

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

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

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called meeting to order at 9:25 A.M.

2. Introductions

Self introductions were made by all attending. Mr. Kahle Jennings, Centralia Public Works Director, will be the alternate for Bill Bates at the Flood Authority work sessions.

3. Project Selection Workshop

Mr. Bruce Mackey stated there were three things to get through this morning: 1) Clarify the role that the Flood Authority wants to take in funding projects and how you want to spend the money you have. 2) Determine what success looks like over the next year. What do you want ESA to do? What do you want in the Plan? 3) Do you like the process for gathering information and the process for making decisions leading to a basin wide package? Do you want the decision matrix and criteria used?

Mr. Mackey distributed copies of House Bill 3375 and House Bill 3374 which provide funding for the Flood Authority and briefly described the bills.

Chairman Averill clarified Bill 3374. The bill was originally put in by the governor to provide local share for the Twin Cities levee project. The wording was changed saying if that project does not go forward then the money would be available for other projects. It is local (non federal) share money so if there is an agreement with the Corps for a project related to the Corps project then that project may qualify.

Mr. Mackey stated Bill 3375 states the Office of Financial Management (OFM) will step forward to participate in a flood mitigation project and the Flood Authority is to participate in the mitigation projects in the Basin. The OFM would be the non-federal sponsor for the Corps projects in the Chehalis Basin and projects to be developed under 2581, the Basin wide General Investigation (GI) study. They will not allot funds unless there is agreement of all at the table. This is reiterated in the interlocal agreement.

Chairman Averill stated there is additional money. The GI study has a congressional grant of \$575,000 for basin wide studies. Because it is federal money and is in the Corps' hands that money has to be matched locally.

It was Mr. Mackey understands that the GI study was to use the efforts that the Partnership put together for the match.

Ms. Lee Napier stated that is correct. We continue to use the Flood Authority because it is changing to a multi-purpose study.

Mr. Mackey stated the money boils down to some kind of basin wide package made up of three pieces: the Twin Cities, the PUD project, and the GI study. If you get federal money in the future, it will probably come from the Corps. We are trying to get the scope going with both the Flood Authority issues and Partnership issues and how projects can be listed in broad terms so they are available for funds when the study is done. We will meet with the Corps to be sure the funding is there now and can be carried over to the next fiscal year. Mr. Mackey talked to Sean Murphy and their delegation was adamant that if those funds have a contract they would roll over.

Mr. Mackey's chart showed where the \$2.5 million would be used: Flood Authority staff, consultants' plan, and ripe and ready projects: Phase II; the Skookumchuck Dam; early warning; Ecosystems; hydraulic; LiDAR; decision support tool.

The plan is the Flood Hazard Management Plan we have been working on. Regarding the Twin Cities project, the local jurisdictions, Flood Authority, Governor's office and the House must approve it if you use the \$47.5 million.

If you are committed to the Ripe and Ready projects, the Twin Cities and PUD projects and a basin wide package, how do you want to spend the money you have? Are these the projects you want to fund?

The way the plan is laid out we will look at alternative analysis today and the list ends there with a list of projects. Right now we have pressure to have deliverables fairly soon. The early warning system and regulations will be done this year. If you look at the legislation and interlocal agreement, the Flood Authority is charged with looking to move as quickly as possible to a flood district, which brings up the question of governance and finance. There are ways to have governance and finance that will meet legislative intent, such as individual flood control zones. ESA can look at alternative ways of governance and finance and include in the plan alternative ways through jurisdictions as well as the advantages and disadvantages. It provides an open discussion to the public as to how the Flood Authority will move to a flood district with the ability to raise funds.

Commissioner Willis asked if we are demanded to form a flood district by legislation.

Chairman Averill stated this funding bill did not demand a flood district but said the money would go to a Flood Authority which could be a district.

Mr. Mackey stated the interlocal agreement states the Flood Authority would oversee the flood mitigation work until a flood district is formed and adopted.

Mr. Mackey suggested that ESA could include this as another chapter in the plan. You can make a good decision and it serves to politically taking pressure off of individuals

asking for projects. Having some type of governance would help you find a home and deal with those individuals.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if it is too soon to know, if we form a flood district, a ball park figure that a district could raise.

