity?
3. Should options be retained for a multi-county Flood District in the future?

Chairman Willis asked if a decision needs to be made on these at this time. Ms. Bissonnette stated yes as that will give the consultants the direction they need to go.

Chairman Willis recessed the meeting and stated these issues would be voted on when the group reconvened.

Chairman Willis reconvened the meeting at 10:25. She pointed out that at this morning's meeting we are using a work shop schedule and we do have the authority to make decisions here. We have a quorum of our members and we can make a provisional decision on where we think we want to go, which is not binding. We will have the opportunity to go in a different direction in the future.

Commissioner Averill made a motion to approve all three provisional decisions. Ms. Powe seconded. Mr. Cook asked if there is a reason why this vote must be taken now. The Flood Authority is a consensus body and he suggested the vote be taken at the afternoon meeting with the entire board present.

Ms. Bissonnette went through the formation schedule so the group could see the timeline for the various steps needed to get the work done on time.

Chairman Willis suggested the group make a decision on each item separately.

1. Should an interim entity be formed by an interlocal agreement?

There was unanimous agreement on this issue.

2. Should a Watershed Management Partnership (WMP) be the focus of the interim entity?

The group asked for more information on the WMP. This entity would take advantage of the Legislation; it is an entity created for this type of thing and it has more tools associated with it compared to another entity under the interlocal cooperative act. Why interim? It would be created by the three FCZD and that could become the permanent flood authority. This lets you get something going right away. It could also later morph into an entity that is a truly separate entity, not an inter-governmental entity (special purpose district). This will get you going after the "yes" vote on the first question.

There was unanimous agreement on this issue.

3. Should options be retained for a multi-county Flood District in the future?

There was unanimous agreement on this issue.

Chairman Willis reiterated that all three items were approved as read and that will give FCS the direction they need to continue their work.

Mr. Cook wanted it noted in the meeting notes that there was a consensus on all three items.

Mr. Swartout asked if Thurston County decides not to form a FCZD and uses its utility district, can the district use rates and charges to support an administrative function. Mr. Spitzer stated it can use rates and charges to support any of the activities of that entity. If it is a true special assessment, it cannot.

Ms. Powe asked if it can do revenue bonds or are those based on assessments. Mr. Spitzer stated there are two categories: general obligation bonds backed by taxes and revenue bonds backed by anything other than taxes. A FCZD can issue general obligation bonds backed by taxes voted on by the people. A WMP can issue revenue bonds; it does not have the power to tax. No one gets bonds unless they can prove they have a permanent stream of revenue from somewhere to repay it.

Chairman Willis suggested coordination between FCS and the other consultants with what the Flood Authority needs to do. She would like to see a work plan to determine what can be achieved in the next twelve months. We don't want to work on something that takes up time that can be used for more important work.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA's plan is in the budget presented to the Flood Authority. That is not full time work and there is enough time to meet the obligations we promised to deliver to the Flood Authority. We also have a time set to work with FCS on this project.

Ms. Bissonnette stated the next steps are the meeting schedule, how to interact with individual counties and the level of public outreach needed for this effort. If the latter is wanted immediately Mr. Hoffman

can put together a public outreach strategy. FCS will work with Mr. Mackey on a combined schedule or program to budget the time. Mr. Spitzer will continue answering questions, such as those regarding the county engineers, and bring back policy issues that are germane to the direction given us. We will not bring information to you that you don't need to make decisions on now.

Discussion followed regarding how to coordinate with the BOCCs. Mr. Swartout stated he has scheduled a meeting with his BOCC on September 23 for an update. In October there will be a follow-up with a specific briefing on the District formation. All of the commissioners reminded the consultants that their time will be bumping up against budget meetings, union negotiations, etc. Time is tight for everyone.

Mr. MacReynold stated the cities of Centralia and Chehalis make up a large portion of the county population. Speaking for Chehalis, if the council is not on board with the FCZD there could be issues. The cities need to be brought into the meetings with the county people. Chehalis is very conservative and very concerned about taxes.

Ms. Bissonnette stated there is an outreach program for the cities, tribe, etc. Mr. Hoffman stated he wants to develop a public plan to involve the cities. If it's a presentation to the council, he can adapt. He was thinking of waiting a little longer until there is an economic analysis so it will be easier for the public to understand.

Mr. Cook suggested putting together a brochure with a fact sheet or something similar to take to the city councils.