Chairman Averill stated the current legislation allows a flood control district to collect .50 on each \$1000 of assessed property value. We have to have a property evaluation with the district; however that district is not just restricted to financing itself from property taxes; it can also get state funding or grants.

Mr. Mackey stated there could be zones that benefit more or less from mitigation and would pay more or less accordingly. If you want to create a district, you put it on the ballot and it goes to a vote.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if there is another option where each county can choose to create its own taxing authority. As we think about the governance chapter, we need to think if we are going to do this as a basin wide approach or county by county.

Mr. Mackey stated if you are looking for a basin-wide package it will cross county boundaries. If you took a flood control zone district, you could create a zone in each county and have an interlocal agreement and implement the package. He feels that providing a plan for governance and finance would give you alternative ways to fund and give technical assistance and it would give information to the elected officials. It would give alternatives to put things together and let you manage expectations. If you like that idea, we would work towards explaining the plan to include that. Mr. Mackey needs to know where the Authority wants to spend its money and what does success look like. The plan you have is a work in progress and all of the work will not be done by the end of the year, but everything must be anticipated so you know how to move forward.

Chairman Averill stated we have 200 identified projects. Some are very small and some are large. When we talk about financing some of these projects, it does not need to be through the Flood Authority or district. For instance, Montesano's treatment plant project got funding. It is a project we want done because it contributes to the overall issue but we don't have to fund it.

Mr. Jim Cook stated the consensus was to move forward and get some shovel-ready projects started.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated regarding governance and finance, perhaps we should lay out a couple of different governance alternatives: our idea of optimal governance form and as we go through the public comment process we want to hear the public's comment and leave the final structure open until we hear those comments.

Mr. Mackey stated as the consultant ESA must be careful what it provides, which will be information. There will be outreach and workshops but we cannot advocate.

Chairman Averill stated we cannot count on the levees to be maintained. If we do something with the Skookumchuck, we need an agreement with Trans Alta or we have to do it, so we must have a structure to have the ability to operate and maintain whatever we do.

Mr. Mackey stated that would be a policy decision that the Flood Authority needs to make.

Commissioner Willis stated as we choose the list of projects we are going to do, and if they have to be sustained, then we must figure out how to sustain them and that must go on the list.

Mr. Mackey presented the PowerPoint. He explained the Prioritization Matrix and the Considerations for Evaluating Projects.

Chairman Averill stated some chapters did not get a lot of attention; the plan needs to go back to jurisdictions and see how it impacts those jurisdictions and then it will be refined.

Mr. Dave Carlton stated it is a work in progress; we worked on goals but that does not mean they cannot be changed. Chapter 1 lists the goals.

There was discussion about funding a project; who might fund it and how to weight it because of possible partners. Grant money would allow a project to move up on a list of potential projects. If it is funded by another agency, that would free up the Flood Authority's money for another project.

Mr. Mackey stated these are the questions for which you need information. When you look at a package how do you hone it down to meet your goals.

Potential Prioritization Criteria

Chairman Averill asked if slide two information should come before slide one.

Mr. Carlton stated before we answer questions, do we need answers to the first three questions before we rate it? If it is not defined, it will be difficult to rate.

Chairman Averill asked if this is the first stage. There are some projects that will be immediately approved and others that will have opposition, such as dredging projects.

Mr. Carlton stated you may come up with a dredging project and it will be at a specific location.

Mr. Johnson stated dredging, impoundment, etc. are concepts, but until you specify a dike that will be so high and will go at a certain location, it is not a project; it is a concept. You should not eliminate the concept.

Mr. Connelly stated if an answer is “no” the project will not be crossed off the list but it will not have as high a priority.

Mr. Mackey stated you are talking about an ongoing capital projects list.

Discussion followed regarding the matrix. Suggestions included changes to some wording, such as: not “ability to fund”; just “fund” and take “ease” out of ease of permitting.

Mr. Carlton asked: Should ability to fund be a criterion for prioritization? Should the ability to operate and maintain be a criterion? Operation & Maintenance almost never comes from a grant. O & M would be under the prioritization criteria but may not be appropriate to list the funding as a prioritization. Make the distinction: bonds, grants, etc.