There was discussion about holding special meetings with FCS. It was decided that on the third Thursday of every month the special meeting would take the place of the work session at least through the end of the year. Mr. Mackey stated that if there is an issue that needs to be addressed it can be taken to the business meeting and we may need to add time onto that meeting.

Chairman Willis stressed that these morning sessions are no longer considered work sessions and that it is very important that the board members attend. Mr. Bruce Treichler suggested advertising the meetings to keep the public aware.

Ms. Powe asked if public comment would be allowed at these special meetings. Chairman Willis stated we would keep that option open. If the crowd becomes too large we may need to change our meeting format. The time and place of the special meetings will not change: Veteran's Museum, third Thursday of every month from 9:00 to 11:30 am.

Mr. Hoffman asked if the group would like to see a public involvement plan at the next meeting. Mr. Mackey stated we have not talked about concurrent things. There are political decisions that could backfire if we don't have all the information; working with individuals is great but before you go public you need information. Emphasize what needs to be done before you go public. Ms. Powe thought it should be introduced to the public right away.

Mr. Hoffman stated the first meeting would be an overview of the work done; the second would be specifics of boundaries and rates.

The business concluded and the meeting adjourned at 11:36 am.

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

**July 15, 2010
Meeting Notes**

Board Members Present: Mark White, Chehalis Tribe; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Julie Balmelli-Powe, City of Chehalis; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Mark Swartout, Thurston County; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor Commissioner

Board Members Absent: Chip Elliott, Town of Pe Ell, Ron Schillinger, Mayor of Montesano

Others Present: Please see sign in sheets

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from June 17, 2010
- Ongoing Efforts Update
- Memo from ESA Adolfson re: County Work on Flood District Formation
- Expenditure Review

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 the agenda

There were no corrections or additions to the agenda and it was approved.

4. Approval of the June 17 meeting notes

There were no corrections or additions to the June 17 meeting notes and they were approved.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Ric Abbett, President of Northwest Steelhead and Salmon Conservation Society, read a letter into the record. It stated that not all of the elected officials and community leaders within the Chehalis Basin are in support of the Twin Cities proposal for dams. It stated the leaders don't have a clear understanding of downstream impacts due to these proposed projects nor of the costs and benefits associated with these projects. It went on to say that there is an increasing interest in a moratorium on steep slope logging and floodplain development. There is also support for the restoration of natural processes in the Basin forestlands and floodplains to mitigate devastating floods.

Mr. Abbett encouraged the Flood Authority to continue its work to identify the most cost effective and durable flood mitigation strategies through the basin. [A copy of Mr. Abbett's letter is available upon request].

6. Reports

a. Chair's Report

Chairman Willis stated two special meetings were held to discuss the formation of a flood district. One was on June 24 and the other was this morning in place of the Flood Authority work session. Some minor decisions have been made to continue the process.

Washington Department of Transportation had a meeting regarding a visual project program where a future project can be seen on a digital display. Mr. Donahue will speak to this in a little more detail.

Last Saturday, Commissioner Valenzuela and Chairman Willis were invited by the Northwest Steelhead and Salmon Conservation Society to go on a plane ride over the river basin. It was a very interesting way to see the proposed dam sites after seeing them from the ground. She thanked the NWSSCS for providing that opportunity.

b. Member Reports

Commissioner Averill stated DOT is doing some freeway widening from Grand Mound south to Lewis County to Exit 81. There is some concern about impacts caused by the Mellen St. widening project, namely the levels of flooding during a 100 year flood event when that project is constructed. The DOT must mitigate against an increase in water that might be created by a project. Lewis County and the cities of Centralia and Chehalis are on the WSDOT sounding board to look at those mitigation projects. They may also impact the projects that the Flood Authority and Corps of Engineers are doing. The Corps is familiar with what DOT is doing and has been working with them.

Ms. Fund stated there will be a meeting on September 23 at the Centralia Middle School for citizens to talk to the Corps about what is happening with the levee projects.

c. Correspondence

Chairman Willis received a letter from the City of Chehalis stating that Ms. Julie Balmelli-Powe will be the representative of that city on the Flood Authority and Mr. Taylor will assume the alternate position.

The Thurston County Pomona Grange sent a letter supporting the retention study, the proposed coordinated study of retention and levees, the reauthorization of a significantly different USACE Twin Cities project with water retention as the primary element that may include levees as a secondary element, and moving toward a flood control zone.