Mr. Johnson stated looking at a big expensive project would be difficult and would need a lot of permits. That project, then, would not get a high priority because it would be difficult to meet all these goals. It may meet the goals and may be the most cost effective but the matrix would score it low.

Mr. Mackey stated that brings up the point of weight. If it is going to be cost effective and have positive environmental benefits it will be weighted higher.

Commissioner Willis stated if it is expensive it will rate lower and that should not be the decision maker. Funding should just read “funding” and eliminate the word “expensive”.

Mr. Mackey asked if the high, medium and low rating was a good approach.

Chairman Averill stated it is a good starting point; we will need to run through a few to see what types of questions arise and adjust accordingly.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated it helps her to know how to pick and choose a project.

Mr. Mackey stated this is making decisions on the major regional projects in the basin-wide package. It does not deal with the list of 200. You need to have some discussion on how to deal with those.

Chairman Averill stated he is reluctant to throw out any of the 200 projects because they have been sponsored by a local jurisdiction. He would like to sort out whether it is a project that would fit in the basin wide plan and if a jurisdiction can take care of it or if a state agency can take care of it.

Mr. Carlton stated you can also use the ranking system to compare alternatives and you may actually want to do the funding.

The Chair recessed the meeting until 11:07.

Mr. Mackey stated there was good feedback on the first three questions. Governance and finance still needs to be included in the plan. One piece not talked about is the list for ripe and ready. He asked how the Flood Authority wants to handle the expectations around those.

Chairman Averill stated the first issue is: does it fit or does it not fit the goals. For those that fit the goals a secondary step is who should follow that project: a county, the State, or should it be something the Flood Authority should do?

Commissioner Valenzuela stated we discussed the inclusion and relative prioritization of projects, so starting here is leaping. She does not want to take anything off the list.

Mr. Mark Swartout asked the purpose of the list. Will it be important to have 1 through 200; they won't do #1 if they have money to do #10. If you took a dredging project and the answer is no on the first three questions, it goes down to the low tier but we say why. People who came to the public meetings can see why it is low tier but when we get more specific information it may go to a different tier. Perhaps they could go into categories.

Mr. Mackey stated it argues for going through the first three questions but it doesn't mean it's not a go; it just means we do not have enough information.

Discussion followed: are there duplicate projects; are projects being adequately defined; combining projects to get more affect; timeliness: are there projects that need to be completed before another can begin?

Mr. Kahle Jennings stated the projects we are focusing on now have basin wide implications and he assumed the 200 projects are more local projects. We will evaluate the projects in the context of the planning projects as they evolve. There may be some projects that will have basin-wide implications.

Commissioner Willis stated it was her understanding that the small projects would be worked on along with the larger projects.

Mr. Carlton stated you are setting up the expectation that you will be doing the local projects but how will you fund the projects when the pot of money runs out?

Chairman Averill stated some projects can be equated to local match on the Twin Cities project and then we can draw on the \$47.5 million.

Discussion: what project is more important to each jurisdiction; should proponents of a project see how the project scored; what would be the basis for categorization; should an initial judgment be done on each project.

Mr. Jennings asked what the role is of the Flood Authority. Should we be in the mud and the dirt or should we be at the 50,000 foot level looking down?

Commissioner Willis stated we told the public we would deal with the big projects and that we will deal with at least some of the smaller projects. We only have \$2.5 million to work with so are we obligated to subtract some of the larger projects?

Chairman Averill stated when we go through the list of 200 there will be some that are local projects and they will be done by the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Swartout stated that is where the governance and finance comes in. For example, Thurston County has a storm water project. We could create a storm water utility to do that project. What benefit does a project have for being on the list? If you have a project on a list and apply for a grant it will get more points.

Mr. Mackey asked if the Flood Authority has indicated it will fund some of these 200 projects.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated we said we would look at them and that means putting all 200 projects through the screening process.

Mr. Jennings stated we are getting distracted looking at the 200 projects when we should be getting the funding mechanism in place to fund more projects. We need to identify some component of that \$2.5 million to go towards some of these projects.

Commissioner Willis stated we are obligated to the public to spend some of that \$2.5 million on some small projects.

Mr. Cook stated the City of Montesano had the money to fund its waste water treatment plant project; perhaps we should go through the list and see if any of the projects can be funded locally.

Ms. Julie Powe suggested each district prioritize its list and then the Flood Authority can look at the importance of each jurisdiction.

Mr. Connelly stated having a project list is important because the formation of a flood district would depend on where the money was being spent and the project that would protect the largest number of people.

Mr. Swartout stated most of the \$2.5 million has been spent but the Flood Authority voted to move forward on those projects so the Flood Authority can make decisions on what projects should be done.

Mr. Mackey asked where we go from here.

Commissioner Willis agreed with Mark, but a critter pad is needed and there is no scientific issue for that. We must keep track of all the things we have had requests for.

Chairman Averill stated there is enough information to start a process.

Mr. Jennings suggested looking at the \$2.5 million to see if we can carve out some of that to focus on some projects.

Mr. Swartout stated the money should be spent on projects for regional benefit rather than on a specific benefit.

Mr. Mackey stated you are looking at a basin wide package and what you have put together is designed to look at the basin.

Chairman Averill stated if there is a project out there, there may be other sources for funding: grants, local assistance, or we can ask the Legislature.

7. Adjourn

As there was no other discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:41 A.M.

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

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

Members Present: Ron Averill, Lewis County; Jim Cook, Aberdeen; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County; Chad Taylor, City of Chehalis; Bill Bates, City of Centralia; Mark White, Chehalis Tribe.

Members Excused: Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano; Kathy Martin, Town of Bucoda

Members Absent: Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from June 18, 2009 Work Session and Business Meeting
- Ripe and Ready Studies Report
- Respective Roles of Authority and Partnership
- Roles Diagrams
- Expenditure Review
- Draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan
- Actions Taken
- EES Progress Payment No 2

1. Call to Order

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

2. Introductions

Flood Authority members and the audience introduced themselves.

3. Approval of Agenda

Without objection, the agenda was approved.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes from June 18, 2009

Without objection, the meeting notes of the work session and business meeting were approved.

5. Public Comments

Mr. Vince Panesko, Richland, WA, commented on the statement made at the morning work session regarding the 50,000 foot view of the Basin. This view would encompass other states and would also give a view of how they are handling their flooding issues. Just recently Oregon signed a funding bill to help with the removal of four dams from the Kalama River Basin which will open about 300 miles of salmon spawning areas. There is an opinion in Lewis County that putting in dams is the right thing to do. Mr. Panesko

believes the Flood Authority needs to look from the high view at what other parts of the country are doing; that it is odd when other states are tearing dams out that we are considering putting dams in.

Mr. Panesko stated the Chronicle is working against the Flood Authority on expectations and that is because there is a groundswell in the Lewis County area that the dams will solve all the problems. He stated the dam will lower the water at Mellen Street by only two feet and there were people in Centralia that had six feet of water in their homes. Phase I of the PUD study did not say how many feet the river would be lowered at different locations, nor did it talk about the floods in other years.

Centralia is hit the hardest of the cities because of Salzer Creek, China Creek and the Newaukum River. Chehalis has the Coal Creek, Dillenbaugh and the North Fork. The North Fork River has an intake. If fish cannot get beyond the intake, put the dam and flood control gates there. That can be done on waterways through Centralia. You need a basin wide solution to all the rivers and solutions have been glossed over.

Mr. Patrick McHugh represents a product called Aqua Fence, a rapidly deployed floodwall barrier. Mr. McHugh wished to introduce this product to the Flood Authority and design engineers to be considered for emergency response. He had information available and requested to be put on the agenda at a future meeting for a PowerPoint presentation. The Aqua Fence is currently installed in Mt. Vernon to protect the downtown historic area.

6. Reports

a. Chairman's Reports

Chairman Averill reported that the Department of Ecology sponsored a tour of the upper basin of the Chehalis River for the Washington Hydrologic Society. We briefed them on what the Flood Authority is doing and problem areas in the basin. A letter of appreciation was received from that agency.