Chairman Willis stated that all correspondence is available upon request.

d. Corps of Engineers Report

Ms. Andrea Takash reported that the Seattle Corps staff met with the Northwestern Division staff on July 8 to discuss both the Twin Cities Project and the GI. The discussion focused on the potential of putting the flood risk management components of the Twin Cities Project and the GI on the same path. The intent is to decrease the cost and schedule on both projects. The next step will be a teleconference with headquarters staff early in August. The Corps will continue to pursue a solution to address the community's concern with the cost and schedule of the projects while still abiding by the applicable laws, regulations and policies.

There was a Twin Cities Project mitigation meeting which was very successful; however a final list was not determined for the mitigation sites so they will meet again on July 21. A final list is expected at the September 1 meeting.

The Corps met with some representatives of the Flood Authority on June 30 to discuss what the September public meetings will look like. Dates and times have been decided: the meeting times will be from 4:00 – 7:00 pm. From 4:00 to 5:30 will be an open house; 5:30 to 6:00 will be a presentation and from 6:00 to 7:00 will be an open mic session for questions and answers. The locations will be: Centralia Middle School on September 23; Swede Hall in Rochester on September 29; and Montesano City Hall on September 30.

The Corps is working on the airport levee rehab which is on schedule and should be completed by the end of July. That is a restoration project to bring the levee back up to its 50-year protection. Next will be the Salzer Creek levee rehab which will commence after the SW Washington Fair closes on August 22. That project will bring the levee back up to its pre-flood protection, which is a 50-year flood protection.

Commissioner Averill clarified that these are existing levees and they are being restored to their original condition and levels of protection.

Ms. Takash stated there is still the Skookumchuck levee which will not be done this summer and the Long Road levee was completed a year ago.

e. State Team Report

Mr. John Donahue stated Curt Stiles at WSDOT runs a section called Visual Engineering. He and others met and Mr. Stiles explained his program that is similar to a Photo Shop process where projects such as the Twin Cities Project could be visualized by property owners and businesses. Flood Authority members were invited and everyone believed there is value in this type of project. The costs involved would be part of the in-kind agreement that the State is currently updating with the Corps. A couple of preliminary still images will be developed for review by the group later and we would work with the Public Works staff at the three jurisdictions affected by the Twin Cities Project. There will be a committee that will review the product and decide where to go from here with that and some other technology that Mr. Stiles introduced to us. The update on the in-kind agreement is still a couple of months out and any work by Mr. Stiles will come after that.

Mr. Donahue is continuing to track the topic discussed by Ms. Takash, the joining of the flood studies under a single authorization and looks forward to the conclusion next month.

Commissioner Averill stated this technology is very interesting. Some questions were posed regarding different methodologies that we would want to show because people are concerned about where the water might go if a levee is put in a particular place. This is a proposal that is just coming forward. We need to know if there will be a cost to us or if it can be funded through some other source, such as the money set aside for the Twin Cities Project. We do not know what the Corps' capability is in this area and this may be duplicating something at the Corps level.

Chairman Willis thought this type of technology would be interesting to use where the Mellen Street Interchange is going to go with the Twin Cities Project in place.

Mr. Donahue hopes some of these questions can be answered at a subsequent meeting after looking at what Mr. Stiles does in a couple of priority locations. We can then consider where we want to go. At that time Mr. Donahue will have information about whether the cost will be incorporated into the current sponsorship agreement or shared in some other way.

f. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. David Plotz stated the EES update is in the member packets. They have completed some model runs and have started incorporating some of the benefit/cost impacts into that report. They are working with the Corps to ensure they are using the most current data for the Basin. The hydrology models are under way. EES is continuing to refine the dam designs because of the request of flood control versus flood control and fish augmentation. They are taking a hard look at the design of the dams and hopefully they can provide that report within a few days.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Ongoing Efforts Update

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Plan was approved on June 17 and authorized Chairman Willis to send out letters to the jurisdictions encouraging them to adopt the plan and that has been done.

On the Early Warning Program, West Consultants have contacted both County staff and emergency operation centers and are putting together a group of people to look at the web portal design so that it meets the needs of the local jurisdictions.

LiDAR is still on hold because of the budget. All the other items are on the agenda for discussion.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA just finished last year's contract under their budget and Mr. Mackey is happy to report that a little over \$82,000 has been returned to the Flood Authority's budget. Part of that is because the General Investigation did not take the time that was anticipated and there were some staff changes. The money can be used as the Flood Authority sees fit.