This morning's work session involved discussion of how to go through the process of project selection. The Flood Authority held public meetings and asked for nominations for projects which resulted in approximately 200 projects. The Authority now needs to determine how to rank the priority for a project and which ones can be funded.

Two months ago the Flood Authority discussed the appropriation of \$574,000 from Congress for the Corps of Engineers' General Investigation. We talked with the Chehalis Basin Partnership, who already has a scope of work with the Corps, about putting these two projects together and combining the funds. We do not have the results of that study and there are still meetings to be held between the Corps, the three Counties and the Tribe to agree on any additional work requirements that may need to be added to the study. Also to be determined is what is to be paid for by the Partnership and what is to be paid for by the Flood Authority.

Chairman Averill stated ESA Adolfson will provide copies of the Flood Hazard Management Plan later in the meeting. These plans should be taken back to the members' jurisdictions to see how they fit with existing plans. There are two objectives for this plan: 1) to identify the projects we need to do, and 2) to create a model flood hazard management plan so all the plans complement each other rather than work against each other. There is still work to be done on the plan.

b. Member Reports

Mr. Bill Bates wished to address Mr. Panesko's comments. Last month Mr. Panesko made some comments regarding the Phase II study and the figures that Mr. Panesko brought to our attention. Mr. Bates would like to see those. In addition, Mr. Panesko had some good comments today and Mr. Bates would like to know what we are doing with the Dillenbaugh, the China Creek and Salzer Creeks. At this point Mr. Bates has not seen anything about these areas. He is assuming they will all be in the Phase II study report. The 50,000 mile idea was his when he talked to Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Jennings. He stated it feels like we are dealing with the minutiae when we should be looking at what could be done immediately and not ten years from now.

Chairman Averill stated the morning work session addressed this issue specifically. There are three parallel efforts: the Basin-wide study of the Flood Authority; the Twin Cities project headed up by the Governor's office and the Corps; and the third is what we need to do about a continuing organization should we build a flood mitigation project for operations and management.

Some of the questions Mr. Bates asked about the Dillenbaugh, China Creek and Salzer Creeks relate to the Corps project. Most of the issues brought up by Mr. Panesko fall into the water retention project of the PUD. The last Authority meeting was with all the stakeholders as to what the scope should be to ensure we are answering all the questions that are out there. The questions raised will go into that study.

The Corps is currently bringing up the original study of 2003 to its 35% model and looking at the 2007 and 2009 flood results and that addresses one of Mr. Panesko's points. We know when we have floods that the main cell of the flood does not always appear at the same location. Depending on where the cell locates determines the results on the river. The data from both of those floods is being considered. Once we have that data we plan through the technical committee to see what types of protection and additional things to look at and study. The 2003 study did look at the China Creek and determined that it did not meet the cost benefit ratios and therefore it was left out. A question directed to the Corps was what else was left out. If it will not be part of the Corps study we may need to make it a Flood Authority project or a local project to get done.

Mr. Bates asked if we are looking at a Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority in the diagram, should we have a third person here from the Corps of Engineers.

Chairman Averill stated the diagram was drawn up because we are getting involved with an increasingly large number of cooperative projects with the Chehalis Basin Partnership. The Earth Economics study that was approved last time is one such project. We are in the process of re-defining the GI study so it meets both the Partnership and Flood Authority requirements. Having this cooperation has resulted in asking the question: What is the role of the Partnership and what is the role of the Flood Authority so we know what is being done and why we are working with each other. That will be further explained later in the agenda today.

c. Correspondence

A letter was sent from the law office of Davis Wright, Tremaine on July 7 to members of the Flood Authority and all jurisdictions. It states that the American Trucking Association and its state affiliate, the Oregon Trucking Association, are concerned that we are not making significant progress to relieve the impact of flooding that occurs in the Chehalis Basin. They suggested if we do not take action we might be eligible for tort claims and they are requesting a response to their letter.

Mr. Mackey and the Chair have had a discussion regarding this letter and asked the Governor's office to look at it and asked for an opinion from the Attorney General. Essentially, the AG stated that there are no grounds for a tort law suit against either the Flood Authority or any jurisdiction. We discovered that the Washington Trucking Association was not a party to this and they were disturbed that this letter had been sent by the national association to a Washington entity on behalf of Oregon instead of Washington and they do not necessarily agree with it. Not all of the Oregon Truckers Association was made aware that this was being done. In other discussions, it appears the main problem is that the Association has not been able to find enough information about what the Flood Authority is doing to satisfy them that we are working towards solutions.

The Governor's office suggested we meet with the truckers in Vancouver. The Chair believes this is a good idea. It will allow an opportunity for the Flood Authority, individual members, the Corps and the Governor's office to explain about where we are going and what our plans are. No date has been set but members will be notified so they can attend if they wish to do so.

Commissioner Willis asked if the members had been provided with the Attorney General's letter.

Chairman Averill stated they have not, but it will be sent to them.

f. Corps of Engineers Report

Mr. Bill Goss, USACE, stated the Corps is working on the 35% design portion of the Twin Cities Project. There are people in the field who are verifying the economic data to update the cost benefit data. At the end of July or early August field verifications will be done on areas of future work for the project to look at utilities, roads, etc, to verify that the drawings are correct.

The Chehalis Basin GI project is also being conducted. A feasibility evaluation will be conducted and weighted equally for the entire basin for both the ecosystem restoration and for flood risk management. The feasibility study identifies ecosystem restoration and flood risk management projects and these recommendations will go into the feasibility report.

Chairman Averill stated there will be several open houses scheduled for the Twin Cities project.

d. State Contingent Report

Mr. John Donahue gave the dates and locations for these open houses:

Thurston County: September 16 at Swede Hall, Rochester

Grays Harbor County: September 23 at Montesano City Hall

Lewis County: September 30 at the Centralia Middle School.

All meeting times are from 4 – 7:00 P.M.

On August 4 there will be a meeting to review Corps material and provide suggestions as to how to conduct the open houses. Glen Connelly is the Chehalis Tribe's representative for that meeting. As part of that, we would like to present information regarding the Corps GI study. Mr. Donahue requested working with the Flood Authority staff and the BAC to review content and collaborate on what that part of the display will look like.

Chairman Averill asked if there was any objection. Hearing none it was approved.

Mr. Donahue stated work with the BAC would commence in the next couple of weeks and when we meet again in August there will be a final version of that information.

e. Facilitator's Report

Mr. Bruce Mackey spoke of the letter from the trucking association. He suggested that since the letter was written to ESA Adolfson, ESA should write back, ignore the accusations and invite the association to meet with Flood Authority members, the Corps and whoever else is appropriate.

The Chair asked if there was any objection. There was no objection and it was approved.

Mr. Mackey stated he has met all the Flood Authority members and appreciated everyone's candidness.

Mr. Mackey attended the Chehalis Basin Partnership's meeting and found that very interesting. He thanked Lee for the invitation.

This morning's work session was very productive in defining the goals and the roles that the Flood Authority wants to play in allocating the \$47.5 million as well as the \$2.5 million. An idea was created as to what success might look like, and that is extending the plan that ESA will produce over the next year to include a section in Governance and

Finance. A memo will be drafted to address some of the issues that were discussed and will be brought back at the next meeting for the Authority's consideration.

Mr. Mackey stated Dave Carlton has left ESA Adolfson and joined the firm PBS & J; however ESA made it clear that the Flood Authority project is one that ESA wants to continue to support and has contracted for Dave's services through PBS & J. Mr. Mackey congratulated Mr. Carlton on his new position and thanked him for still working with ESA and the Flood Authority.

Chairman Averill stated a piece of correspondence was missed. Commissioner Willis mentioned an article in the Daily World regarding \$1 million to the Corps. Congress is in its 2010 appropriation process and the House has made a proposal. The Senate will need to do the same. He asked Mr. Sean Murphy to explain.