8. Peer Review and Fisheries Study

Mr. Mackey reported that the Peer Review contract has been signed and the review is under way and should be completed by July 23.

The fisheries RFP went out and proposals came back last Monday. Those have been distributed to the selection committee. Three proposals were received and interviews, if necessary, will be conducted on July 22.

Mr. Johnson stated he has a placeholder with his County Commissioners for July 26 for adoption and approval of that contract. He asked if that was a reasonable time or if it should be re-scheduled.

Mr. Mackey stated if the interviews are on the 22nd those will be followed by negotiations with the firm that is chosen to refine the scope and budget. That most likely will not be done until the end of July and Mr. Mackey anticipates the contract will be ready the first part of August.

9. Flood District Formation

Mr. Mackey stated the flood district formation kick off meeting was June 24. Discussions included options of a flood control district or flood control zone district, the schedule, and the policy decisions

that need to be made. The group looking at district formation met again this morning and had a discussion with FCS and came to some basic conclusions: an interim entity could be formed by interlocal agreement which would meet the June 2011 deadline; they will proceed with a Watershed Management Partnership being the formation of that. These are tentative agreements meaning FCS Group can get more information and begin to show what kinds of decisions need to be made. It was clear that taking this approach does not foreclose future options, such as refining the formation or being able to deal with rates and charges.

Commissioner Averill stated alternatively the interim organization would morph into a flood district or flood control zone district which would probably require legislation. Current legislation does not have a single entity multi-county flood control zone district if that is the direction we want to take.

10. Staff Work on Flood District Formation

Mr. Mackey stated it is critical to gain economic and population information for FCS to begin the economic analysis and look at the benefits and costs associated with forming a district so people can make informed decisions. In doing that, information was sent to ESA and ESA sent it to the counties, Tribe and jurisdictions. In the original budget \$40,175 was put aside for staff work. That was to compensate the counties and other entities that were trying to provide this information. We are recommending that the counties use this portion of funding to meet these requests by FCS with oversight from the Board Advisory Committee. We suggest you do that for work that is already under way and that you approve up to that amount being funded to do this work as long as there is oversight by the BAC. Mr. Mackey stated there is a memo in the packet on this issue.

Commissioner Averill appreciates the recognition that the compilation of this data involves costs and since the legislation provides funding we are making it available to the Counties who need to provide data. He is not fond of passing to the BAC the job of making decisions for this Authority in terms of priorities of how this money might be expended or if we need to determine if more money needs to be provided in order to accomplish the objectives. The BAC can provide oversight but the decisions should come before the Flood Authority.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA is asking the Board to make the decision that they could spend up to that amount on that task.

Commissioner Averill stated his issue is prioritization. He is concerned that the first items will get paid and there will be no money left for the others. He asked how these are going to be prioritized.

Mr. Mackey stated it will be difficult to keep it on schedule if every step requires authorization from the Board. We knew this information was coming in so how can we get the Board's approval? He asked Mr. Swartout if he remembered how much was being looked at for the first request.

Mr. Swartout stated Commissioner Valenzuela's concern was the same. If one county came in early with their billing will the other counties or cities be reimbursed for their costs? On the other side of it he has spoken with his GIS department and he does not know how he can give ESA a cost. Perhaps GIS can give an estimate of what it will cost; once everyone submits an estimate the fear can be alleviated that we will go over budget.

Mr. Mackey stated the BAC did consider this and discuss it. Mr. Swartout stated each entity will have different levels of information to give and that needs to be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Averill suggested sitting down with FCS to determine their priorities. We can estimate some costs and then decide if they need the GIS studies or what the most important need is.

Mr. Johnson stated there is a list detailing the data that they need. Some of that data is readily available. Mr. Johnson met with the Lewis County GIS manager and he looked at what kinds of data are readily available from Lewis County GIS. He estimated how long it would take to assemble that and how much it would cost. It is not that much money, less than 10 hours. Mr. Johnson believes the \$40,000 is more than enough to do that. If we have to come back for approval on every expense we are going to be several months down the road getting this accomplished.

Mr. Mark White stated he looked at the list and he said nearly all of it can be easily downloaded from the Internet. It is a waste of time to send the list to the jurisdictions. The group should download what they can.

Commissioner Averill stated he would go along with this but at the point that you see you will be in trouble you need to come back to the Board.