Mr. Murphy stated he is quite sure the Senate has gone through its process and the Daily World article mentioned by Commissioner Willis reflects the numbers related to what the Senate has already done. Included in the House version is \$500,000 for the Twin Cities project for 2010 and \$500,000 for the GI study to allow the Corps to continue on both those efforts. Final appropriation is subject to joint conference agreement.

g. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. Dave Muller, Lewis County PUD, stated EES Consulting continues to work on the Phase II study with two fronts: fisheries environmental work and the geo technical work. The first scoping meeting for the fisheries environmental work was on June 25 with a fairly good attendance. Commissioners Averill and Willis attended, as well as state agencies, property owners and private citizens. The meeting was to gather information regarding current available data on the Chehalis River, all related to water quality, water quantity and fisheries. EES Consulting had done some preliminary work and others in attendance, the Chehalis Tribe, WDFW and DOE, offered additional information. All that data will be consolidated into their scoping document which will most likely be available in August. At that point, additional studies will be defined for the environmental and fisheries side.

The geotechnical work is the other side. Shannon and Wilson is in the area conducting a site review, walking the ground of the dam site. The geo techs will be in the area next week. To date, they have had conversations with property owners about current information they have regarding the geo technical information, maps and aerial photographs.

Old Business

7. Ripe and Ready Studies Reports

Mr. Dave Carlton, PBS & J, reported on the various studies in the Ripe and Ready Report.

- Skookumchuck Dam modification feasibility has had enough work done to determine the existing large pipe under the dam is blocked with concrete. They are still investigating the idea of an agreement with Puget Sound Energy to

produce power and sell it to Puget Sound, particularly during the winter so the pool can be lowered. They are also looking at temporary siphons that could be used to drain the pool more quickly when there is notice of a flood event.

- Early Warning System program: We are still working on selecting and hiring a consultant under contract. That should happen before the next meeting.
- Ecosystems Services is still proceeding and the contract was signed last month. We are trying to set up a meeting between Ecosystems Services, ESA and the Corps of Engineers to determine how to potentially get some of their work incorporated in the cost benefit analysis for the GI study.
- The Lower Basin hydraulic model is something that has been discussed at length. This is a hydraulic model to estimate flood elevations and the extent of flooding between here and Aberdeen. There is a model but it needs to be updated with all the LiDAR information and new bathymetry. USGS would like to have that information for its decision support tool for which they are contracting with the Corps of Engineers. The Corps would like it so they can better refine what happens down stream if the Twin Cities project is to proceed. FEMA is also looking at re-doing the maps in both Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties, potentially starting as early as this fall. There are three potential partners who could front all the money, in which case we can use our money for another project. Part of Mr. Carlton's new job is working with FEMA in determining what needs a new flood study.
- Seamless LiDAR is in the contracting stage between Lewis County and the Puget Sound LiDAR consortium to get the LiDAR information we asked for. It is coming in at about \$70,000 under what was budgeted which is great news. That should be filmed this winter when the trees are bare.

A question was asked if the Flood Authority would see a flood map or spec sheet on that.

Mr. Carlton stated that could be done and there is already a map of where it will be and we are doing it to meet federal specifications.

- Decision Support Tool: USGS and the Corps have been working to reach an agreement on the scope of work. One problem is that in the original scope of work the model was to give average daily flows. For each day you should be able to determine how much water flowed past a point, but it would not give us flood peaks. The Flood Authority is really interested in what the peak flow is past the site because that determines the peak depth, or how much water someone will get in his house. The Corps said this is a different model and it will add about \$70,000 to the cost so we are still trying to work through that to come to some agreement.
- Analysis of Alternatives will be included in the USGS scope of work and it is about a year away.

Chairman Averill stated that the BOCC acting as Lead Agent did approve the agreement with Earth Economics and with ESA Adolfson. He asked that Mr. Johnson get copies of those agreements to all members of the Authority.

8. Approach to Regulatory Recommendations

Mr. Mackey stated during the June meeting the Flood Authority approved establishing a work group to evaluate existing flood related regulations for the member jurisdictions, and to develop findings and options to present to the Flood Authority. The Flood Authority will use those to recommend a consistent set of best use practices that various jurisdictions could follow if they desire to do so.