Chairman Willis stated final authority sits with this Board.

Mr. Swartout is waiting to hear from his GIS department and if Grays Harbor County can do the same thing we should be able to come up with a cost estimate that will not go over the \$40,000 figure.

Chairman Willis asked what is needed from the Board at this time since this is a line item in the budget.

Mr. Mackey recommends that the counties should be allowed to use this money on the establishment of the basin-wide flood district as needed, provided all expenses are approved by the BAC in advance and provided that they do not exceed this amount.

Mr. White asked if this is limited to just the counties. Mr. Mackey stated it is all the jurisdictions in the flood authority that provide the information and he would change the language to read "jurisdictions".

Mr. Jim Cook made the motion; Dan Thompson seconded. There was no further discussion. No one opposed and the motion passed by consensus.

11. Flood Awareness Week

Mr. Swartout explained that four jurisdictions are in the NFIP Community Rating System. Those include Thurston and Lewis Counties, Chehalis and Centralia. A lot of credit is received for the public outreach effort for flood awareness. Thurston County is starting a flood awareness week this year and he does not want it to be confused with a disaster preparedness expo. This will begin on October 25 and if other jurisdictions are interested in doing something like this it would be helpful if everyone did it the same week. It makes sense that the entire basin is conducting the same kind of public outreach at the same time.

The sort of things we are thinking about doing is for the BOCC to adopt a proclamation that that week is a flood awareness week. There is a "map your neighborhood" program on October 27 for people who come to the training to learn how to prepare for an emergency.

On October 23 Kevin Farrell with DOE will be presenting a program. The activities include proper sandbagging techniques, how to do a property risk analysis on your property, individuals can learn how to do a rapid response to an emergency. On October 25 there will also be a faith community workshop which will focus on flood response.

There will be media tips, a flood bulletin mailed out to everyone who lives in the flood plain and a telephone notification program which individuals must sign up for in advance.

It would be very beneficial if other jurisdictions in the basin were to participate in these programs at the same time.

Chairman Willis stated this is a good program and asked Mr. Swartout to send out information to all the jurisdictions. She also noted that because of the early warning and preparedness the last flood's damage was considerably less than the previous.

Mr. Swartout stated the high schools in Thurston County will be having a sand-bag filling competition.

12. Ecosystem Services

Mr. Mackey stated the report from Earth Economics had been distributed and Mr. Dave Batker offered to make a presentation if the Flood Authority would like him to do that. There will be no extra cost for that presentation.

Commissioner Averill stated if Mr. Batker does come there needs to be a time limit set for the presentation. All the board members have seen the revised study and Commissioner Averill does not see the value of a long presentation.

Mr. Mackey believed twenty minutes would be enough time and it will be during the regular meeting.

Mr. Swartout, speaking for Commissioner Valenzuela, suggested leaving the time open in case there is considerable conversation or questions.

Chairman Willis asked Mr. Mackey to add Mr. Batker to a future agenda at Mr. Mackey's discretion.

NEW BUSINESS

13. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the report looks different because of the way the OFM contract reads with respect to the budget appropriation. There are three categories: governance, studies and the early warning system which are spelled out in the appropriation. Included in the governance column are three things that were individual line items in the last budget report, which were salaries, supplies, goods and services, travel and ESA Adolfson facilitation services. Studies include studies that were contracted prior to July 1, 2010 and the early warning system which was spelled out specifically in the appropriation and funded for a specific amount.

For the period of June 14 to July 14 there was a total of \$40,623.70 expended; most of that had to do with studies. There is an unencumbered fund balance and Mr. Johnson assumes studies and other work will use that up. It was refreshing to hear about the rollover from Mr. Mackey and he thanked him and his staff for being so efficient.

14. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting will be Thursday, August 19, 2010 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. The morning meeting, a special meeting rather than a work session, will be held from 9:00 to 11:30 at the Veterans Museum. These special meetings will be to discuss the formation of a flood district with the FCS Group. Decisions can be made at those meetings; the public is encouraged to attend as well as the board members. The special meetings will continue through the end of this year.

On Friday, July 16 at 2:00 the Fisheries Study Peer Review sub-committee will meet at the Timberland Service Center. The public is invited. It is possible there will be interviews on Thursday, July 29.

Chairman Willis thanked the media for attending the Flood Authority meetings and getting information out to the public.

15. Adjourn

The business before the Flood Authority concluded and adjournment was at 2:40 p.m.