Also approved was for ESA to set up some meetings and work with designated people on the staff along with the BAC. Mr. Mackey is looking for nominees of people most familiar with each jurisdiction's regulations, such as planning or building staff. This will be done through three workshops. Mr. Mackey passed a sign up sheet around to the members and asked for the name and contact information of that person. A date has not yet been set for the first workshop but it is anticipated they will begin in August.

9. Respective Roles of Authority and Partnership

Ms. Lee Napier stated at last month's meeting she addressed the group about the Partnership and introduced the concept of clarifying the roles and responsibilities. It was brought to the Partnership's attention that there was confusion between the two groups. It was agreed that the roles should be clarified and in the member packets there are a couple of versions of clarifying roles.

The first version was introduced to the Partnership and while the Partnership liked the idea it did not quite clarify the roles and responsibilities. Commissioner Willis developed her idea which was simpler and then the BAC came up with its idea. That is the version titled "Cooperation between the CRB Flood Authority and the CB Partnership".

The Steering Technical Committee and the Water Quality Committee came up with their version and that was distributed at today's meeting and it is the version that Ms. Napier would like to present to the Flood Authority for consideration. Depending on feedback from the Flood Authority, it will go back to the Partnership next Friday.

Chairman Averill asked if the last version is acceptable to the Flood Authority.

Commissioner Willis recommended acceptance of the last version. She stated that some citizens said they knew of the two groups and asked how they compare to each other and under what circumstances are they working together. With those questions and the request for an explanation is how the first drawings started to appear.

Commissioner Willis asked if this had been seen by the public yet.

Ms. Napier stated the Steering Technical Committee and the Water Quality Committee provided input last week. Spencer Easton took it to ESA's graphic artist and this is the first time it has been seen.

Chairman Averill likes this version as it shows the statutes that put both organizations in place, the missions of each organization and meeting times.

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority has not adopted an official Mission Statement. He tried to say what he thought the mission is from various documents. We are not saying you have a mission statement, but you do have a mission and this is what you think it is.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if a flood district is created in the future, what would be the future of the Partnership.

Chairman Averill stated the Partnership has a different mission and will go on regardless of what mechanisms are available for flood mitigation. Its work on ecosystem restoration will continue. Unfortunately, all water basins are undergoing restrictions of funding to continue with their projects. If a flood district is formed, a decision needs to be made as to where the Flood Authority goes because the flood district would pick up all of the things we are doing.

Chairman Averill stated without objection, the final version would be adopted. There was no objection.

New Business

10. Expenditure Review

Mr. Johnson explained the expenses, with nearly \$1.5 million left for studies; however a portion of those dollars are obligated for ripe and ready studies that have already been approved.

Chairman Averill stated there is \$250,000 obligated to do the PUD Phase II. The PUD has submitted two bills to us and those will come out of the \$1,963,053.79 balance seen on the report.

Mr. Johnson stated without objection the financial people would come back with a projected expenditure budget that better reflects what has been obligated, what has been spent and what is left.

11. Flood Plan

Mr. Mackey distributed a copy of the draft Flood Hazard Management Plan to the board members. It includes a memo from ESA Adolfson that reflects some changes. The Plan has a CD included and there is a general index to the CD in Chapter 6 that explains how to pull up maps for a specific area. The maps are based on current FEMA maps.

The Plan is a living document, and as discussed at the morning work session, a section can be added on governance and finance. These chapters will change and will get more material as outlined in the memo.

Mr. Mackey stated the board members and the BAC each received a copy. If anyone needs a copy, please contact Spencer Easton.

12. Success Stories

Mr. Mackey stated the success stories, now called Actions Taken, are materials that are being put together to take to the open houses and for informational workshops, as well as a general update to the public. He passed around a mock-up poster for the basin for review.

The Actions Taken is in alphabetical order by Counties, Tribe and Cities and he would like to add or subtract from it as the members see fit. He asked that the people under each heading look at it to be sure statements are correct. If something has been missed they can be added and edits can be e-mailed to Spencer so they can be incorporated.

13. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting will be Thursday, August 20 from 1:30 to 3:30. *There will be no morning work session on that day.*

14. Adjourn

As there was no other business before the Authority, the meeting adjourned at 2:46 P.M.